AGENDA

Thursday, February 2, 2017
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
Watsonville City Council Chambers
275 Main St., Ste 450
Watsonville, 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 January 19, 2017 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

**POLICY ITEMS**

   *No consent items*

**PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS**

   *No consent items*

**BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS**

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

**ADMINISTRATION ITEMS**

9. Approve CalPERS health benefit contribution rates for plan year 2017 (Resolution)
10. Approve appointment to the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

11. Approve opening Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee Nominations

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

12. Accept monthly meeting schedule

13. Accept correspondence log

14. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to the City of Santa Cruz Council Members regarding the recognition of former City of Santa Cruz Public Works Director Bill Fieberling from the Bicycle Advisory Committee
   b. Letter to the County of Santa Cruz Public Works Director John Presleigh regarding appreciation of green bike lane installations from the Bicycle Advisory Committee

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

16. Accept information items
   a. Letter dated January 13, 2017 from Caltrans District 5 regarding the completion of the Highway 17 Access Management Plan
   b. 2018 California State Rail Plan Factsheet

REGULAR AGENDA

17. Commissioner reports – oral reports

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

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

20. Measure D Update
   (George Dondero, Executive Director, Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Summary of the voter-approved Measure D Ordinance
21. 2017 Legislative Program and Funding Updates
(Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Draft Legislative Program
   c. Comparison of State Funding Proposals from Gus Khouri, Central Coalition Legislative Assistant
   d. Comparison of State Funding Proposals from the California Association of Councils Government (CalCOG)
   e. RTC support letter for Assembly Bill (AB) 1 and Senate Bill (SB) 1

22. Highway 9/San Lorenzo Valley Corridor Plan – Contract Award
(Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a consultant agreement
   c. Scope of Work from the Request for Proposals (RFP)
   d. Project factsheet

23. City of Santa Cruz Rail Trail Project Phasing Plan and Cooperative Agreement
(Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. City of Santa Cruz staff report, presented at the November 1, 2016 Council meeting
   c. Resolution authorizing a cooperative agreement between the City of Santa Cruz and the RTC

24. Next meetings
The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 2, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean Street, 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 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 anticipo al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis.) Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance) by calling (831) 460-3200.
**TITLE VI NOTICE TO BENEFICIARIES**

The RTC operates its programs and services without regard to race, color and national origin in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Any person believing to have been aggrieved by the RTC under Title VI may file a complaint with RTC by contacting the RTC at (831) 460-3212 or 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 or online at [www.sccrtc.org](http://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](http://www.sccrtc.org). También se puede quejar directamente con la Administración Federal de Transporte en la Oficina de Derechos Civiles, Atención: Coordinador del Programa Titulo VI, East Building, 5th Floor-TCR, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, Washington, DC 20590.
MINUTES

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

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

1. Roll call

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

Members present:

Zach Friend  
Cynthia Chase  
Greg Caput  
Randy Johnson  
Jacques Bertrand  
Norm Hagen (alt)

John Leopold  
Ryan Coonerty  
Jimmy Dutra  
Bruce McPherson  
Ed Bottorff  
Aileen Loe (ex-officio)

Staff present:

George Dondero  
Yesenia Parra  
Grace Blakeslee  
Tegan Speiser  
Karena Pushnik

Luis Mendez  
Jenn Eames  
Amy Naranjo  
Kim Shultz

2. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

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

CLOSED SESSION

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

OPEN SESSION

4. Report on closed session

Commissioners reconvened to open session at 9:41 a.m. and there was no closed session report.
5. Oral communications

Jack Nelson, said that warnings from scientists about global warming are relevant to our local situation and the Commission should consider the impact of green house gas emissions when making decisions about local transportation.

6. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

A replacement page for the agenda and a handout for Item 21 were distributed.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Commissioner Johnson asked that Item 14 be pulled from the Consent Agenda. Item 14 was placed on the Regular Agenda as Item 19.1. Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Chase seconded the consent agenda, as amended. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Friend, Chase, Leopold, Coonerty, Caput, Dutra, Johnson, McPherson, Bertrand, Bottorff and Commissioner Alternate Hagen voting “aye”.

**MINUTES**

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

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

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

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

11. Accepted draft minutes of the December 15, 2016 Interagency Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

**POLICY ITEMS**

None

**PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS**

None

**BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS**

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

13. Approved City of Santa Cruz Article 8 Transportation Development Act allocation request (Resolution 13-17)

**ADMINISTRATION ITEMS**

14. Approve Executive Director’s Employment Agreement

Chair Friend moved the item to the beginning of the regular agenda as Item 19.1
**INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS**

15. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

16. Accepted correspondence log

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

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

19. Accepted 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**

19.1 Approve Executive Director’s Employment Agreement – *previously Item 14*

Commissioner Johnson requested clarification on the details behind the decisions made for the compensation package for the Executive Director.

Commissioners discussed: the comparative study completed to merit an appropriate compensation package for the Executive Director; the importance of ensuring a transparent process; and the RTC’s obligations in respects to salaries and tax payer money.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Alternate Hagen seconded the ad-hoc Committee’s recommendation to approve the following changes in the RTC Executive Director's contract: a one-time merit increase of 4%, effective January 1, 2017 and one additional week of vacation per year. The motion passed with Commissioners Friend, Chase, Leopold, Coonerty, Dutra, McPherson, Bertrand, Bottorff and Commissioner Alternate Hagen voting “aye” and Commissioners Johnson and Caput voting “no”.

20. Commissioner reports – oral reports

Commissioner McPherson reported that transportation funding bills are currently being discussed by the legislature and Matt Cate, Director for the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), stated that he is hopeful that Senate Bill (SB) 1 and Assembly Bill (AB) 1 will bridge the $2 billion transportation funding gap between those bills and Governor Brown’s proposal for transportation funding.

Commissioner Dutra reported that homes on Holohan Road at East Lake Avenue in Watsonville have been flooded due to the recent storms and he hopes that infrastructure issues in South County will be addressed and fixed in the near future.

George Dondero, Executive Director, reported on: the RTC sending letters of support to the legislature for transportation funding bills SB1 and AB1, and to advocate for an increase in funding to the Governor’s transportation funding proposal; President-elect Trump’s nominee for Secretary of Transportation, Elaine Chao, and her vague support of direct federal spending on transportation to rebuild the nation’s infrastructure; a Measure D update to be presented at the February 2nd RTC meeting, discussions with entities that are to receive direct allocations, the all-day workshop for newly approved self help counties; and his trip to the Transportation Research Board (TRB) annual conference in Washington DC.

22. Caltrans report and consider action items

Aileen Loe, Caltrans District 5 Deputy Director, reported on: Caltrans crews working hard to keep people moving while they respond to damages caused by the recent storms; the Highway 129 curve realignment project being delayed due to the weather; the installation of more hydrogen and fast charging stations to give people confidence when taking trips and to promote alternative fueled vehicle usage; and the reframing of the selection process for the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP).

Commissioners discussed: the fast charging stations completing a full charge in approximately 20 minutes; how fast charging stations installed at privately owned gas stations rather than only on Caltrans property could fill the location gaps; the procedures for Caltrans maintenance workers when dealing with homeless encampments; and California having the highest homeless population in the nation.

23. Presentation from City of Santa Cruz Public Works – oral report

Chris Schneiter, City of Santa Cruz Assistant Public Works Director, reported on current transportation projects in Santa Cruz, including: the Pacific Avenue Contra-flow Bike Lanes Project that will start in the spring; the Branciforte Creek Bike and Pedestrian Bridge and Trail project that will start in April; schematic design development for segment 7 of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST); the Highway 1 and 9 intersection safety project; safety improvement projects that were awarded grants for installation of rapid flashing beacons at marked crosswalks; and the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County matching grants for design and environmental review for segment 8 and 9 of the MBSST, and for designs to widen the walkway on the San Lorenzo Trestle.

Commissioners discussed: the distance required between flashing light beacons and the criteria for the locations; appreciation to the Public Works department for their success in obtaining grants for safety improvements and for coordinating with other jurisdictions; and appreciation for the Pacific Avenue Contra-flow Bike Lanes Project.

24. Agreement with the State Board of Equalization for Administrative Functions Related to the New Measure D Transportation Sales Tax Program

Luis Mendez, Deputy Director, presented the staff report. Mr. Mendez reported that on behalf of the RTC, the State Board of Equalization (BOE) will be administering the collection of the new Measure D ½-cent sales tax program that will take effect on April 1, 2017. He noted that there are administration fees associated with the BOE and staff will provide an update on development of the implementation plan in February.
Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Dutra seconded staff recommendations to adopt (Resolution 14-17) authorizing RTC managers to execute the Preparatory Agreement and Administrative Agreement with the State Board of Equalization; and to adopt (Resolution 15-17) authorizing examination of tax records. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Friend, Chase, Leopold, Coonerty, Caput, Dutra, Johnson, McPherson, Bertrand, Bottorff and Commissioner Alternate Hagen voting "aye".

25. Cruz511 Program Update

Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner, presented the staff report. Ms. Naranjo gave a live-feed tour of the Cruz511.org website and an update to the Cruz511 program, which included information on: real-time traffic conditions; construction and traffic alerts; information help desk services; the countywide bike map; online ride matching; outreach efforts for public information and awareness; online activity data tracking; and social media integration. Ms. Naranjo noted that the new user-oriented transit travel planning project will be aimed at acquiring new Metro bus riders, upgrading and expanding park and ride facilities for commuters, and inclusive targeted marketing for seniors and South County residents. Tegan Speiser, Senior Transportation Planner, reported that marketing plans to spread awareness about the program are currently being developed.

Commissioners discussed: their appreciation for the user-friendly services provided by the Cruz511 program; how Cruz511.org is mobile responsive and a great resource for finding information on traffic conditions, road closures, and ridesharing; how information is relayed and linked from other databases to Cruz511.org to show notices and alerts; utilizing the significant growth rate of users on Cruz511.org, that are checking on current road conditions impacted by the recent storms, to advocate for carpooling; partnering with other applications to leverage the program’s budget and to track Cruz511 referred ridesharing; comparing the Cruz511 program to similar programs at different agencies and making messaging consistent while incorporating the needs of the community; the need for targeted outreach to seniors in South County; consideration of personalized marketing plans when testing strategies for different neighborhoods and businesses; how the frequently refreshed Caltrans traffic still frames are available on the Cruz511.org map from Highway 17 through Highway 1 to Watsonville; satisfying the demands for additional Park and Ride locations in neighborhoods and updating signage; and appreciation to Tegan Speiser for developing the Cruz511 program.

Jack Nelson, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, said that the Bay Area Commuter Benefits Program has been shown to be successful and is an alternative to traffic congestion. Mr. Nelson noted that there is a crisis of imagination and a similar commuter program should replace plans for widening Highway 1.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Chase seconded staff recommendation to accept the Cruz511 program update. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Friend, Chase, Leopold, Coonerty, Caput, Dutra, Johnson, McPherson, Bertrand, Bottorff and Commissioner Alternate Hagen voting "aye".

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.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenn Eames, Staff

Attendees:
Erich Friedrich  Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
Alex Clifford  Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
Jack Nelson  Campaign for Sensible Transportation
Kara Guzman  Sentinel
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### TDA REVENUE REPORT
#### FY 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY15 - 16 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY16 - 17 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY16 - 17 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>601,300</td>
<td>618,978</td>
<td>629,500</td>
<td>10,522</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>101.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>801,800</td>
<td>825,373</td>
<td>839,400</td>
<td>14,027</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>101.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>872,384</td>
<td>898,032</td>
<td>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>632,900</td>
<td>-4,276</td>
<td>-0.67%</td>
<td>101.85%</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>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,970,056</td>
<td>9,059,403</td>
<td>5,321,745</td>
<td>96,651</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

I:\FISCAL\TDA\MonthlyReceipts\FY2017\[FY2017 TDA Receipts.xlsx]FY2017
TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer

RE: CalPERS health benefit contribution rates for plan year 2017

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that, as required by CalPERS, the Regional Transportation Commission adopt revised resolutions (Attachments 1 and 2) to continue providing CalPERS Health Benefits to RTC employees pursuant to the approved Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).

BACKGROUND

Medical insurance is currently offered to all RTC active and retired employees through the CalPERS Health Benefits Program as established in the Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with the RTC’s two bargaining groups and in the Executive Director’s employment agreement. As per these agreements, the RTC contributes to the cost of the employee’s health insurance premiums at levels established by each Memoranda of Understanding with the Community of RTC Employees (CORE), the RTC Association of Middle Management (RAMM), and the Executive Director’s employment contract. Currently, all of the RTC bargaining agreements are identical in terms of the amounts that the RTC contributes toward employee and dependent health premiums. The amount contributed by RTC for retired employees and their dependents is set at a lower amount than for active employees with annual increases as required by law.

The CalPERS Health Benefits Program is governed by PEMHCA, the Public Employees Medical and Hospital Care Act. To offer employee benefits through this program, the RTC must abide by PEMHCA rules and annually adopt and file resolutions with CalPERS regarding health insurance contribution rates for the upcoming year. Resolutions must be filed by November of the preceding year to establish the following year’s contribution amounts.

DISCUSSION

As required, the RTC has already approved and submitted to CalPERS resolutions for the 2017 health benefits. However, CalPERS notified RTC staff in December 2016 that the resolutions approved by the RTC in October 2016 and submitted to CalPERS in November of 2016 required re-approval by the RTC as some of the language has been revised by CalPERS. In addition, due to the increase in health
premiums, the RTC retiree contribution must be increased by another $50.00 for Employee plus 1 and Employee plus 2 to meet the minimum retiree contribution pursuant to government code 22892(c) CalPERS now also requires that the benefits for the Executive Director be on a separate resolution. Benefit levels remain the same for all RTC active staff as outlined on the resolutions approved at the October 6, 2016 Commission meeting.

The current Memoranda of Understanding for both the Community of RTC Employees (CORE) and the RTC Association of Middle Management (RAMM) specify the percentage of health insurance premiums to be paid by the RTC and by employees respectively based on the premium costs set each year by CalPERS. Premium and contribution rates for 2017 are included in Attachment 3. Premium payments made for the Executive Director are consistent with those provided to employees in the bargaining units.

The attached resolutions (Attachments 1 and 2) reflects the contribution levels and provisions established in the MOUs currently in effect until March 2018 and changes made by CalPERS.

SUMMARY

To continue in the CalPERS Health Insurance program governed by the Public Employees Medical and Hospital Care Act (PEMCHA), the RTC must comply with the rules and regulations set forth by PEMCHA and submit updated and reapproved resolutions by the end of February 2017 that set the contribution rates for health insurance premiums for this year. The resolutions before you today fulfill this commitment to meet the PEMHCA rules. Staff recommends that the RTC adopt the attached resolutions (Attachments 1 and 2) outlining the RTC’s health insurance contribution amounts for RTC active employees and retirees for calendar year 2017.

Attachments:
1. Resolution for CalPERS Health Benefits – CORE and RAMM Employees
2. Resolution for CalPERS Health Benefits-Executive Director
3. CalPERS/RTC Health Plan Rates for 2017 and MOU excerpt
RESOLUTION NO. 16-17
FIXING THE EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION AT UNEQUAL AMOUNTS FOR EMPLOYEES AND ANNUITANTS
UNDER THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT
WITH RESPECT TO A RECOGNIZED EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION

WHEREAS, (1) Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is a contracting agency under Government Code Section 22920 and subject to the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act (the “Act”) for participation by members of 001 General Rep/Mid Mgr/Unrep; and

WHEREAS, (2) Government Code Section 22892(a) provides that a contracting agency subject to Act shall fix the amount of the employer contribution by resolution; and

WHEREAS, (3) Government Code Section 22892(b) provides that the employer contribution shall be an equal amount for both employees and annuitants, but may not be less than the amount prescribed by Section 22892(b) of the Act; and

WHEREAS, (4) Government Code Section 22892(c) provides that, notwithstanding Section 22892(b), a contracting agency may establish a lesser monthly employer contribution for annuitants than for employees, provided that the monthly employer contribution for annuitants is annually increased to equal an amount not less than the number of years the contracting agency has been subject to this subdivision multiplied by 5 percent of the current monthly employer contribution for employees, until such time as the amounts are equal; and

RESOLVED, (a) That the employer contribution for each employee shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his/her enrollment, including the enrollment of family members in a health benefits plan up to a maximum of $973.61 per month with respect to employee enrolled for self alone, $1,844.73 per month for employee enrolled for self and one family member, and $2,398.15 per month for employee enrolled for self and two or more family members; and be it further

RESOLVED, (b) That the employer contribution for each annuitant shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his/her enrollment, including the enrollment of family members in a health benefits plan up to a maximum of $857.00 per month with respect to employee enrolled for self alone, $957.00 per month for employee enrolled for self and one family member, and $1013.00 per month for employee enrolled for self and two or more family members; and be it further

RESOLVED, (c) That the employer contribution for each annuitant shall be increased annually by 5 percent of the monthly contribution for employees, multiplied by the number of years the contracting agency has been subject to the Act, until such time as the contributions are equal;

And that the contributions for employees and annuitants shall be in addition to those amounts contributed by the Public Agency for administrative fees and to the Contingency Reserve Fund; and be it further

RESOLVED, (d) Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission has fully complied with any and all applicable provisions of Government Code Section 7507 in electing the benefits set forth above; and be it further
RESOLVED,  (e) That the participation of the employees and annuitants of Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission shall be subject to determination of its status as an “agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State” that is eligible to participate in a governmental plan within the meaning of Section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code, upon publication of final Regulations pursuant to such Section. If it is determined that Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission would not qualify as an agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State under such final Regulations, CalPERS may be obligated, and reserves the right to terminate the health coverage of all participants of the employer.

RESOLVED,  (f) That the executive body appoint and direct, and it does hereby appoint and direct, the Administrative Services Officer to file with the Board a verified copy of this resolution, and to perform on behalf of Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission all functions required of it under the Act.

Adopted at a regular meeting of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at the City of Watsonville Council Chambers, this 2nd day of February, 2017.

Signed: _________________________________
Zach Friend, Commission Chair

Attest: _________________________________
George Dondero, Secretary
RESOLUTION NO. 17-17
FIXING THE EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION AT UNEQUAL AMOUNTS FOR EMPLOYEES AND ANNUITANTS UNDER THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT WITH RESPECT TO A RECOGNIZED EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION

WHEREAS, (1) Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is a contracting agency under Government Code Section 22920 and subject to the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act (the “Act”) for participation by members of 002 Executive Director; and

WHEREAS, (2) Government Code Section 22892(a) provides that a contracting agency subject to Act shall fix the amount of the employer contribution by resolution; and

WHEREAS, (3) Government Code Section 22892(b) provides that the employer contribution shall be an equal amount for both employees and annuitants, but may not be less than the amount prescribed by Section 22892(b) of the Act; and

WHEREAS, (4) Government Code Section 22892(c) provides that, notwithstanding Section 22892(b), a contracting agency may establish a lesser monthly employer contribution for annuitants than for employees, provided that the monthly employer contribution for annuitants is annually increased to equal an amount not less than the number of years the contracting agency has been subject to this subdivision multiplied by 5 percent of the current monthly employer contribution for employees, until such time as the amounts are equal; and

RESOLVED, (a) That the employer contribution for each employee shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his/her enrollment, including the enrollment of family members in a health benefits plan up to a maximum of $973.61 per month with respect to employee enrolled for self alone, $1,844.73 per month for employee enrolled for self and one family member, and $2,398.15 per month for employee enrolled for self and two or more family members; and be it further

RESOLVED, (b) That the employer contribution for each annuitant shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his/her enrollment, including the enrollment of family members in a health benefits plan up to a maximum of $857.00 per month with respect to employee enrolled for self alone, $957.00 per month for employee enrolled for self and one family member, and $1013.00 per month for employee enrolled for self and two or more family members; and be it further

RESOLVED, (c) That the employer contribution for each annuitant shall be increased annually by 5 percent of the monthly contribution for employees, multiplied by the number of years the contracting agency has been subject to the Act, until such time as the contributions are equal;

And that the contributions for employees and annuitants shall be in addition to those amounts contributed by the Public Agency for administrative fees and to the Contingency Reserve Fund; and be it further

RESOLVED, (d) Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission has fully complied with any and all applicable provisions of Government Code Section 7507 in electing the benefits set forth above; and be it further
RESOLVED, (e) That the participation of the employees and annuitants of Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission shall be subject to determination of its status as an “agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State” that is eligible to participate in a governmental plan within the meaning of Section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code, upon publication of final Regulations pursuant to such Section. If it is determined that Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission would not qualify as an agency or instrumentality of the state or political subdivision of a State under such final Regulations, CalPERS may be obligated, and reserves the right to terminate the health coverage of all participants of the employer.

RESOLVED, (f) That the executive body appoint and direct, and it does hereby appoint and direct, the Administrative Services Officer to file with the Board a verified copy of this resolution, and to perform on behalf of Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission all functions required of it under the Act.

Adopted at a regular meeting of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at the City of Watsonville Council Chambers, this 2nd day of February, 2017.

Signed: _________________________________
Zach Friend, Commission Chair

Attest: _________________________________
George Dondero, Secretary
## RTC Employees and Retirees

Medical Plan Rates - 2017

Coverage Effective: January 1 2017 through December 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Code</th>
<th>Monthly Premium</th>
<th>RTC Contribution</th>
<th>EE Cost For Plan</th>
<th>EE Cost Admin 0.31% of Premium</th>
<th>Total EE Cost</th>
<th>EE PAY PERIOD COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3011 1,024.85</td>
<td>973.61</td>
<td>51.24</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>54.42</td>
<td>27.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>3012 2,049.70</td>
<td>1,844.73</td>
<td>204.97</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>211.32</td>
<td>105.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>3013 2,664.61</td>
<td>2,398.15</td>
<td>266.46</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>274.72</td>
<td>137.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>454 783.46</td>
<td>783.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>455 1,566.92</td>
<td>1,566.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>456 2,037.00</td>
<td>2037.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>450 733.29</td>
<td>733.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>451 1,466.58</td>
<td>1,466.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>452 1,906.55</td>
<td>1,906.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>2821 733.39</td>
<td>733.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>2822 1,466.78</td>
<td>1,466.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>2823 1,906.81</td>
<td>1,906.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3201 830.30</td>
<td>830.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>3202 1,660.60</td>
<td>1,660.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>3203 2,158.78</td>
<td>2,158.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>721 736.27</td>
<td>736.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>722 1,472.54</td>
<td>1,472.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>733 1,914.30</td>
<td>1,914.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3251 932.39</td>
<td>932.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>3252 1,864.78</td>
<td>1,864.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>3253 2,424.21</td>
<td>2,398.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>426 1062.26</td>
<td>973.61</td>
<td>88.65</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>91.95</td>
<td>45.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>427 2,124.52</td>
<td>1,844.73</td>
<td>81.76</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>88.35</td>
<td>44.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>428 2,761.88</td>
<td>2,398.15</td>
<td>106.28</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>114.84</td>
<td>57.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Retirees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Code</th>
<th>Monthly Premium</th>
<th>RTC Contribution</th>
<th>EE Cost For Plan</th>
<th>EE Cost Admin 0.31% of Premium</th>
<th>Total EE Cost</th>
<th>EE PAY PERIOD COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>857.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>957.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>1013.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner
RE: Appointment to the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

RECOMMENDATION
The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission:
1. Approve Dulce Lizarraga-Chagolla (Attachment 1) to the E&D TAC for the Social Services Provider- Senior position; and,
2. Nominate members of their community for vacant positions as shown in the revised membership roster (Attachment 2).

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

DISCUSSION
At its December 2016 meeting, the E&D TAC recommended that the RTC approve Dulce Lizarraga-Chagolla (Attachment 1) to the E&D TAC for one of the two Social Services Provider- Senior positions. This position was previously vacant. The other Social Services Provider- Senior position is represented by Clay Kempf, Executive Director of the Seniors Council.

Dulch Lizarraga- Chagolla is a community organization for the Central Coast Center for Independent Living (CCCIL). CCCIL provides advocacy, education, and support to people with disabilities, their families, and the community. Ms. Lizarraga-Chagolla has lived in Santa Cruz for 24 years. Attached is Ms. Lizarraga-Chagolla’s application to serve as a member of the E&D TAC (Attachment 1) including her statement of qualification/interest and a revised roster (Attachment 2).

The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve Dulce Lizarraga-Chagolla (Attachment 1) to the E&D TAC for the Social Services Provider- Senior position.

In addition, active recruitment is underway for vacant member and alternate positions representing:
- 1st Supervisorial District
- 5th Supervisorial District
Staff would appreciate assistance from commissioners in filling the vacant positions, both member and alternate positions. An E&D TAC membership application can be found on the RTC’s website.

SUMMARY

The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve Dulce Lizarraga-Chagolla (Attachment 1) to the E&D TAC for one of the Social Services Provider- Seniors position.

Attachments:

1. Committee Appointment Applications for Dulce Lizarraga-Chagolla
2. E&D TAC Roster

S:\RTC\TC2017\TC0217\Consent Agenda\E&DTAC Appointment\SR_ED-Feb-Lizarraga.docx
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

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

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Dulce Ma Leavago-Chupalla

Home address: [Redacted]

Mailing address (if different): [CCCL Office]

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

E-mail: [Redacted]

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 24 years

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

□ Social Services Provider □ Seniors (COUNTY)

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

None at this moment.
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Avenue Women's Center Early Childhood Education Center</td>
<td>303 Walnut Ave. Santa Cruz CA. 95060</td>
<td>Volunteer at Children Center</td>
<td>September to December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekes Ave. Santa Cruz CA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastline Inc Support</td>
<td>500 Seabright Ave. Suite 103</td>
<td>In home support Services</td>
<td>January 2015 to May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz CA. 95662</td>
<td>Companionship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCIL</td>
<td>1350 41st Avenue, Capitola CA. 95010</td>
<td>Community Advocacy</td>
<td>May 2016 to Current</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

Date: 9-23-2016
Statement of Qualifications:

My name is Dulce Lizarraga-Chagolla, and I have been living in Santa Cruz County for 24 years. I’m interested in serving on the ED & TAC committee because of the work they do to support people with disabilities. I strongly believe that working in collaboration with this committee can help improve the future of the disabled community which I believe is secluded. The influenced of working for CCCIL (Central Coast center for Independent Living) as a community organizer can allowed me to advocate in the Transportation field and provide direct output of what the needs are for people with disabilities.
### Membership Roster
December 2016

(Year in Parentheses) = Membership Expiration Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dulce Lizarraga-Chagolla (2020)</td>
<td>Social Services Provider - Seniors (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Molesky (2017)</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Lamb (2018)</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (60+)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supervisorial District Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>1st District (Leopold)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Welch (2019)</td>
<td>4th District (Caput)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>5th District (McPherson)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grace Blakeslee, Staff, Regional Transportation Commission
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer
RE: Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee Nominations

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that commissioners wishing to be appointed or reappointed to the RTC’s Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee inform the RTC Chair or Executive Director of their interest by February 10, 2017.

BACKGROUND

The RTC Rules and Regulations indicate that the RTC will make committee appointments at their March meeting. Historically, the RTC has requested that Commissioners inform the Commission Chair or Executive Director of their interest in serving on a committee during the February RTC meeting. Currently, the RTC has one standing committee composed of commissioners, the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee (B&A/P).

DISCUSSION

As established in the RTC’s Rules and Regulations, commissioner appointments to committees are made annually at the March RTC meeting by the Chair with concurrence of the RTC. There is one standing RTC committee which involves commissioner appointments, the Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee.

The Budget & Administration/Personnel Committee serves to review and monitor issues relating to the budget, work program, and other administrative functions of the RTC and makes recommendations to the Commission regarding such items. The B&A/P committee also functions as the Personnel Committee to review personnel matters.

The 2016 members of the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Coonerty</td>
<td>Andy Schiffrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Leopold</td>
<td>Dave Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Caput</td>
<td>Tony Gregorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce McPherson</td>
<td>Virginia Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach Friend</td>
<td>Patrick Mulhearn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff recommends that commissioners wishing to be appointed or reappointed to the B&A/P Committee inform the RTC Chair or Executive Director of their interest by February 10, 2017.

SUMMARY

The RTC has one standing commissioner committee, the Budget and Administration /Personnel Committee (B&A/P). Staff recommends that by February 10, 2017 individual Commissioners inform the Chair or Executive Director of their interest in continuing to serve on or being newly appointed to the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee.
# Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

**THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE**

**February 2017**
**Through**
**April 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>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>2/13/17</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</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>3/16/17*</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>Immediately following the TPW</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>4/6/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10/17</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/17</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/20/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/20/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RTC Commission Offices – 1523 Pacific Ave. – Santa Cruz, CA
Board of Supervisors Chambers/CAO 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
## Correspondence Log
### February 2, 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>12/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>01/23/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Drulias</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>01/23/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Steinbruner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/24/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>01/23/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Blain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>01/23/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Kett</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail With Train Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>01/10/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Deboer</td>
<td>Unified Corridor Study Survey &amp; Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Arnold S</td>
<td>Leff, M.D.</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Traffic Safety Programming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>c/o John Mondo</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rental Invoice for Property #179286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Monning</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SB 1 (Beall) &amp; AB 1 (Frazier) - Transportation Funding and Reform Package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Caballero</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SB 1 (Beall) &amp; AB 1 (Frazier) - Transportation Funding and Reform Package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SB 1 (Beall) &amp; AB 1 (Frazier) - Transportation Funding and Reform Package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Frazier</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>AB 1 (Frazier) &amp; SB 1 (Beall) - Transportation Funding and Reform Package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Beall</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SB 1 (Beall) &amp; AB 1 (Frazier) - Transportation Funding and Reform Package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>SF Chron BART Extension - Fremont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/19/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>Geiger</td>
<td>Curbing on Porter Street Soquel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/20/17</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Financial Page Big-Ticket Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/20/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Armanino</td>
<td>Trees Along Rail Line</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>01/21/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>01/25/17</td>
<td>GDY</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unified Corridor Investment Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>01/23/17</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Milosevich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/23/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Gandesbery</td>
<td>California State Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Segments 5 and 7 - Request for Scope Expansion and Budget Adjustment (Grant Number 14-085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>01/25/17</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Rail With Trail&quot; Versus &quot;Rail-Trail&quot; Term in Highlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>01/25/17</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Crisis &amp; Wasting Time on a Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>01/25/17</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica Mei</td>
<td>Gershen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freight Train Schedule Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>01/25/17</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Kramer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 24, 2017

City of Santa Cruz Council Members  
809 Center Street  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: Recognition of former City of Santa Cruz Public Works Director Bill Fieberling

Dear Santa Cruz City Council members,

I am writing on behalf of the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee to request that former Public Works Director Bill Fieberling be recognized by naming a significant piece of bicycle and pedestrian public structure or project in his honor. He passed away in May of 2016 after spending his entire career in public service.

After serving as the Public Works Director for the City of Roseville, Mr. Fieberling moved to Santa Cruz to become the Director of Public Works in 1962. During his time at the City, his accomplishments included expanding the Wastewater Treatment Plant to comply with the landmark Clean Water Act, the implementation of the downtown Pacific Garden Mall, expansion of city services to the new University of California, and the West Cliff Drive multi-use path. After his retirement, Mr. Fieberling continued to stay involved by serving on the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee, where he was a tireless advocate for the Arana Gulch Trail and other bicycle projects.

In recognition of Bill Fieberling’s many accomplishments for the City of Santa Cruz and cyclists in particular, the Bicycle Advisory Committee asks that he be remembered through the naming of a local bicycle and pedestrian structure or project in his honor.

The Committee thanks you for your consideration of this request. Please feel free to contact the RTC’s Bicycle Program Manager and staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org, for this and any other committee related matters.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Casterson  
Bicycle Advisory Committee Vice-Chair

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee  
City of Santa Cruz Public Works Assistant Director (CS)
January 25, 2017

John Presleigh, County of Santa Cruz Public Works Director
County of Santa Cruz
701 Ocean Street, Room 410
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: Appreciation of green bike lane installations

Dear Mr. Presleigh and Public Works staff,

On behalf of the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee, I am writing to appreciate the County’s installation of green lane treatments at the Freedom Boulevard freeway interchange. This location has long been a challenge for cyclists due to the speed differential between people biking and drivers entering the freeway. The green lane treatments have increased the visibility of people on bikes at this interchange, and Committee members report a significant improvement in safety and comfort since their installation.

The Bicycle Advisory Committee also appreciates the upcoming installation of green lane treatments at the Soquel Drive interchange. We would welcome an update on the construction schedule for this project, and would strongly support any future installation of green lane treatments at freeway interchanges in the County. The State Park Drive interchange in particular is a priority for Committee members since it is the site where a cyclist fatality occurred.

The Committee thanks you for your commitment to encouraging bicycling and improving the comfort and safety of cyclists on County roadways. Please feel free to contact the RTC’s Bicycle Program Manager and staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org, for this and any other committee related matters.

Sincerely,

Amelia Conlen
Bicycle Advisory Committee Chair

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

From: Bill Drulias
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2016 8:53 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission
Subject: RE: It's FINAL: Voters say "Yes!" to Measure D for Transportation

Could someone let me know if this tax is placed into the general fund or is there a system in place that will actually funnel funds to each of the items outlined? If there is a funneling system where would I go to see how this will work?

Bill Drulias
Director of Design
Verde Design, Inc.,

From: Karena Pushnik [mailto:kpushnik@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 11:18 AM
To: Bill Drulias
Subject: FW: It's FINAL: Voters say "Yes!" to Measure D for Transportation

Hello Bill Drulias -

Funding from Measure D will be allocated by percentage according to the voter-approved Expenditure Plan. We are currently working with the Board of Equalization and other entities to set up systems to receive and distribute Measure D funds to the direct recipients: local jurisdictions (cities and county), Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District and Community Bridges. Other accounts will be set up for regional project funds such as the Highway Corridors, Active Transportation (Coastal Trail) and Rail Corridors categories.

Please let us know if you would like to be included in the eNews distribution for ongoing information about Measure D. Thank you.

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

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

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news

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

From: Bill Drulias
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 11:51 AM
To: Karena Pushnik
Subject: RE: It's FINAL: Voters say "Yes!" to Measure D for Transportation

Yes, I would like to continue receiving information. Something that would be of great interest would be to see funds that are raised, into what accounts as we move forward. I feel this would be a good thing to show the public on an ongoing basis to prove the funds are be accumulated for the stated projects. To many times these types of funds are collected and then put into the 'general funds' where they are spent on anything but where they were intended.

Bill Drulias
Director of Design
Verde Design, Inc.,

Excellent! I will add your email to the Measure D eNews group.

I understand your concern about funds going into the "general fund." There will be many taxpayer safeguards put in place. One safeguard requirement for entities receiving direct allocations -- such as the cities, county, Metro Transit District and Community Bridges -- is that a baseline is being established to show that they are increasing/augmenting transportation projects or services, not supplanting existing transportation funding. This is called Maintenance of Effort, it's required by the Public Utilities Code, and is included as a requirement in the voter-approved Ordinance (see Section 26). Many other communities have similar programs in place.

Thank you.

Karena Pushnik
@ the RTC | 831.460.3210
From: David Steinbruner  
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 7:25 AM  
To: 'info@sccrtc.org'  
Subject: Santa Cruz Rail

Just making sure you know that there is strong support for rail in Santa Cruz County. I’m looking forward to taking the train to work from Aptos.

I am also curious about the status of the potential move of the Golden Gate Railway Museum to Santa Cruz. Any news on that, please?

D. A. Steinbruner

01/23/17

Dear Mr. Steinbruner,

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

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

Thank you,

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

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant, Art Exhibit Coordinator  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.460.3205

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Jim Blain  
Sent: Saturday, December 24, 2016 12:25 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission  
Subject: Comment on Rail Trail study

http://files.constantcontact.com/99f61389001/082959db-874f-4181-8b0e-27189eed58e0.pdf

To: SCCTC
Suggest the upcoming meetings include the above link for public view which illustrates what might be possible for Santa Cruz as a viable transportation system. Note the long life concrete ties and welded rail for quiet and efficient service.

With best regards,
Jim Blain
Scotts Valley, CA

01/23/17

Jim Blain –
The Sonoma Marin Rail Transit (SMART) system is an interesting system and was one of many reviewed by the consultants that worked on the Santa Cruz County Rail Transit Feasibility Study.

Voter-approved Measure D includes direction to undertake an environmental and economic analysis of future transit and other transportation uses of the rail corridor. Please click on the Measure D link for more information.

Thank you.

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

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
-----Original Message-----
From: Brandon Kett
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2016 7:43 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail with trail planning

Dear RTC Administration,

Please forward my attached letter to all of the RTC Commissioners for them to consider at their meetings.

Thank you, Brandon Kett

Watsonville CA

01/23/17

Dear Mr. Kett,

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

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

Thank you,

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

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant, Art Exhibit Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.460.3205
Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Santa Cruz County
Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
info@sccrtc.org

RE: Rail with Trail planning.

Dear Regional Transportation Commissioners,

My name is Brandon Kett, and I have lived in Watsonville most of my 64 years of life. My mother and my grandfather were born in Watsonville, and my great-grandfather came to Watsonville in the 1850s.

I am writing with concern about the decision that you will be making regarding future transportation for our historic 32 mile railway. I read a recent commentary in ‘The Sentinel,’ (12-25-16), by a small special interest group who call themselves “The Great Santa Cruz County Trail Group.” Their commentary argues for the benefits of removing the existing rails and train operation. They suggest a paved trail for pedestrian and bicyclists only. I hope you will consider my responses below to each of their positions on the matter:

1. The Great SCC Trail Group states that the current RTC plan does not separate cyclists from pedestrians. **Response: The trail in Monterey has been used and loved by its community and tourists for decades, and there is no separation between cyclists and pedestrians on that trail. It works fine.**

2. The Great SCC Trail Group complains that the RTC current plan will remove much of the hillside foliage and trees along the railway. **Response: The primary purpose of our railway has always been to provide transportation. It has always been a requirement for the rail operators to clear brush and certain trees from encroaching on the right-of-way. It is important to continue to remove the errant growth for the railway to function.**

3. The Great SCC Trail Group suggests that keeping the encroaching foliage would be a good thing. They suggest that we turn our historic railway into a “linear park” by allowing the overgrown shrubbery to remain. **Response: We need to maintain the full width of the rail bed so it can be safely used for transportation purposes. Allowing excessive foliage growth as a linear park is risking fire danger.**

4. The Great SCC Trail Group suggests that the railroad tracks may never be used so we should remove them and preserve the right to re-install the tracks in the future. This is called “Rail-banking.” **Response: Once you remove the tracks it would become close to impossible to reinstall them in the future. There would be lawsuits by the people who live next to the trail corridor that have gotten used to no trains. Rail-banking risks permanent rail-removing.**
5. The Great SCC Trail Group claims the current plan is expensive and years away from completion because of the train; they suggest trail only would be inexpensive and up and going within a year or two. **Response:** They are right, it’s going to take a long time and be expensive to build the whole 32 miles. However it will be worth it to have a light rail public transit system for our grandchildren and future residents of our county, as well as ourselves. Having both the trail and the rail will be the best way forward with the most options.

6. The Great SCC Trail Group point out the physical and mental health benefits by having a walking and cycling path. **Response:** This is obvious, but a trail can exist with a train. There are lots of people who do not like to ride bikes! And there are lots of people who don’t have the time to travel on foot or bike to get around our county. We need a light rail because our highways are plugged with traffic.

To conclude, I get the impression that this trail group has not taken into consideration the needs of Watsonville. **Watsonville residents have the biggest need for an alternate mode of transportation.** Most commuters are coming from the Pajaro Valley to north county to work, which dictates that the RTC should not be removing tracks. **This railway corridor belongs to the south county residents too.** Please preserve our options and stay with your current plan.

Thank you for listening.
Respectfully submitted,

Brandon Kett

Watsonville CA 95076
From: Brian Peoples  
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 6:40 AM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Cc: Zach Friend; rli12@comcast.net; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jimmy.dutra@cityofwatsonville.org; John Leopold; cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; Alex Clifford; Barrow Emerson; cmathews@cityofsantacruz.com; lmendez@sccrtc.org; gdondoro@sccrtc.org  
Subject: "Rail with Trail" versus "Rail-Trail" term in highlights

RTC Staff,

In the "highlights" from the 1/19/17 meeting under paragraph "Presentation from City of Santa Cruz Public Works", you incorrectly used the term "rail-trail" when discussing the design and environmental reviews for segments 8 and 9 of the Coastal Corridor and designs to widen the walkway on the San Lorenzo Trestle.

The current planning being performed is for a "rail with trail". This is very confusing to the public and it is important that all RTC communications be accurate. It is an industry standard that "rail-trail" is for removal of tracks and building trail and "rail with trail" is building trail parallel to tracks.

Can you please update the "highlights" to reflect that you are investing tax dollars in a rail with trail? The public is confused.

Best regards,

Brian Peoples
Executive Director
Trail Now

01/25/17

Brian Peoples –

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

The Regional Transportation Commission is the state-designated agency charged with short and long term transportation planning, policy and funding for all of Santa Cruz County residents. In that capacity, the RTC has been working for two decades to acquire the Santa Cruz Branch Rail line as an alternate multi-use transportation corridor to the parallel congested main artery, Highway 1.

As you are aware, more than 2/3 of Santa Cruz County voters approved Measure D which explicitly includes two funding categories for projects in the rail corridor: the "Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (Coastal Rail Trail)," and the "Rail Corridor" including an environmental and economic analysis of the rail corridor for possible future transit and other transportation uses. At the RTC’s December 2016 meeting, the board reviewed and accepted the report on options for future use of the rail corridor and directed staff to expedite work on the rail corridor analysis.

While there may be confusion about terminology, in part by advocates, there is no intention to change the language included in voter-approved Measure D.

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

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

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
January 13, 2017

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

Dear Mr. Dondero:

Caltrans is pleased to announce the completion of the Highway 17 Access Management Plan (17 AMP). The goal of the conceptual plan is to maintain safety, reduce traffic congestion, and improve access for residents. The 17 AMP outlines concept recommendations to reduce traffic conflict points on the route in order to preserve the function and operation of the corridor. It features a range of techniques including managing median barriers, making entrances and exits more efficient, and creating grade-separated interchanges to fully eliminate left turns across the highway. The 17 AMP final report is available on the plan website at http://www.ca-hwy17amp.org/.

The 17 AMP represents an innovative approach to corridor access management and is one of the first studies of its kind for the State Highway System. This proud accomplishment would not be possible without the invaluable leadership and support of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission. Additionally, the 17 AMP is a community-based plan and is driven by robust input from the local community and through the multi-agency teamwork with our Santa Cruz County transportation partners.

The 17 AMP is a long-range planning-level study, which is the first step in a complex process. We look forward to building from this effort and working together toward plan implementation. We welcome SCCRTC to review the listing of concepts and recommendations, consider how these align with regional goals and priorities, and integrate improvements into the Regional Transportation Plan accordingly.

Sincerely,

AILEEN K. LOE  
Deputy District Director  
Planning & Local Assistance

Enclosure

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
Caltrans is beginning work on its new 2018 Rail Plan which will provide an exciting new framework for California’s rail network and set the stage for new and better rail and community connections in the State for the next 20 years and beyond.

**THE RAIL PLAN’S MISSION**

The mission of the 2018 Rail Plan is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient California rail network that successfully moves people and goods while enhancing the State’s economy and livability.

**What is the 2018 CALIFORNIA STATE RAIL PLAN?**

The 2018 Rail Plan will present a vision and strategies for California’s future passenger and freight rail network, which will guide state investments supporting implementation of an integrated rail network. It also fulfills state and federal rail plan requirements.

The Rail Plan is not being developed in a vacuum – it is an important element in the comprehensive examination of statewide transportation investment strategies tied to the 2040 California Transportation Plan:

This overall plan for the State seeks to build on regional initiatives for curbing greenhouse gas emissions and climate change by coordinating statewide planning for all transportation modes, including air, roads and highways, local and regional public transit, and passenger and freight rail.

**YES, RAIL CAN... provide solutions to today’s transportation challenges:**

- Rail provides a safe, quality and efficient transportation choice for Californians;
- Rail provides a cost-effective, and often best-value, investment in transportation infrastructure that minimizes impacts on our communities and supports economic growth;
- Rail can help reduce current highway and air transportation congestion in our highly urbanized state, where population is expected to grow to nearly 50-million by 2050.
- Rail, including electrified rail, is an effective way to help achieve the state’s greenhouse gas emission targets and other air quality benefits.

See the website [www.californiastaterailplan.com](http://www.californiastaterailplan.com) for more information.
The 2018 Rail Plan builds on previous Caltrans rail plans, and yet is more ambitious as it will provide a vision for freight and passenger rail that will include an integrated high-speed, intercity, and commuter passenger rail system with better timed connections and more transportation options.

The 2018 Rail Plan will also address how rail can help achieve statewide greenhouse gas emissions mandates.

**WHAT IS NEW about the 2018 Rail Plan?**

The 2018 Rail Plan builds on previous Caltrans rail plans, and yet is more ambitious as it will provide a vision for freight and passenger rail that will include an integrated high-speed, intercity, and commuter passenger rail system with better timed connections and more transportation options.

The 2018 Rail Plan will also address how rail can help achieve statewide greenhouse gas emissions mandates.

**PROJECT SCHEDULE**

- **July 2015**  
  Began preparation of the 2018 Rail Plan

- **Early 2016**  
  Launch of new Rail Plan website and public online survey to provide early input on rail issues and opportunities

- **Spring 2017**  
  Draft 2018 Rail Plan will be available to the public for review and provide feedback during a public comment period

- **Mid-2018**  
  The final Rail Plan will be released, including responses to public comments

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

Caltrans convened a Stakeholder Advisory Committee in November 2015 as a technical and policy working group to provide input and expertise in the development of the 2018 Rail Plan. The committee meets quarterly through August 2017, and includes passenger rail operators, planning agencies, freight rail interests, Tribal Nations, private railroads, transit operators, and neighboring states. Advocacy groups representing environmental, disadvantaged communities, livable communities/active transportation and agricultural interests are also included.

A full roster of participating agencies is available on www.californiastaterailplan.com/about

In addition, Caltrans has a focused Native American outreach program for the 2018 Rail Plan which includes appointing three Native American tribal representatives to the Stakeholder Committee, tribal listening sessions early in the Rail Plan development process, formal consultation options for the draft 2018 Rail Plan, and providing regular updates to the Caltrans Native American Advisory Council.

**How YOU can GET INVOLVED:**

This Rail Plan planning process is being designed to allow for early and meaningful public participation throughout, with several options for input and feedback.

- **Sign up** to receive e-mail updates and notifications on the Rail Plan planning process
- **Provide comments** through the website's online comment form
- **Send an email** to Railplan@dot.ca.gov
- **Attend public meetings (in person or online),** and provide feedback on the Draft Plan during the Public Comment Period in Spring of 2017
- **Bookmark the website** and check it often for updates: www.californiastaterailplan.com

**contact us**

E-mail: Railplan@dot.ca.gov  
Website: www.californiastaterailplan.com
District Director’s Report
A quarterly publication for our transportation partners

CTP 2040
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.

SBCAG partnered with the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments and the Ventura County Transportation Commission to conduct the study funded through a Caltrans Strategic Partnerships transportation planning grant. More information at:

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/msgssubmit/
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/final-draft-ctp2040/index.shtml

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:


CTP 2040 continued

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

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.

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.

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:


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.

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:


## 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 (0T540)</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 Caserly 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 Description</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>
## Programmed/Funded SHOPP Projects in Santa Cruz County

### Jan 2017 Semi-Annual List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Ready To List (Target)</th>
<th>Project Manager Phone #</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000) CON/RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6/18.7</td>
<td>0Q690 0500000317</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>At and near Boulder Creek at various locations, from 0.9 mile south of Glengarry Road to 0.2 mile north of McCarrigan Mill Road. Pollution source control.</td>
<td>Hwy 9 Source Control</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5/13/2014(A)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,866 Award/$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>0R610 0500000363</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>In Monterey and Santa Cruz counties at various locations on Routes 1, 9, 68, and 218. Upgrade pedestrian curb ramps. (Project in SC; some work in MON)</td>
<td>Monterey - Santa Cruz ADA</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>4/2/2015(A)</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia 805-542-4718</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathy.digrazia@dot.ca.gov">kathy.digrazia@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,226 Award/$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>9.5/10.0</td>
<td>0T540 0500000857</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County, west of Chittenden Road. Improve roadway alignment.</td>
<td>Hwy 129 Roadalignment</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>4/1/2015(A)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$5,830 Award/$101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>0G190 0514000123</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>In Santa Barbara, Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz counties at various locations. Replace overhead signs with retro-reflective sheving.</td>
<td>Replace Overhead Signs</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5/20/2015(A)</td>
<td>Aaron Henkel 805-549-3084</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.henkel@dot.ca.gov">aaron.henkel@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$2,307 Award/$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>0J490 0514000120</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>In Santa Barbara, Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and San Luis Obispo counties at various locations. Upgrade highway signs and lighting. (Project in BB; some work in SC)</td>
<td>Exit Retrofit Signs</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5/12/2015(A)</td>
<td>Lisa Lowerson 805-542-4764</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisa.lowerson@dot.ca.gov">lisa.lowerson@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$5,990 Award/$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>0T980 0514000134</td>
<td>2592</td>
<td>In Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, and Santa Cruz counties at various intersections. Upgrade signalized intersections to include Accessible Pedestrian System (APS) push buttons and countdown pedestrian heads. (Project in BB; some work in SC)</td>
<td>Accelerated APS</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>6/16/2015(A)</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia 805-542-4718</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathy.digrazia@dot.ca.gov">kathy.digrazia@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,374 Award/$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7/1.4</td>
<td>0Q600 0500000290</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz, from 0.7 mile north of Route 1/17 Separation to Baulk Park Undergrounding. Storm water mitigation.</td>
<td>Hwy 17 Storm Water Mitigation</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5/2/2016(A)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$6,499 Award/$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5/17.4</td>
<td>1C100 0512000074</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td>In and near the city of Santa Cruz, on Route 1, also on Route 17 (PM 0.0/6.3) at various locations. Construct roadside paving, access gates, and relocate facilities.</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Worker Safety</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>6/15/2016</td>
<td>Luis Diaz 805-542-4678</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luis.diaz@dot.ca.gov">luis.diaz@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,430 Vote/$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3/9.4</td>
<td>0T980 0500002044</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley, from south of Topanga Road to 0.1 mile south of Laurel Road. Shoulder widening and concrete guardrail.</td>
<td>Hwy 17 Shoulder Widening and Concrete Guardrail</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>6/25/2015(A)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$6,428 Award/$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.6/9.5</td>
<td>1G800 0515001017</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td>In and near the towns of Santa Cruz and Scotts Valley, on Routes 1 and 17 at various locations, also in Monterey County on Route 101 in Salinas (PM 85.7/98.8). Drought conservation improvements. (Project in MON &amp; SCR Counties.)</td>
<td>Upgrade Irrigation Systems for Drought Conservation</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lance Gorman 805-549-3315</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lance.gorman@dot.ca.gov">lance.gorman@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$600/$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programmed in 13/14 FY

### Programmed in 14/15 FY

### Programmed in 15/16 FY

**NOTE:** For general information about the SHOPP program contact Sherri Martin at (805) 549-3788 or sherri.martin@dot.ca.gov

List is provided in January and July of each year.

* RTL=Actual (target achieved)
# PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS in Santa Cruz County

## Jan 2017 Semi-Annual List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Ready To List (Target)</th>
<th>Project Manager Phone #</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7/3.9</td>
<td>1H730</td>
<td>0516000148</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, at Buena Vista Drive Undercrossing. Repair sinkholes, drainage system and install erosion control measures.</td>
<td>Reconstruct failed drainage system.</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lance Gorman</td>
<td>805-549-3515</td>
<td>$760/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7/3.9</td>
<td>1H730</td>
<td>0516000148</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County on Route 1 from 0.4 mile to 0.2 mile South of Buena Vista Undercrossing. Reconstruct failed embankment and drainage system.</td>
<td>Buena Vista Slope &amp; Drainage Repair</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lance Gorman</td>
<td>805-549-3515</td>
<td>$2,000/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.2/17.5</td>
<td>1C850</td>
<td>0512000240</td>
<td>Near the city of Santa Cruz, from North Aptos Underpass to Route 9. Rehabilitate pavement.</td>
<td>SCR-1 Pavement Overlay</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>3/30/2018</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>850-542-4678</td>
<td>$14,952/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1/0.4</td>
<td>1C670</td>
<td>0512000194</td>
<td>Near the city of Santa Cruz, from southbound exit ramp to Route 1 to entrance ramp from Pasadera Drive. Widen shoulder and construct centerline rumble strips.</td>
<td>Pasadera Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>4/2/2018</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>850-542-4678</td>
<td>$5,713/181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.1/23.8</td>
<td>1C660</td>
<td>0512000185</td>
<td>In Castle Rock State Park, from 5 miles south to 3.3 miles south of Route 35. Widen shoulders, replace guardrail and construct centerline rumble strips.</td>
<td>Hwy 9 Shoulder Widening, Guardrail Upgrades, and Center Rumble Strips</td>
<td>PA&amp;EED</td>
<td>3/23/2018</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>805-549-3396</td>
<td>$7,658/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.8/9.5</td>
<td>1F030</td>
<td>0513000037</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, from east of Lakeview Road to west of Old Chittenango Road; also from the Santa Cruz/San Benito County line to School Road (PM 0.00 to 0.4). Place open graded friction pavement and upgrade guardrail (Project in SCR; some work in SBt)</td>
<td>129 Open Grade Overlay and MBGR Upgrade</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>10/17/16(A)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>805-549-3386</td>
<td>Suballocated $3,814 Vote/$61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.7/8.3</td>
<td>1G400</td>
<td>0517500009</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, from the Casserty/Carlton Road intersection to the Santa Clara County line. Construct rumble strip and place pavement striping and marking.</td>
<td>SCR 152 Centerline Rumble Strip</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5/4/2016(A)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>805-549-3386</td>
<td>$270 Award/50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Programmed in 16/17 FY

## Programmed in 17/18 FY

**NOTE:** For general information about the SHOPP program contact Sherri Martin at (805) 549-3788 or sherri.martin@dot.ca.gov

List is provided in January and July of each year.

* RTL=Actual [target achieved]
# PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS in Santa Cruz County

## Jan 2017 Semi-Annual List

### Programmed in 18/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R0.0/R8.1</td>
<td>1C360 051300002I</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, from south of Salinas Road to south of Larkin Valley Road Undercrossing. Construct maintenance vehicle pull outs, repairing guardrail, improve gate access and relocate irrigation equipment. (Project in MON; some work in SCR.)</td>
<td>MON SCR Roadside Safety PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>3/26/2019</td>
<td>Aaron Henkel 805-549-3584</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.henkel@dot.ca.gov">aaron.henkel@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$2,766/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>1G160 0514000018</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County, on Routes 1, 9, 17, 26, and 152 at various locations. Install Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS).</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County APS PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>1/11/2019</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia 805-542-4718</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathy.digrazia@dot.ca.gov">kathy.digrazia@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,337/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>1G310 0514000040</td>
<td>2596</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, on various routes at various locations. Replace and install advance curve warning signs. (Project in MON also in SCR &amp; SB Counties)</td>
<td>Warning Sign Upgrades PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>5/1/2019</td>
<td>Joe Erwin 805-549-3792</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joe.erwin@dot.ca.gov">joe.erwin@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,852/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0/12.6</td>
<td>1F520 0514000005</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td>In and near Soquel, from north of Santa's Village Road to the Santa Clara County line. Pavement rehabilitation.</td>
<td>North Route 17 CAPM PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>7/2/2018</td>
<td>Luis Duazo 805-549-4679</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov">luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$4,167/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.1/7.5</td>
<td>1F760 051400005I</td>
<td>2538</td>
<td>In and near the city of Santa Cruz, from Route 1 to north of Fall Creek Drive. Stormwater improvements.</td>
<td>SCR 9 South Drainage and Erosion Control Improvements PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>5/4/2020</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$2,356/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4/1.4</td>
<td>1G990 05160000010</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, at Lakeview Road. Construct roundabout and improve street lighting.</td>
<td>129/Lakeview Intersection Project PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>6/1/2020</td>
<td>Luis Duazo 805-549-4679</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov">luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$4,481/68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,17</td>
<td>16.7/16.7, 0.3/0.3</td>
<td>1H60 051600020</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td>In and near Santa Cruz County, north of 1/8 mile south of Route 17/1 Separation to 0.4 miles south of Residencia Overcrossing; also on Route 17 (PM 0.00:3). Realign southbound Route 17 connector to southbound Route 1.</td>
<td>Construct Ramp Safety Improvements PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>11/27/2019</td>
<td>Luis Duazo 805-549-4679</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov">luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$5,811/65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programmed in 19/20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1/7.5</td>
<td>1F200 051400007I</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>In and near the city of Santa Cruz, from Route 1 to north of Fall Creek Drive. Stormwater improvements.</td>
<td>SCR 9 South Drainage and Erosion Control Improvements PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>5/4/2020</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$2,356/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4/1.4</td>
<td>1G260 0516000020</td>
<td>2656</td>
<td>In and near Santa Cruz, north of 1/8 mile south of Route 17/1 Separation to 0.4 miles south of Residencia Overcrossing; also on Route 17 (PM 0.00:3). Realign southbound Route 17 connector to southbound Route 1.</td>
<td>Construct Ramp Safety Improvements PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>11/27/2019</td>
<td>Luis Duazo 805-549-4679</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov">luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$5,811/65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) = Actual dateRTL was achieved.

Minor A Projects

Note: Construction Award or Vote costs are actuals; otherwise Construction costs are estimates.

---

**NOTE:** For general information about the SHOPP program contact Sherri Martin at (805) 549-3788 or sherri.martin@dot.ca.gov

List is provided in January and July of each year.

* RTL=Actual (target achieved)
RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is for information; no action is requested.

BACKGROUND

Measure D, the transportation improvement measure, was passed by more than a 2/3 majority of Santa Cruz County voters on November 8, 2016. Measure D includes 5 categories of projects including neighborhood projects, highway corridors, transit/paratransit for seniors and people with disabilities, active transportation, and the rail corridor. The Regional Transportation Commission is the designated agency to implement and administer the measure. Some funds will be allocated directly by formula to local jurisdictions and transit service providers.

Attached is a summary of the voter-approved Measure D ordinance (Attachment 1). More information about Measure D, including the full ordinance and the expenditure plan are online at: www.sccrtc.org/move.

DISCUSSION

The Regional Transportation Commission has transitioned into implementation of Measure D and is moving full speed ahead. RTC staff participated in a full day workshop with staff from the three other new self help counties (Monterey, Stanislaus and Merced.) At the workshop staff from some well established self help counties (Alameda, Marin, Tulare, Madera, Santa Barbara and San Joaquin) shared experience and resources for a range of tasks related to program management, expenditure plans, project delivery, public outreach, and financial management. The RTC will be able to take advantage of implementation and administration systems and work practiced by experienced self-help counties. However, there are unique situations to each county for which each county has to develop its own implementation and administration systems. Thus far, it seems that only Santa Cruz County has a “return to source” variable in its formula for distribution of funds to cities and the county.

The following outlines the working plan for Measure D implementation. This will continue to be refined as implementation progresses.
Administration and Fiscal  
Based on the voter-approved ordinance, staff is setting up a work plan, timeline, systems for compliance with each section, and budget for each task (initial and ongoing.) RTC staff is assessing which tasks can be done in-house, and what types of outside expertise will be needed.

RTC staff tasks will be integrated into the RTC’s Overall Work Program and budget. This will be available to the RTC for review as part of the annual budget and work program development, with drafts reviewed by the RTC’s Budget & Administration/Personnel Committee first and currently scheduled for RTC approval at its April meeting.

At the RTC’s January meeting, the RTC approved resolutions to enter into agreements with the State Board of Equalization to collect and distribute tax receipts. Fiscal staff are developing procedures for review and distribution of funding and items to be included in the annual reports. The RTC will need to hire an independent auditor to conduct the annual fiscal audits or include audit of Measure D as part of the annual fiscal audits already done by an independent auditor. However it is done, it must be clear and transparent to ensure that the oversight committee can adequately and efficiently perform its duty to review the expenditure of measure funds. The Expenditure Plan delineates five different transportation categories to receive percentages of total receipts. Separate accounts will be set up for each Measure D category. Described below is information about direct allocations to recipients such as local jurisdictions, transit and paratransit operators, which will be paid from these separate categories. RTC staff is assessing banking options for tax receipts including an understanding of costs and benefits of various arrangements.

The State Board of Equalization will begin collecting revenues on April 1, 2017. While the first payments to the RTC are expected to be received in July 2017, the RTC is required to reimburse the County Elections Department and pay Board of Equalization fees from the initial tax receipts.

Direct Allocations to Local Jurisdictions, Transit, Paratransit  
RTC staff is developing guidelines and agreements with direct recipient agencies including mechanisms to ensure that Measure D funds increase/expand transportation projects and services and do not supplant funding already allocated to transportation activities. This requirement, called Maintenance of Effort, was included in the voter-approved ordinance as mandated by California law.

All entities receiving Measure D funds (including the RTC) will be required to develop a five-year program of projects, identifying how each agency plans to use Measure D funds in the upcoming 5 years. The 5-year plan will be updated annually and approved through a public hearing process at each agency. Starting in 2018, agencies will adopt an annual report which includes an updated five-year program of projects, a report on the prior year expenditures, progress made to improve the transportation system, maintenance of effort using other revenues for transportation, and the degree that Measure D funds were used to secure additional funding from other sources (matching funds). An analysis of expenditures will be part of the annual fiscal audit.
One meeting was held with direct recipients to review components of the ordinance, discuss public participation requirements, and hear feedback on implementation. RTC staff expects to provide an agreement and guidelines, as well as an estimate of first year revenues in February and require that the direct recipient agreements and five-year program of projects be approved by their respective boards/councils by June 30. The annual report, including updated five year plans and reports on how revenues were spent in FY17/18 will be issued late in 2018. Discussion at the meeting included the possibility of advancing Measure D funds for needed projects and repairs, especially considering the recent storms. RTC staff is exploring various possibilities.

Regional Projects

In addition to developing five-year plans for the regional transportation categories -- Highway Corridors, Active Transportation/Coastal Rail Trail and the Rail Corridor, as well as Highway 9 and the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing – the RTC will prepare an implementation plan for the full 30 years of Measure D.

The implementation plan will provide a timeline and projections for delivery and cash flow of regional projects. As set forth in Section 8 of the ordinance, the implementation plan will be updated at least every five years, following a public hearing. The purposes of the implementation plan are to provide additional information on the scope, cost, and delivery schedule of each Expenditure Plan project or program, provide updated revenue projections and discuss possible financing tools that may be needed to deliver the Expenditure Plan within the 30 years promised to voters. It will also describe the risks, critical issues and opportunities that the RTC should address to expeditiously deliver the Expenditure Plan, including opportunities for matching funds and proposed bonding to accelerate project delivery. Per the voter-approved ordinance, pay-as-you-go financing is the preferred method of financing transportation improvements and programs. However, the RTC, per the ordinance, may decide to use bond financing to accelerate larger regional projects. Use of bonding or short term loans will depend on project delivery schedules, funding needs, matching fund opportunities, and cash flow estimates. Direct recipients may not bond against Measure D revenues, but could access options such as cooperative fund agreements among agencies receiving Measure D funds, or other means to advance funding for ready projects. Staff plans to bring the draft five-year program of projects for regional categories and the strategic implementation plan to the RTC board for review at their May meeting.

Public Engagement

RTC staff is developing a communications plan to continue the high level of community engagement and enthusiasm already experienced for Measure D. Existing RTC channels of communication will be used including the televised RTC meetings, website, fact sheets, eNews, Facebook, Twitter and Nextdoor. A Measure D logo will be required to be prominent on project construction signs and project milestones and achievements will be highlighted. Staff plans to bring the communications plan to the RTC for review at their April meeting.

All Measure D revenue recipients will be required to provide an opportunity for public input on their five-year program of projects with a public hearing by their boards or
councils when their first plan is adopted this spring. Community Bridges does not have a public agency board, therefore the RTC’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) will review Community Bridges’ five-year plans.

An annual report will be developed to highlight Measure D achievements. The annual report will summarize expenditures from the prior fiscal year, which will be audited annually and reviewed by the oversight committee. Annual Reports will likely be available in the November-December timeframe starting in 2018.

Oversight Committee

As delineated in the ordinance, an oversight committee of not more than five people will be formed by the RTC to review Measure D expenditures according to the expenditure plan, review the annual fiscal audit and release an annual report of the oversight activities. The ordinance includes membership requirements and that the committee will meet one to four times per year. A draft plan for independent oversight committee membership, selection criteria, duties, bylaws, reporting, and other details will come to the RTC in May 2017.

SUMMARY

The RTC is rapidly moving ahead with Measure D implementation including administration, fiscal, oversight and engagement activities, including using best practices from other self help counties. In addition, the RTC is working with Measure D recipient agencies to develop five-year programs of projects, annual report requirements, and other required agreements.

Attachment 1: Summary of the Voter-Approved Measure D Ordinance

s:\rtc\tc2017\tc0217\regular agenda\measured\md_update-sr.docx
Summary of Measure D Ordinance

Full Ordinance is online at: www.sccrtc.org/move

1) **Ordinance**: The Ordinance is the full text of Measure D, including the Expenditure Plan. It was referenced in the ballot question which the voters approved and was included in the voter guide.

2) **Title**: The Ordinance notes the measure may also be referred to as: “Santa Cruz County Transportation Improvement Plan Measure” or “Measure D” or “Traffic Relief, Road Repair, Safety, Transit Improvement Measure” or “Transportation Improvement Plan (TRIP)” or “Santa Cruz County Transportation Tax Measure” (Sections 1 & 4)

3) **Responsible Entity**: Local Transportation Authority (LTA): Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for the administration of the tax proceeds, consistent with State-defined LTA. (Sections 4, 6)

4) **What**: Retail Transactions and Use Tax of one-half of one percent (0.5%) for a period of thirty (30) years. “Measure Revenue” or “Transportation Tax Revenue” includes any interest or other earnings thereon. Note: *a Retail Transactions and Use Tax is slightly different from “sales and use tax”* (Section 2)

5) **Effective Dates**: April 1, 2017 – March 31, 2047. Expires thirty (30) years from the Operative Date (April 1, 2017). (First day of the first calendar quarter commencing more than 110 days after the adoption of this Ordinance.) (Sections 3, 33, & 34)

6) **Expenditure Plan**: Adopted as part of voter action, this is the plan for the expenditure of revenues expected to be derived from the tax, together with other federal, state, and local funds expected to be available for transportation projects and programs over next 30 years. (Section 4H, Exhibit A)

7) **Fund Distribution**: (Sections 8A)
   - Projects and programs funded in the Expenditure Plan will be implemented over the 30-year time horizon of the Transportation Tax. Three types of investments are funded by the Expenditure Plan:
     i. Investment categories which are allocated a percentage of net revenues (RTC)
     ii. Capital investments which are allocated specific dollar amounts (RTC)
     iii. Ongoing direct allocations of a percentage of net revenues to be distributed to cities, the County of Santa Cruz, and transit operators for capital projects and operations.
   - RTC shall distribute revenues no less than quarterly to local jurisdictions, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, and the Consolidated Transportation Service Agency based on the formulas set forth in the Expenditure Plan. (Section 8A)
   - Agencies implementing the Expenditure Plan projects may accumulate revenue over multiple years so that sufficient funding is available for larger and long-term projects.
Any interest income earned on funds allocated pursuant to this ordinance shall be expended only for the purposes for which the funds were allocated. *(Section 8C)*

- RTC shall allocate, administer and oversee the expenditure of all Measure Revenues which are not directly allocated by formula annually to other agencies, consistent with the Expenditure Plan, as it may be amended in accordance with the Act and this Ordinance through an Implementation Plan. *(Section 8B)*
- RTC may, at the discretion of the RTC’s Board, enter into agreement with the County Auditor-Controller to allocate revenues.

8) **Coop Fund Agreements:** *(Section 11)*
- Revenues may be transferred or exchanged between or among jurisdictions receiving funds from this measure.
  - Jurisdictions receiving funds may, by annual or multi-year agreement, exchange funds provided that the percentage of funds allocated as provided in the Expenditure Plan is maintained over the duration of the period of time the tax is imposed.
  - Agreements to exchange funds, including fund repayment provisions, must be approved by the RTC and shall be consistent with all rules adopted or approved by the RTC relating to such exchanges.
  - The RTC may exchange revenues for State or federal funds allocated or granted to any public agency within or outside the area or jurisdiction of the RTC to maximize effectiveness in the use of the revenues. Such federal or State funds shall be distributed in the same manner as revenues derived from this ordinance.
  - The RTC shall maintain for public review an accounting of all balances that are subject to cooperative agreements approved pursuant to this section.

9) **Eligible Uses of Measure Funds:** Measure D revenue, including any interest or other earnings thereon, may only be used for transportation purposes described in the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, including:

- **Expenditure Plan Projects/Eligible Expenses**
  - All capital investments will be made based upon clearly defined project descriptions and limits resulting from the outcomes of environmental analyses, as applicable.
  - **Capital:** Construction, acquisition, maintenance, and operation of streets, roads, highways, including local roads, state highways and public transit systems; and
  - **Pre-Construction:** Planning, environmental reviews, engineering and design costs, and related right-of-way acquisition.
  - **Environmental Review:** Prior to commencement of any specific project or activity identified in the Expenditure Plan, applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) shall be completed. *(Section 31).* (If environmental is not cleared, project will not be implemented.)
  - **Bonding Costs:** Debt service on bonds or other indebtedness, and expenses and reserves in connection with the issuance of the same.
• **Other Project Costs:** For related transportation purposes consistent with the Expenditure Plan, including project management and oversight of the projects to be funded using the Transportation Tax, such as coordination with other responsible agencies as well as project delivery and negotiation of project agreements. Defense or prosecution of legal actions related thereto.

• **RTC-Lead Projects:** RTC may engage, contract with, employ and compensate any public or private agency, party, contractor or professional for the planning, finance, approval, design, construction, acquisition of right of way, maintenance, operation, control and repair of any road, highway, bus, rail or other transportation facility. However, the RTC shall not be responsible for the maintenance or operation of any State highway facilities following construction contract completion. *(Sec 13: Execution of Duties)*

Other Costs:

• **Election Cost:** Payments to the County of Santa Cruz for any election costs. Election costs will be funded from Year 1 Measure Revenues before net proceeds are disbursed to the projects and programs in the Expenditure Plan. Reimbursement of the County of Santa Cruz for the costs of this election shall be deferred until it can be paid from the Measure Revenues collected when the Transportation Tax goes into effect. *(Sec. 14)*

• **BOE Payments:** Set up and ongoing required payments to the Board of Equalization *(max 1.5% of proceeds)*

• Defense or prosecution of legal actions related to implementation of measure or projects

• **Administration:** Implementation and administration of all provisions and requirements of the Ordinance, as amended. *(Section 12)*
  
  o Costs of program administration and oversight. Any funds necessary for the RTC’s administration, implementation and oversight of the tax shall be paid by Measure Revenues - in order to ensure that the cost of administration, implementation and oversight this Measure are not borne by other programs and sources, such as TDA.
  
  o Admin functions include staff support, audits, programming processes, reporting, financial management, compiling and publishing an annual report, providing public information concerning the Ordinance, rent, supplies, contract and consulting services, overhead, legal, administrative expenses, other responsibilities as may be necessary and reasonable to administer the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.
  
  o Administrative costs are taken off top, prior to the distribution of the Transportation Tax Revenue as provided in the Expenditure Plan.
  
  o RTC shall not expend more than one percent of the funds generated for administrative salaries and benefits net of the amount of fees paid to the State Board of Equalization for collection of the tax.
  
  o Costs of performing or contracting for project-related work shall be paid from the revenues of tax allocated to the appropriate purpose and project.
10) **Maintenance Of Effort:** *(Section 26)* Required by PUC 180001(e)

- Funds generated will be used to supplement and not replace existing revenues used for transportation purposes. Existing funds, revenues and other resources being used for transportation purposes include but are not limited to federal and state funding, the collection of traffic impact mitigation fees, other local impact fees, and dedications of property. Measure Revenues shall not be used to replace existing transportation funding or to replace requirements for new development to provide for its own transportation needs.
- Entities receiving Measure Revenues shall maintain their existing commitment of discretionary local transportation-related expenditures for transportation purposes pursuant to this ordinance.
- RTC shall enforce this Section by appropriate actions, including fiscal audits of the local agencies.

11) **Implementation Plan:** *(Sections 8A)* To be updated by RTC at least every 5 years, following a public hearing. The purposes of the Implementation Plan are to:

- Define the scope, cost, and delivery schedule of each Expenditure Plan project or program,
- Detail the revenue projections and possible financing tools needed to deliver the Expenditure Plan within the 30 years promised to voters, and
- Describe the risks, critical issues and opportunities that the Authority should address to expeditiously deliver the Expenditure Plan.

12) **Amendments:** *(Sections 24 and 25)*

- **Ordinance:** Non-BOE/state statute-related amendments to Ordinance require a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the total membership of the Authority. *Sec 24 & 25*
- **Expenditure Plan:** If a project is determined undeliverable or infeasible, or does not need all the funds, the balance of the terminated or completed project will be reallocated to another project or program of the same type or otherwise serving the same objectives. “This Ordinance and Expenditure Plan may be amended to provide for the use of additional federal, state, and local revenues, to account for unexpected revenues, or to take into consideration unforeseen circumstances. Should a project implementing agency determine that a planned project has become undeliverable, infeasible or unfundable due to circumstances unforeseen at the time this Ordinance and Expenditure Plan were created, or should a project not require all funds programmed for that project or have excess funding, funding set forth at project termination will be reallocated to another project or program of the same type or otherwise serving the same objectives.” *(Sec 25)*
- **Process for amendments:** Set forth in statutes (PUC Section 180207)
  - Initiation of amendments by the RTC reciting findings of necessity;
  - Provision of notice and a copy of the amendments provided to the Board of Supervisors and the City Councils in Santa Cruz County;
  - The proposed amendments shall become effective 45 days after notice is given.
Amendments shall require a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the total membership of the RTC.

Implementation Plan: The Implementation Plan may be amended by a majority vote of the RTC, however, amendment of the Implementation Plan shall not serve to amend provisions of the Expenditure Plan. (see above for Ord/Exp Plan amendment process)

13) Leveraging/Change in Funds: (Section 9) Leveraging or matching of outside funding sources is strongly encouraged. Any additional transportation revenues made available through their replacement by matching funds will be spent based on the principles outlined for fund allocations described in the Expenditure Plan.

14) Financing/Bonding Authority: (Section 10)

- While, pay-as-you-go financing is the preferred method of financing transportation improvements and programs under this Ordinance, the measure provides RTC with the authority to bond against the funds only if the RTC board finds it to be cost effective and to accelerate implementation of projects.
- Ordinance only gives RTC the power to sell or issue, from time to time, on or before the collection of taxes, bonds, or other evidence of indebtedness for capital projects. It does not give other entities the authority to bond against the funds.
- The decision to bond would be considered following consultation with bond counsel. The RTC could also consider requests from local jurisdictions that are interested in receiving several years worth of funds at one time in order to immediately address some of the backlog of needs. Including this authority in the measure does not mandate that bonding would occur but provides the option to do so if the RTC and project sponsors find that it would be cost beneficial. (Not spelled out in Ordinance, but in practice/from June 2, 2016 Staff report.)

15) Taxpayer Safeguards, Audits & Accountability: (Section 32) Independent citizen’s oversight and annual audit reports for public review are required.

Accountability is of utmost importance in delivering public investments with public dollars. In order to ensure accountability, transparency and public oversight of all funds collected and allocated under this Measure and to comply with state law, all of the following shall apply:

A. Annual Report. (Section 32A) Each agency receiving Measure Revenue shall annually adopt, after holding a public hearing, an annual report which includes 1) a five-year program of projects including information about each of the projects to be funded with Measure Revenues allocated according to the Expenditure Plan. Local and regional agencies shall submit their program of projects to the Authority in a format that can be easily understood by members of the public. 2) Description of expenditures of Measure Revenues from the most recently completed fiscal year. The purpose of requiring the most recently completed fiscal
year expenditures is to allow the Authority to prepare a comprehensive report to the public on the expenditure of funds generated by this Ordinance.

B. **Annual Audit.** *(Section 32B)* No less than annually, an independent annual audit shall be conducted of the expenditure of all funds generated by the transportation tax. The audit, which shall be made available to the public, shall report on evidence that the expenditure of funds is in accordance with this Plan as adopted by the voters in approving the Ordinance on November 8, 2016. The Authority will also prepare a publicly available annual report on past and upcoming activities and publish an annual financial statement.

C. **Independent Oversight Committee.** *(Section 32C)*
An Independent Oversight Committee shall be formed by the Board of Directors of the Authority to review the annual independent fiscal audit of the expenditure of the Transportation Tax funds and issue an annual report on its findings regarding compliance with the requirements of the Expenditure Plan and the Ordinance to the Authority Board of Directors. The total membership of the Independent Oversight Committee shall not exceed **five (5) members** and any vacancy which may occur from time to time shall be filled by the Board of Directors of the Authority as soon as reasonably possible.

Members of the Independent Oversight Committee shall be residents of Santa Cruz County who are neither elected officials of any government, nor employees from any agency or organization that either oversees or implements projects funded from the proceeds of the sales tax. Members will fairly represent the geographical, social, cultural, and economic diversity of Santa Cruz County to ensure maximum benefit for transportation users. The Committee shall include at least one person with an accounting or fiscal management background.

Independent Oversight Committee meetings will be announced in advance and will be open to the general public. The Independent Oversight Committee shall meet at least once but no more than four times per year.

The responsibilities of this Committee include:
- Reviewing Expenditure Plan expenditures on an annual basis to ensure they conform to the Ordinance.
- Reviewing the annual audit and report prepared by an independent auditor, describing how funds were spent.
- Produce a publicly available Annual Report of Oversight Activities.

D. Decisions regarding implementation of the Ordinance will be made by the Authority in public meetings, subject to the Brown Act. *(Section 32D)*

16) **Lawsuits on Ordinance:** Even if one part of Ordinance found invalid, rest remains. *(Sec. 29)*
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)  
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Sr. Transportation Planner  
RE: 2017 Legislative Program and Funding Updates

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve State and Federal Legislative Programs for 2017 (Attachment 1) to assist in analyzing the transportation impacts of legislative activities.

BACKGROUND

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

DISCUSSION

2017 Legislative Priorities

Staff worked with RTC committee members, other agencies in California, and its federal assistant (Capital Edge) to develop the RTC’s 2017 State and Federal Legislative Programs. Draft 2017 legislative priorities for the RTC are attached (Attachment 1). The Legislative Program guides RTC staff and board member comments on legislative and administrative proposals that are raised throughout the year. **Staff recommends that the RTC review the draft legislative priorities (Attachment 1), identify any additional issues that the RTC should monitor or pursue, and adopt the 2017 Legislative Program.**

Given that traditional revenue sources, such as gas taxes, are unpredictable, have dropped significantly in recent years, and generate less than half of what is needed
to operate, maintain, and improve the transportation system, the recommended legislative priorities for 2017 once again focus on preserving funds designated for transportation and generating new, more stable revenue sources. Staff recommends that the RTC continue to support legislative proposals that: increase funds for local roadway preservation, transit, active transportation, the Freeway Service Patrol, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and other programs.

New stable funding is still needed, especially since the drop in gasoline and diesel prices has resulted in severe reductions in revenues designated for local streets and roads, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the State Transit Assistance (STA) program, and other programs.

The California Legislature reconvened on January 4th, 2017 to begin its work in the new two-year session. Legislators have begun introducing bills related to transportation. February 17, 2017 is the deadline to introduce bills. Staff works with its partners to review and provide input on bills which may impact transportation in Santa Cruz County.

**New State Transportation Funding Proposals**

On January 10, 2017, Governor Brown released his state budget proposal (a summary was included in the January 19 RTC agenda). As promised in November, Governor Brown once again included a proposal to increase funding for transportation infrastructure. On December 5, 2016, the first day of the new legislative session, Senator Beall and Assembly Member Frazier, chairs of the Senate and Assembly transportation committees, introduced updated transportation funding proposals SB 1 and AB 1, respectively. All three proposals combine elements of proposals that have been floated in the legislature over the past two years. They include a mix of taxes, fees and cap-and-trade money to fund a range of projects and programs – with an emphasis on repairing existing infrastructure. Attachments 2 and 3 provide comparisons of the proposals.

New stable funding continues to be needed, especially since the drop in gasoline and diesel prices is resulting in severe reductions in tax revenues designated for Local Streets and Roads, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the State Transit Assistance (STA) program. While the three proposals do not include sufficient funds to fully address the backlog of local street and road, state highway, transit, and active transportation infrastructure needs, they are a good start. While smaller than the Assembly and Senate proposals, according to the California State Transportation Agency Secretary, adoption of the Governor’s proposal would create enough new funding to restore the $754 million eliminated in the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), as well as create $800 million in new programming capacity in the 2018 STIP.

While the Governor, state legislative leaders, and President-elect Trump have indicated they will make infrastructure funding a priority this year, many anticipate that both federal and state leaders will instead be focused on health care,
immigration and other non-transportation issues. It remains uncertain if the state legislature will be able to reach a deal that meets the two-thirds vote requirement. It is unclear if Congress and President Trump will propose transportation funding or programs that benefit Santa Cruz County. As it is very important to have the state partner in funding Santa Cruz County’s multimodal transportation, staff has sent support letters for AB 1 and SB 1 (Attachment 4). Given the range of sometimes competing interests, it is especially important for the RTC, cities, the County, METRO, and the public to continue to emphasize the importance of state and federal funding for local roads, transit, and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for regional projects that benefit Santa Cruz County residents.

**Federal Transportation Updates**

In response to the Trump administration’s interest in infrastructure investment the National Governors Association is collecting wish lists for a trillion-dollars in infrastructure spending, with an emphasis on “shovel ready” projects that are far enough along in engineering, approval and even construction to begin using the money quickly, and those that enhance national security and economic competitiveness, especially in manufacturing. The President has expressed a preference for partnerships between government and private industry, used in projects like toll roads that can attract private investors with a steady stream of revenue. While it is highly unlikely these funds will be made available for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County, RTC and METRO staff submitted a few projects to Caltrans for consideration.

President Trump’s nominee for Secretary of Transportation, Elaine Chao, is a veteran of both Bush Administrations. She offered many promises of cooperation during her confirmation hearing and indicated that a task force for infrastructure investment would be convened soon. Chao recognizes the Highway Trust Fund, the major funding stream for federal surface transportation projects, “is in bad shape,” and that lawmakers must find new options to pay for any proposal to maintain current infrastructure, let alone plan for any new projects. She expressed strong support for more public-private partnerships, streamlining federal regulations to expedite transportation projects.

On January 24, 2017, President Trump issued an executive order to expedite environmental reviews and approvals for high priority infrastructure projects.

According to the Washington publication *The Hill*, President Trump’s team is also preparing a budget that could propose significant reductions in federal domestic discretionary spending. Some suspect that the President may include proposals similar to those found in the Heritage Foundation blueprint including:

- Elimination of the Federal Transit Administration (over 5 years)
- Elimination of TIGER grants at DOT
- Elimination of federal subsidies for Amtrak
- Elimination of the New Starts Rail Program
California Senator Kamala Harris has been appointed to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, which is responsible for transportation programs.

SUMMARY

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopts legislative priorities to guide its analysis of state and federal legislative or administrative actions that could impact transportation projects in Santa Cruz County. Given that traditional revenue sources, such as gas taxes, are unpredictable and generate less than half of what is needed to operate, maintain, and improve the transportation system, the recommended legislative priorities for 2017 (Attachment 1) once again focus on increasing and stabilizing transportation funding.

Attachments:

1. Draft Legislative Program
2. Comparison of State Funding Proposals from Gus Khouri, Central Coast Coalition Legislative Assistant
3. Comparison of State Funding Proposals from CalCOG
4. RTC support letter for AB 1 and SB 1

\rtcserv2\shared\rtc\tc2017\tc0217\regular agenda\legislativeprogram\legislativeprogram2017-sr.docx
Address Transportation Funding Shortfalls

- **Restore and Stabilize Funding:** Support legislation and other efforts to restore, increase and stabilize funding for transit, local streets and roads, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects.
  - Protect all current and future taxes and fees and other transportation funds (including Highway Users Tax Account (HUTA), transit, and regional funds) from elimination or diversion to other State programs, General Fund loans, general obligation bond debt service, or to other non-transportation purposes.
  - Restore the price-based excise tax to at least 18-cents per gallon and eliminate annual downward adjustments.
  - Restore, protect, and expand the funding and decision-making role of local and regional agencies, rather than the State making top-down funding decisions that are not community-based.
  - Restore State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) county-shares. Over $9 million in past county shares need to be restored to the Santa Cruz County region and new stable funding is needed to address multimodal regional transportation priorities.*

- **Increase State Funding for All Transportation Modes:**
  State investments have not kept pace with the demand and cost to maintain and operate California’s transportation system. Immediate and long-term sustainable solutions are needed.
  - **Immediate measures:** Support measures that immediately increase funds for transportation, including but not limited to a comprehensive transportation funding package and other measures which: index and increase state gas and diesel taxes; new transportation bonds, if debt repayments do not negatively impact other transportation programs; new vehicle license and/or vehicle registration fees; *increased state funds for the Freeway Service Patrol program.
  - **New funding systems:** Phase in new funding systems which are tied to system use, rather than fuel consumption or fuel prices. May include new user fees, such as a Road User Charge or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) fee and other alternative funding mechanisms.
  - **Redirect and Increase Weight Fees:** Restore approximately $1 billion per year in truck weight fees that have been diverted to pay for General Fund bond debt obligations, and restore all the of the price-based gas tax to STIP and Local Streets and Roads.
  - **Cap & Trade:**
    - Increase percent of Cap & Trade revenues allocated to transportation projects and programs that help reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Santa Cruz County.
    - Broaden the definition of “disadvantaged communities” to ensure areas in Santa Cruz County that are recognized as such under most understandings of the term are not excluded from the definition used for the Cap and Trade program.

For more information contact the RTC at 831-460-3200; info@sccrtc.org; 1523 Pacific Ave., Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Support options to replace the loss of redevelopment funding, to support economic development and affordable housing consistent with sustainable community strategies.

Distribution: For any statewide or federal revenues, ensure a strong role for regional agencies in planning and determining transportation investment priorities; ensure funds are available for projects in Santa Cruz County, are distributed equitably, and are not disproportionately distributed to large regions.

STA: Ensure that any new State Transit Assistance (STA) formulas do not diminish revenues to Santa Cruz County which are needed to operate and maintain the local transit network.*

Support multimodal transportation system: Support legislation that increases funding for and supports implementation of complete streets, active transportation bike, pedestrian, transit projects, transit-oriented development, and *specialized transportation for seniors and people with disabilities in Santa Cruz County.

Electrification of vehicle fleets: Support funding and coordination, including policy, planning, and infrastructure, for vehicle electrification. Support improved utility pricing for public transit fleets.*

Expand local revenue-raising opportunities and innovative financing options to address the significant backlog of transportation needs. Provide locals with the ability to supplement and leverage state funding for investments that protect state and local transportation assets.

Expand the authority of the RTC and local entities to increase taxes and fees for transportation projects, including new gas taxes and vehicle registration fees.

Support clarifying amendment to Government Code Section 65089.20 that will give RTPAs equal treatment with Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to seek voter approval for a local vehicle registration fee. (SB83 cleanup)

Lower Vote Threshold: Support efforts to amend the California constitution to lower the voter threshold for local transportation funding measures, such as local sales tax or vehicle registration fee ballot measures, from the 2/3 supermajority to a simple majority or 55% vote.

Support measures and programs that improve transportation safety: Includes support for commercial driver, bus driver, motorist, bicyclist, safe routes to schools training programs which reduce collisions.*

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

Project Implementation

Streamlining & Expediting:
Support legislation and other efforts that modernize and accelerate project delivery and the creation of jobs. Support delegation of National Environmental Policy Act review and fund allocation responsibilities to Caltrans, environmental streamlining measures for bike, pedestrian, transit, and infrastructure preservation within existing public rights of way, and other measures that expedite project delivery.*
**Advanced Mitigation:**
Support implementation of “advanced mitigation” environmental programs, including approving up-front environmental mitigation funding for projects, such as the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing.

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

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

Support inclusion of complete streets within SHOPP projects, as appropriate, but especially in areas where state highways serve as main streets, such as Highway 9 and Highway 152 in Santa Cruz County.*

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

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

**SB 743 Implementation:** Ensure SB743 (Steinberg, 2013) implementation supports infill development and expedites transportation project delivery.*

**Administrative:** Allow advance payment of planning, programming, and monitoring (PPM) and other program funds, in order to resolve cash flow challenges faced especially by small regional agencies, including the RTC.*

**Unfunded Mandates:** Oppose unfunded mandates and seek funding for mandates imposed in recent years. Require new regulatory proposals to include an estimate of the cost and impact such proposals will have in the delivery of California’s transportation program.*

**Commuter Programs:** Expand statutory authority for regions statewide to adopt and implement a regional commuter benefits ordinance similar to the successful program in the Bay Area.*
**Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission**

**2017 FEDERAL Legislative Program**

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

- **Stabilize and Increase Funding.** Current per-gallon gasoline fees are insufficient.
  - **Increase funding levels** for all modes to bring transportation infrastructure up to a good state of repair and meet growing transportation needs in Santa Cruz County. Support increase and index of federal fuel taxes that are available for projects in Santa Cruz County.
  - **Develop new funding mechanisms** that ensure the financial integrity of the Highway Trust Fund and Mass Transportation Account.
  - **Innovative Financing:** Ensure proposals for public-private partnerships and innovative financing are favorable for project implementation in Santa Cruz County.*

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

- **TIGER:** Maintain the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant program at or above current levels.

- **Oppose unfunded mandates** and support legislation that provides funding for past mandates.*

- **FAST Act Implementation**
  - Support legislation and administrative strategies to implement the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act or "FAST Act" federal authorization bill, in a way that ensures the best possible outcome for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County. Ensure that DOT implementation of MAP-21 and FAST Act rules and regulations do not have a negative impact on local projects and programs.
  - **Active Transportation:** Support continued funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects
  - **Transit:** Support increased funding for transit, continued and accelerated growth of the Small Transit Intensive Cities Program (STIC), funding for acquisition of transit capital (Bus and Bus Facilities, and Low and No Emissions Bus Programs), and increase funds for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) implementation, state of good repair, and other transit programs.

- **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** Support development of new funding programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation, expand eligibility for CMAQ and other funding programs to Santa Cruz County. *Support funding and coordination of vehicle electrification planning and infrastructure.

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

- **Marketplace Fairness:** Allow states and local governments to collect sales taxes on out-of-state online purchases, which would increase TDA and local sales tax revenues.

---

For more information contact the RTC at 831-460-3200; info@sccrtc.org;
1523 Pacific Ave., Santa Cruz, CA 95060
## Comparison of the 2017 Major Funding Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Governor's Proposal As of 1/10/17</th>
<th>AB 1 (Frazier) As of 12/5/16</th>
<th>SB 1 (Beall) As of 12/5/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gas Excise Tax Increase (currently 9.8 cents)</strong></td>
<td>Elimination of annual BOE adjustments with priced-based portion of gas tax reset to 18 cents ($1.1B), amount increased to 3.5 cents to 21.5 (~$630m), annual CPI adjustments Total of ~$1.625</td>
<td>Eliminates of BOE adjustments ($1.1B), 12-cent increase ($1.8B), annual CPI adjustments Total of ~$2.9B</td>
<td>Same as AB 1, but 12-cent increase is phased over 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diesel Excise Tax Increase</strong></td>
<td>11 cent increase ($425m) adjusted annually</td>
<td>20 cent increase ($600m) adjusted every 3 years</td>
<td>Same as AB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diesel Sales Tax Increase (Currently 1.75%)</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Increase by 3.5% to 5.25% ($263m) adjusted to CPI every 3 years</td>
<td>Increased by 4% to 5.5% ($338m) with .5% ($75m) directed to intercity and commuter rail, adjusted to CPI every three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Registration Fee</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$38 ($1.3B), adjusted every 3 years</td>
<td>Same as AB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Access Fee/Highway User Fee</strong></td>
<td>$65 ($2.1B)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZEV-specific Fee</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$165 ($21m) adjusted to CPI every 3 years</td>
<td>$100 ($13m), adjusted to CPI every 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Vehicle Fee Increase</strong></td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$38 ($203 for ZEVs)</td>
<td>$38 ($138 for ZEVs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cap &amp; Trade</strong></td>
<td>TIRCP ($400m) ATP ($100m)</td>
<td>$300m TIRCP** from 10%-20% LCTOP^ from 5% to 10%</td>
<td>Same as AB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Revenue (Non-article XIX &amp; off-road)</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$185m</td>
<td>Same as AB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight Fees</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$500m (returned over 5 years), cap of $500m to be transferred for non-transportation purposes in FY 2020-21</td>
<td>Difference from AB 1 is that 50% of funds would be capped starting in FY 2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund Loan Repayments</strong></td>
<td>$706m repaid over 3 years to various accounts (TIRCP, trade corridors, &amp; repairs on local roads &amp; state hwys.</td>
<td>$706m Over two years to locals and SHOPP</td>
<td>Same as AB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caltrans Efficiencies</strong></td>
<td>$100m</td>
<td>~$150m</td>
<td>$70m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total Annual Funding Increase</strong>**</td>
<td>~$4.3 billion</td>
<td>~$6 Billion</td>
<td>~$6 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Attachment 2*
## Annual Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Expenditures</th>
<th>Governor’s Proposal</th>
<th>AB 1 (Frazier)</th>
<th>SB 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Rehab &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>$2.9B</td>
<td>$4.3B</td>
<td>$4.3B after 3rd year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight/Corridor Mobility</td>
<td>$275m (Trade and Mobility Corridors)</td>
<td>$600m</td>
<td>Same as AB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail and Transit</td>
<td>$500m</td>
<td>$563m</td>
<td>$638m (w/. 5% for commuter and intercity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>Restores $754 million in cuts to 2016 STIP, $800m for 2018 STIP</td>
<td>$577m</td>
<td>Same as AB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program</td>
<td>$100m</td>
<td>$80m, up to $150m</td>
<td>$80m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$25m for SB 375 grants</td>
<td>$200m for Self-Help Counties; $120m (over four years) for advanced mitigation, $2m for CSU research</td>
<td>Same as AB 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Accountability & Reforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability &amp; Reforms</th>
<th>Governor’s Proposal</th>
<th>AB 1 (Frazier)</th>
<th>SB 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to the CTC</td>
<td>Both Caltrans &amp; locals</td>
<td>Both Caltrans &amp; locals</td>
<td>Both Caltrans &amp; locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Maintenance of Effort Requirements</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Allocation of SHOPPP</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Required by 2017</td>
<td>Required by 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Order Contracting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Eliminates the sunset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Private Partnerships</td>
<td>Extends sunset from 2017 to 2027</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption</td>
<td>Exempts projects in existing right of way</td>
<td>Exempts projects in existing right of way</td>
<td>Exempts projects in existing right of way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Delegation</td>
<td>Eliminates sunset</td>
<td>Eliminates sunset</td>
<td>Eliminates sunset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Advance Mitigation Program</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Constitutional Protection</td>
<td>CTC Independence, Inspector General, Constitutional Protection</td>
<td>Same as AB 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prepared by Gus Khouri, Legislative Assistant for the Central Coast Coalition*
### AB 1 & SB 1: REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance &amp; Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>.12 cents/gallon</td>
<td>$1.8 billion</td>
<td>(SB 1 phases the tax in over three years - indexed for inflations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fee</td>
<td>$38 per vehicle</td>
<td>$1.3 billion</td>
<td>(indexed for inflation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEV Registration Fee</td>
<td>$165 per vehicle</td>
<td>$21 million</td>
<td>(SB 1 uses $100 fee and raises $13 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3.121 billion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Price Based Excise Tax to 17</td>
<td>7.5 cents/gallon</td>
<td>$1.1 billion</td>
<td>Rate indexed going forward; increase is from current rate: 9.8 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirect Misc. Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td>$125 million</td>
<td>Off road and Ag Uses Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Weight Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500 million</td>
<td>(Phased in over 5 years @ $100 million/yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1.725 billion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excise Tax Base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap &amp; Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excise Tax - Transit</td>
<td>3.5% increase</td>
<td>$263 million</td>
<td>Doubles TIRCP and LCTOP (Assumes $2 Billion/yr in auction proceeds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05% increase</td>
<td>$40 million</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB 1 imposes an addition 1/2% that raises $40 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$563 million</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Add (Caltrans Efficiencies)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$70 million</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ONGOING REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Approximately $6.1 Billion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AB 1 and SB 1 Expenditures Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Help Funds</td>
<td>$200 million</td>
<td>RMRA Set Aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Mitigation</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
<td>RMRA Set Aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$5 million</td>
<td>RMRA Set Aside - in SB 1, this figure is only $2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>$80 million</td>
<td>RMRA Set Aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State RMRA</td>
<td>$1.4 Billion</td>
<td>50% of RMRA after Set Asides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local RMRA</td>
<td>$1.4 Billion</td>
<td>50% of RMRA after Set Asides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.125 Billion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Account</td>
<td></td>
<td>Akk funds would be indexed to inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets &amp; Roads (44%)</td>
<td>$760 million</td>
<td>SB 1 makes delegations that reflect the discussions in AB 2170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (12%)</td>
<td>$207 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Regional (44% *.75)</td>
<td>$570 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Inter-regiona (44%*.25)</td>
<td>$190 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.725 Billion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit capital &amp; ops (STA)</td>
<td>$263 million</td>
<td>(SB 1 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC &amp; Commuter Rail</td>
<td>$40 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIRCP &amp; LCTOP</td>
<td>$300 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$563 million</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous: Add to Active Transportation</td>
<td>$70 million</td>
<td>Caltrans efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. $6.1 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plus One Time Loan Repayments

| State RMRA funds                  | $353 Million |                                         |
| Local RMRA funds                  | $353 Million |                                         |
| **Total**                         | **$706 Million** |                                           |
### GOVERNOR’s TRANSPORTATION PROPOSAL: REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Registration Fee</td>
<td>$68 per vehicle</td>
<td>$2.1 Billion</td>
<td>ZEVs are included. Indexed for inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reset Price Based Excise Rate</td>
<td>$68 per vehicle</td>
<td>$2.1 Billion</td>
<td>ZEVs are included. Indexed for inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retore base to 18 cents</td>
<td>$70 million</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 yr average (assumes current CTC Fund Estimate that rate climbs back to 18 cents by 2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add an addition 3.5 cents</td>
<td>$520 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Inflation Indexing (10 yr Ave)</td>
<td>$510 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price Based Excise Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.1 Billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excise Tax</td>
<td>11 cents gallon</td>
<td>$425 Billion</td>
<td>figure is based on 10 year average after indexing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap and Trade</td>
<td>$500 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Efficiencies</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ONGOING REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.25 Billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOVERNOR’s EXPENDITURE PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program</td>
<td>$400 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 375 Local Planning Grants</td>
<td>$25 million</td>
<td>Not indexed, to be further defined by TBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Mobility Program</td>
<td>$275 million</td>
<td>Not indexed, to be further defined by TBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Partnership (begin 7/1/2018)</td>
<td>$250 million</td>
<td>Not indexed, to be further defined by TBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local STIP (regional programming)</td>
<td>$65 million</td>
<td>(increase over current fund estimate; zeros out after 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets &amp; Roads (from Excise Adjustment)</td>
<td>$85 million</td>
<td>(increase over current fund estimate; zeros out after 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets &amp; Roads (from Registration Fee)</td>
<td>1 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$2.2 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP/Maintenance (from Registration Fee)</td>
<td>1.7 billion</td>
<td>(increase over current fund estimate; zeros out after 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPPP (current allocation)</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
<td>(increase over current fund estimate; zeros out after 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional STIP</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Corridors</td>
<td>$250 million</td>
<td>Not indexed, to be further defined by TBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$2.0 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ONGOING ALLOCATIONS</strong></td>
<td>$4.2 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Loan Repayments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Corridors</td>
<td>$323 Million</td>
<td>Loan Repayments made over three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program</td>
<td>$256 Million</td>
<td>Loan Repayments made over three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP/Maintenance</td>
<td>$127 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$706 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES & ASSUMPTIONS

**Price Based Excise Tax.** Based on the structure from last year, this table projects that the 21.5 cents, only 18 cents goes to the State Highway Account (which includes funding for the STIP, SHOPP, and LSR on a 44-12-44 formula). The additional 3.5 cents and all indexing (including the indexing on the base 18 cents), goes to the new Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account. The figures for the STIP are low in this table because there is no indexing and the Administration projects that the PBE will return to 18 cents by the fourth year of its 10 year calculation.

**Calculation Method.** Like last year’s proposal, the Administration seems to be making 10 year projections and dividing by 10 to come up with the annual budget figure. This explains in part how the Administration proposal gets $425 million out of an 11 cent increase in the Diesel Tax when the Legislative proposals are calculating $600 million for a 20 cent increase. The administration appears to be factoring the indexing over that time period. However, only some of the funds appear to be indexed.

**Disclaimer: Some Guess Work Here.** This is based on some educated guessing, back of the envelope estimates, and the assumption that the proposal will largely be structured like last year with most of the funding going into one larger new fund that is split roughly evenly between state and local programs. We will have to wait for the Trailer Bill Language (Feb 1) to be sure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Reforms &amp; Accountability</th>
<th>Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy Design Manual</td>
<td>Include Complete Streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td>Exemption for work in existing right of way</td>
<td>Exemption for work in existing right of way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Delegation</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Mitigation</td>
<td>Sets Program Framework w 4 yrs Funding</td>
<td>Supports, Program &amp; funding not yet defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Delegation</td>
<td>Extended Permanently</td>
<td>Extend Permanently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Transportation Comm</td>
<td>Independent from CalSTA</td>
<td>Expand Oversight Role (but no reorganization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>CTC Oversight</td>
<td>State Highway Performance Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Funding Accountability</td>
<td>CTC Oversight over RMRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting</td>
<td>Plan to double contracts to small, disadvantaged, and disabled veteran enterprises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Shortage</td>
<td>Work force; job training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Streamlining</td>
<td>CM/GC project delivery until 2025</td>
<td>Extend Public-Private Partnership Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintence job ordering contracting pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Expand Caltrans federal exchange/state match program; provide flexibility for engineering and ROW contracting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Protections (anticipated)</td>
<td>Protect Transportation Revenues 55% Threshold</td>
<td>Protect Transportation Revenues 55% Threshold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


January 18, 2017

The Honorable Jim Frazier
Member, California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 3091
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: AB 1 (Frazier) & SB 1 (Beall) – Transportation Funding and Reform Package

Dear Assembly Member Frazier,

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRRTC) writes in strong support of SB 1 (Beall) and AB 1 (Frazier). The SCCRRTC thanks you for your continued perseverance and leadership in trying to address California’s tremendous transportation infrastructure needs. SB 1 (Beall) and AB 1 (Frazier) would provide much needed funding to address some of the overwhelming backlog of roadway, transit, and highway preservation needs in Santa Cruz County and ensure existing revenues meant for transportation projects are redirected to transportation. We especially appreciate your strong commitment to restore and increase funding to preserve and maintain the local roadway network, restoring funding for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which SCCRRTC uses to fund a balance of highway, local road, transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects, and increasing State Transit Assistance (STA) and Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) funds, which are critical to Santa Cruz County’s public transportation system.

In Santa Cruz County, with the gasoline tax value continually dwindling and not keeping pace with the cost to operate and maintain the local roadway network, the backlog of pavement maintenance needed in Santa Cruz County has grown to over $150 million. Unfortunately, even with the commitment of gas taxes and new local measure funds (approved by voters in November 2016), less than $16 million a year is currently available to improve local pavement conditions. As roads deteriorate, they become increasingly expensive to repair. Last year the California Transportation Commission (CTC) deleted over $750 million in projects from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Santa Cruz County’s unprogrammed county share is now over $9 million. We have been waiting to access most of these funds for over four years.

SB 1 (Beall) and AB 1 (Frazier) would result in new revenues for Santa Cruz County’s priority transportation improvements including road maintenance and rehabilitation, safety projects, transit, and complete street improvements. Without additional funding, 25% of local streets and roads will be in failed condition in 10 years, transit service will be cut, and critical bicycle and pedestrian safety and other projects postponed.
We cannot stress enough the importance of taking action to address the transportation funding shortfall. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue. For these reasons, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) supports SB 1 (Beall) and AB 1 (Frazier).

Sincerely,

George Dondero
Executive Director
SCCRTC

Cc: California State Association of Counties
RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff and the Evaluation Committee recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into an agreement for professional consulting services to prepare a multimodal complete streets plan for the Highway 9 corridor through San Lorenzo Valley.

BACKGROUND

Highway 9 is the primary travel corridor through San Lorenzo Valley, it serves as the “Main Street” and economic center for the towns of Felton, Ben Lomond, Brookdale, and Boulder Creek, and as an interregional arterial connecting Silicon Valley and Santa Cruz. San Lorenzo Valley community members, the County of Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, Caltrans, the RTC and other stakeholders have identified significant transportation deficiencies along the corridor. However, since state, federal, and local revenues are severely constrained, a comprehensive plan is needed to prioritize transportation investments for this important corridor.

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) was awarded a Sustainable Communities Transportation Planning Grant (FTA 5304) of $249,000 from Caltrans to prepare a complete streets corridor transportation plan for the Highway 9-San Lorenzo Valley corridor. The RTC also budgeted the required 11.47% local match. Funds for this project are designated for consultant services, RTC staff work, and participation of County of Santa Cruz and Santa Cruz METRO staff. In addition to serving on the consultant evaluation committee, METRO, County, and Caltrans staff will be assisting with public outreach, review of technical analysis, and review of the draft plan.

The plan will identify, evaluate, prioritize, and enable implementation of the most critical and cost effective transportation projects in the corridor. This includes prioritization of projects for $10 million in Measure D funds available over the next 30 years to improve transportation for San Lorenzo Valley residents. The multimodal plan will focus on safety for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists;
access to schools, businesses, and bus stops; traffic operations, pavement conditions, drainage and other needs in this important travel corridor.

DISCUSSION

Consultant Selection
On December 2, 2016, the RTC released a request for proposals (RFP) for consultant services to prepare the multimodal transportation plan for the Highway 9 corridor. Proposals were due on January 17, 2017. RTC received proposals from three consultant teams.

An evaluation committee, comprised of staff from Caltrans, Santa Cruz County Public Works, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District and RTC, reviewed the proposals for completeness and content. Based on criteria specified in the RFP and information from the written proposals, interviews, and references, the evaluation committee ranked two firms very close together. At the time of this report, staff is still checking references and will report on and recommend the RTC negotiate and execute a contract with the highest ranked consultant team at the February 2 RTC meeting. Both of the two highest ranked firms, Kimley-Horn (subconsultant TrailPeople) and W-Trans (subconsultants RRM Design Group and Mesiti-Miller Engineering), have extensive experience preparing complete street plans, work on state highways and in Santa Cruz County, a strong understanding of the services required in the request for proposals, and innovative methods proposed for preparing the plan. Both consultant teams have the experience needed to help the community analyze and prioritize multimodal transportation projects for the Highway 9 corridor in San Lorenzo Valley.

Consultant Contract
RTC staff recommends adopting a resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate and execute an agreement for consultant services. A replacement resolution page will be provided that specifies the recommended firm. If negotiations with the highest ranked firm are unsuccessful, the Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and execute a contract with next highest ranked consultant.

As shown in the work plan from the RFP (Attachment 2) and summarized below, tasks to be completed by the consultant team include:

- Corridor travel analysis and needs assessment, including documentation of existing conditions and identification of infrastructure gaps;
- answer questions about what can be done within Caltrans’ right-of-way;
- include conceptual complete street designs and be used to facilitate subsequent design, environmental review and construction of improvements;
- provide data, evaluation, analysis, and public deliberation to make informed decisions;
- prioritize transportation projects that can be implemented in the short and mid-term to address transportation challenges on the corridor; and
- assist RTC staff with public outreach throughout plan development.
This corridor-specific plan will be a stepping stone to securing funding for priority investments and provide a framework for partnering with Caltrans to implement investments that promote complete streets, implement sustainable communities strategies, and improve multi-modal access, connectivity, safety, security, system preservation, economic vitality and environmental quality.

Next Steps
Several public meetings have been held in San Lorenzo Valley to solicit information from the community in recent years. As the lead for the public outreach component of the plan, RTC staff will work with the project team (Caltrans, County of Santa Cruz, METRO, and the consultant) to build upon past outreach efforts and continue gathering input from the community and Commissioners throughout development of the plan using a range of activities. This includes seeking input on goals and evaluation measures, the needs assessment, the implementation plan, and the draft and final plan through workshops, stakeholder meetings, and online tools.

Additional information on this project is available on the RTC [website](#) and in the attached fact sheet ([Attachment 3](#)).

**SUMMARY**

Caltrans has awarded the RTC a planning grant of $249,000 to prepare a complete streets plan for the Highway 9 corridor through San Lorenzo Valley (SLV). The plan will identify, evaluate, and prioritize transportation projects that improve safety, access to schools, businesses, and bus stops, and traffic operations. RTC staff recommends that the RTC authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into a consultant agreement to support development of the plan.

**Attachments**
1. Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to Enter into a Consultant Agreement
2. Scope of Work from the Request for Proposals (RFP)
3. Project fact sheet
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RESOLUTION NO. 18-17

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of February 2, 2017
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO A
CONTRACT WITH ____________[Firm Name] FOR CONSULTANT SERVICES TO
PREPARE A HIGHWAY 9/SAN LORENZO VALLEY CORRIDOR PLAN

WHEREAS, Highway 9 serves as the backbone for the movement of people and
goods through San Lorenzo Valley, providing access to schools, commercial,
residential, and recreational destinations; and

WHEREAS, San Lorenzo Valley community members, the County of Santa Cruz,
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, Caltrans and other stakeholders have
identified transportation deficiencies along the corridor, including collision locations,
gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian networks, lack of accessible paths to bus stops,
operational deficiencies that impact economic vitality and safety, and pavement,
drainage, and other assets in disrepair; and

WHEREAS, given severe funding constraints a corridor plan is needed to
evaluate and prioritize transportation investments in the corridor; and

WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has awarded
the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) a Federal Transit
Administration (FTA) 5304 Sustainable Communities planning grant to conduct a
prepare a complete streets plan for the State Route 9 (Highway 9) corridor that
identifies, prioritizes and enables implementation of the most critical and cost
effective transportation projects through San Lorenzo Valley (SLV); and

WHEREAS, the RTC’s approved FY16/17 budget and work program includes
funds for consultant services to prepare a complete streets plan for the Highway 9
through San Lorenzo Valley;

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

1. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and enter into an
   agreement with ____________[Firm Name] for the Highway 9/San Lorenzo
   Valley Complete Streets Corridor Plan; and

2. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and execute amendments
to this agreement provided that the amendments are consistent with the
RTC’s approved budget and work program.

3. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and enter into a contract
with the second highest ranked consultant team, in the event that negotiations with the highest rank consultant are unsuccessful.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

ATTEST:

______________________________
Zach Friend, Chair

_________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: RTC Fiscal, RTC and Consultant Project Managers
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**Summary:**
The RTC intends to engage the services of a consultant or consultant team to develop a complete streets plan for the State Route 9 (SR9) travel corridor through San Lorenzo Valley (SLV). The Highway 9 - San Lorenzo Valley Complete Streets Corridor Transportation Plan (SR9/SLV Plan) will document existing conditions and plans for the corridor, identify multimodal travel needs and infrastructure gaps, and provide the data, evaluation, analysis, and public deliberation necessary to make informed decisions when prioritizing transportation projects that can be implemented in the short- and mid-term. The plan will identify opportunities to address transportation challenges on the SR 9/San Lorenzo Valley corridor, improve multi-modal access and connectivity, safety and security, operations, economic vitality and environmental quality, as well as advance other local, regional, state and federal transportation planning goals and objectives.

The selected consultant must demonstrate to the evaluation committee’s satisfaction its qualifications to provide the services summarized below and outlined under “Consultant Tasks.” Generally, tasks include:

- Define goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria for the Highway 9 Corridor through San Lorenzo Valley (SLV).
- Corridor travel analysis and needs assessment to identify projects that would advance goals and objectives.
- Evaluation and prioritization of investment options, including identification of potential funding sources, use of metrics to evaluate the degree to which different projects address deficiencies and goals for the corridor, and development of a prioritized list of short-term and mid-term projects that are reasonable to implement.
- Prepare and present draft and final corridor plan.
- Assist RTC staff with public outreach throughout plan development.

**Project Area:**
The corridor covered in this plan is generally expected to cover the areas along Highway 9 from Henry Cowell State Park in Felton to the northern intersection of Highway 236 north of Boulder Creek and may include some alternative roads parallel to Highway 9, such as Glen Arbor, or off-road trails, especially given some constraints along the highway.

**Timeline:**
Consultant services for the SR9/SLV Plan are anticipated to last from February 2017 through March 2018.

**Consultant Tasks:**
The following describes the anticipated tasks and deliverables for the SR9/SLV Plan.

**Task 1: Project Administration**
**Tasks:** Project kick-off, management, coordination, and administration.

**Deliverables:** Executed contract, coordination meetings and notes, ongoing communications, etc.

**Task 2: Corridor Plan**
**Task 2.1: Kick-off Meeting.** Refine and finalize the scope of work and project schedule.
Task 2.2: Review Prior Studies and Planning Efforts

- Collect, review, reference, and build upon documents related to land use and transportation in the project area. May include the following:
  - Relevant Caltrans Documents and Programs
    - SR 9 and SR 236 Route/Transportation Concept Reports
    - District System Management Plan
    - *Smart Mobility 2010: A Call to Action for the New Decade* (The Smart Mobility Framework)
    - *Main Street, California: A Guide for Improving Community and Transportation Vitality*
    - 10-Year State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)
    - Right-of-way maps of project area
    - California Transportation Plan
    - Strategic management Plans
  - Santa Cruz County General Plan – circulation updates currently under development
  - Felton, Ben Lomond, and Boulder Creek Town Plans
  - County of Santa Cruz Town Hall Meetings
  - Santa Cruz County Capital Improvement Program
  - Santa Cruz County Economic Vitality Study (EVS) and Economic Development Vision and Strategy (EDVS),
  - Sustainable Santa Cruz County
  - Sustainable Santa Cruz County
  - San Lorenzo Valley Trail Feasibility Study
  - Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTC) and Monterey Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (AMBAG)
    - SCS Implementation Toolkit from AMBAG
  - Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook
  - METRO Short Range Transit Plan, Bus Stop Guidelines, COA, and transit rider information
  - Bike and Pedestrian Hazard Reports (RTC)
  - Other information from local social service providers, elected officials, Santa Cruz METRO, schools, colleges.

- **Deliverable:** Discussion and incorporation of data, project ideas and other findings from existing plans and planning efforts into the SR9/SLV plan.

Task 2.3: Define Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria

- Develop a cohesive list of goals and objectives for the corridor; clarify what is hoped to be accomplished from the plan; ensure consistency with local, regional, state and federal planning goals and initiatives.
- Establish evaluation criteria, based on the objectives, to be used to analyze and prioritize a range of investment options to address deficiencies and goals for the corridor. Consider criteria used by funding entities and state/federal grant programs. Depending on the availability of data, some of the criteria may be more specific and quantitative while others will be more qualitative.
- Finalize goals, objectives and evaluation criteria based on public input, recommendations from partner entities, and concurrence from governing boards (Board of Supervisors and/or RTC).

- **Deliverable:** Goals, objectives and evaluation criteria, documentation of process

Task 2.4: Corridor Travel Analysis and Needs Assessment

- Identify existing conditions and projected future needs.
• Gather existing conditions and background data, including traffic volumes, travel times, collision data, land use, and demographic information. Identify activity centers and other transportation magnets. Provide statistics required for common grant programs.
• Consider forecasted changes in population and demographics, economic activity (jobs), and travel patterns for people and goods.
• Identify multimodal projects (investment options) that would advance goals and objectives, and address deficiencies and challenges noted in Attachment A1 and through public outreach, including improved access, mobility, safety, operations, and asset management.
  o Collaborate with local residents and regional partners, including Caltrans, to address interregional, regional, and local travel on SR 9.
    ▪ Coordinate with Caltrans, the County of Santa Cruz, and Santa Cruz METRO to identify and document maintenance and transportation facility preservation needs.
  o May include field surveys with partner agency representatives and needs assessment to document existing conditions, identify opportunities and constraints, and photograph sites.
  o Determine the extent to which existing infrastructure satisfies current needs.
  o Identify where changes to systems operations can improve efficiency.
• Prepare maps showing corridor limits, surrounding land uses (existing and planned), collision incidents, physical constraints, transportation deficiencies, and investment options.
• Prepare Existing Conditions Report for public review documenting existing conditions, infrastructure needs/gaps, safety issues and focus areas to be addressed in the plan. The existing conditions report will be developed with Project Oversight Team and community input through stakeholder and public meetings.

**Deliverable: Needs Assessment Report**

**Task 2.5: Evaluation and Prioritization of Investment Options**
• Identification and evaluation of potential funding sources (e.g., federal funds, state funds, transit and local sales or property taxes allocated for transportation).
• Utilize metrics to evaluate the degree to which different investments address issues and advance goals for corridor (e.g. performance measures/scoring criteria).
• Evaluate possible infrastructure and service investments and identify priorities that are reasonable to implement within forecasted revenues/ in consideration of financial constraints.
  o Work with Caltrans, the County of Santa Cruz, and Santa Cruz METRO to identify scale/magnitude of costs for projects (not design engineering level), including ongoing maintenance and operating costs.
• Recommend a prioritized list of short-term and mid-term investment options (program of projects) that address goals and objectives within realistic revenues. Including, but not limited to:
  o Priorities for each town, between town centers, and interregional travel
  o Complete streets components that could be coordinated with or incorporated into State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects.
  o “Low hanging fruit” project for bicyclists and pedestrians, especially near schools.
  o Discussion of possible constraints, tradeoffs, and feasibility of different concepts/options.
  Screen project ideas and concepts to ensure unrealistic expectations are not established.
• Environmental justice analysis of prioritized projects to ensure transportation investments are provided in an equitable manner and ensure there are no disproportionate adverse impacts, particularly on disadvantaged populations (under represented, low-income or minority communities).

**Deliverable: Investment Evaluation Report**
Task 2.6: Implementation Plan
- Identify implementation strategies and timeline.
  - Description of implementation process/next steps
  - Strategies to fund and sequence priority projects
  - Options to streamline implementation of solutions, such as joint-use maintenance agreements to minimize encroachment permit processing, best practices, design standards
- Include conceptual complete street design options for different sections of the corridor (e.g. rural, residential, main street areas), following Caltrans review.
- Reflect refined community desires and overall demands that can realistically be implemented.
- Identify complete streets components that could be incorporated into SHOIPP projects and projects that would be cost-effective priority candidates for various grant programs, or possible new local funds.

- **Deliverable:** Implementation Report

Task 2.7: Administrative Draft and Draft Corridor Plan
- Prepare an administrative draft corridor plan for review by Project Oversight Team prior to public review. Contents of the Corridor Plan document are anticipated to include:
  - Executive summary
  - Corridor Travel Analysis and Needs Assessment
  - Evaluation and Prioritization of Investment Options
  - Inventory potential funding sources
  - Graphics, maps, photos, and other visuals
  - Recommendations for short and mid-term transportation improvements, including project prioritization and phasing
  - Implementation strategies to fund and sequence priority projects – including description of implementation process/next steps
  - Summary of the public outreach process, including outcomes of public workshops, presentations, and outreach efforts.
- Incorporate comments from project oversight team and revise the administrative draft for public release.
- Public review on the Draft Plan

- **Deliverables:** Administrative Draft and Draft Corridor Plan

Task 2.8: Prepare Final Corridor Plan
- Prepare Final Corridor Plan, responding to public comments and incorporating staff, stakeholder, and board feedback.
- Present Final Corridor Plan for approval by the Board of Supervisors and acceptance by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC).

- **Deliverables:** Final Corridor Plan incorporating public and stakeholder input

Task 2.9: Assist with Public Engagement – Ongoing
*Note RTC will be the lead for public engagement. The following is a list of consultant tasks only.*
- Provide input on public involvement plan and engagement efforts that provide multiple, diverse opportunities for members of the public to participate in the development of the plan.
- Identify and help set up interactive methods to engage participation and generate thoughtful input, including internet-based methods and tools.
- Preparation of presentations and materials for public meetings, workshops, and online outreach efforts, including maps and other visual displays.
- Presentations at a minimum of 3 meetings.
• Assist with providing responses to technical questions.

• **Deliverables:** Provide input on public outreach plan; development of interactive online methods to engage participation, PowerPoint presentations, maps, graphics, other visual aids.

RTC staff to take lead on development of public outreach plan, project webpage, online surveys, electronic newsletters, flyers, factsheets that provide project information, notifications about public input opportunities, news releases, setting up meeting facilities, establishment of a technical advisory group, outreach to the public, including stakeholders and community groups, and compiling and responding to public comments, questions or concerns. This plan will build off momentum from meetings, tours, and public outreach conducted over the past three years, in order to identify solutions that balance and integrate community values; but also actively engage organizations representing low income, minority, senior, youth and other groups that are often typically underrepresented. Outreach will include proven methods for engaging San Lorenzo Valley communities, including web-based outreach and surveys, town-specific meetings, outreach to students and parents through the school district, and working with non-profits and service organizations.

**Coordination:**
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) will coordinate the development of the plan, including management of consultant services and public and stakeholder engagement. The consultant team must be willing and able to work closely with the Project Oversight Team (RTC, Caltrans, County of Santa Cruz, and Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)). Working with the Project Oversight Team includes, but is not limited to, prompt responses to phone calls and emails, sharing of draft materials, and participation in coordination meetings.
Attachment A1: SR9/San Lorenzo Valley Corridor Challenges and Deficiencies

The following is a partial list of some of the key challenges that have been identified by the community in this mountainous corridor:

- Safety for all modes
  - Narrow and curvy road in mountainous area, shoulders very narrow or non-existent in some sections, resulting in road sharing challenges
  - Significant injury and fatal collisions
  - Need improved lighting and visibility for pedestrians, especially at crossings
  - Speeding is common, and a major concern especially in town centers and near schools.
  - Sight distances are limited
  - Guard and bridge rail replacements are needed
  - Improved drainage is needed to improve safety and minimize storm water runoff into San Lorenzo River Watershed
  - Insufficient passing lanes and turnouts.

- Gaps in bicycle and pedestrian facilities along the corridor
  - No continuous sidewalks or pathways, including through town centers; gaps in ADA-compliant pedestrian facilities; limited pedestrian crossings; obstacles for pedestrians.
  - Existing infrastructure for bicyclists is not adequate to accommodate safe, convenient access. Bicycle lanes, bicycle parking, and other bike facilities are either incomplete or completely missing in many sections of the corridor. Lack of facilities and signage between town centers.
  - Lack of safe routes for walking or biking to San Lorenzo Valley High School, Middle School, and Elementary School in Felton and Boulder Creek Elementary School. The result is students walking in the shoulder or dirt paths along the highway. Total K-12 enrollment along this section of SR9 is over 3,000.
  - Gaps in the active transportation network contribute to poor health conditions.

- Improved access to transit service along the corridor is needed.
  - Limited bus service, resulting in limited mobility options and a significant amount of hitchhiking among both youth and adults.
  - Lack of accessible facilities providing safe paths to walk or bike to public bus stops.
  - Upgrades are needed to bus stops, including facilities to provide shelter from weather.
  - Growing paratransit needs for seniors and people with disabilities.
  - Need to look at alternatives to public bus service.

- Corridor Operations: Speeding, left turn access, driveways, traffic jams through commercial and school zones, intersections, and limited passing lanes and turnouts all present operational challenges.

- Challenges implementing relatively small projects in the state right-of-way, such as streetscape projects in main street sections, pedestrian-friendly street lighting, street furniture, installation of new bicycle racks, and bus stop upgrades.

- System preservation and drainage, especially as this area is subject to heavy rains and storm water runoff into the San Lorenzo River Watershed.

- Preservation of historic, cultural and environmental assets, including wildlife, trees, parks.

- Access to businesses and jobs along the corridor, to support economic vitality and address issues related to parking, ingress and egress.

- Funding needs are more than double available revenues.
Project Summary
A complete streets plan for a ten mile section of Highway 9 through San Lorenzo Valley (SLV) that identifies, prioritizes, and enables implementation of the most critical and cost effective transportation projects. This mountainous roadway serves as the “Main Street” and economic center for the towns of Felton, Ben Lomond, Brookdale, and Boulder Creek and as an interregional arterial connecting Silicon Valley and Santa Cruz. This plan will focus on safety for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists; access to schools, businesses, and bus stops; traffic operations, pavement conditions, drainage and other needs in this important travel corridor.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Major Milestones

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

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

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

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
831-460-3200
info@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org/slv
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Receive an update from the City of Santa Cruz on the 2.1-mile rail trail project underway and the two-part phasing plan; and

2. Approve the attached resolution (Attachment 2) authorizing the Executive Director to enter into necessary agreements and amendments to implement the City of Santa Cruz project and other funded rail trail projects.

BACKGROUND

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

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

In February 2016, the RTC received a presentation on preliminary designs for the project and authorized staff to negotiate and enter into implementation agreements with the City of Santa Cruz and other rail trail project implementing entities, as necessary.

DISCUSSION

The City of Santa Cruz has been working closely with the RTC and its rail operator, Iowa Pacific (doing business locally as Santa Cruz and Monterey Bay
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Railway), to design a 2.1-mile bicycle and pedestrian rail trail project from Natural Bridges Drive to Pacific Avenue.

**Design and Phasing Plan**
Following presentation of preliminary designs at an Open House in January of last year, City of Santa Cruz staff and consultants refined the design plans to reflect public input and requests. Of note were improvements so as to locate the trail entirely on one side of the tracks and to expand the trail’s width. After extensive negotiations with New Leaf Community Market and the land owner, a parking lot reconfiguration was agreed upon that will resolve a choke point in the trail design at the corner of Swift and the railroad tracks that would have entailed relocating the trail to the inland side for a short stretch. The successful agreement will enable the entirety of the 2.1 miles of trail to be located on the coastal side.

Additionally, designing the project to 16 feet of usable paved width was requested by the community and stakeholders in anticipation of high usage numbers and the benefit of separating different modes of travel. Cost estimates were determined for a community preferred 16-foot width trail throughout the entire length but unfortunately the cost surpasses available funding. City staff therefore proposes phasing the project implementation into a Phase 1 project to extend from Natural Bridges Drive to California Street and a Phase 2 project to connect California Street to Pacific Ave at the Wharf roundabout.

The attached staff report (Attachment 1) presented by City staff to the November 1, 2016 Santa Cruz City Council meeting details the cost increases which range from $1.75M for construction of a 12-foot trail as presented in the RTC’s trail Master Plan and $3.65M for construction of a 16-foot trail throughout the length of the project as preferred. These costs reflect construction figures only and not all the preliminary design, environmental review and permitting work which are staying constant. The Council approved the recommended plan dividing the trail into 16-foot Phase 1 and 12-foot Phase 2 projects. The staff report and solutions approved by the Santa Cruz City Council will also be presented by Chris Schneiter, City of Santa Cruz Assistant Public Works Director at the February 2, 2017 RTC meeting. Solutions to be discussed include seeking additional funding from Measure D or other grant funds to complete both phases.

**Cooperative Agreement**
RTC staff and County Counsel have been working with City of Santa Cruz staff and the city’s attorney to develop a cooperative agreement setting out the duties and responsibilities for project construction and maintenance. The agreement specifies that the City of Santa Cruz is responsible for construction and maintenance of the constructed improvements and that no funding is provided at this time for the maintenance. City staff does note that one of Measure D’s objectives is to fund trail maintenance and that reimbursement will likely be requested for annual maintenance costs. Liability for use is shared by both agencies. Addressing hazardous materials is the responsibility of the RTC as the property owner.
While the RTC previously authorized the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into an agreement, this item is being brought back to the Commission with a summary of details since it will be used as a general guideline for other rail trail projects, as needed. The Cooperative Agreement, signed by the City of Santa Cruz City Manager, is attached (Exhibit 1).

**Staff recommends that the RTC receive a presentation on the City of Santa Cruz rail trail project and implementation phasing plan due to cost increases. Staff also recommends that the RTC approve a resolution (Attachment 2) authorizing the Executive Director to enter into agreements and amendments as necessary to implement the City of Santa Cruz project.** As discussed, this agreement will be used for other projects as necessary.

**SUMMARY**

The City of Santa Cruz is implementing a 2.1-mile rail trail project from Natural Bridges Drive to Pacific Avenue. Staff recommends approval of the City of Santa Cruz's project phasing plan and the attached resolution authorizing the Executive Director to enter into necessary agreements and amendments to implement this trail projects and others as needed.

---

**Attachment 1**: City of Santa Cruz staff report, presented at the November 1, 2016 Council meeting

**Attachment 2**: Resolution (with Exhibit 1: Cooperative Agreement between the City of Santa Cruz and the RTC)
CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA REPORT

DATE: 10/18/2016

AGENDA OF: 11/1/2016

DEPARTMENT: Public Works

SUBJECT: Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (Rail Trail) – Segment 7 (c401413) – Final Schematic Plan, Phasing Plan, Cooperative Agreement and Contract Amendment No. 2 (PW)

RECOMMENDATION: Motion to approve the Final Schematic Plan, Phasing Plan, Cooperative Agreement and Contract Amendment No. 2 with RRM Design Group for additional design services for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (Rail Trail) – Segment 7 (c401413) in the amount of $77,750.00 and authorize the City Manager to execute the Cooperative Agreement and Contract Amendment No. 2, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney.

BACKGROUND: On November 24, 2014, Council authorized staff to advertise the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Segment 7 (Natural Bridges to Pacific Avenue) Request for Qualifications for design and environmental review services and authorized the City Manager to execute a contract in a form acceptable to the City Attorney. The project services were awarded to RRM Design Group in the amount of $798,533.00 which is funded by a grant and a local match. RRM had completed the master plan and were the designer of the Arana Gulch Multi-Use Trail projects.

On January 28, 2016, staff and RRM presented the preliminary schematic plan at an open house event where over 100 people were shown the proposed alignment and they had an opportunity to express their views and comments on the project. The project team has met with stakeholder groups and impacted departments to evaluate and incorporate comments and ideas into the project design, with the main focus on two significant proposed alignment changes at New Leaf Community Market and La Barranca Park.

On May 2, 2016, staff presented the La Barranca Park realignment option to the Parks and Recreation Commission. This option would have realigned a portion of the trail onto La Barranca Park to improve visibility, security, and emergency access to the trail. Commissioners and the public alike expressed concerns about impacts to the linear park users, the slope of the ramp between the park and rail being more difficult for riders and pedestrians, and the “no man’s land” that may happen to the remaining rail area when the public use is not provided for. In addition, redesign costs to study this alignment was $95,584.00. The La Barranca option was withdrawn and Fire and Police have concurred that the original alignment adjacent to the rail line can work with lighting, security cameras, and widening of the trail, all of which has been incorporated into the Final Schematic Plan.
On May 24, 2016, Contract Amendment No.1 with RRM was approved by Council in the amount of $54,420.00 for additional survey and alignment work to complete the project design, environmental review and construction documents.

In June 2016, after nine months of discussions, New Leaf Community Market and the land owner agreed to a parking lot reconfiguration that allows for the trail to be constructed on the coastal side of the tracks. With this major development, the project in its entirety, Natural Bridges Drive to Pacific Avenue (2.1 miles), is on the coastal side of the tracks, as shown on the Final Schematic Plan.

On September 19, 2016, staff presented the Final Schematic plan to the Transportation and Public Works Commission (TPWC). The Commissioners motion carried unanimously to recommend that the City Council approve the Final Schematic Plan and direct staff to complete construction documents based on the Final Schematic Plan.

DISCUSSION: The Final Schematic Plan typically represents the completion of the preliminary engineering phase, with enough information to complete the environmental studies and submit for permits. Since the TPWC meeting, a design development cost estimate of construction has been developed, staff finalized discussions with SCCRTC on a cooperative agreement for construction and maintenance of the project, tentative agreement has been reached with the CPUC for the crossings, and environmental studies have been initiated. (See Final Schematic Plans, Sheets TS-1.01 to CP-1.21). The most recent and unfortunate news is the project as designed, a 2.1 mile long and 16-foot wide all-weather trail, is estimated to cost $8.15 million for construction. The current federal and state grants, and local construction funding is at $4.5 million, presenting a $3.65 million shortfall. The construction of the trail between California and Pacific is the most expensive section of the project, representing 70% of the project cost. It requires the most excavation, retaining walls, storm drains, lighting and security cameras. Subsequently staff and the consultant team evaluated the cost estimate and project design from three perspectives; 1) Acquire additional funding, 2) develop a less expensive full length project, and 3) phase the project.

While acquiring some additional funding may be possible for the project through Measure D or other grant funds, it’s not likely to be available immediately and there are many competing interests. The project is funded by a federal earmark and STIP funding, both vulnerable funds and there is pressure to obligate the funds soon. Reducing the trail width to 12-feet and eliminating some more durable features that impact maintenance, reduces the cost estimate to $6.25 million ($1.75 million shortfall). While a 12-foot trail is adequate for most uses, if the trail is as popular with the community as expected, a 16-foot wide trail is preferred as noted at the open house. The additional width helps to separate different modes of travel. In addition, the width reduction in the California-Pacific section can constrain emergency vehicle access when bikes and pedestrians are present.

The staff preferred approach is to phase the project to maximize the community benefit within the envelope of available funding. There is a logical opportunity, based on community need and use, and cost and funding to create two phases. Phase I, from Natural Bridges Drive to California Street, and Phase II, from California Street to Pacific Avenue are proposed. Funding exceeds the construction cost estimate of $2.18 million for Phase I and the majority of the path is then complete and usable to its full community preferred 16-foot width. The original goal to improve access to west side schools, neighborhoods and Downtown is maintained, and access to the Beach Area and Eastside are via existing bike lanes and sidewalks on Bay, to West Cliff Drive and Beach Street facilities. See Phasing Plan.
Two options for Phase II were evaluated, constructing to the current proposed 16-foot width, which is estimated at $5.98 million or to a more constrained 12-foot width which is estimated at $4.43 million. For every additional foot of width there is a corresponding added foot in height and robustness of the wall, increasing costs by $1.55 million between the two options. Staff recommends completing the design for the 16-foot wide trail for Phase I and a 12-foot wide trail for Phase II, the environmental review and coastal development permit (only needed for Phase II) so that it is shovel ready for future grant applications. The project cost estimate for both phases, as proposed is $6.61 million, presenting a $2.1 million shortfall for Phase II.

Staff is meeting with the project proponents and stakeholders to assess the concerns for this approach, and will report back to Council at the December 13 meeting. Staff has met with SCCRTC staff to determine the technical issues with the federal and state funding to phase the project. It is likely that we will have to amend the funding details with the California Transportation Commission early next year.

Staff seeks Council approval of the Final Schematic Plan (with a revision of Phase II to 12 feet wide) and Phasing Plan. Once the Final Schematic Plan is approved by Council, the construction plan and specification will begin in conjunction with obtaining environmental permitting and right-of-way certification. Construction bid set documents are anticipated to be brought back for Council approval and authorization to advertise in summer 2017.

Public Works and the City Attorney working with SCCRTC staff and County Counsel developed a cooperative agreement setting out the duties and responsibilities of the project construction and maintenance. The agreement specifies that the city is responsible for construction and maintenance of the constructed improvements. No funding is provided at this time for the maintenance, though one of Measure D’s objectives is to fund trail maintenance. Liability for use is shared by both agencies. Addressing hazardous materials is the sole responsibility of the owner, SCCRTC. The minimum annual cost for Public Works and Parks Department to maintain the path is estimated at $85,000 per year and equates to a half time fte in Parks, using some existing staff resources, some new equipment and contract services. The costs will likely increase as additional services are identified by staff and requested by the community. In addition it is anticipated that the trail will have to be resurfaced every 10-15 years at a cost of $100,000. These costs will be incorporated in the FY2019 budget process. Staff recommends approval of the Cooperative Agreement and a request that the SCCRTC consider reimbursing the City for annual maintenance costs. See Cooperative Agreement.

Staff recommends approval of Contract Amendment No. 2 with RRM encapsulates RRM Amendment No. 4, in the amount of $75,720, and is for the new alignment and associated changes between Swift Street and Fair Avenue (New Leaf) and additional intersection improvements at Bay Street and California Street. See Contract Amendment No. 2.

FISCAL IMPACT: The project design is funded in the current fiscal year and the project construction is proposed to be funded in FY 2017 and 2018. Funds include grants from Federal Earmark, State Transportation Improvement Program, City General Capital Improvement Program funds, local private and nonprofit donations including $50,000 from the Coastal Conservancy Grant and a $50,000 donation from Friends of the Rail &Trail (FORT). Staff and its partners continue to explore additional grants and donations as needed. Staff is exploring using Measure D, and additional grants and donations to compensate for the additional design costs.
ATTACHMENTS:
Final Schematic Plan, Sheets TS-1.01 to CP-1.21
Phasing Plan
Cooperative Agreement
Contract Amendment No. 2
RRM Amendment No. 4
RESOLUTION NO. 19-17

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of February 2, 2017
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

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

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, in December, 2013, the RTC programmed $4,060,000 to a rail trail project within the City of Santa Cruz and matching funds were provided by the City of Santa Cruz, the California Coastal Conservancy and other local private funding partners;

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Cruz public works department is implementing the project and will be responsible for ongoing maintenance;

WHEREAS, three other rail trail projects are under way within the City of Watsonville, on the north coast, and on a segment straddling the City and County of Santa Cruz;

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

1. The Executive Director, or his designee, is authorized to enter into a Cooperative Agreement as provided in Exhibit 1 with the City of Santa Cruz;

2. The Executive Director, or his designee, is authorized to enter into agreements with other entities implementing segments of the rail trail, so long as projects are consistent with RTC approvals or funding allocations;

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

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

________________________
Zach Friend, Chair

ATTEST:

__________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

**Exhibit 1**: Cooperative Agreement between the City of Santa Cruz and the RTC

Distribution: RTC Fiscal
  RTC MBSST Planner
  City of Santa Cruz Public Works
  City of Watsonville Public Works
  City of Capitola Public Works
  County of Santa Cruz Public Works
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Cooperative Agreement
By and Between
The City of Santa Cruz
And
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

For design, environmental review, permitting, construction and maintenance of a portion of Segment 7 of Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (Natural Bridges to Pacific Avenue) on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way

This Cooperative Agreement for the design, environmental review, permitting, construction and maintenance of a portion of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Segment 7 (Project) is entered into this ______ day of ______________________, 2016, by and between the City of Santa Cruz (City) and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), with reference to the Recitals set forth below. City and RTC may be referred to herein individually as a “Party” and collectively as the “Parties”.

I. RECITALS

WHEREAS, RTC purchased from Union Pacific Railroad and now owns that certain real property identified as the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Rail Line) right-of-way for preservation, continuation of freight and recreational rail service, implementation of additional recreational rail service, potential future passenger rail service and construction of a bicycle and pedestrian trail; and

WHEREAS, RTC secured the services of Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway (Railway) for the purpose of maintaining and providing recreational and freight rail services on the Rail Line and entered into an Administration, Coordination and License Agreement (ACL) with Railway, and the ACL is incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, Union Pacific Railroad retained a freight easement of 10 feet from the centerline of any track on the Rail Line (Freight Easement), and transferred the Freight Easement and railroad operations agreements for the Rail Line to Railway; and

WHEREAS, Railway was designated by the Surface Transportation Board (STB) as the common carrier for the Rail Line; and

WHEREAS, RTC produced and adopted the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network Master Plan and certified the corresponding environmental document, which includes construction of a multi-use trail along the Rail Line right-of-way and is incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, the MBsST Network Master Plan was adopted by the City of Santa Cruz Council on March 24, 2015 in a show of support and endorsement;

WHEREAS, the MBsST Network Master Plan identifies trail segments including Segment 7, “Coastal Santa Cruz,” consisting of a 3.10-mile segment of trail along the Rail Line right-of-way; and
WHEREAS, the MBSST Network Master Plan also identifies design standards and guidelines applicable to the design and construction of trail segments, including Segment 7; and

WHEREAS, all references to the MBSST Network Master Plan herein shall refer to the most current MBSST Network Master Plan and amendments available at the time of the project design and approval; and

WHEREAS, in December 2013, the RTC allocated $4,060,000 in state and federal transportation funds to the City for construction of a 2.1 mile portion of Segment 7 (Project), which includes approximately 1.5 feet of the outer boundary of the freight easement at some locations;

WHEREAS, according to Resolution 13-14, the Project “shall be designed and implemented in a manner consistent with the Master Plan, Environmental Impact Report, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to the extent possible” including incorporation of design standards and RTC’s advisory committee reviews when feasible; and

WHEREAS, an additional $50,000 is being provided by the California Coastal Conservancy for the Project through the RTC, and Conservancy obligations need to be met to receive such funds; and

WHEREAS, the City has committed $1,240,000 in local matching funds and is accepting private and private nonprofit donations for the Project; and

WHEREAS, the City has agreed to undertake the design, environmental analysis, permitting, construction, and maintenance of the 2.1 mile portion of the Project consistent with the MBSST Network Master Plan and upon the terms and conditions set forth herein; and

WHEREAS, the RTC has agreed to authorize the City access to the Rail Line for purposes of design, environmental review, permitting, and construction of the Project, upon the terms and conditions set forth herein, and to undertake maintenance of the Project upon completion consistent with the MBSST Network Master Plan.

II. TERMS OF AGREEMENT

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises contained herein and incorporating the Recitals above, the Parties agree as follows:

1. Right to Access: RTC hereby authorizes the City and its consultants, contractors and subcontractors to enter upon that certain property owned by RTC and described in the MBSST Network Master Plan as a portion of Segment 7 (Project), “Coastal Santa Cruz,” consisting of a 2.1 mile segment of trail, for the purposes and upon the terms and conditions described herein. The RTC has agreed to coordinate with City to provide access to the freight easement area for purposes of design, environmental review, permitting, construction and maintenance of the Project, subject to the coordination with the Railway and in accordance with the ACL. City shall be responsible for directly coordinating access with the Railway, with RTC’s reasonable assistance, if needed. City will have the right to terminate this Agreement if City, its contractors or agents are not authorized access by either the RTC or the Railway, after the City has provided reasonable
written notice to RTC and the City has undertaken in good faith to resolve the basis for denial of access to the Project area by the RTC or Railway, as applicable.

2. **Funding:** RTC has allocated the amount of Four Million Sixty Thousand Dollars ($4,060,000.00) in state and federal transportation funds to the City for design, environmental review, permitting, construction of the Project consistent with the MBSST Network Master Plan and this Agreement. The City has allocated $1,240,000 in local matching funds for the cost related to this Project. In addition, the California Coastal Conservancy has contributed Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000.00) for the Project, use of which is subject to all conditions thereof, which are incorporated herein by this reference. The RTC and the City mutually agree to seek additional funding or to revise the scope of the Project should it be more costly than the available committed funding.

3. **Design, Environmental Review, Permitting, Construction:** City is responsible to contract for the design, environmental review, permitting and construction of the Project consistent with the MBSST Network Master Plan and this Agreement.
   a. The design of the Project shall be consistent with the MBSST Final Master Plan. The final design of the Project is subject to RTC administrative approval and approval of the Railway, or its successor-in-interest, prior to final approval by the City, and shall be done within 30 days of receipt of plans by RTC, provided that, at the time of approval by RTC, Railway has agreed that the Project design will not materially interfere with Railway's rights and operations under the ACL or Railway's Freight Service rights and obligations under federal law or under the Freight Easement, unless approved by the Surface Transportation Board. Any consultant or contractor selected by the City for the design, environmental review, permitting and construction of all or any portion of the Project shall be subject to the administrative approval of the RTC within 10 days of receipt of intent to award or contract prior to an award or execution of a contract with such consultant or contractor.
   b. All contracts for the design, environmental review, permitting, and construction of the Project shall require compliance with applicable requirements under any federal, state or local law or regulation and all applicable conditions of any funding used for the design or construction of the Project, including but not limited to all applicable prevailing wage and related labor laws under Labor Code section 1710-1815 and related regulations.
   c. City shall require payment and performance bonds for all contracts for construction of the Project in accordance with applicable law, regulations and/or funding conditions. All payment and performance bonds and any warranties required for the construction of the Project shall name the City and RTC as co-obligees. No bonds are required for minor projects executed by the City, and as defined by City ordinance.
   d. City shall require all consultants, contractors and subcontractors performing work relating to the Project to carry adequate insurance including professional liability insurance for all design professionals, commercial general liability insurance with contractual liability coverage, and workers compensation insurance in accordance with applicable law and the City's requirements, and meet the requirements of Railway, including the terms of a
Right-of-Entry agreement with Railway, if applicable. Railroad Protective Liability Insurance shall be required in accordance with Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) requirements. All policies of insurance required for the Project shall name RTC, Railway and City, and their respective officials, officers, employees and agents as additional insureds. City shall submit the insurance requirements for all contracts for the Project to RTC and Railway for administrative review and approval prior to issuing any request for proposals or bids, or prior to an award if no formal procurement procedure is undertaken. RTC review and approval of insurance requirements shall be completed within a reasonable time not to exceed fifteen (15) days from receipt, provided they meet all requirements of Railway.

e. City shall require all consultants, contractors and subcontractors performing work relating to the Project to defend and indemnify the City, the RTC, and Railway, and each of their respective officials, officers, employees and agents, from and against any claims, demands and liability arising from such work to the fullest extent allowed by applicable law.

f. Proof of insurance, endorsements and/or bonds acceptable to the RTC shall be provided to the RTC prior to commencement of work under any contract for the Project.

g. In the event of discovery of unanticipated hazardous materials, cultural, archeological, and paleontological or other protected resources during construction of the Project, City shall be responsible to cause construction to stop and shall notify RTC within 24 hours of the discovery. Work may resume only after RTC completes its investigation and RTC authorizes City to resume work on the Project. RTC shall bear the responsibility for the costs of Project oversight by Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Services (SCCEHS) and for remediating any potential or actual threats to the environment or public health and safety relating to the Project as required by SCCEHS; provided, however, that the total cost of oversight and remediation shall not exceed Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000), attributable from Coastal Conservancy funds referenced in the Recitals, and that in the event the cost of compliance and/or mediation hereunder exceeds or is projected to exceed that amount, the RTC may seek additional funding or may terminate this Agreement at its sole discretion by notifying the City in writing. The City shall be entitled to compensation for all eligible Project costs incurred by the City up to and including the effective date of termination.

h. City shall keep RTC and Railway apprised of the current construction schedule, status, delays and any disputes potentially affecting the scheduled completion of the Project. City shall handle any contract dispute with any consultant, contractor or subcontractor under contract to the City for the design and/or construction of the Project improvements to the extent such dispute is due to the City's actions, excluding any dispute which arises or is caused by RTC and or Railway relating to this Project under this Cooperative Agreement.

i. The City shall require its contractor(s) to ensure that the Project area is maintained in a safe and secure condition reasonably acceptable to the City and RTC at all times during construction, including during work stoppage due to dispute or other causes.
j. City and RTC shall each comply with all commitments and conditions set forth in the environmental documents, permits, approvals and applicable agreements as they apply to their respective obligations under this Agreement.

4. Telecommunication Conduit: The Project may include two telecommunication conduits, one for use by RTC and one for governmental use by the City from Pacific Avenue to Bay Street in the streetlight electrical trench. Each conduit shall be clearly marked and reserved for use by each Party and its respective agents in the future. Each Party reserves the right to utilize its respective conduit to serve its network needs, subject to the limitations of California Department of Transportation Master Agreement No. 64A0238 relating to purchase of the rail right-of-way.
   a. City and RTC agree to negotiate location, funding, installation and maintenance of hand holes, junction boxes and lateral communications conduit in order to maximize the utility and value of the conduit pathways along the Project as a part of a wider network infrastructure.

5. Approvals: City is responsible to obtain all permits and approvals necessary for completion and maintenance of the Project. RTC shall reasonably and in a timely manner cooperate with the City as necessary for the City to obtain such permits and approvals.

6. Term and Termination: This Agreement shall remain in effect until the Project is completed, including maintenance obligations as provided in paragraph 9 and until or unless this Agreement is terminated or amended as provided herein. Either Party may terminate this Agreement at any time prior to execution of a contract for the construction of the Project, effective upon providing written notice to the other Party. After execution of a contract for construction of the Project, termination may be effected only by mutual agreement of the Parties. The City shall be entitled to compensation for all eligible Project costs incurred by the City up to and including the effective date of termination.

7. Amendment: This Agreement may be amended only by mutual written agreement executed by duly authorized representatives of both Parties.

8. Acceptance of Completed Improvements: Upon completion of construction of the Project (or any portion thereof if partial acceptance is permitted under the City’s contract for construction) but prior to final acceptance by the City, the RTC and Railway shall be notified of completion and the RTC shall consider approval of the improvements as consistent with the MBSST Network Master Plan; provided, however that any determination by RTC of the Project’s consistency with the MBSST Network Master Plan shall not waive any claims or exonerate any contractor or subcontractor from liability for any defects in construction of any improvements whether patent or latent. Review and approval by RTC shall be completed within 30 days of request for approval by the City, provided, however, that the Railway has agreed that the Project, as constructed, will not materially interfere with Railway’s rights and operations under this Agreement or Railway’s
Freight Service rights and obligations under federal law or under the Freight Easement, unless first approved by STB. Title to completed Project shall vest in RTC upon final acceptance.

9. **Maintenance:** After final completion and acceptance of the Project by the City, the City shall be responsible for maintenance of the Project improvements consistent with the MBSSST Network Master Plan, limited to the following: paving, retaining walls, storm drains, fences, striping, signage, lighting and traffic control and warning devices, which were installed by the City relating to the Project; and excluding railroad gates, flashers, control systems, the Rail Line, the Freight Easement area or other areas or apparatus controlled or to be maintained by the Railway, RTC or other third party. The City is not responsible for any drainage maintenance, weed abatement, vegetation management, trash collection over the Freight Easement area, the responsibility for which has been delegated to the Railway under the ACL.

   a. The City’s maintenance duties shall be for a term of 20 years following the completion and acceptance of the Project. The Parties shall reasonably cooperate to facilitate the maintenance of the Project consistent with the MBSSST Network Master Plan. The City may contract for maintenance of the Project, provided that the RTC administratively approves the proposed contractor prior to execution of a contract by the City. Any contract for maintenance of the Project is to be consistent with the MBSSST Network Master Plan and all applicable federal, state and local law and regulations. The term for maintenance duties is separate from the term of this Agreement.

   b. Both parties agree to actively seek funding to reimburse the City for maintenance costs incurred within the immediately preceding three (3) years. Nothing in this agreement shall prevent RTC and City to request maintenance funds from other private or public sources.

   c. City’s maintenance duties shall be limited to only the items installed by the City as specified above, and its maintenance duties shall not be expanded to repair, remedy or cure any defects or conditions attributable to Railway, RTC or other third party, except use by the public. City may avail itself of any and all legal remedies, including the right to seek reimbursement, from any party responsible for causing damage or contributing to the defective condition of the items for which City has agreed to maintain.

10. **Insurance:** The City’s contractor(s) responsible for maintenance of the Project shall maintain in force starting upon completion of the Project and for the duration of maintenance of the Project a policy of Comprehensive or Commercial General Liability Insurance at least as broad as ISO Form CG 00 01 with a minimum limit of $1,000,000 combined single limit per occurrence, and $2,000,000 in the aggregate including coverage for: (a) products and completed operations, (b) personal injury, (c) broad form property damage, (d) contractual liability, and (e) cross-liability. Such policy shall name the RTC, Railway and City, their respective officials, officers, employees and agents as additional insureds and shall waive all rights of subrogation against the RTC, Railway and City. Railroad Protective Liability Insurance shall be required in accordance with Federal
Railroad Administration (FRA) requirements. Proof of insurance acceptable to the RTC, Railway and City shall be provided to the RTC prior to commencement of contracted maintenance activities, and thereafter at any time during the term of this Agreement at RTC's request. In addition to the forgoing, the City and/ or its contractor(s) responsible for maintenance of the Project shall meet the requirements of Railway, including the terms of a Right-of-Entry agreement with Railway, if applicable.

11. Indemnity: Each Party ("Indemnitor") shall defend and indemnify the other Party, its respective governing board, officers, officials and employees (collectively, "Indemnities") from and against any and all claims, demands, losses, damages, defense costs, or liability of any kind or nature (collectively, "Claims") which any Indemnitee may sustain or incur or which may be imposed upon it but only in proportion to and to the extent such Claims result from, arise out of, or in any manner are caused by Indemnitor's or its consultant's or contractor's negligent or intentional acts or omissions relating to this Agreement.


a. This Agreement, along with any attachments, is the full and complete integration of the Parties' agreement with respect to the matters addressed herein, and that this Agreement supersedes any previous written or oral agreements between the Parties with respect to the matters addressed herein.

b. The unenforceability, invalidity or illegality of any provision(s) of this Agreement shall not render the other provisions unenforceable, invalid or illegal.

c. Waiver by any Party of any portion of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of the same or any other portion hereof.

d. This Agreement shall be governed by and interpreted in accordance with California law.

e. Neither Party may assign this Agreement unless this Agreement is amended in accordance with its terms.

f. Each Party acknowledges that it has reviewed this Agreement and that the normal rule of construction to the effect that any ambiguities are to be resolved against the drafting party shall not be employed in the interpretation of this Agreement.

g. The Parties may execute this Agreement in two or more counterparts, which shall, in the aggregate, be deemed an original but all of which, together, shall constitute one and the same instrument.
This AGREEMENT is effective as of the date first written above or the date last written below, whichever is later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</th>
<th>CITY OF SANTA CRUZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BY:</td>
<td>BY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS:</td>
<td>ITS: City Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date: 12-15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval as to Form:</td>
<td>Approval as to Form:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Counsel</td>
<td>City Attorney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>