AGENDA

Thursday, September 7, 2017
9:00 a.m.

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

NOTE
See the last page for details about access for people with disabilities, translation services, 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 visit sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/

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  Oscar Rios
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  Norm Hagen

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

OPEN SESSION

2. Oral communications

Any member of the public may address the Commission 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, and may not take action on items that are not on the agenda.

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

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

CONSENT AGENDA

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

MINUTES

4. Accept draft minutes of the May 11, 2017 Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee meeting

5. Accept draft minutes of the May 25, 2017 Interagency Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

6. Approve draft minutes of the June 1, 2017 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

7. Accept draft minutes of the Special Meeting June 5, 2017 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

8. Accept draft minutes of the June 13, 2017 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting.

9. Approve draft minutes of the June 15, 2017 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

10. Approve draft minutes of the August 17, 2017 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

11. Accept draft minutes of the August 17, 2017 Interagency Transportation Advisory Committee meeting
POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

No consent items

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

12. Accept status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues for June, July and August

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

13. Approve appointments to the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC)

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

14. Accept monthly meeting schedule

15. Accept correspondence log

16. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to the Santa Cruz County Public Works Department regarding the Aptos Village Project Bus Stop Replacement from the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC)

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

18. Accept information items-none

REGULAR AGENDA

19. Commissioner reports on RTC related items – oral reports

20. Director’s Report – oral report

21. Caltrans report
   a. District Director’s report
   b. Santa Cruz County project updates
   c. Cap-and-Trade Fund Allocations News Release
22. Visualizing Sustainable Transportation  
(Anais Schenk, Transportation Planner)

a. Staff Report  
b. Map of Owl Locations  
c. Example Images from other Owl Projects

23. 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Call for Projects  
(Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)

a. Staff Report  
b. Proposed Evaluation Criteria  
c. Eligible Projects  
d. Priority Projects

24. Highway 1 Corridor Tiered Environmental Document-Status Report  
(Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner)

a. Staff Report

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

a. SAFE agenda attached separately

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

27. Next meetings

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 5, 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, September 21 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 all Santa Cruz County public libraries.

For information regarding library locations and hours, please check online at www.santacruzpl.org or www.cityofwatsonville.org/public-library

On-line viewing: The SCCRTC encourages the reduction of paper waste and therefore makes meeting materials available online. Agendas are typically posted 5 days prior to each meeting. To receive email notification when complete agenda packet materials are posted to our website please visit sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/

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

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 anticipio al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis.) Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance) by calling (831) 460-3200.

TITLE VI NOTICE TO BENEFICIARIES

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

AVISO A BENEFICIARIOS SOBRE EL TITULO VI

La RTC conduce sus programas y otorga sus servicios sin considerar raza, color u origen nacional de acuerdo al Titulo VI del Acta Sobre los Derechos Civiles. Cualquier persona que cree haber sido ofendida por la RTC bajo el Titulo VI puede entregar queja con la RTC comunicándose al (831) 460-3212 o 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 o en línea al www.sccrtc.org. También se puede quejar directamente con la Administración Federal de Transporte en la Oficina de Derechos Civiles, Atención: Coordinador del Programa Titulo VI, East Building, 5th Floor-TCR, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, Washington, DC 20590.
The meeting was called to order by Committee Chair Schiffrin at 3:07

**Members Present**
Commissioner John Leopold
Commissioner Alternate Virginia Johnson
Commissioner Alternate Patrick Mulhearn
Commissioner Alternate Tony Gregorio
Commissioner Alternate Andy Schiffrin

**RTC Staff**
George Dondero
Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra
Daniel Nikuna

1. **Introductions** - Self introductions were made

2. **Additions or changes to consent and regular agenda**

   Replacement pages for item 5 were distributed.

3. **Oral communications**

**CONSENT AGENDA**
Commissioner Alternate Mulhearn moved and Commissioner Alternate Johnson seconded the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioner Alternate’s Mulhearn, Johnson, Gregorio and Schiffrin voting “aye.”

4. Approved minutes of the March 9, 2017 committee special meeting

5. Accepted Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 third quarter warrants and monthly credit card reports
REGULAR AGENDA

6. Amendments to the Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Rules and Regulations and Administrative and Fiscal Policies

Deputy Director Luis Mendez noted that staff is recommending updates to the RTC’ Rules and Regulations and the Administrative Fiscal Policies. The changes to the Rules and Regulations are due to some legislative changes specifically as it relates to SB508 Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transportation Act (STA) fund distribution and changes within the RTC operations. He said that more changes are likely to take place in the near future due to Measure D requirements and additional changes to STA. Administrative Policy changes are also due to RTC operation changes and direction from Commissioners.

Commissioner Leopold arrived.

Commissioners discussed the need for transparency when staff is approved for travel or training and the need to update the document fee schedule to reflect actual cost no to exceed $100 per year.

Commissioner Alternate Virginia Johnson motioned and Commissioner Leopold seconded the staff recommendations to recommend to the Regional Transportation Commission to:

1. Approve the draft revised RTC Rules and Regulations and
2. Approve the draft revised RTC Administrative and Fiscal Policies with the change to the provision for out of state travel to be modified such that advance approval by the RTC Board for out of state travel would not be required but reporting to the RTC would be and to update the document fee schedule for RTC agenda packets not to exceed $100.

Motion passed unanimously with Commissioner Leopold, and Commissioner Alternates Mulhearn, Johnson, Gregorio, and Schiffrin voting “aye”.

7. Measure D Policies and Procedures

Deputy Director Luis Mendez reviewed the draft Measure D policies and Procedures.

Commissioners directed staff to ensure the policies are consistent with the ordinance and to include language to allow building a reserve. They also directed staff to include language in the inter-fund exchange to ensure project categories have access to funds from all allocations.

8. Measure D 30-Year Revenue Estimate

Deputy Director Luis Mendez reviewed the method used to determine the estimates noting that a long term history for growth was used which shows a higher estimate than last presented.
Commissioners expressed their gratitude for the increase in the estimate.

9. Adjournment – the meeting adjourned at 3:45pm

The next Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 8, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. in the CAO's Conference Room, 701 Ocean St. 5th floor, Santa Cruz CA

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra, Staff
ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT
Tim Bailey, County Public Works
Claire Fliesler, Santa Cruz Planning
Murray Fontes, Watsonville Public Works and Planning Proxy
Scott Hamby, Scotts Valley Public Works
Pete Rasmussen, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
Josh Spangrud, Santa Cruz Public Works

RTC Staff Present: Ginger Dykaar, Rachel Moriconi, Kim Shultz

Others Present:
Jennifer Calate, Caltrans District 5 Planning - via telephone
Ilan Zun, Chamber of Commerce;
Luis Duazo, Caltrans District 5
Peter New, Caltrans District 5

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Fontes called the meeting to order.

2. **Introductions:** Self introductions were made. The Committee welcomed Tom Bailey as a new ITAC member representing County of Santa Cruz Public Works.

3. **Oral Communications:** None.

4. **Additions, deletions, or changes to consent and regular agendas:** It was noted that pages 22-24 were inadvertently included in the packet and should be ignored. Item 10 was moved after Item 7.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

5. **Approved Minutes of the April 20, 2017 ITAC meeting (Fliesler/Fontes).** The motion passed unanimously with Bailey, Fliesler, Fontes, Hamby and Spangrud voting yes. Rasmussen abstained.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

6. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents
Ecology Action: Piet Canin reported that the 30th Annual Bike Week was very successful with over 10,000 participants in 8 days of activities and events. Safe routes to schools safety education programs continue, with work that was funded by the Cycle 1 Active Transportation Program finishing up.

Scotts Valley: Scott Hamby reported that City Council is scheduled to consider its 5-year plan for Measure D revenues on June 21. Bean Creek Road and Glenwood Drive, which sustained significant damage, are high priorities. FEMA has given approval to start work on Glenwood Dr. repairs. The city is also updating its pavement management system (PMS), which will help prioritize specific pavement projects for Measure D and other funds in the future. The city is soliciting bids for the Scotts Valley Dr./Mt. Hermon Rd./Whispering Pines intersection project.

METRO: Pete Rasmussen reported that the Measure D 5-year plan is part of METRO’s budget. METRO is recruiting and training bus operators and partnering with RTC and other agencies on implementing several planning projects.

County of Santa Cruz: Tim Bailey reported that the County Board of Supervisors will consider its Measure D 5-year plan on June 27. He noted that over 230 sites were damaged during the winter storms. The County is seeking funding from FEMA and FHWA to help cover the cost of repairs. Temporary bridges are planned on Valencia Road and Soquel-San Jose Road. Construction on Glenwood, Highland, and Eureka Canyon is all underway. Construction on Casserly Road is expected to start next month.

Santa Cruz: Josh Spangrud reported that City Council is scheduled to approve its 5-year plan for Measure D revenues on June 13. $5 million in roadway preservation contracts have been completed thus far this year, with an additional $5 million in work to go out to bid soon. The city is including complete streets components in many pavement projects. The Branciforte Creek bicycle/pedestrian bridge is under construction. Right-of-way work continues on the Highway 1/9 Intersection project.

Watsonville: Murray Fontes reported that the city recently received the “Bike Friendly Community” Bronze Award from the League of American Bicyclists. The city also received a planning grant from Caltrans to develop a City of Watsonville Complete Streets Plan. He appreciated the assistance of RTC staff in preparing the application. He noted work continues on the Main Street Improvement Project, including improved pedestrian facilities and trees. The City Council approved its Measure D 5-year plan in March and will consider the Measure D Master Agreement in June. He noted that an Open Streets event was held earlier this month.

RTC: Rachel Moriconi reported that the RTC approved the Master Agreement for Measure D formulas funds which are designated for cities, the County, Santa Cruz METRO, and Community Bridges. Cruz511 in Your Neighborhood events were held in central Watsonville and the eastside of Santa Cruz in May. The program provides customized travel information to residents in these neighborhoods. As part of the Visualizing Sustainable Transportation planning project, focus groups have been held in several areas of the county soliciting information which is being used to develop graphics showing what sustainable transportation infrastructure scenarios might look like at several locations. A community meeting is being held on May 31 in Felton for the Highway 9 Complete Streets Corridor Plan.

7. Highway 1/17 Interchange Aesthetic Treatments
Peter New, Caltrans District 5 Landscape Architect, and Luis Duazo, Caltrans Project Manager, solicited input from ITAC members on possible retaining wall aesthetic treatments for Caltrans projects on Highway 17 near Pasatiempo and the design of bridge rails replacements along the Highway 1/17 interchange. Mr. New highlighted that options are usually context-based. Kim Shultz noted that the style of retaining walls selected for the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project was based on community input. ITAC discussed various design options, considering ongoing maintenance, contractor skill, urban versus rural character and continuity with other facilities in the area. Caltrans suggested that for future projects along Highway 1 it would be helpful to have a long range aesthetics plan for corridor bridges, walls, and other features. This typically takes place during the design phase of project implementation.

Piet Canin left the meeting.

10. 3-Year State Highway Project Initiation Document Priorities

Rachel Moriconi reported that Caltrans is developing its 3-year work plan for Project Initiation Documents (PID) that are required in advance of seeking and securing funds for state highway projects. A PID identifies preliminary scope, schedule and cost information and is required for State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects. Staff recommended that ITAC members identify highway projects that they intend to pursue in the next few years and to confirm if previously identified projects remain near-term priorities. She noted that Highway 1 projects which are being evaluated as part of the Highway 1 Corridor-Tier 1 environmental document do not require a new PID and that the Highway 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening project has a completed PID.

Meeting attendees provided input on priority highway projects that may need a PID in the near future. City of Santa Cruz staff confirmed that intersection improvements on Mission Street at Bay Street and Chestnut/King Street are priorities for the city and University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC). Watsonville’s Highway 152/Main Street/Freedom Boulevard roundabout proposal is on hold. Implementation of complete streets designs on Highway 152/Main Street from Rodriguez St. to Lake Ave. is a high priority for Watsonville. Scotts Valley staff suggested that the project initiation document for the SR 17 at Mt. Hermon Road southbound off-ramp interchange begin in FY19/20. Adding a bicycle/pedestrian bridge at the north end of Scotts Valley near Vine Hill Road was identified in the Highway 17 Access Management Plan.

8. Provided input on Unified Corridor Study Scenarios

Ginger Dykaar provided an update on the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) for three parallel routes: Highway 1, Soquel Ave/Drive and Freedom Blvd., and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. She noted that a scenario analysis will be performed to identify a package of transportation projects that will provide the greatest benefit, advancing sustainability goals. Staff requested that the ITAC provide input on the draft list of scenarios to be evaluated in the study.
Members requested clarification and provided input on specific projects and groupings. Members suggested access to highway onramps and the impact of ramp metering on local streets be considered. Staff requested that committee members provide any additional comments by May 30. The RTC is scheduled to finalize scenarios to be evaluated by the consultant team at its June 15 meeting.

9. Received Updates on State Funding Programs – Senate Bill 1 (SB1) Implementation

Rachel Moriconi provided updates on the state’s implementation plans for the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (SB1). She noted that since SB1 provides considerably more stability to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) than the price-based excise tax has in recent years, staff is optimistic that the region will be able to access at least some of its over $9 million unprogrammed balance, which includes funds deleted in the 2016 STIP. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) will consider programming additional funds made available to the Active Transportation Program (ATP) to previously approved projects that can be advanced into FY17/18 and FY18/19 and to projects that previously applied for ATP funds, but were not funded. She noted that the CTC will be working with the League of Cities and California State Association of Counties (CSAC) to develop guidelines for funds to cities and counties.

11. Next meeting: The next ITAC meeting scheduled for June 15, 2017 was subsequently canceled.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi, RTC Planner
Executive Director George Dondero called the meeting to order at 9:01 am and communicated that Chair Friend and Vice-Chair Chase were both absent from the RTC meeting. Commissioner Hagen moved to have Commissioner Leopold chair the meeting and Commissioner McPherson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

1. Roll call
   Members present:
   Greg Caput            John Leopold
   Ryan Coonerty        Bruce McPherson
   Oscar Rios            Ed Bottorff
   Jacques Bertrand      Norm Hagen
   Randy Johnson         Aileen Loe (ex-officio)
   Patrick Mulhearn (alt) Tony Gregorio (alt)

   Staff present:
   George Dondero        Luis Mendez
   Jenn Eames            Yesenia Parra
   Cory Caletti          Karena Pushnik

2. Oral communications

   **Brian Peoples**, Trail Now, said that Trail Now’s support contributed to the success of Measure D and that trains will not sufficiently address the County’s transportation issues.

   **Josh Stephens**, Community member, thanked the Commission for pursuing sustainable transportation options and said that rolling back on the plans for a rail with trail would undermine California’s goal to reduce green house gas emissions.

   **Michael Saint**, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, stated that Watsonville residents who were not previously informed about plans for the Rail Trail were
excited upon learning about the possibility of having a train to relieve traffic congestion on Highway 1.

Lowell Hurst, Watsonville citizen, gave a traffic report on the morning commute and an update on Harkins Slough road projects.

Theresa Rogerson, Santa Cruz County Public Health, invited the Commission to attend a Vision Zero forum on June 29th at the Simpkins Center from 4pm to 6pm.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas
   Additional materials for Items 11 and 21 were distributed.

CONSENT AGENDA
   Commissioner Caput moved and Commissioner Coonerty seconded the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Rios, Caput, Hagen, Coonerty, McPherson, Leopold, Bottorff, Bertrand, Johnson, and Commissioner Alternate Mulhearn voting “aye”.

MINUTES
4. Accepted draft minutes of the April 17, 2017 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting
5. Approved draft minutes of the May 4, 2017 Regional Transportation Commission meeting
6. Approved draft minutes of the May 18, 2017 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

POLICY ITEMS
   None

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS
7. Approved Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) amendments (Resolution 37-17)

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS
8. Accepted status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues
9. Approved Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 Claims for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, the Ride ‘n’ Stride Program, and the Bike to Work Program (Resolutions 38-17, 39-17)
10. Approved contracting for Measure D Revenue Analysis, Reporting, and Auditing services

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS
11. Approved amendments to the RTC Rules and Regulations and Administrative and Fiscal Policies

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS
12. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

13. Accepted correspondence log

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

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

16. Accept information items - None

**REGULAR AGENDA**

17. Commissioner reports on RTC related items – oral reports

Commissioner McPherson reported on the Highway 9/San Lorenzo Valley (SLV) Transportation Corridor Open House that was held last night at the Felton Community Hall.

Commissioner Rios thanked Caltrans for the road repairs completed on Main Street in Watsonville.

Commissioner Caput reported on the reroute options due to the road closure for the construction starting next week to build a new bridge on Smith and Casserly Road in Watsonville.

*Chair Leopold moved Item 18 to come after Item 23 and moved Item 19 to come after Item 20.*

20. Project Updates from City of Watsonville Public Works – oral presentation

Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville Public Works, provided a PowerPoint presentation with updates on several transportation projects in Watsonville, which included: multiple roadway projects; road and trail maintenance; traffic control projects; planning, outreach, and education projects; and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvement projects. He stated that Senate Bill 1 (SB1) funds would be used to supplement Measure D funded projects and backfill high construction costs. Mr. Fontes also reported that the City of Watsonville was recently awarded the Bicycle Friendly Community Bronze Award from The League of American Bicyclists and that Saturday is National Trails Day.

Commissioners discussed: their appreciation for the City of Watsonville’s work to meet the goals of Measure D; appreciation for bike and pedestrian safety improvements; and the Struve Slough Trail being a great bike and pedestrian resource.

19. Caltrans report

Aileen Loe, District 5 Deputy Director, reported on: the recent approval of “Toward an Active California” plan to increase active transportation; storm damage costs reaching $1 billion; the land slide in Big Sur being the largest in California history;
and Caltrans’ excitement for additional funds for road repairs with the passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB1).

Commissioners expressed their appreciation for work performed by Caltrans.

21. **9:30 PUBLIC HEARING** Adoption of Regional and Community Bridges Lift Line Five-Year Programs of Projects for Measure D

Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the staff report. Ms. Pushnik reported that the 5-year programs of projects identify how each agency will utilize their Measure D allocations and provided details on RTC projects that will be funded through Measure D.

Chair Leopold opened the Public Hearing at: 9:35 a.m.

**Jessica Evans**, said that following through with public process in a transparent way is important to improve community trust and that community outreach beyond social media is needed to accurately reflect the opinion of the community. She noted her hope that segments 7 and 8 of the Rail Trail will continue in an expeditious manner.

**Nancy Faulstich**, Regeneration-Pajaro Valley Climate Action, stated that basing decisions on the minority will affect future generations and maintaining the trail is vital to ensure equity for those with communication hurdles that would utilize a rail service.

**Jeannie LePage**, Ecology Action, stated that Ecology Action supports Measure D and appreciates the RTC’s efforts to improve safety for cyclists with the Rail Trail.

**Josh Stephens**, said that there is great potential in keeping the train tracks and that the community would like to see sustainable transportation options sooner rather than later. He noted that it is vital to continue efforts for a public process and that he is looking forward to the completion of segment 7 of the Rail Trail.

**Michael Saint**, said widening the freeway will not reduce congestion but rather will encourage people to drive more miles because drivers are not being charged for using roads. He noted that induced demand is bad for the environment and a waste of funds.

**Becky Steinbruner**, stated that she supports bike bridges to enhance bike safety near schools and supports maintaining the rail as long as it doesn’t hold back building of the trail. She noted that development in Aptos Village will bring more cars and that alternatives to Highway 1 are needed.

**Stephen Slade**, Land Trust of Santa Cruz County, said that the Land Trust committed $6 million to assist with building the North Coast Rail Trail segment as soon as possible. He noted that RTC plans are consistent with the Land Trust’s and Measure D’s plans.

**Barry Scott**, stated that he hopes that the possibility of having a passenger rail will be revisited and that the majority of the community supports utilizing the rail
corridor for public transportation. He noted that the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) is rail with trail and urged the Commission to stay on track.

**Janneka Strauss**, said that she is happy that the day has come to adopt the 5-year plan for the Rail Trail and that cyclists want to see the trail built as soon as possible. She noted that she is also looking forward to bike improvements on Highway 9/San Lorenzo Valley (SLV), supports future studies for passenger rail, and is eager to see the results of the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS).

**Mark Mesiti-Miller**, Community member, urged the Commission to support the 5-year plans as outlined and stated that the north coast segments will improve community awareness of the Rail Trail and will encourage reduced commutes. He said that he is excited about the possibility of the plans and noted that voters deserve action and results.

**Gail McNulty**, said that there are some people in the community that are unaware of the plans for the Rail Trail. She noted that keeping the tracks won’t accommodate a trail width for pedestrian and cyclist simultaneous use and that the rail corridor ultimately won’t get people to where they need to go.

**Lowell Hurst**, encouraged the RTC to be brave and bold with move forward with plans.

Commissioner Caput left the meeting and Commissioner Alternate Gregorio arrived.

Chair Leopold closed the Public Hearing at 9:58 a.m.

Commissioners discussed: how Measure D fund allocations will be used to maintain the tracks on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line; costs associated with railroad bridge rehabilitations; including the Freedom Blvd extension of service to Watsonville in the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS); the need to increase outreach and public awareness of plans; utilization of alternate means of outreach for seniors; the possibility of a separate measure to gather voter support for rail service from Watsonville to Santa Cruz; Measure D being a brilliant campaign that helps the community collaborate to discuss transportation issues; anticipation of results from the UCS to provide details on transportation issues and assist with making policy decisions; the current state of economics having a major impact on policy decisions; encouragement for the public to research RTC projects and engage in the public process; appreciation to RTC staff for compiling information in an understandable way, with a collective approach that addresses various needs; the importance of looking at both the scope of the plan and the size of the infrastructure when considering plans for multi-modal investments; making infrastructure improvements that are adaptable to future transportation changes; the community’s quality of life improvements with more access to transportation options; moving forward towards the County’s transportation goals with a thoughtful approach; having a fast track on Highway 1 for buses; Highway 1 being the backbone of the community and focusing on expediting construction start dates; appreciation for the public’s input and voter’s support; the Rail Trail estimated opening in the first 5 years of the 30-year implementation plan; Caltrans’ function and role with the Highway 1 Environmental Impact Report (EIR); and the proposed 5-year plans being in line with the promises made to voters in Measure D.
Commissioner McPherson moved and Commissioner Rios seconded staff recommendations to hold a public meeting and adopt (Resolution 40-17):

1. Approving the Measure D 5-year programs of projects for the regional projects overseen by the RTC -- Highway Corridors, Active Transportation and Rail Corridor investment categories, -- the San Lorenzo Valley Highway 9 Corridor Improvements, the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing and Community Bridges-Lift Line (Exhibits A through F); and

2. Amending the FY 2017/18 RTC budget to reflect these approved Measure D 5-year programs of projects; and

3. Authorizing the Executive Director to enter into agreements with implementing agencies, as may be necessary, to ensure requirements of the Measure D Ordinance are met and to proceed with projects as outlined in the approved Measure D “5-year programs of projects.

The motion passed with Commissioners Rios, Hagen, Coonerty, McPherson, Leopold, Bottorff, Bertrand, and Commissioner Alternates Mulhearn and Gregorio voting “aye” and Commissioner Johnson voting “no”

Commissioner Johnson left the meeting.

22. **10:30 Special Appreciation** for key supporters of Measure D – Casey Beyer, Ken Kannappan, and Bill Tysseling

George Dondero, Executive Director, presented awards of appreciation to Casey Beyer, Ken Kannappan, and Bill Tysseling. Mr. Dondero shared the leadership efforts made by Mr. Beyer, Mr. Kannappan, and Mr. Tysseling at key moments during the campaign to assist with raising community support for Measure D.

Commissioners discussed: their appreciation for Mr. Beyer’s, Mr. Kannappan’s, and Mr. Tysseling’s civic engagement, dedication, tenacity, leadership, support, broad visions, and for playing an incredible role early on in the campaign to help show the community how Measure D could leave a lasting impact on transportation infrastructure in Santa Cruz County; and Measure D being a collaborative effort that has ultimately made the community a better place.

Bill Tysseling, thanked the Commission for their efforts to improve the community’s quality of life and stated that he is grateful for his participation and that the success of Measure D has been a great outcome for all.

Ken Kannappan, thanked George Dondero for his leadership and stated that the Measure D campaign provided a wonderful experience for himself and Plantronics in forming partnerships with the community.

Casey Beyer, thanked the Commission for their dedication to addressing Santa Cruz County’s transportation issues and stated that it took collaborative efforts to make Measure D successful and that leadership is not a place in line, but rather it is action. Commissioner Caput rejoined the meeting and Commissioner Alternate Gregorio left the meeting.
Commissioner McPherson moved and Commissioner Coonerty seconded recognitions of appreciation **(Resolutions 41-17, 42-17, 43-17)** for Casey Beyer, Ken Kannappan, and Bill Tysseling, for their vision and leadership in supporting Measure D. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Rios, Caput, Hagen, Coonerty, McPherson, Leopold, Bottorff, Bertrand, and Commissioner Alternate Mulhearn voting “aye”.

23. **Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 Work Program**

Luis Mendez, Deputy Director, presented the staff report.

Commissioners discussed: the critical need to pass Measure D to be able to address the transportation needs of Santa Cruz County; and increasing outreach efforts to the public.

Jessica Evans, urged the Commission to include Spanish outreach in print form.

Barry Scott, stated that increased outreach is needed in the Spanish communities.

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner Bertrand seconded the staff recommendation to approve the draft final Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 RTC Work Program. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Rios, Caput, Hagen, Coonerty, McPherson, Leopold, Bottorff, Bertrand, and Commissioner Alternate Mulhearn voting “aye”.

18. **Director’s Report – oral report** - moved to come after Item 23

George Dondero, Executive Director, reported on: the progress of the Unified Corridor Investment Study (USC) online survey and outreach efforts; prioritization of sustainable transportation projects; a Design Charette held for the Visualization Sustainable Transportation project; utilization of new technology to improve outreach; and upcoming RTC staff retirements and staffing changes.

Commissioners discussed their appreciation for RTC staffs’ proactive outreach efforts.

Chair Leopold opened up Oral Communications again at the end of the meeting:

Becky Steinbruner, Aptos resident, requested that efforts be made to ensure that adequate built-in public noticing for all construction to be done is included in the plans for projects that are being considered for grant awards.

Janneka Strauss, Bike Santa Cruz County, thanked the Commission and the community for supporting Open Streets Watsonville on May 21st and noted that sustained support is what allows for the ethos of the event and supports community oriented success for everyone.

Gail McNulty, Santa Cruz County Greenways, stated that loud voices are needed to represent the minority of community and that the Citizen’s Oversight Committee should have all options and views represented. She noted that the majority of people who supported Measure D were in support of safe transportation options.
Next meetings

There will be no meetings in July.

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 3, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the Scotts Valley City Council Chambers, 1 Civic Center Drive, Scotts Valley, CA

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenn Eames, Staff

Attendees:

Jessica Evans  Community Member
Barry Scott  CoastalRail.org
Brian Peoples  Trail Now
Gail McNulty  Santa Cruz County Greenway
Janneka Strauss  Bike Santa Cruz County
Lowell Hurst  City of Watsonville
Theresa Rogerson  Santa Cruz County Public Health
Becky Steinbruner  Aptos Resident
Michael Saint  Campaign for Sensible Transportation
Mark Mesiti-Miller  Community Member
Nancy Faulstich  Pajaro Valley Climate Action Network
Josh Stephens  Community Member
Jeannie LePage  Ecology Action
Stephen Slade  Land Trust of Santa Cruz County
Heather Adamson  Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
Keith Severson  Granite Rock
Steve Snodgrass  Granite Rock
Chris Schneider  City of Santa Cruz
Kristen Petersen  Office of Representative Panetta
Stephen Svele  Rincon Consultants
John Mukhar  MNS Engineers
1. Call to Order: Chair Conlen called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm.

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
Grace Voss, District 1  
Peter Scott, District 3  
Kem Akol, District 4  
Amelia Conlen, City of Santa Cruz, Chair  
Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville  
Leo Jed, CTSC

**Staff:**  
Cory Caletti, Sr Transportation Planner  
Gingery Dykaar, Transportation Planner

**Guests:**  
Stanley Sokolow, self/CFST  
Gail McNulty, self/parent/SCCo Greenways  
Steve Doindis, self/City of Capitola applicant  
Lynn Lauridsen and Theresia Rogerson, County Health Services Agency

**Unexcused Absences:**
Kira Ticus, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work  
Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike to Work (Alt)

**Excused Absences:**
Janneke Strause, District 1 (Alt)  
David Casterson, District 2, Vice-Chair  
Jim Cook, District 2 (Alt.)  
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)  
Rick Hyman, District 5  
Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)

**Vacancies:**
District 4 – Alternate  
District 5 – Alternate  
City of Santa Cruz – Alternate  
City of Scotts Valley – Voting and Alternate  
City of Capitola – Voting and Alternate  
City of Watsonville – Alternate

3. Announcements – Cory Caletti, staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, brought to members’ attention the fact that the RTC’s Rules and Regulations have been updated and Committee chairs are now able to serve two-year terms.

4. Oral communications – Chair Conlen reminded members to read packet materials so they
are able to engage in committee discussions in informed ways. Member Murray Fontes reported that the City of Watsonville was awarded a bronze level Bicycle Friendly Community award from the League of American Bicyclists. He acknowledged the great assistance the City of Watsonville received in filling out the application from staff at the Health Services Agency, Bike Santa Cruz County, United Way and other partners. Member Grace Voss announced that a number of Santa Cruz County residents are participating in a Climate Ride and have fundraised for efforts that support local bicycle advocacy efforts. Guest Bryan Largay, a San Lorenzo Valley resident, encouraged members to participate in the development of the Highway 9 Corridor Plan. Cory Caletti reported that the RTC held a public workshop in Felton recently and over 50 members of the community attended and provided input into needed transportation and safety improvements in the San Lorenzo Valley. She indicated that a survey will be released in the near future that she will forward. Guest Stanley Sokolow announced that he will be presenting at a “Visions on the Corridor” to be held on June 17th in Watsonville where he will discuss the potential for bus rapid transit on the rail corridor.

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – A replacement page was provided for Item #16.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

6. Approved draft minutes of the April 10, 2017 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accept letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee to the City of Santa Cruz Planning Commission regarding improved bicycle access as part of the 2424 Mission Street hotel reconstruction Project

8. Accepted letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee to the California Natural Resources Agency in support of the City of Santa Cruz' Urban Greening Program grant application

9. Accepted letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee to the City of Scotts Valley City Council regarding refinements to bicycle-friendly elements included in the Mount Hermon Road/Scotts Valley Drive/Whispering Pines Drive intersection project

10. Accepted notice of Caltrans’ adoption of “Toward an Active California’” the final State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, and Executive Summary

11. Accepted summary of Hazard Reports

12. Accepted summary of 5-year Measure D allocations for the Active Transportation/MBSST/Rail Trail Category as approved by the RTC at the June 1, 2017 meeting
13. Accepted updated to the Commission’s Rules and Regulations as approved by the RTC at the June 1, 2017 meeting and comment from Bicycle Committee member Rick Hyman

REGULAR AGENDA

14. Presentation of Certificates of Appreciation to former Bicycle Advisory Committee members Andy Ward, Daniel Kostelec and Lex Rau - Chair Conlen recognized the three departing members and presented Andy Ward, the only one of the three in attendance, with a framed Certificate of Appreciation for his long-standing service.

15. Overview of Traffic Safety Programs provided by the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency - Lynn Lauridsen and Theresia Rogerson, HSA staff, provided an overview of programs operated by HSA and the funding sources that sustain the programs. They thanked the RTC and the Committee for the ongoing TDA funding support.

16. Consideration of scenarios to be evaluated in the Unified Corridor Investment Study - Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner, summarized the staff report. Members and guests asked clarifying questions and provided feedback. Members noted that an explanation in the staff report on how the scenarios were developed would have assisted them in their understanding of the scenarios. Schematics depicting the combinations of projects would also have been helpful. Following the discussion, a motion (Jed/Akol) was made to recommend including self-driving cars in all scenarios. The motion failed with members Voss, Scott, Conlen, and Fontes voting against the motion and Akol voting in favor. Another motion was made (Jed/Akol) to recommend eliminating self-driving cars from all scenarios. The motion passed with members Scott, Conlen and Jed voting in favor and Akol and Fontes voting against. Grace Voss abstained. Another motion recommending refinements to Scenarios E and D failed with members Voss, Conlen and Jed voting in favor and Fontes, Akol, and Scott voting against. A final motion (Jed/Akol) to recommend that the dedicated bus lane included in Scenario D be revised to a dedicated lane for bus rapid transit and bikes passed unanimously with members Voss, Scott, Akol, Conlen, Fontes, and Jed voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

17. Yacht Harbor Bicycle Circulation - Kem Akol reported that Claire Fliesler of the City of Santa Cruz presented the City's Active Transportation Plan at the recent Port Commission meeting. With respect to bicycle circulation issues, the Port Commission will engage with the public about possible improvements during development of the Segment 8/9 rail trail project that will extend from the San Lorenzo River walkway at the Boardwalk to 17th Ave. The Port Commission reported no notable problems related to bicycle circulation at this time. Given lack of time, Mr. Akol will bring a recommended action to a future meeting.

18. Updates related to Committee functions - None

19. Adjourned – 8:35 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for August 14th, 2017, from 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA.
Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
### Minutes
**Tuesday, June 13, 2017**

**Watsonville Community Room**  
275 Main Street, Suite 400, Watsonville 95076

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Call to Order: 1:35 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members Present:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unexcused Absences:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA</td>
<td>Pam Arnsberger, 2nd District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Daugherty, Metro Transit</td>
<td>Greta Kleiner, Potential Transit User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Elsea, 3rd District</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara Lamb, Potential Transit User</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulce Lizarraga-Chagilla, Social Service</td>
<td>RTC Staff Present:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider-Seniors</td>
<td>Grace Blakeslee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Naranjo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nestor Guevara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternates Present:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Others Present:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Diaz, CTSA-Lift Line</td>
<td>Becky Steinbruner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Duncanson, 2nd District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Warnock, Metro Transit/ParaCruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Talbott, Seniors Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excused Absences:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Oral Communications

- John Daugherty, Metro Transit, announced that the Watsonville Transit Center will now be open from 8:00AM to 5:00PM Monday through Friday. Additionally, the new Santa Cruz Metro Headways publication with summer service changes is now available.
- Becky Steinbruner, a member of the public, provided information about the proposed bus stop for inbound Metro Transit Route 71 included in the Phase 1 Aptos Village Project and expressed concern regarding the bus stop design.
- Grace Blakeslee, RTC staff, announced a meeting on traffic violence in Santa Cruz County June 29th from 4pm-6pm at Simpkins Swim Center sponsored by the Community Traffic Safety Coalition.

4. Additions or deletions to the consent or regular agenda

Becky Streinbruner, a member of the public, requested that the Committee discuss the Phase 1 Aptos Village project. Staff informed committee members that construction of the
improvement referred to by Ms. Streinbruner was scheduled to begin prior to the next regular meeting of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC). The County of Santa Cruz, the Phase I Aptos Village project sponsor, was not soliciting input on the project at this time; however, if the Committee wanted to discuss the project and provide comments on the project, the decision should occur and a letter sent before the construction deadline.

**Action:** A motion (Lamb/Elsea) to add Review of Phase 1 Aptos Village Project to Regular Agenda as item 20a. Motion carries.

Grace Blakeslee, RTC staff, requested that item 19 be deleted, as CTSC staff was not present. Ms. Blakeslee also provided an E&D TAC application form submitted by Kirk Ance as add-on pages for item 8.

### CONSENT AGENDA

**Action:** A motion (Daugherty/Lamb) was made to approve the minutes of the April 11, 2017 E&D TAC meeting. The motion passed unanimously with members Berkowitz, Daugherty, Elsea, Kempf, Lamb, and Welch Bettencourt voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

**Action:** A motion (Daugherty/Elsea) was made to approve Items 6 through 16 of the Consent Agenda. The motion passed unanimously with members Berkowitz, Daugherty, Elsea, Kempf, Lamb, and Welch Bettencourt voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

5. Approved Minutes from April 11, 2017
6. Receive Transportation Development Act Revenue Report
7. Received RTC Meeting Highlights
8. Recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve reappointments to E&D TAC Committee
9. Recommend the Regional Transportation Commission approve Tara Ireland as Social Services Provider – Persons of Limited Means Committee Member
10. Receive E&D TAC Roster May 2017
11. Receive Final 2017 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs List
12. Receive Caltrans’ adoption of “Toward an Active California”, the final State and Pedestrian Plan and Executive Summary
13. Receive a summary of Community Bridges Lift Line and Regional Projects Measure D Five-Year Plans approve by the RTC at the June 1, 2017 meeting
14. Receive updates to the RTC Rules and Regulations as approved by the RTC at the June 1, 2017 meeting
15. Received Information Items
   a. Access Board to Issue Guidance on International Symbol of Accessibility
16. Received Agency TDA Reports
   a. Volunteer Center – FY16/17 Third Quarter Report
   b. Community Bridges – None
   c. Santa Cruz Metro – FY18 and FY19 Operating Budgets and FY18 Capital Budget –
      public hearing June 23, 2017 at the Santa Cruz City Council Chambers at 8:30 am
      (May 17, 2017 Santa Cruz Metro Board packet, page 199)

REGULAR AGENDA

17. Transportation Network Companies and Taxi Company Updates

   Amy Naranjo, RTC Transportation Planner provided information on Transportation Network
   Companies (TNC’s). TNC’s provide ride sharing services through their phone applications.
   The most popular of these companies are Uber and Lyft. These companies have partnered
   with transit agencies to provide rides in areas with limited transit services. Committee
   members discussed paratransit services provided by Uber and Lyft.

18. ParaCruz Quarterly Services Report Review

   April Warnock, Metro staff reviewed the quarterly Paracruz report. Ms. Warnock reported
   that the number of rides provided has been decreasing. Metro recently hired 4 new vehicle
   operators, making for 29 total operators now.

19. County of Santa Cruz Health Services Department Traffic Safety Programs

   Item deleted from agenda.

20. Unified Corridor Investment Study – Scenario

   Grace Blakeslee, RTC staff informed committee members that the Unified Corridors
   Investment Study (UCS) includes a two-step scenario analysis which will evaluate different
   project groupings. Ms. Blakeslee requested input from E&D TAC committee members on the
   proposed project groupings for inclusion in the step 1 analysis. E&D TAC members inquired
   about access to the three routes included in the study from outside the project area, and
   connections between corridors.

21. Phase 1 Aptos Village Project

   Becky Steinbruner, a member of the public, described her understanding of the proposed
   design for the new bus stop for inbound Metro Transit Route 71 included in the Phase 1
   Aptos Village Project and raised questions about the proposed bus stop design’s consistency
   with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations and about accessibility during
   project construction. Grace Blakeslee, RTC staff, informed committee members that the
   Aptos Village project was reviewed by the E&D TAC in 2013. Committee members discussed
   options for obtaining more information about the Metro Transit Route 71 bus stop design.

   Action: A motion (Lamb/Elsea) was made to write letter to County of Santa Cruz to inquire
   about the Metro Transit Route 71 bus stop design and consistency with ADA regulations.
   The motion passed unanimously with members Berkowitz, Daugherty, Elsea, Kempf, Lamb,
   and Welch Bettencourt voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

22. Pedestrian Safety Work Group
Veronica Elsea informed committee members that the What Pedestrians and Bicyclists wanted each other to know brochure was translated into Spanish, though layout was not completed.

23. E&D TAC 2017 Calendar Update

Grace Blakeslee, RTC staff, presented an updated calendar for 2017 E&D TAC meetings, which includes a Special Meeting on November 14, 2017 to allow for discussion of projects that submitted a request for funding.

24. Adjourn: 3:40 pm

Respectfully submitted, Grace Blakeslee, RTC Staff
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1. Introductions

Vice Chair Chase called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

Members present:
Cynthia Chase  Zach Friend
John Leopold  Jacques Bertrand
Norm Hagen  Ed Bottorff
Bruce McPherson  Sandy Brown
Randy Johnson  Oscar Rios
Greg Caput  Alternate Patrick Mulhearn

Staff present:
George Dondero  Karena Pushnik
Jenn Eames  Yesenia Parra
Ginger Dykaar  Grace Blakeslee
Cory Caletti  Cathy Judd

2. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

The commission adjourned to closed session at: 9:03 a.m.

CLOSED SESSION

3. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-INITIATION OF LITIGATION (Paragraph (4) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 of the Government Code): One case

OPEN SESSION

4. Report on closed session

The commission reconvened to open session at 9:24 a.m. and there was no closed session report.
5. Oral communications

**Jack Nelson**, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, read an excerpt about how to build livable and sustainable communities from the book “Walkable City” by Jeff Speck.

**Rob Quinn**, Physicians for Trails, stated that the rail corridor is ideal for incorporating a trail to provide a safe place for people to ride bikes and exercise, and a safe path for people with disabilities.

**Gail McNulty**, Santa Cruz County Greenways, stated that the County needs safe and convenient bike routes to connect people to where they need to go. She said that increased utilization of efficient buses on Highway 1 and implementation of a trail-only plan on the rail corridor would reduce traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.

6. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

An informational handout, a handout for Item 10, and a replacement page for Item 11 were distributed.

George Dondero, Executive Director, went over the informational handout which provided details on the proposed allocation formula to Self-Help Counties for Senate Bill 1 (SB1), the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, as addressed in a letter from the bill’s co-sponsors, California Senator Jim Beall and Assemblyman Jim Frazier, to the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner McPherson seconded the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Leopold, Chase, Friend, McPherson, Caput, Brown, Johnson, Bertrand, Bottorff, Hagen, and Rios voting “aye”.

7. Approved Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 Budget and Work Program (Resolution 44-17)

8. Approved rejection of claim from Paul and Nicole Cruz

**REGULAR AGENDA**

9. Resolution of appreciation for retiree: Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant

George Dondero, Executive Director, reported that Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant, will retire on June 30, 2017 after 15 years of exemplary service with the RTC. Mr. Dondero commended Ms. Judd for her support and dedication. Mr. Dondero noted that Jennifer Eames would also be departing on June 30th and thanked her for her 2 years of service with the RTC.
Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner McPherson seconded the recognition of appreciation (Resolution 45-17) for retiring Administrative Assistant, Cathy Judd. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Leopold, Chase, Friend, Brown, McPherson, Caput, Johnson, Bertrand, Bottorff, Hagen, and Rios voting “aye”.

10. Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) – Draft Scenarios

Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner, presented the staff report with a PowerPoint presentation.

Commissioners discussed: the total number of participants in the most recent survey in comparison to previously conducted surveys and other comparable surveys; the lack of public awareness in Watsonville about plans for the rail corridor; the UCS’s triple bottom line approach and what considerations go into equity goals; performance measures of economic indicators; survey participants not matching the true community demographics and relying on scientific means instead to figure out what is important to the community’s transportation needs; the goal of the UCS being to look at all corridors and maximize efficiency rather than predetermining an outcome; the RTC having a responsibility to provide services and outreach efforts to marginalized citizens; the importance of the criteria updates from Kimley-Horn; weighing public expenditures and funding allocations to cover initial and on-going project costs; UCS scenario evaluations and direct goals that support economic vitality; population growth impacts on planning criteria for sustainability and strategizing efforts to better serve communities that have projected growth; and population increases being in correlation with median incomes.

William Kingsley, Community member, requested additional information regarding: the project timeline for the Highway 1 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and when the Measure D Oversight Committee would be formed. He reiterated his comments previously submitted to the Commission concerning transportation crowding and unsafe speeds with motorized bikes.

Richard Marlais, Community member, said that no matter what scenario the Commission decides on, maps should accommodate density in the areas that have public transportation stops.

Michael Saint, Aptos resident, stated that door to door Spanish outreach is needed in Watsonville to raise public awareness about the Rail Trail. He reported that recently passed Senate Bill 100 (SB100) doubled California’s clean energy goal and set requirements for wide-scale transportation electrification and noted that auxiliary lanes on Highway 1 will hinder future sustainability efforts.

Stanley Sokolow, Community member, said that transportation agencies look at transit oriented development (TOD) to measure economic vitality. He noted that comparative studies have shown bus rapid transit (BRT) to be more efficient than trains.

Jack Nelson, stated that he is concerned with measuring the efficiency of the proposed scenarios and would love to see individual components studied before combining them into scenarios and that the induced travel demand model be included in the study.
**Gail McNulty**, said that she is concerned with the validity of the survey results and that the scenarios may predefine what the consultants should be looking at. She noted that economic vitality correlates with a bike path and that individual components should be studied.

**Brett Garrett**, Community member, stated that he felt that there was disconnect on the questions asked in the survey and the feedback that he wanted to give. He noted his hopes for personal rapid transit (PRT) to be included in the UCS.

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

**Bruno Kaiser**, Seaview Ranch Homeowners Association, said that Highway 1 needs to be expanded to three lanes down to Aptos to allow for efficient driving.

**Community member**, stated that the added auxiliary lanes on Highway 1 were a waste of time and money.

**Mark Mesiti-Miller**, Community member, stated that the online survey successfully captured what the public felt should be studied and that quality research should be relied on before moving forward with decisions. He noted that he trusts and sees that all components are included in the scenarios and that it is important that additional criteria are included to measure efficiency.

**David Fyfe**, Transportation Consultant, said that the challenges of the corridors being studied are unique because Santa Cruz County is nestled between ocean and mountains and there is no room for expansion. He noted that he is glad that the UCS is being conducted so that safety and traffic congestion improvements can be made to Highway 1 and for the possibility of having a train.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Chase seconded staff recommendations to:

1. Review and approve the scenarios to be evaluated in the Unified Corridor Investment Study; and
2. Review and approve the minor revisions to the goals, criteria, and performance measures as recommended by Kimley-Horn and Associates.

The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Leopold, Chase, Brown, Caput, McPherson, Johnson, Bertrand, Bottorff, Hagen, Rios, and Commissioner Alternate Mulhearn voting “aye”.

Commissioner Johnson left the meeting.

11. North Coast Rail Trail Segment of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network – Environmental Impact Report

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the staff report and reported that Rincon Consultants were chosen by the evaluation committee to perform the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
Stanley Sokolow, requested clarification on the alternate routes proposed in the scope.

Gail McNulty, requested clarification on the alternate routes proposed in the scope and the timeframe for public participation.

William Kingsley, asked if the North Coast Rail Trail EIR was included in the outlined expenditures in Measure D.

Community member, requested clarification on the EIR review in relation to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

North Coast Resident, requested clarification on the timeline for the NEPA and CEQA process, if the federal government will do a Notice of Preparation (NOP) as well, and if the EIR will include Davenport.

Commissioner Hagen moved and Commissioner Bertrand seconded staff recommendation to adopt (Resolution 46-17) authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into an agreement with Rincon Consultants to perform an Environmental Impact Report for the North Coast Rail Trail Project. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Leopold, Chase, Brown, Caput, McPherson, Bertrand, Bottorff, Hagen, Rios, and Commissioner Alternate Mulhearn voting “aye”.

12. Next meetings

There are no meetings in July.

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 3, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the Scotts Valley City Council Chambers, 1 Civic Center Drive, Scotts Valley, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, August 17, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main Street, Suite 400, Watsonville, CA.

The meeting adjourned at: 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenn Eames, Staff

Attendees:
Brett Garrett  Community member
Bruno Kaiser  Seaview Ranch Homeowners Association
David Fyfe  AECOM
Erich Friedrich  Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest Goodhart</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail McNulty</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Greenway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Voss</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Cycling Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Nelson</td>
<td>Campaign for Sensible Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Baruer</td>
<td>DNCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Giberson</td>
<td>Harris Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Mesiti-Miller</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty D</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Saint</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Marlais</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Quinn</td>
<td>Physicians for trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Sokolow</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Slade</td>
<td>Land Trust of Santa Cruz County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Cavelieri</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kingsley</td>
<td>Community member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting was called to Order at 9:00 a.m.

1. Introductions

Members present:
Randy Johnson    Oscar Rios
Greg Caput     Ryan Coonerty
Zach Friend    John Leopold
Bruce McPherson    Ed Bottorff
Mike Rotkin (alt)    Donna Lind (alt)
Kristen Petersen (alt.)

Staff present
George Dondero    Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra     Rachel Moriconi
Ginger Dykaar    Cory Caletti
Virginia Vaquero

2. Oral Communications

Brett Garrett, Community member spoke in support of a letter from Campaign for Sustainable Transportation. He suggested that the SB1 funding include Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) and asked the Commission to consider this a viable means of transportation.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

No Consent Agenda items
REGULAR AGENDA

4. State Funding Updates: Senate Bill 1 (SB1), Cap and Trade, and the 2018 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner provided updates on State Funding. Ms. Moriconi noted the October 16, 2017 deadline to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for the local jurisdictions’ list of projects for SB1 funding.

Commissioners thanked Ms. Moriconi for her thorough report.

Michael Saint, a member of Campaign for Sensible Transportation, thanked the Commission for their hard work and service to our community. He reminded the Commission about goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. He noted that prioritizing transportation projects to meet the greenhouse gas emission reduction goal is crucial.

5. Santa Cruz County Measure D – Taxpayer Oversight Committee Draft Bylaws

Luis Mendez, Deputy Director, discussed the proposed draft Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee Bylaws.

Commissioners discussed: the importance of clarity for the role of the oversight committee; training for members of the oversight committee and the selection process.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Alternate Rotkin second to:

1. Review and approve amendments to the Regional Transportation Commission Rules and Regulations to establish the Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee and its bylaws including amendments to Section II, Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 (Attachment 1) and addition of Exhibit 2A (Attachment 2); and

2. Approve the application (Attachment 3) for Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee membership and direct staff to begin conducting outreach to fill the committee so that the committee can start their work when the first year Measure D audit of expenditures are expected to be ready in early 2019.

Motion passed unanimously with Commissioners, Johnson, Rios, Caput, Coonerty, Friend, Leopold, McPherson, Bottorff and Commissioner Alternate’s Rotkin, Lind, and Petersen voting “aye”.

6. Creation of RTC Communications Specialist position and replacement of Accountant Technician position with an Accountant series

George Dondero, Executive Director, presented the staff report.
Commissioners discussed the possibility of current staff taking on outreach responsibilities; the perception that Measure D money is being used for staffing rather than transportation projects; the importance of having current and accurate information delivered to the community in a timely manner; the need for a bilingual Communications Specialist and the additional duties for staff due to the passing of Measure D.

**Veronica Rodriquez**, SEIU Local 521 noted the SEIU’s concern in eliminating the Accounting Technician position and the concerns for the current incumbent. Responding to a comment by Ms. Rodriguez, Executive Director Dondero said that staff has and will continue to work with the union to implement these new positions accordingly.

**Mark Mesiti-Miller**, community member voiced his support for the creation of a Communications Specialist position and encouraged the RTC to include a bilingual requirement to better serve the community.

Commissioner Leopold left the meeting.

**Mike Saint**, requested that the Communications Specialist be asked to reach out to advocacy groups.

Commissioner Alternate Rotkin moved and Commissioner Coonerty seconded the staff recommendations to:

1. Create a new staff position to be called Communications Specialist and authorize adding $157,000 to the Regional Transportation Commission FY 2017-18 budget for staffing to cover the wages and benefits for the position;

2. Replace the staff position titled Accounting Technician with a staff series titled Accountant (Accountant I, II and III); and

3. Direct the staff to begin recruitment to fill these positions.

Commissioners also directed staff to do their due diligence to encourage bilingual candidates to apply for the Communications Specialist and that the Communications Specialist reaches out to advocacy groups.

Motion carried with Commissioners Rios, Caput, Coonerty, Friend, McPherson, Bottorff, and Commissioner Alternate’s Lind, Petersen and Rotkin voting “aye” and Commissioners Caput and Johnson voting “no”.

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

The RTC meeting adjourned to the SAFE meeting at 10:01 a.m.

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

The RTC meeting reconvened at 10:10 a.m.
9. Next meetings

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 7, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 801 Ocean Street, 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, September 21, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Office, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

The meeting adjourned at 10:11 am

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra, Staff

Attendees:
Micheal Saint Campaign for Sensible Transportation
Erich Friedrich Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
Murrey Fontes City of Watsonville
Mark Mesiti-Miller Community Member
Veronica Rodriguez SEIU Local 521
Brett Garrett Community Member
Santa Cruz County  
Regional Transportation Commission  
Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) 

DRAFT MINUTES 
Thursday, August 17, 2017, 1:30 p.m.  
SCCRTC Conference Room  
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT
Teresa Buika, University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC) 
Jim Burr, Santa Cruz Public Works  
Claire Fliesler, Santa Cruz Planning  
Murray Fontes, Watsonville Public Works and Planning Proxy  
Erich Friedrich, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)  
Scott Hamby, Scotts Valley Public Works  
Jessica Kahn, Scotts Valley Planning Proxy  
Tom Hiltner, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)  
Steve Wiesner, County Public Works

RTC Staff Present: Ginger Dykaar, Rachel Moriconi, Anais Schenk

Others Present:  
Brett Garrett, public  
Sarah Harmon, County HSA  
Theresa Rogerson, Health Services Agency (HSA)/Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)  
Stanley Sokolow, public  
Piet Canin, Ecology Action-TDM Program - via telephone

1. Call to Order: Chair Fontes called the meeting to order.

2. Introductions: Self introductions were made.

3. Oral Communications: None.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Approved Minutes of the May 25, 2017 ITAC meeting. The minutes were corrected to show that Piet Canin and Teresa Buika attended the May 25 meeting. A motion (Fliesler/Buika) to approve the amended minutes passed unanimously with all members in attendance voting yes.

6. Received flyer for Architecture & Engineering (A&E) Consultant Contracts training on September 21, 2017
REGULAR AGENDA

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

Scotts Valley: Jessica Kahn and Scott Hamby reported that construction will be starting soon on the Scotts Valley Dr./Mt. Hermon Rd./Whispering Pines intersection, which is funded with a combination of STBG/RSTPX, Measure D, and city funds. A recent survey of pavement conditions show the city's average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is 66 (out of 100) which is fair. Construction of the Glen Canyon Rd/Green Hills Rd/S. Navarra Dr bike corridor and roadway preservation project is now scheduled for spring 2018.

AMBAG: AMBAG staff is close to finishing the draft 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and associated environmental review document. AMBAG is working to address model challenges. Rachel Moriconi reminded agencies that requests for amendments to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) are due to AMBAG on 8/18/17.

RTC: Rachel Moriconi reported on staffing changes at the RTC, noting retirements (recent and planned) and that the RTC will be hiring an engineer, transportation planning technician, administrative assistants, communication specialist, and accountant. She also noted that Anais Schenk joined the RTC staff as a transportation planner. Anais Schenk reported that she will be setting up meetings with local jurisdictions to discuss locations and other details for the bicycle route signage project. She noted that she is also working on the RTC’s Visualizing Sustainable Transportation and transportation demand management projects. Ginger Dykaar reported that stakeholder meetings will be held in early September on the Unified Corridor Investment Study, with RTC-advisory committee review of the initial scenarios analysis in September. RTC staff is also working on the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) document.

METRO: Tom Hiltner reported that METRO is hosting an electric bus to evaluate how well it works and specifications. METRO will be testing a circulator route for downtown Watsonville this winter, funded by a cap-and-trade Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) grant. METRO has also submitted an application for 9 new CNG buses to replace older diesel buses.

Santa Cruz: Jim Burr reported that the Branciforte Creek bicycle/pedestrian bridge is almost complete, with a ribbon-cutting event scheduled for September 28. The city is reviewing proposal for design of the San Lorenzo River Trestle walkway; is wrapping up this year’s Measure H-funded overlay project; and installed a bike box on Seabright Ave at Soquel Ave. The “Street Smarts” public safety education campaign is kicking off, with a community event on September 13. Claire Fliesler reported that bike share will be rolling out in March 2018. The privately-funded program is expected to include 250 bicycles at 25 stations citywide and can be expanded to other jurisdictions. Pre-construction work continues for Segment 7 of the Rail Trail.

Watsonville: Murray Fontes reported that the city did not receive any bids for the Main Street Improvement Project, which includes sidewalk and intersection improvements. The city will re-advertise the project and is going out to bid for STIP-funded sidewalk infill and Airport
Boulevard projects this fall.

**UCSC:** Teresa Buika reported that UCSC is finishing installation of electric vehicle (EV) chargers at several parking lots. [PG&E’s EV Charging Network](https://www.pge.com/ev/charging) program is also being used to install new EV infrastructure at additional locations. UCSC and METRO are also testing articulated buses on three routes.

**County of Santa Cruz:** Steve Wiesner reported that the County has been focused on repairing and reopening roads damaged by storms earlier this year, including Soquel-San Jose Road and Valencia Road. A new bridge has been installed on Casserly Road. Storm damage repair work continues on several roadways, including Bear Creek Road and Swanton Road over Molino Creek. Construction of phase 1 of the Aptos Village project is expected to re-start in September. A new pavement management system study is starting and will be used to prioritize projects for the next five years. The county resubmitted its Active Transportation Program (ATP) application for a pedestrian walkway between San Lorenzo Valley (SLV) High School and Fall Creek Drive. The County is working with Ecology Action and the County Health Services Agency (HSA) on a Caltrans Planning grant for safe routes to schools (SRTS) and active transportation planning. He also reported that the County is hiring engineers, in part to replace three senior staff members.

**Ecology Action:** Piet Canin reported that EA is expanding its SRTS outreach work, in partnership with HSA. EA is planning an event at Abbott Square for National EV Week on September 9. EA is also hiring staff to work on Bike to Work Day, bike commuter, rail and trail and SRTS programs.

8. **Vision Zero report: “The Impact of Traffic Violence on Santa Cruz County”**

Theresa Rogerson and Sarah Harmon from the County Health Services Agency (HSA) presented the Vision Zero “The Impact of Traffic Violence on Santa Cruz County” report. The report emphasizes the need to prevent transportation-related deaths and injuries. It includes statistics about collisions, identifies high-injury corridors, and analyzes trends in different areas of the county. Sarah Harmon highlighted that traveling at unsafe speeds and distracted driving are major causes of incidents; 54% of severe/fatal crashes were on 6% of roadways in the county; and pedestrian deaths and serious injuries made up 46% of incidents in Watsonville in the twelve month period from May 2016 to May 2017, as compared to 2% countywide. HSA and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) are working on a toolkit for agencies that includes vision zero policies and plans that prioritize the prevention of traffic deaths and injuries and provides technical support and data that can be used to secure funding for projects that will prevent transportation-related fatalities and injuries. HSA/CTSC is also reaching out to the community with information to reduce crashes. The report and additional information is online at: [www.sctrafficsafety.org/VisionZero](http://www.sctrafficsafety.org/VisionZero). HSA staff responded to questions and suggestions from ITAC members about data, coordination with other state and local safety programs, outreach plans, and terminology.

9. **State Funding Updates**

Rachel Moriconi provided updates on state funding programs, including the state’s implementation plans for new Senate Bill 1 programs and revenues. She highlighted that plans for FY17/18 SB1 formula funds to cities and counties are due to the CTC by October 16,
2017. She also provided updates on the State Transit Assistance program, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), SB 1 competitive programs, and Cap and Trade programs. She requested that agencies report on their planned use of new SB 1 formula funds and identify priority projects that would be potential candidates for competitive state funding programs.

Tom Hiltner reported that METRO plans to use FY17/18 State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to serve as a match for grants for bus replacements; is looking at possible Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) candidates, such as Pacific Station; and may request a planning grant to evaluate the downtown Santa Cruz bus route structure. Jim Burr reported that Santa Cruz will likely seek new state funds for the Highway 1/9 intersection. Murray Fontes reported that Watsonville will likely use SB1 formula funds on road maintenance and may apply for a planning grant with Ecology Action for safe routes to schools plans. Teresa Buika reported that UCSC may seek a planning grant for a TDM-best strategies planning tool. Steve Wiesner reported that the County will likely use SB 1 formula funds as match to grants for storm damage repairs for the next few years, then on its pavement management system. The County may partner with Scotts Valley and Ecology Action on a joint active transportation plan. Bicycle plan updates, green bicycle lanes priorities, and pedestrian facilities plans for more urban areas are also possible candidates. Jessica Kahn reported that some of Scotts Valley’s SB 1 funds will likely be used on the Green Hills Road project and implementation of its new pavement management system. Erich Friedrich reported that AMBAG may use new SB 1 planning funds on the activity-based model and Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) planning and implementation.

10. **Active Transportation Program (ATP) Update**

Rachel Moriconi reported that the CTC expects to release its staff recommendations by the end of the month for the 2017 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Augmentation, which will make approximately $115 million in new FY17/18 and FY18/19 SB1 funds available to previously approved projects that can be advanced into FY17/18 and FY18/19 and to projects that previously applied for ATP funds, but were not funded. Over $500 million was requested, including for five projects in Santa Cruz County.

Ms. Moriconi noted that the CTC is working with Caltrans to streamline the application for smaller projects for Cycle 4 next year. Agencies identified some possible candidates for the 2018 call for projects and challenges with the ATP program, including Highway 1/Harkins Slough Road bicycle/pedestrian bridge, active transportation plans, San Lorenzo River walkway lighting, Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) segments 8 and 9 construction, Vision Zero safety projects, and bike commuter programs.

11. **2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Development**

Rachel Moriconi reported that staff anticipates that the RTC will issue a call for projects in September for the region’s formula shares of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)/Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX), SB 1 State Transit Assistance, and SB 1 Local Partnership Program funds. The RTC’s proposal for STIP funds is due to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) by December 15, 2017. She requested that the ITAC provide input on the draft evaluation criteria and requested updates on previously programmed projects, including
any potential cost increases by August 23. Members indicated support for criteria related to number of people served, safety, system preservation, and changes in vehicle miles traveled and associated air pollution to continue to be given the greatest consideration. It was noted that with city and county SB 1-formula fund plans, Caltrans planning grant applications, and 2018 RTIP applications all due in October, agencies will be very busy in September and October.

12. **Measure D: Informing the Public about Investments**

Rachel Moriconi reported that Measure D recipient agencies are required to inform the public about how Measure D revenues are being used. She requested input on draft signage specifications and other methods to keep taxpayers informed. Staff also requested updates on schedules for Measure D-funded projects. Agencies noted that especially for smaller and short term projects it is uncommon for there to be signage at construction sites. Discussion of the item will be continued at a future meeting.

13. **Next meeting:** The next ITAC meeting scheduled for September 21, 2017 will begin at 1:00 p.m. (instead of 1:30 p.m.). The meeting will be followed by a Caltrans Local Assistance training on new requirements for Architecture & Engineering contracts at 2:30 p.m.

**The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.**

*Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi, RTC Planner*
<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>% 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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>842,100</td>
<td>849,639</td>
<td>843,800</td>
<td>-5,839</td>
<td>-0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>763,406</td>
<td>783,442</td>
<td>911,051</td>
<td>127,609</td>
<td>16.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>559,000</td>
<td>555,688</td>
<td>626,200</td>
<td>70,512</td>
<td>12.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>745,400</td>
<td>740,917</td>
<td>834,900</td>
<td>93,983</td>
<td>12.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>795,139</td>
<td>904,623</td>
<td>563,619</td>
<td>-341,004</td>
<td>-37.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,970,056</td>
<td>9,059,403</td>
<td>9,101,315</td>
<td>41,912</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:*
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# TDA Revenue Report FY 2017-2018

## Cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY16 - 17 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY17 - 18 Estimate Revenue</th>
<th>FY17 - 18 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% of Actual to Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>629,500</td>
<td>637,054</td>
<td>583,500</td>
<td>-53,554</td>
<td>-8.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>839,400</td>
<td>849,473</td>
<td>778,000</td>
<td>-71,473</td>
<td>-8.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>872,266</td>
<td>882,733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>657,500</td>
<td>665,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>876,700</td>
<td>887,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>813,479</td>
<td>823,241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>632,900</td>
<td>646,849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>843,800</td>
<td>862,431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>911,051</td>
<td>781,837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>626,200</td>
<td>572,496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>834,900</td>
<td>763,397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>563,619</td>
<td>814,337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9,101,315</td>
<td>9,186,458</td>
<td>1,361,500</td>
<td>-125,027</td>
<td>-1.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
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TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner

RE: Appointments 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 Tara Ireland’s appointment (Attachment 1) to the E&D TAC member position representing Social Service Provider- Persons of Limited Means
2. Approve Kirk Ance’s reappointment (Attachment 2) to the E&D TAC member position representing the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency; and,
3. Nominate members for vacant positions as shown in the revised membership roster (Attachment 3).

BACKGROUND

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

DISCUSSION

At its June 2017 meeting, the E&D TAC recommended that the RTC approve Tara Ireland (Attachment 1) for the E&D TAC member position representing Social Service Provided-Persons of Limited Means. Ms. Ireland is the Senior Programs Director for the Volunteer Center and oversees the Volunteer Center’s Transportation Program for Santa Cruz, San Lorenzo Valley and Watsonville.

Also at its June 2017 meeting, the E&D TAC recommended that the RTC approve re-appointment of Kirk Ance (Attachment 2) to the member position representing the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency. Mr. Ance is the Transportation Program Director for Community Bridges-Lift Line. Lift Line provides door-to-door transportation services free of charge to eligible seniors and people living with disabilities. Community Bridges-Lift Line serves as the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency for Santa Cruz County.

The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve Tara Ireland’s appointment (Attachment1) to the E&D TAC member position representing Social Service Provider- Persons of Limited Means and approve Kirk Ance’s reappointment (Attachment 2) to the E&D TAC member position representing the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency.
Active recruitment is underway for the following E&D TAC representatives:

- 1st Supervisorial District- **member** and alternate
- 5th Supervisorial District - **member** and alternate
- Social Service Provider Representing People with Disabilities (County) –**member** and alternate
- Social Service Provider Representing People with Disabilities- **member**
- 4th Supervisorial District –alternate
- Social Service Provider Representing Seniors (County) – alternate
- Potential Transit User 60+ - alternate
- Potential Transit User Disabled - alternate

Staff would appreciate assistance from commissioners in filling the vacant positions, both member and alternate positions. An E&D TAC membership application can be found at [www.sccrtc.org/edtac-app](http://www.sccrtc.org/edtac-app).

**SUMMARY**
The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) functions best when all committee membership and alternate positions are filled. The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve Tara Ireland’s appointment (Attachment 1) to the E&D TAC member position representing Social Service Provider- Persons of Limited Means and approve Kirk Ance’s reappointment (Attachment 2) to the E&D TAC member position representing the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency.

**Attachments:**
1. Committee Appointment Application for Tara Ireland
2. Committee Reappointment Application for Kirk Ance
3. E&D TAC Roster
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COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

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

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name:    Tara Ireland
Home address:    [redacted]
Mailing address: Same
Phone: (home) [redacted]  (business/message) [redacted]
E-mail:   rsvpvol@scvolunteercenter.org

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 14 years
Position(s) I am applying for:     Representative on the E&D TAC
Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

While I have not served on a government commission or committee in the past. I have assisted with various commissions and committees in my role at the City of Santa Cruz. Specifically, I have assisted with various events and planning for the Sister Cities Committee and Friends of Parks and Recreation. I also worked with the Women’s Commission at the City of Santa Cruz.
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center of Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>1740 17th Ave. Santa Cruz, CA 95062</td>
<td>Senior Programs Director</td>
<td>1/1/17-Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>323 Church Street Santa Cruz, CA 95060</td>
<td>Recreation Programs</td>
<td>11/4/08-5/5/15</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.

Tara E. Ireland
Signature 4/13/17

How did you learn about this opportunity? Lois Connell – Volunteer Center

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
1:E&DTAC/MEMBERS/Application/COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION.doc
**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

In March of 2017, I took over the role of Senior Programs Director from Debbi Brooks, who retired. My new position now requires supervision of our Transportation Program for Santa Cruz, San Lorenzo Valley and Watsonville. Lois Connell and I are both coordinating the Transportation Program until July, 2017. In August, I will assume the sole responsibility of The Volunteer Center, Transportation Program and will hopefully be a representative on the E&D TAC. I am enthusiastic about transportation options for our seniors in Santa Cruz County. I look forward to learning from the E&D TAC Committee and sharing information and knowledge about our community programs.
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

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

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Kirkance
Home address: [Redacted]
Mailing address (if different): [Redacted]
Phone: (Cell) [Redacted] (business/message) [Redacted]
E-mail: Kirka@cbridges.org

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 28 Years
Position(s) I am applying for: E&D TAC Member

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
I have been an E&D TAC Member for over about five years.
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges/Lift Line (CTSA)</td>
<td>236 Santa Cruz Ave.</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>1997 to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Past 6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I would like to remain on this committee to continue my support for the elderly and disabled residents. My qualifying experience is that I have worked for the Santa Cruz County CTSA (Lift Line) for over 20 years and understand transportation and it’s needs for the elderly and disabled.

My accomplishments on the committee have been being part of a group that makes decision and moves things forward on behalf of the elderly and disabled in a positive and dedicated manner. Also reaching out and meeting unmet needs such as adding to the out of county transportation program and adding a new same day rides program.

The committee’s endeavors that most interest me are all of them however I have the most knowledge on transportation needs for the elderly and disabled.

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

[Signature]

June 12, 2017

Date

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
# Membership Roster
## September 2017

(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>vacant</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled</td>
<td>Sheryl Hagemann (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled (County)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Daugherty, Vice Chair (2019)</td>
<td>SCMTD (Metro)</td>
<td>April Warnock (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Lamb (2018)</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (60+)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory District Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Welch (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grace Blakeslee, Staff, Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**3 MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE**  

**September 2017 Through November 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>9/7/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/17</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Note special meeting date</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/17</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Traffic Operations Systems Committee/ Safe on 17 Task Force</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/18/17</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Note special meeting date</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:00 pm*</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Note earlier start time</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/5/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/17</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/17</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Note meeting date 1 week later</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Note meeting date 1 week later</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>B&amp;A/P Meeting</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/17</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Note special meeting date</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/17</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Note: special meeting date</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/17</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>RTC Offices Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/17</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>RTC Offices Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RTC Commission Offices – 1523 Pacific Ave. – Santa Cruz, CA  
Board of Supervisors Chambers/CAO Conference room – 701 Ocean St-5th floor – Santa Cruz, CA  
City of Capitola-Council Chambers – 420 Capitola Ave – Capitola, CA  
City of Santa Cruz-Council Chambers – 809 Center St – Santa Cruz, CA  
City of Scotts Valley-Council Chamber – 1 Civic Center Dr – Scotts Valley, CA  
City of Watsonville-Council Chambers/Community Room – 275 Main St – Watsonville, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/25/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/26/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joanne Reiter</td>
<td>Support Rail and Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John Horvath</td>
<td>Transportation Study Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>06/09/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Daniel Paduano</td>
<td>Railbus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John Babcock</td>
<td>Widen Highway One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jaime Sanchez</td>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jerilyn Bodemar</td>
<td>Keep the Rail Between Watsonville &amp; North Santa Cruz County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Scott Visa</td>
<td>Keep the Rails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carol Long</td>
<td>Rail Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pam Stearns</td>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Olivia Silva</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/27/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jeanne Greatorex</td>
<td>Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/27/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nancy Faulstich</td>
<td>Preserve Rail Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/27/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Denise Lucy</td>
<td>Rail Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/29/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>EJ Armstrong</td>
<td>Hwy 9 Fixes, Easement, Bike Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/29/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Yvonne Undeen</td>
<td>Keep Rails Connecting North &amp; South SC County in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/29/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian Peoples</td>
<td>Trail Now Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/31/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Manu Koenig</td>
<td>Vote &quot;NO&quot; on Resolution No. 40-12, Stand Up for Trail Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/31/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Patricia Ruppelt</td>
<td>Rail Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/31/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>05/31/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gregory Cannoles</td>
<td>Caltrans District 5 Maintenance &amp; Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/31/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/01/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Judy Verbeck</td>
<td>Rail Trail Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/31/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/01/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alexandra Kilkoff</td>
<td>Train from Watsonville to Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/31/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/01/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Evelyn Gonzalez</td>
<td>Watsonville wants a Rail Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jun-17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/01/17</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Rhoads</td>
<td>Moffat and Nichol</td>
<td>Kim Schultz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Amendment #1 to Consultant Service Agreement- Mar Vista Bike/Pedestrian Crossing of State Route (Highway 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/17</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick Venter</td>
<td>Kimley-Horn &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>Ginger Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Notice to Proceed-Unified Corridor Investment Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>06/09/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Greatorex</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/05/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td>Transportation Delays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>GDy</td>
<td>06/19/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Longinotti</td>
<td>UCIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</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>06/06/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>调查</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07/17</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>出</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>张</td>
<td>李</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>GGy</td>
<td>06/10/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Sokolow</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/12/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Walecka</td>
<td>Allen Creek Greenway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/12/17</td>
<td>Document Plan</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>出</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Garin</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Caltrans District 5 Branch Chief Advance Planning-Travel Modeling &amp; Forecasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/14/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Geiger</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/14/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Kingsley</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Slade</td>
<td>Land Trust of Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/14/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/14/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Sokolow</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/14/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/14/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/15/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Soriahkov</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Elsea</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/21/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Plomp</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/20/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Elissa</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>无</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>06/20/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Lustgarden</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>E Porter</td>
<td>Environmental Health Services County Government Center</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/20/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Watsonville Trail on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/20/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>Saeed</td>
<td>Valizadeh</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Reimbursement of Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/21/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>Inns By The Sea, Inc.</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/21/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Ow</td>
<td>University Business Park</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 233528 for Parking Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/21/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>Seabright Station Partnership</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 221084 for Beautification Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/23/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Russ</td>
<td>Mancillas</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rail Gilroy to Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/24/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>Graniterock-Watsonville</td>
<td>Gas Tax Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/26/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Caltrans Meetings June 26-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>入</td>
<td>Fiscal Officer/SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Kanemasu</td>
<td>Acting Chief State Controller</td>
<td>Transportation Fiscal Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Type</td>
<td>Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</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>06/27/17</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Ambrosini</td>
<td>Office of Project Implementation Dept of Transportation</td>
<td>Program Supplemental Agreements for Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/17</td>
<td>Letter L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorandum</td>
<td>Measure D Recipient Agencies</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Executed Master Agreement for Measure D Direct Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/11/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Hudkins</td>
<td>Railroad at Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/12/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Fully Proposed to rail in Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/17</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td>07/12/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Ambrosini</td>
<td>Dept of Transportation-Division of Local Assistance</td>
<td>Fund Allocation from the Active Transportation Program for the SCCRTC to install 875 directional signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/17</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td>07/12/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Palmisano</td>
<td>Director of Public Works City of Watsonville</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Ambrosini</td>
<td>Dept of Transportation-Division of Local Assistance</td>
<td>Requested Fund Allocation from the Regional Improvement Program for the City of Watsonville Construct sidewalk, Harkins Slough Road from Ohlone Parkway to 200 East and Main Street from Pennsylvania Drive and Pacifica Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td>07/14/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Clement</td>
<td>Dept of Transportation-Division of Local Assistance</td>
<td>Fund Allocation from the Regional Improvement Program for the City of Watsonville Widen Roadway, upgrade C&amp;G, and sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Vaquero</td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Bruffey</td>
<td>First Set of Measure D Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Vaquero</td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Bruffey</td>
<td>First Set of Measure D Projects-Residents of Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Bertold</td>
<td>The branch line from Watsonville to Davenport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/14/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>First Set of Measure D Projects Approved-Branciforte Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/14/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Lucia</td>
<td>MacLean</td>
<td>Importance of rails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/17</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td>07/14/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Sawhill</td>
<td>Friends of the Rail &amp; Trail</td>
<td>Great Santa Cruz Trail Group Study Referenced in the Unified Corridor Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/14/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/14/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td>Grand Jury on Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/14/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/14/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>First Set of Measure D Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/17/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/17/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Coonerty</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Huskey</td>
<td>Support of the Rails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/19/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/19/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Perrigo, Jr.</td>
<td>CFST</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee for Unified Corridor Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/20/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/20/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Van Allen</td>
<td>CFST</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee for Unified Corridor Study Study-missing invitation to the UCI Focus Group to the Campaign for Sensible transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/20/17</td>
<td>Email O</td>
<td>07/20/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Van Allen</td>
<td>CFST</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee for Unified Corridor Study Study-missing invitation to the UCI Focus Group to the Campaign for Sensible transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/20/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>07/20/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yesenia</td>
<td>Parra</td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>H&amp;H Engineering</td>
<td>Delinquent Payment from Iowa Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/20/17</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>07/20/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seema</td>
<td>Prasad</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission-SAFE</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Safe on 17 Invoice:April 1, 2017-June 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter/Email/Format</td>
<td>In/Out</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/21/17</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Duazo</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SRT Auxiliary Lanes Construction Final Invoices #28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/24/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td>Iowa Pacific Failure-SC Sentinel Article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/24/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero/Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Terrazas</td>
<td>Humble Sea Brewery</td>
<td>City Resolution-Café Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/24/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>Hedstrom</td>
<td>Measure D Voter-Yes</td>
<td>Scrap Plans for Commuter Train</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td>Wasting taxpayer dollars on Aptos Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/17</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>Dougherty, Director</td>
<td>Department of Transportation, Transportation Development</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>2017 Performance Audit Certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/28/17</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Kitayama</td>
<td>Kitayama Bros., Inc.</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Responsibility for design and repairs to drainage from your property onto the adjacent SCCRTC Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/17</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Beyer</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Letter to request peer review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>Pico</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Key Information on the Iowa Pacific Storing of 152 Rail Cars in Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/17</td>
<td>Email O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>SCRTC</td>
<td>Richelle</td>
<td>Noroyan</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz, Councilmember</td>
<td>Health Hazard-Abandoned structure near tracks off of Swift Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/17</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Bathrick</td>
<td>Bus Infrastructure Program Manager/Federal Transit Administration/Office of</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Support of Santa Cruz Metro’s Bus Replacement Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/17</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Accountancy Corporation</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Nikuna</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>TDA and STA Funds to Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCM1D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Blakeslee</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>Steinbruner</td>
<td>Aptsos Resident</td>
<td>Question RE:E&amp;D TAC Approved action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Blakeslee</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>UCS: Please include personal rapid transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/07/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Blakeslee</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Please keep the trail line optional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Blakeslee</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Rosenberger</td>
<td>Rail in Santa Cruz County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/17</td>
<td>Email O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Guigliemo</td>
<td>Vasquez, Officer</td>
<td>Capitola Police Department</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Vazquez, Officer</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Trespass Letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/17</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Ellis, President</td>
<td>Iowa Pacific Holdings</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Notice of Obligations under Administration, Coordination and License Agreement dated September 27, 2012 between the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and Santa Cruz &amp; Monterey Bay Railway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Longinotti</td>
<td>Campaign for Sensible Transportation</td>
<td>Input on the Unified Corridors Study</td>
<td>Santa Cruz &amp; Monterey Bay Railway v. Greenleaf Wholesale Florist, Inc. (LEAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Rosenberger</td>
<td>Rail in Santa Cruz County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/17</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Perrigo</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Your Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Type</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>In/Out</td>
<td>Date Resp</td>
<td>First TO</td>
<td>Last TO</td>
<td>Organization TO</td>
<td>First FROM</td>
<td>Last FROM</td>
<td>Organization FROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>08/16/17</td>
<td>MarSue</td>
<td>Morrill, CPA, Chief, External Audits-Local Agencies</td>
<td>Cal Dept of Transportation-Independent Office of Audits and Investigations</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>8/17/2017</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Ambrosini</td>
<td>Dept of Transportation</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Nikuna</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/23/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>08/23/17</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Calate</td>
<td>CalTrans District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/24/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>8/24/2017</td>
<td>Commissioners</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Greg McPheeters</td>
<td>Greg McPheeters</td>
<td>Sierra Club of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Sierra Club Requests Peer Review of the GSCTG Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>8/25/2017</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Greg McPheeters</td>
<td>Sierra Club of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Sierra Club Requests Peer Review of the GSCTG Study</td>
<td>Invoice #3 for the SR9/San Lorenzo Valley Complete Streets Corridor Trans Plan Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>08/28/17</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Calate</td>
<td>CalTrans District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>08/28/17</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Calate</td>
<td>CalTrans District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>8/29/2017</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>Pico</td>
<td>Discrepancy in Iowa Pacific oil tanker storage income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June 16, 2017

Jack Soriahkoff
County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department
809 Center Street, Room 201
Santa Cruz, California 95062

RE: Aptos Village Project Bus Stop Replacement

Dear Mr. Soriahkoff,

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

At its meeting on June 13, 2017, the E&D TAC discussed the design and location for the inbound bus stop replacement included in the Aptos Village Project located near the intersection of Soquel Drive and Trout Gulch Road. Information about the Aptos Village Project was previously provided to the E&D TAC by County of Santa Cruz staff in 2013. In order to keep informed about the current project improvements, the committee approved a motion to write a letter to the County of Santa Cruz Public Works staff to inquire about the location and design of the bus stop replacement included in the Aptos Village Project, particularly as it relates to the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA), and any changes to the design since this committee's review in 2013. The committee also approved a motion to request that the County of Santa Cruz Public works staff attend the August 8, 2017 meeting of the E&D TAC to provide a oral update and answer questions.

We very much look forward to having an informative discussion with you at our August 8, 2017 meeting. Thank you for continuing to work with us to meet the transportation needs of all county residents.

Sincerely,

Veronica Elsea, Chair
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
Subject: Rail/Trail

Your Message

I was at the Watsonville meeting this morning about the rail/trail between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. After coming home and thinking about everything I heard, I'm a little puzzled about all the talk of big bucks, more taxes, more measures on the ballot for the train. Why would the rail cost such a huge sum of money? Doesn't or hasn't that route been used for the Christmas train recently? Would it really be out of the question to upgrade the tracks some what and put the old train on line? Give it a year or a season as a test run before dumping in the big bucks? Maybe have riders sign up and only allow these folks to be the "tester". I just don't see why initially it has to be all or nothing. Otherwise all the projects for bikes, senior, pedestrians, etc sound really well thought out.

Thank you.

Subject: FW: Rail Corridor - Greatorex, Jeanne

Hello Jeanne Greatorex –

Your comments about use of the rail corridor were received and will be made available for consideration by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) board. There are a multitude of options for use of the rail corridor including transit options. A Rail Transit Feasibility Study was completed in Dec 2015 and compared costs and ridership for seven options. One option (G1), proposed by the existing railroad operator, included use of their existing stock of diesel locomotives. While an option like this would alleviate the need to buy new vehicles, there are trade offs. Many of the newer vehicles are cleaner and quieter. Please check out the study for more details. Measure D included funding for the following projects in the rail corridor:

- Construction of a bicycle/pedestrian trail (Coastal Rail Trail)
- Preservation and maintenance of the corridor, including existing infrastructure
- Analysis (including economic and environmental) of transportation options on the corridor

For more information about Measure D or the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS), please visit the RTC website: www.sccrtc.org.

Please let us know if you’d like to be included on the eNews list for Measure D, or UCS. Thank you!

Karena Pushnik
Senior Transportation 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
Please make the following improvements to the evaluation process:

1. **Before creating scenarios that combine different transportation elements, each element needs to be evaluated on its own merits.** The problem with starting with the scenario analysis is that a good element could be thrown out because it is grouped in with poorly performing elements. For example, *bus-only lanes on Soquel Ave/Dr. and Freedom Blvd* is an element that may have a lot of potential along parts of that corridor. This element appears in Scenario D where it is grouped with the financially dubious *rail transit on Highway 1 from Santa Cruz to Watsonville.*

2. **Open the black box,** or as your math teacher used to say, "Show your work." The consultant will operate a traffic model in order to evaluate these scenarios. There needs to be a transparent process whereby community members can check the assumptions made as inputs to the model and how conclusions are derived. We ask that an advisory team made up of community members be formed to monitor the technical work of the consultant.

3. **Induced demand needs to be included in the modeling.**

4. We already know enough from existing research to **exclude elements that don’t meet the criteria.** For example, the option to expand Highway 1 auxiliary lanes, accompanied by the reconstruction of overpasses, has been the subject of a $13 million draft EIR. It performs dismally on the criteria for:

   - **efficiency** (The TSM Alternative "would result in very slight improvement in traffic congestion when compared to the No Build Alternative")
   - **safety** ("The total accident rates overall and by segment in 2035 under the Tier I Corridor TSM Alternative would be the same as the accident rates for the No Build Alternative.")
   - **environmental impact** (The TSM Alternative would result in a 25% increase in greenhouse gas emission over the No Build Alternative)
   - **supporting economic vitality** The highway widening project drains limited public revenue away from transit. Good transit lowers transportation costs, the second highest household expenditure for many people in our County.

Elissa Wagner
Aptos

---

From: info@sccrtc.org [mailto:info@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 9:55 AM
To: 'leeseve'
Subject: RE: Evaluation process-Wagner,E

Dear Ms. Wagner,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Unified Corridor Investment Study Project Team and the Commission for their review.

If you would like to be notified of commission meetings that will be discussing the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS), please sign up for UCS eNews on the SCCRTC website.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at [www.sccrtc.org](http://www.sccrtc.org) for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you,

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

*Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news*
1. **Before creating scenarios that combine different transportation elements, each element needs to be evaluated on its own merits.** The problem with starting with the scenario analysis is that a good element could be thrown out because it is grouped in with poorly performing elements. For example, bus-only lanes on Soquel Ave/Dr. and Freedom Blvd is an element that may have a lot of potential along parts of that corridor. This element appears in Scenario D where it is grouped with the financially dubious **rail transit on Highway 1 from Santa Cruz to Watsonville**.

2. **Open the black box,** or as your math teacher used to say, "Show your work." The consultant will operate a traffic model in order to evaluate these scenarios. There needs to be a transparent process whereby community members can check the assumptions made as inputs to the model and how conclusions are derived. We ask that an advisory team made up of community members be formed to monitor the technical work of the consultant.

3. **Induced demand needs to be included in the modeling.**

4. We already know enough from existing research to **exclude elements that don’t meet the criteria.** For example, the option to expand Highway 1 auxiliary lanes, accompanied by the reconstruction of overpasses, has been the subject of a $13 million draft EIR. It performs dismally on the criteria for:

   - **efficiency**  (The TSM Alternative “would result in very slight improvement in traffic congestion when compared to the No Build Alternative”)
   - **safety**  (“The total accident rates overall and by segment in 2035 under the Tier I Corridor TSM Alternative would be the same as the accident rates for the No Build Alternative.”)
   - **environmental impact**  (The TSM Alternative would result in a 25% increase in greenhouse gas emission over the No Build Alternative)
   - **supporting economic vitality**  The highway widening project drains limited public revenue away from transit. Good transit lowers transportation costs, the second highest household expenditure for many people in our County.

Thank you,

Steve Lustgarden
Susan Kauffman

---

From: info@sccrtc.org [mailto:info@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2017 9:56 AM
To: 'Steve Lustgarden'
Subject: RE: Please make the following improvements to the evaluation process for the Unified Corridors Investment Study-Lustgarden,S

Dear Mr. Lustgarden,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Unified Corridor Investment Study Project Team and the Commission for their review.

If you would like to be notified of commission meetings that will be discussing the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS), please sign up for UCS eNews on the SCCRTC website.

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
The Goal
I would like to propose a plan that would, I hope, be supported by diverse voices including Trail Now, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, and the Chamber of Commerce. My hypothesis is that CFST could support removing the railroad tracks if there is a plan in place to replace the tracks with better public transit infrastructure. Everybody wins!

The Vision

Start with “PRT” or Personal Rapid Transit, as described at [http://www.santacruzprt.com/](http://www.santacruzprt.com/). Please check that website if you’re not familiar with the concept.

Now imagine extending the PRT system, to at least Natural Bridges and Cabrillo College. The PRT infrastructure would include overhead guideway rails, above the current railroad tracks or anywhere else that makes sense.

Short-term Steps
I suggest creating a “master plan” of how to achieve a PRT system that connects downtown Santa Cruz with UCSC, Natural Bridges and Cabrillo College. There also needs to be an improved connection to Watsonville which might be PRT, BRT, or some other system. Ensure that any trail and pathway development is consistent with the master plan. (For example, this might involve designing “attachment points” where modular PRT infrastructure can be added later.)

For Commuters
The PRT system is intended to be faster and more convenient than trains or BRT would be. Note, PRT can easily accommodate 2700 passengers per hour which is much higher than the estimated (maximum) 5000 passengers per day for a rail system.

For Tourists
Instead of driving, tourists will ride PRT because it’s fun! They will come to Santa Cruz to experience our PRT system. The views from the above-ground podcars will be amazing. A hotel might want to fund an extension to serve the hotel.

For Businesses
PRT helps employees get to work more easily, and it helps customers to get there without struggling for parking.

Audio (and maybe video) system
Passengers can choose between silence, tourist information, radio broadcasts, music, restaurant listings, etc. The ability to choose is one of the many features that makes PRT fun to ride.

For Walkers and Cyclists
I think PRT is compatible with the goals of “Trail Now” / “Great Santa Cruz Trail” / “Santa Cruz County Greenway.” A large portion of the wide Greenway would include PRT overhead. It’s a feature, not a bug, providing shade and transportation options. And in some areas, especially bridges, it will make sense to build raised paths for biking and walking on top of the PRT guideways.

Addressing Homelessness
The system can be designed to meet human needs that go beyond public transit. For example, a PRT station could include public restrooms, and a podcar could provide safe overnight shelter for someone who has nowhere else to go. (I would hope that our City and County will find better solutions, but a compassionately designed PRT could improve lives.)

Impact on Parking
This project would dramatically reduce the need for downtown parking. Redirect parking funds toward public transit.

Carbon Footprint
This project would create a fantastic opportunity to reduce our community’s carbon footprint. Coordinate with Monterey Bay Community Power to add overhead solar panels and windmills where practical.

Climate Resilience
PRT infrastructure is mostly overhead and therefore largely immune to the effects of sea level rise and flooding.

Costs

PRT is estimated to cost $10-15 million per mile, depending on whether it includes solar panels.

Capital outlay for train from Santa Cruz to Aptos or Capitola is estimated at $9-12 million per mile (or, extending to Watsonville, as low as $4 million per mile).

Aesthetics

The system can be designed for beauty! It should also be quiet enough to run at all hours without disturbing people. In my vision, the podcars would hang from the guideway rails, and solar panels could be installed on top of the guideways.

Sincerely,

Brett Garrett
Santa Cruz, CA

From: info@sccrtc.org [mailto:info@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2017 1:37 PM
To: 'Brett Garrett'
Subject: RE: Proposed scenario for Unified Corridor Investment Study-Garrett,B

Dear Mr. Garnett,

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

Please visit the SCCRTC website at [www.sccrtc.org](http://www.sccrtc.org) for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you,

Cathy Judd
July 7, 2016

Mr. Bud Colligan
South Swell Ventures
Sent via email

Dear Mr. Colligan:

RTC staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft report titled “The Great Santa Cruz Trail 2016.” RTC staff agrees that the addition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way with connections to the rest of the area’s bicycle and pedestrian network will vastly improve bicycling and walking for Santa Cruz County residents and visitors. This will help significantly towards achieving the goals for bicycling and walking established in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan.

General Comments

While RTC staff appreciates and shares the goal of enhancing and increasing bicycling and walking in our county, we find the report to be limited in scope and incomplete in its analysis. The question intended for the report to answer as identified on page 1 (“What is the best use of the corridor within an overall transportation system for the county and region?”) would indicate that a comparison of a range of different options would have been addressed.

For instance, the RTC and the community’s goal of providing a multimodal transportation system that serves the multitude of users in Santa Cruz County are not taken into account. The rail line corridor is an extremely valuable new asset for Santa Cruz County. The RTC has the responsibility to maximize its usage, both now and in the future, based on the needs of the community. A rail-with-trail keeps the option open for passenger rail service to serve the future needs of residents and visitors of Santa Cruz County. Many residents in Santa Cruz County are not able to utilize a multi-use trail but could greatly benefit from passenger rail service along this corridor, and others might use both in combination to travel longer distances.

The RTC’s decision to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (to continue existing rail service, implement recreational rail service, preserve the rail corridor, construct a bicycle and pedestrian path alongside the tracks, and explore future potential additional uses of the corridor) was the result of nearly two decades of work, studies, analysis, inspections, and many public meetings and hearings at which a broad range of community members expressed support.

As the regional entity charged with planning and public policy for future transportation needs, the RTC is required to conduct a public process when developing any planning document to determine the needs of the community. A complete Trail Only study would also need to go through a public process and
account for time and costs related to undoing contracts and agreements with the California Transportation Commission (CTC), Surface Transportation Board (STB) and Iowa Pacific Holdings. A significant amount of regulatory, administrative and legal resources and expenses would be incurred over a multi-year process which would delay implementation of any trail project. These costs and the delay are not factored in to the per-mile estimate.

In general, RTC staff did not review the majority of the numbers and figures (such as cost, usage, level of service) that were developed for this study for accuracy. The following comments are offered to clarify stated inaccuracies.

Specific Comments

1. The map on the second page of the PDF file states, “32-Mile Former Santa Cruz Branch Line Corridor.” This is still an active rail line with Iowa Pacific Holdings operating on the line as discussed on page 3; therefore, it should be characterized as, “32-Mile Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Corridor.”

2. Page ii states, “This report studies a never before considered “Trail Only” option for the Santa Cruz Branch Line.” This is not correct. The RTC considered adding such an option to the list of alternatives in the environmental document for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network. The RTC unanimously decided not to include it in the environmental document. In addition, in the 1990's the RTC sent a letter to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) asking about the possibility of using Proposition 116 funds to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Corridor only to build a trail as a way to preserve the corridor. The CTC responded that such a project would not be eligible for Proposition 116 funds.

3. Page 1: The third sentence of the first paragraph states, “In 2010, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) used $11 million of this funding to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line to provide rail service alongside a trail.” This is not correct. The sentence should read, “In 2012, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) used $10.2 million of this funding to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line to continue existing rail service, implement recreation rail service, preserve the rail corridor, construct a bicycle and pedestrian path alongside the tracks, and explore future potential additional uses of the corridor.”

4. Page 1: The fourth sentence of the first paragraph states, “The current direction – for a Rail-with-Trail approach – was set as a result of the Proposition 116 requirements.” This is not correct. The RTC's decision to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for the purposes specified in Item 3 above was the result of nearly two decades of work, studies, analysis, inspections, and many public meetings and hearings at which a broad range of community members expressed support and opposition for different options.

5. Page 1: The blue text at the bottom right hand corner states, “...up to 32 miles of existing unused rail corridor...” This is not correct. The Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line is an active rail line with Iowa Pacific Holdings as a railway operator, as stated on page 3. Parts of the rail corridor
are currently being used regularly or semi-regularly and rail vehicles may operate anywhere on the entire rail line according to rights granted by federal law and the STB.

6. Page 3: The last sentence of the first paragraph states, "Occasional seasonal tourist trains continue to operate, but no regular passenger service has existed since the last run of the Suntan Express in 1959." Santa Cruz Big Tress and Pacific Railroad operate trains to the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk during the greater part of the year and likely consider that their service is not occasional but rather regular scheduled tourist service. The train that operated from San Jose to Santa Cruz until 1959 was known as the "Suntan Special."

7. Page 3: The last sentence of the fourth paragraph states, "Yet it is just this scenario (trail-only) that seems most likely to be fully constructible and operational within a short time frame using discrete and attainable funding." It may be true that a trail-only scenario can be fully constructed more quickly if legislative mandates, contracts and agreements are not factored in; however, the RTC must plan and implement projects for the long term to provide for the transportation needs of the current and future generations. For this reason, the RTC, on behalf of the community, must be very careful about short-term projects that may prematurely eliminate options to meet long-term transportation needs. Thus, while a trail may be "constructible" within a short time frame, that construction period is likely to begin much later than assumed in the Trail-Only scenario due to time and resources needed to undo agreements and contracts with the CTC, STB, Iowa Pacific and others. Based on our experience with the rail industry and the attendant regulatory agencies, it would be naïve to assume otherwise.

8. Pages 7 and 8: Walking and bike sheds also show the population of the county that could more readily utilize passenger rail service along the rail corridor. By providing an improved walking, biking and transit options, more people can be served along this rail corridor.

9. Page 9 indicates that the RTC established a 25-foot minimum width policy for the rail-and-trail system. It should be noted that the RTC policy is for a 12-foot minimum trail with a 20-foot envelope to be used exclusively for train operations (as per the agreement with Iowa Pacific). The RTC acknowledged that 25 feet is the absolute minimum width that would allow for a train and trail system. At a planning level (without right-of-way surveying), the RTC determined that only 1/3 of a mile fits under the very limited constraint.

10. Page 13: The challenges of building a trail of this magnitude that extends the length of the county are discussed throughout the Master Plan. These challenges are surmountable and in fact the North Coast segment, Westside Santa Cruz and Watsonville sections of the trail are in design and will be constructed in the next few years. Grant applications have been submitted to fund sections of the trail in mid-county.

11. Pages 24-26 and Appendix B regarding Anticipated Usage of the Trail: The study states that the trail will draw an estimated 890 to 1,400 new daily bicycle commuters. This number of new daily bicycle commuters is inconsistent with the statement in the report that this trail would then serve as a catalyst for increasing bicycle and pedestrian commute from 3% to 20% of commute trips. Often more conservative estimates for walkshed and bikesheds are used in usage models than those used in this trail study (pages 7-8). Appendix B shows that the study counted census commute trips of up to 8 miles with start and end points within 1.5 miles of the
corridor when estimating use. This is significantly higher than the more common modeling assumption that people may commute by bike if their trip is a maximum of 3 or 5 miles.

12. Notably, the Rail Transit Feasibility Study estimated up to 5,500 trips (boardings) per day (Scenario G) under baseline/current conditions. Your report shows only half of that number. The bolded text on page 24 suggests that the only justification for investing in transit is congestion reduction. While there can be some congestion reduction resulting from shifting trips from single-occupancy vehicles onto transit, this study fails to discuss the other benefits of public transportation. Most significant are that transit expands options for traveling between destinations and for some public transit is the only option, especially for those traveling more than 3 miles or with limited abilities. For instance 70 percent of local transit riders have an annual income of under $25,000 and 60 percent of riders have an annual household income of below $15,000 and 82 percent of riders do not have access to a private vehicle. Rail transit provides more predictable travel time reliability and reduce travel times, especially compared to bicycling, walking, and even the bus and driving between some destinations.

13. Page 27: The Rail with trail level of service (LOS) based on trail widths are misrepresenting the widths for the segments noted. For example, on the La Selva Beach segment, an additional bridge is proposed for the trail parallel to the rail bridge and for the north coast, the draft design is for 12 ft paved and 6 to 12 ft decomposed granite. The RTC will utilize the maximum allowable widths for the trail in each section. RTC staff is not aware of any study showing that potential trail usage is measurably impacted if a trail is 2 feet wider or narrower.

RTC staff appreciates the opportunity to review the study and your enthusiasm for providing the Santa Cruz County community with the finest bicycle and pedestrian facilities possible. We look forward to continuing to work with you and your team on forging solutions desired by the community as a whole.

Sincerely,

George Dondero
Executive Director

CC: Regional Transportation Commission
Dear RTC,

I am concerned about the plans for the railroad at Santa Cruz. As a rail fan I have walked the tracks from Santa Cruz to Davenport and the other way within sight of Watsonville. I have also ridden the train from Watsonville to Santa Cruz and then up to Roaring Camp at Felton. I enjoyed it very much and admire its potential. This is a continuous rail which provides important options for access by rail. We know that railroads are fuel efficient and much cleaner than automobiles. It is difficult to replace track if it has been removed.

Railroads are good for the environment. This grade is especially scenic. It is an asset to the community.

The Staggers rail act preferred retaining rail corridors even if the rails were removed. They are a useful utility corridor and they improve property values in the area they run through. They are good for walking, bikes and sometimes horses. The corridor then exists if the rail is wanted again.

If the quarry at Davenport reopens it will prefer rail transport. That would help employment.

The railroad at Roaring Camp near Felton is an asset to the community. They benefit from the tracks being nearby. They especially help with diverted parking to their sizable parking lot and letting the people enjoy the train ride along the San Lorenzo River directly to the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk. It lessens traffic and parking problems in Santa Cruz. It helps bring people to the Boardwalk. That has long been an important source of revenue and employment. The history of the area includes the Sun Tan Specials of long ago. There is a long and joyous history of people taking the train to Santa Cruz.

I urge you to consider retaining the track or at least retaining the corridor as a Rail Trail.

Thank you,

Jim Hudkins

Alameda, CA
As I saw there is an effort to get taxpayers and voters to write in about rail in Santa Cruz, I would once again like to voice my complete opposition to rail being maintained and built up along the coastal corridor. We need a wide protected trail to offer protection to bike riders, pedestrians and othersthat would like to participate in active transportation in Santa Cruz County. A train would be expensive, provide a narrow trail space and would be a huge burden to the county. I urge all of our commissioners to take swift action and build a trail only solution along the corridor.

Jack Brown
523 Townsend Drive
Aptos, CA 95003
805-433-4245
To whom this may concern,

It has come to my attention that several individuals from the groups "Trail Now" and "Greenway" want to have the railroad tracks on the Davenport Branch Line as well as Roaring Camp's tracks to the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk torn up and replaced with a bike trail. This is not only a fundamentally destructive proposal, this will destroy a part of Santa Cruz's rich railroad history that is still active to this day. Trains played (and still play) a major role in Santa Cruz County as they not only hauled freight and passengers across the county, they carried tourists to and from their destinations. Not only will this proposition waste millions of dollars, it will take away hundreds of jobs and a large majority of Santa Cruz County's tourism. The Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission has a responsibility to preserve as much of our transportation history, which includes the railroad tracks. Please consider this keeping the railroad tracks for future generations to fully understand Santa Cruz County's heritage. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Karis Keiji Muramoto
Hello RTC,
I am writing you to voice my support for the rail lines that link Santa Cruz and Roaring Camp together. I would be shocked to learn that these would be removed for trails. It would be like taking out the bottom of HWY9 or 17 to Santa Cruz. Roaring Camp offers visitors to the area easy access to both areas, and brings tourist revenue to Santa Cruz, helps Felton and the local economy in general. I am not sure how removing access to the Boardwalk or SC would be beneficial to either area.

There are more hiking trails in the area then what people use. There is only one rail line that links these areas.

Please consider these thoughts when voting.

Christine Clement
Felton Resident
I am curious why there is nothing in your five-year plan that addresses the needs of the residents of Watsonville. They are the ones who suffer the most from the deliberate inaction of north county activists who run the RTC. Is it because they are mostly Hispanics and therefore are not important? Sounds harsh but that is how it appears. Is the expectation that Watsonville residents will all ride bikes on your ridiculous rail trail to get to North County jobs since the buses are all stuck in the deliberate traffic jams on Highway 1? Ellen Pirie told a Chamber meeting probably 20 years ago that a commuter rail would never happen as the daily cost of a ride would be at least $60. I still take Ellen at her word to this day. Every time a new segment of Highway 1 is completed, you lose the support for further widening from that segment of the county residents and surely this is by design. So why outright disregard of Watsonville residents?
Charles H. Bruffey, MHA

---

Hello Kenneth,

Another Measure D milestone has been achieved to Move Santa Cruz County Forward! The County, all four cities, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, Community Bridges and the Regional Transportation Commission have held public hearings and approved their first set of projects for Measure D transportation improvement funds (for 2017 – 2022).

Following Public Input, First Set of Five-Year Plans Approved
Measure D Projects Can Now Begin!

Review Current 5-Year Plans on the RTC website:

- Streets, Roads, Safe Routes to School
- Highway Corridor Projects
- Transit and Paratransit
- Coastal Rail Trail
- Rail Corridor (including the Unified Corridor Study)
- San Lorenzo Valley/Highway 9
- Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing

Annually, each entity is required to update their plans via a public hearing and, after the first year, provide information about projects delivered and an audit of funds expended. These materials will be available on the RTC website.
July 13, 2017

George Donedo, Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Great Santa Cruz Trail Group study referenced in the Unified Corridor Study

Dear Mr. Donedo,

As you know, the Great Santa Cruz Trail Group (GSCTG) submitted and presented a report, the privately funded, to support their idea that the highest and best use of the rail corridor is to remove the existing tracks and construct separate bicycle and pedestrian paths. We understand this same GSCTG report was cited as a reference document in the Unified Corridor Study, currently underway. Because the GSCTG report contains several egregious misrepresentations, we urge the RTC to immediately perform a rigorous technical peer review of the GSCTG report.

While the GSCTG report contains many misrepresentations, the most egregious of these is the cost analysis presented on page 27, supported by a summary table on page 23 (copies attached). On page 27, the report compares the per-mile capital costs of their trail-only plan with the rail-with-trail plan detailed in the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan (the MBSST plan). This comparison is an egregious misrepresentation of facts because:

1. The $1.6M per mile cost cited is the simple arithmetic average of the costs of five example projects summarized on page 23. Unfortunately, the five example projects are substantially different than their trail-only proposal in design, configuration, scope of work, time of construction, construction market location and even whether or not the example project is in a rail corridor (see attached - Analysis of the Five GSCTG Example Projects). In fact some of the examples cited were mostly constructed in the last century and one has not yet even started construction. In spite of these substantial differences, there is no evidence any adjustments were made to normalize the figures to their proposed project. Accordingly, the estimated per-mile capital cost appears to be grossly underestimated.

2. Furthermore, the $1.6M per-mile cost does not include the RTC’s $32M estimated cost of removing the tracks from our existing rail corridor. Considering the cost of track removal alone, raises their per-mile cost by over $1M per-mile to $2.6M.

3. The cited $4M per-mile cost of the rail-with-trail is a fully loaded cost figure and includes all pre-construction costs such as design, engineering, permitting, construction management and contingency. Dividing the estimated $75.6M construction cost by the 30.3 miles of trail, yields a corrected capital cost of only $2.5M per-mile.

Accordingly, it is our considered opinion that if the cited costs of the GSCTG example projects were adjusted to account for the differences identified in the attached table, and, the $32M cost of track removal was included,
the estimated per-mile capital cost of the GSCTG trail-only proposal would substantially exceed the estimated $2.5M per-mile capital cost of the MBSST rail-with-trail. **For this reason alone, the RTC should immediately provide an independent peer-review and analysis of the GSCTG report.**

However, there are a number of other claims made in the GSCTG report that warrant independent peer review including:

On pages 9-12, the GSCTG report discusses various constraints. Pages 11-12 contain two maps illustrating multiple ROW constraints where existing ROW is noted to be: 15’, 15-20’, 20’, <20’, 20-22’, 20-25’, 25’ max, and <25’. Each and every one of these claimed ROW dimensions should be compared against the available ROW described in the property record to avoid any misrepresentation of the available ROW along the rail corridor.

In a text box on page 15, the GSCTG makes six claims about the proposed Great Santa Cruz Trail. The validity of these claims should be investigated and the veracity of each claim tested and compared to the proposed rail trail detailed in the MBSST Network Master Plan.

On pages 24 through 26, the GSCTG report implies that anticipated use of their proposed separated bike and pedestrian facility will be greater than that of the MBSST. An independent review should explore the analysis provided and report on the validity of any implied claims made in the GSCTG report.

On page 27, the GSCTG report states a belief that a trail-only option could be open for use sooner than the current planned rail-with-trail as detailed in the MBSST. The validity of this claim should be addressed in the peer review.

Furthermore, both Barry Scott and Mark Mesiti-Miller submitted written comments (October 17, 2016) raising other serious concerns with the GSCTG report. We also remind you of a letter sent to the RTC from the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy dated August 17, 2016 raising several additional issues with the GSCTG report. All concerns expressed in the aforementioned documents should be addressed in the peer review.

Lastly, the peer review process must evaluate the trail proposed in the GSCTG report against the adopted public policies delineated in the MBSST Network Master Plan.

We trust the RTC will promptly undertake the independent peer review outlined above. Should you wish to discuss this matter any further or if FORT can be of any assistance, please contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Sawhill, Chair  
Friends of the Rail & Trail
# Analysis of the Five GSCTG Example Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Project</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Coastal Recreation Trail</td>
<td>Project consists of a single, multi-use path, a portion of which is constructed over old tracks but much of which is constructed along existing railroad tracks. This path does not provide separate pedestrian and bike lanes. This project began in the 1970's with the first section opening in 1980. Additional sections were added over time (1990's and 2000's). No apparent adjustment of the cost was done to account for the different design conditions nor the much older dates of construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razorback Regional Greenway <a href="https://www.nwatrails.org/trail/razorback-regional-greenway/">https://www.nwatrails.org/trail/razorback-regional-greenway/</a></td>
<td>Project consists of a single, multi-use path, of which substantial portions are constructed alongside existing actively used railroad tracks. This project does not provide separate pedestrian and bike lanes and does not include the cost of track removal for the rail-with-trail portions. The project is located in Arkansas not California. No apparent adjustment of the cost was done to account for the different design conditions nor the different market conditions where the project is located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV Link <a href="http://www.coachellavalleylink.com/">http://www.coachellavalleylink.com/</a></td>
<td>This project is planned to be a 50 mile long separate bike and pedestrian path. Construction has not yet started. CV Link is a poor example as it is a brand new trail and not a rail-to-trail or rail-with-trail as there is no associated rail corridor. Accordingly, the cost of rail removal is not included. Furthermore, this project is located in the desert, largely parallels an existing highway and has very few creeks or swales to cross. No apparent adjustment of the cost was done to account for the different design / funding conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC Regional Trail <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eastside_Rail_Corridor">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eastside_Rail_Corridor</a></td>
<td>This 42 mile trail network is planned to be a single, multi-use path that does not provide separate pedestrian and bike lanes. The only portion completed so far is 5.6 miles long and is a simple gravel path. Figures used are from planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Great Allegheny Passage**  
https://www.gaptrail.org/trail-info/about-the-trail |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project consists of a single, multi-use path largely paved with crushed limestone (gravel). This project includes a very successful 16 mile long stretch that functions satisfactorily alongside an active rail line offering both freight and passenger service. This path does not provide separate pedestrian and bike lanes and may or may not include the cost of track removal. This project was largely constructed in the 1980's and 90's and is located in Pennsylvania not California. No apparent adjustment of the cost was done to account for the different design conditions nor the different market conditions where the project is located nor the much older dates of construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

documents and may or may not include removal of tracks. The project is located in Washington not California. No apparent adjustment of the cost was done to account for the different design / funding conditions nor the different market conditions where the project is located.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEER TRAIL</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TRAIL LENGTH (MILES)</th>
<th>RAIL BANKING</th>
<th>VISION</th>
<th>FUNDING</th>
<th>OUTCOMES/ BENEFITS</th>
<th>COST PER MILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Coastal Recreation Trail</td>
<td>Monterey County, California</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Maximize the economic and education benefits of the National Marine Sanctuary; address transportation impact issues such as parking and traffic circulation</td>
<td>The cost of this section of the coastal trail is unclear, due to the various mechanisms for making the trail corridor available. However, the 2007 Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Master Plan identifies a cost of $28.5 million for upgrades of existing sections and construction of new trail segments along the 34 miles between Pacific Grove to the Santa Cruz County line.*</td>
<td>Public connection to natural resources, economic development, non-motorized transportation alternative</td>
<td>$0.8 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razorback Regional Greenway</td>
<td>Northwestern Arkansas</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Create a “spine” trail and integrate existing trails into a regional trail network</td>
<td>$38 million, mostly funded through TIGER and private grant</td>
<td>Economic development, increased foot traffic to nearby businesses, education, mobility</td>
<td>$1.1 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV Link</td>
<td>Riverside County, California</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Create an alternative to Highway 111 for non-motorized and Neighborhood Electric Vehicle uses</td>
<td>$99.4 million, $75.6 million funded through various sources</td>
<td>Public health, safety, tourism, increased property values, reduced VMT, job creation</td>
<td>$2 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC Regional Trail</td>
<td>King County, Washington</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Provide a regional non-motorized trail for everyday commuters and recreational users</td>
<td>$132–$183 million, funding not yet identified</td>
<td>Regional mobility, economic development, public health, non-motorized transportation, cultural preservation, art</td>
<td>$2.1–$3.6 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Allegheny Passage</td>
<td>West Pennsylvania/ Central Maryland</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Provide a non-motorized, multipurpose trail</td>
<td>$80 million, various funding sources</td>
<td>Economic development, local business growth</td>
<td>$0.5 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Santa Cruz Trail</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>A highest quality trail to meet Santa Cruz County Transportation goals</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Improved health, safety, and sustainability</td>
<td>Estimated $1.6 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: [www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/long-range-planning/Moss_Landing_Community_Plan/Monterey_Bay_Sanctuary_Scenic_Trail_Master_Plan_July_2007.pdf](www.co.monterey.ca.us/planning/long-range-planning/Moss_Landing_Community_Plan/Monterey_Bay_Sanctuary_Scenic_Trail_Master_Plan_July_2007.pdf)
BRINGING THE VISION TO LIFE

PROJECT COST

The table to the right compares the estimated per-mile capital costs of the Trail-Only and Rail-with-Trail scenarios.

There are still many decisions to be made regarding either scenario's design, vehicle type, alignment, amenities, access improvements, and other investments. These decisions will have significant impacts on the costs of either outcome. However, the table demonstrates the vast differences in per mile start-up capital needs. To put these numbers into context, we estimate the Trail-Only scenario to serve tens of thousands of people daily (including people who would start bicycling due to the comfort provided by the new off-street facility), whereas the SCCRTC estimates 2,750 daily round-trip users.\textsuperscript{17} A Trail-Only design will provide transportation, economic, recreation, and health benefits to Santa Cruz County residents and visitors at a fraction of the cost of passenger rail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COSTS</th>
<th>TRAIL-ONLY</th>
<th>RAIL-WITH-TRAIL*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs (per mile)</td>
<td>$1.6 million**</td>
<td>$4 million***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Represents costs for the trail portion

**Conservative estimate based on average cost of the five case study trails included in this report

***Appendix C, page C-8, Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan

Eight miles of the MBSST trail are currently in design and environmental review phases, with construction scheduled in 2017. The remainder of the trail will be built as funding becomes available. This study acknowledges that a change in direction would require a new public process. Even so, because of the high cost of likely bridge and environmental mitigations for the full 32-mile Rail-with-Trail solution, we believe a less costly Trail-Only option could be open for use by residents and visitors much sooner.

17 SCCRTC Rail Transit Feasibility Study, Table 6-11
From: Chuck Bergtold [mailto:cberg@cruzio.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 11:17 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: The branch line from Watsonville to davenport

Sir,

I would very much hope that the whole line is maintained for future use. The line from the boardwalk to davenport is important for several reasons/

First: it will provide transportation to the new national park as a option to the narrow route one and provide an amazing journey along the coast with ocean views and thru the fields for visitors from around the world and locals alike. I rode the Chiggen steam train from felton to wilder ranch, and what a feeling it was to steam up the coast with the open space feeling of freedom in the oceanside!

Second: It will provide freight rail service for the removal of dirty dirt, and deconstruction of the cement plant, thus keeping trucks off our roads for the year or more it will take to remove the entire plant once it is purchased from cemex.

I admire the vision it takes to keep the rail option on track for future generations. You only have to look back in time to the sun tan specials that were extremely popular in the 30's and 40's. Also the street cars than ran from santa cruz to capitola along the beach.

sincerely, chuck bergtold
santa cruz
Hello,
Please do not remove any (more) rails in Santa Cruz County. One of the biggest mistakes ever made in California was the removal of train tracks. Originally from Alameda but now in Ben Lomond, I remember the rails removed from the City of Alameda. Boy is this regretted now! All over the state.

I DO NOT support the bike trails movement. Living where I do, I see what horrible damage bikes do to the terrain. Biking in this area is recreational, not a way to commute. I do not want my tax dollars supporting more bike trails.

Rails are the way to go.

Thank you,
Lucia MacLean

--
Lucia MacLean
From: Contact Request Form [mailto:admin@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2017 6:17 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: New submission from Contact Form

This Contact Request Form has been submitted by a member of the public to http://sccrtc.org/contact-us/.
Name
   RONALD PERRIGO JR
Email
   rperrigojr@gmail.com
Subject
   RAIL LINE BETWEEN WATSONVILLE AND DAVENPORT
Your Message
   I WHOLE HEARTEDLY SUPPORT RETAINING THE RAILS, AND LOOK TO THEM AS A RESOURCE FOR OUR FUTURE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS IN SANTA CRUZ COUNTY.

THANK YOU. RONALD PERRIGO JR
RTC Board members,

Please do what's right for the community by scrapping the plans for the commuter train and build a bike/walking trail. My boss was recently hit by a car while she was biking to work. She broke her pelvis and her wrist and was told she's lucky to be alive.

Please do what you know is the right thing to do.

Yes on Measure D Voter,
Erik Hedstrom
Aptos, CA
831-419-7869
erikh1974@gmail.com
July 28, 2017

George Dondero  
Executive Director  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Ave  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Peer review of the Great Santa Cruz Trail Group study

Dear Mr. Dondero,

Many of my Chamber members have brought up an issue that I would like clarification on regarding the proposed steps involved with the Regional Transportation Commission’s Unified Corridor Study (UCS) and specifically, the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail proposed for the existing rail corridor.

As a matter of background and as you know well, the Chamber was actively involved in supporting Measure D which received the necessary 2/3 voter approval so future transportation alternatives could be explored.

It is our understanding that a separate proposed use of the rail corridor - Great Santa Cruz Trail Group (GSCTG) report was sent to the RTC for consideration last year. We understand that the organization had a name change but essentially the report submitted last year is basis of their suggested future use of the corridor. The Chamber is also aware, the RTC included the GSCTG report as a reference document in the documents provided to the retained RTC consultant responsible for completing the UCS.

The UCS must be conducted in an open and transparent public discussion. The Chamber believes that any potential use option should receive a full analysis — both environmental and economic — to ensure the public is receiving the most accurate and factual information.

When the RTC or any public agency conducts an analysis of a project, that analysis should be given careful review based on the most reliable information available to the public. In some instances an agency may call upon a third party peer review to conduct an unbiased evaluation of the project or proposed project. This is common through the public planning process and is considered ‘best practice.’

I would like to know if that peer review is in the RTC consultant’s scope of work? If it is not in the current scope of work, the Chamber requests the RTC staff take this peer review request to your Commission for consideration. A third party peer review of the GSCTG report and other proposed options would provide the public the best and unbiased understanding of the best use of the corridor.
From what we understand to date, no analysis has been done. To ensure the integrity of the UCS and the relationship that this independent report could provide on the overall scope of the UCS, this step may be necessary. Whenever important issues arise in our community, the Chamber supports a transparent and public consideration of the facts involved. A review by objective experts would be useful to individuals, organizations and community stakeholders relying on UCS reference documents for reliable information. As the public agency responsible for the integrity of the UCS and the associated public process, the RTC should take appropriate steps to ensure that an independent peer review provides that level of scrutiny for the public’s benefit.

Thank you for considering our views on this important issue.

Casey Beyer
Chief Executive Officer
Santa Cruz Area Chamber of Commerce
August 4, 2017

George Dondero, Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Peer review of the Great Santa Cruz Trail Group study

Dear Mr. Dondero,

We understand the RTC recently received a request to provide a peer review of the Great Santa Cruz Trail Group (GSCTG) study from the Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail and Trail (FORT).

Bike Santa Cruz County (BSCC) has reviewed FORT’s request and agrees a prompt peer review of the GSCTG study is warranted. Accordingly, BSCC supports FORT’s request and trusts the RTC will promptly proceed with the peer review.

Should you wish to discuss this matter any further, please contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

Janneke Strause
Executive Director
Bike Santa Cruz County
director@bikesantacruzcounty.org
(831) 425-0665
From: Chuck Bruffey [mailto:cbruffey@rmgscc.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 10:33 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: RE: First Set of Measure D Projects Approved

I am curious why there is nothing in your five-year plan that addresses the needs of the residents of Watsonville. They are the ones who suffer the most from the deliberate inaction of north county activists who run the RTC. Is it because they are mostly Hispanics and therefore are not important? Sounds harsh but that is how it appears. Is the expectation that Watsonville residents will all ride bikes on your ridiculous rail trail to get to North County jobs since the buses are all stuck in the deliberate traffic jams on Highway 1? Ellen Pirie told a Chamber meeting probably 20 years ago that a commuter rail would never happen as the daily cost of a ride would be at least $60. I still take Ellen at her word to this day. Every time a new segment of Highway 1 is completed, you lose the support for further widening from that segment of the county residents and surely this is by design. So why outright disregard of Watsonville residents?
Charles H. Bruffey, MHA

From: Regional Transportation Commission [mailto:info@sccrtc.ccsend.com] On Behalf Of Regional Transportation Commission
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 10:03 AM
To: Info <Info@rmgscc.com>
Subject: RTC: First Set of Measure D Projects Approved

Hello Kenneth,

Another Measure D milestone has been achieved to Move Santa Cruz County Forward! The County, all four cities, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, Community Bridges and the Regional Transportation Commission have held public hearings and approved their first set of projects for Measure D transportation improvement funds (for 2017 – 2022). Following Public Input, First Set of Five-Year Plans Approved Measure D Projects Can Now Begin!

Review Current 5-Year Plans on the RTC website:
- Streets, Roads, Safe Routes to School
- Highway Corridor Projects
- Transit and Paratransit
- Coastal Rail Trail
- Rail Corridor (including the Unified Corridor Study)
- San Lorenzo Valley/Highway 9
- Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing

Annually, each entity is required to update their plans via a public hearing and, after the first year, provide information about projects delivered and an audit of funds expended. These materials will be available on the RTC website.
Dear Regional Transportation Commissioners,

I advocate that *Personal Rapid Transit* (PRT) and/or *Group Rapid Transit* should be strongly considered and carefully studied as a possible implementation for all *rail transit* projects included in the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Modern PRT systems constitute a form of rail transit because they use a guideway which can be a monorail or a set of tracks. I assert, *PRT is rail transit.*

Because PRT uses automated podcars, a PRT system would cover two of the *Scenario D* projects, *Rail Transit on Hwy 1 between Santa Cruz and Watsonville* and *Self Driving Cars*. I believe PRT is the most feasible and cost-effective way to achieve rail transit on Highway 1. Unlike conventional rail, the overhead guideways of a PRT system would not interfere with traffic.

PRT is the key to making *Scenario D* practical and affordable, while providing additional benefits such as direct service to Cabrillo College, high schools, and hospital emergency rooms.

Furthermore, I advocate that *Scenarios B, E, and F* should include PRT as a possible approach, likely the best approach, for the Rail Corridor projects *Local Rail Transit with Interregional Connections* and *Freight Service on Rail*. By providing freight transport, a PRT system would reduce the number of trucks on the freeway.

Personal Rapid Transit excels in meeting the RTC’s stated Goals, Criteria, and Performance Measures. PRT is also a simple way to achieve the Sustainability Targets described in Chapter 4, “Vision for 2035,” of the RTC’s 2014 Regional Transportation Plan, including some targets that are deemed unattainable under current plans. Please see the attachment in which I highlighted the goals and targets where I believe PRT *profoundly exceeds* other forms of public transportation. For both UCS and Vision for 2035, I highlighted *most* of the list!

Perhaps best of all, depending on the system details, the system can be installed and operated without making any demand on the budget. Modern technologies have such low operating costs that the ticket revenues would be sufficient to pay off the system.

Personal Rapid Transit would improve transportation, reduce carbon emissions, improve public safety, and reduce costs, enabling the County to attain the RTC’s goals and targets. I’m not asking you to take my word for it. Instead, please obtain a professional analysis, as part of the study that is already underway.

The Unified Corridor Investment Study will influence planning for many years to come, so it is crucially important to include emerging technology such as PRT which may also be implemented in nearby cities within the next few years.

PRT represents a desperately needed paradigm shift toward a sustainable future.

Santa Cruz County is in a unique position to lead the way, and we can do this.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brett Garrett
190 Walnut Ave #307
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Dear RTC:

Please keep the Trail Line operational!

The stories I heard from my GRANDMOTHER about the amazing Portland rail system she rode in her youth make me firmly believe that a working rail line is something you do not abandon.

Wouldn’t it be AWESOME for our kids to wave “bye bye” to the traffic on HWY 1 as they roll on by?

Thank you for your consideration!

Patty Walters
1711 King Street
Santa Cruz, CA

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

Patty Walters
phone: 831-458-1305
fax: 831-458-1307
email: pwalters@waltersconsulting.com
www.waltersconsulting.com
Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Unified Corridor Investment Study Project Team and the Commission for their review.

If you would like to be notified of commission meetings that will be discussing the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS), please sign up for UCS eNews on the SCCRTC website.

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

Thank you,
Virginia

Virginia Vaquero, Administrative Assistant, Art Exhibit Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.460.3205
Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
To: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and Staff  
Re: Input on the Unified Corridors Study (UCS)  
August 10, 2017

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

On behalf of the members of the Campaign for Sensible Transportation (CFST) I want to express gratitude for the opportunity to offer input on the UCS. We hope that the study will give our community the information we need to build consensus around measures to address our transportation challenges.

As you are probably aware, the CFST strongly supports keeping the transit option for the rail right of way. Although we can empathize with those who want to see a trail-only development of that corridor, we believe the trail-only option would be achieved at the expense of an important transit alternative for our county’s residents.

Since our community is divided on the question of our transportation future, the credibility of the UCS is of utmost importance. We believe the credibility of the UCS process would be enhanced by the formation of a Unified Corridors Subcommittee of the RTC. We suggest that community stakeholders be invited to participate in some ongoing way with that subcommittee.

As we know personally from engagement with City of Santa Cruz on water policy, a credibility gap can develop between the public and a public agency that is planning a project. Such a gap could easily develop with the UCS, because the nature of evaluating and ranking options is a technical task in which the public and elected decision-makers are less informed than staff and consultants.

Will the Commissioners be involved in the process of assigning weight (importance) to each of the performance measures? Will any meetings of the technical team be open to the public? How often will the work products of the technical team come to the Commission for review and how much time will the Commission be able to spend on the review?

It is our experience that the technical discussions are always infused with value judgments. For example, we note that four of the five performance measures of the goal, “Reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people and facilitate the transport of goods,” are measurements of peak period travel performance. This would likely result in higher scores for transportation measures that focus on commute travel. Hence additional measures are needed if we value addressing the 75-80% of county trips that are not commute trips. We think Commissioner and public involvement can help make technical decisions such as these reflect public values.

We believe the formation of an RTC subcommittee will increase the likelihood that the study will receive public acceptance. Our comments and questions at this stage in the UCS process are attached. There is an executive summary on the next page that summarizes the entire document.

-Rick Longinotti, Co-Chair
Executive Summary of CFST Comments on the UCS Process

I. Goals and Performance Measures

Provide education on induced travel and its effect on attempts to relieve congestion

Add performance measures
We urge the Commission to adopt the following additional performance measures that assess each project’s effectiveness in providing access. Current performance measures are good at measuring peak period travel, but not travel and access at other times.

1. The quality of the pedestrian and bicyclist experience
2. The quality of the public transit experience
3. The ability of a project to foster land use patterns where people’s destinations are within walking distance
4. Person trips (not solely across a N-S screenline)
5. Number of children walking or riding a bike to school
6. Transit travel time (not just at peak periods), including a way to account for headways
7. Percentage of people that can travel to key destinations within a 30-minute walk, bike or transit trip

II. Scenarios and Projects

Soquel / Freedom Blvd.
1. Demonstrate the transit time effectiveness of measures to enhance bus performance, individually and cumulatively.
2. Protected bike lanes in all scenarios, instead of combined with bus lanes
3. Examine a wide variety of bus-preference scenarios, including dedicated lanes during peak periods; elimination of parking and/or left turn lanes; cordon pricing for Soquel Dr.; etc

Rail Corridor
Examine the feasibility of a variety of scenarios of bus rapid transit and educate about the potential of PRT.

Highway 1
Educate about the induced travel impacts on attempts to relieve congestion as for example, Mission St. intersections; Hwy 1 expansion projects

Transportation Demand Management
Recommend a trip-reduction ordinance for employers and new residential development
Goals and Performance Measures

1. **Will the consultants and staff provide information on induced travel?**

We urge the staff and consultants to summarize the research on induced travel.1 Our understanding of the research suggests that measures that reduce automobile travel time on highways, such as new lanes, ramp metering, and new transit routes parallel to the highway, become offset by induced travel effects. In areas such as ours with high pent-up demand for travel, any congestion relief is short-lived.

The public needs to more exposure to this research, as a significant portion of local public opinion supports the belief than adding lanes to Highway 1 will reduce congestion. We urge the UCS to consider induced travel when reporting “peak period mean automobile travel time.”

2. **Performance measures are needed that measure access, rather than just modes of transportation.**

The Regional Transportation Plan makes clear that the goal of all transportation is people’s access to the ways they meet their needs:

*Goal 1: Improve people’s access to jobs, schools, health care and other regular needs in ways that improve health, reduce pollution and retain money in the local economy.*

   A. Since access is the goal, the UCS needs additional performance measures for the UCS such as: the *quality of the pedestrian and bicyclist experience.* This includes the safety of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, but there’s more. The decision to take a walk or ride a bike is affected by the amount and speed of vehicular traffic. So projects that tend to facilitate auto travel generally negatively affect walking and bicycling.

   B. Access to public transit is largely dependent on boarding locations and frequency of service, and people are more likely to use public transit if they enjoy it. The *quality of the public transit experience* is an important performance measure.

   C. Access is also negatively affected by projects that perpetuate automobile dependency. A landscape built primarily for access by motorized transportation is characterized by destinations (workplaces; shopping; schools; recreation) that are far apart. Such a landscape tends to make car travel a prerequisite for full access. So we suggest an additional performance measure, *ability of a project to foster land use patterns where people’s destinations are within walking distance.*

---

1 [http://www.vtpi.org/gentraf.pdf](http://www.vtpi.org/gentraf.pdf) "Generated Traffic and Induced Travel: Implications for Transport Planning” 18 July 2017 by Todd Litman of the Victoria Transport Policy Institute: This paper describes how generated traffic can be incorporated into transport planning. “...the economic value of a scheme can be overestimated by the omission of even a small amount of induced traffic.”
D. We urge the UCS to include person-trips as a performance measure (not just person-trips across a N-S screenline), as this will give fair representation for trips outside of peak commute periods.

3. We suggest an additional performance measure pertaining to the UCS goal: “reducing adverse health impacts”. We note that the Regional Transportation Plan’s Goal #1 goes beyond the UCS goal of reducing adverse health impacts. It calls for improving access in ways that improve health.

Since active transportation is associated with lower rates of obesity, heart disease and diabetes, we propose a performance measure of number of children walking or riding a bike to school. Our county’s youth health statistics are sad: 25% of white children and 50% of Latino children have body weight outside the healthy fitness zone, according to the California Department of Education.

4. We suggest additional performance measures pertaining to the UCS goal, “Reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people and facilitate the transport of goods.”

Most of the performance measures pertaining to this goal have to do with peak period travel. We acknowledge that peak period travel is perhaps our toughest transportation challenge. However, commute trips represent just 20-25% of all trips in our county, according to AMBAG. We believe that a broader focus than just the commute period will yield solutions that are more beneficial to the community than a narrow focus on commute solutions.

An example of a negative outcome from a narrow focus on commute trips was the planning of the Bay Area Rapid Transit. BART focused on getting commuters to job centers in San Francisco and Oakland to the exclusion of other priorities. Instead of connecting the downtowns of communities such as San Leandro, Hayward and Fremont, planners located BART stations at the periphery of those communities. Outside of the cities of San Francisco, Oakland and Berkeley, BART was designed as a park-and-ride system. This was a missed opportunity to foster development in the core of those cities and reduce auto dependency.

The UCS needs performance measures that will help us differentiate the benefits of a transit line designed to serve mainly commuters and one that can serve both commuters and a significant portion of the other trips. We suggest adding the following measures:

• Transit travel time, including a way to account for headways (waiting time for the next transit vehicle)²

And drawing from the performance measure #1a in the Regional Transportation Plan:

² Jarrett Walker, http://humantransit.org, notes that accounting for the time spent waiting for public transit is crucial to making transit investment decisions. In addition to actual time spent in transit he includes the average headway divided by two.
**Percentage of people that can travel to key destinations within a 30-minute walk, bike or transit trip.**

---

**Scenarios and Projects**

**Soquel Ave/Drive – Freedom Blvd.**

**Bus and bike shared lane:**
Our investigation of shared bike-bus lanes in other areas leads us to the conclusion that a cyclist’s perception of safety is much more enhanced by a buffered bike lane than by a lane shared with buses. Since an important goal is to expand the number of people taking trips by bicycle, we oppose the bike-bus lane concept. Instead we support buffered/protected bike lanes in all scenarios.

**Bus rapid transit lite; Increased transit frequency; dedicated bus lanes.**
There could be a problem with putting the dedicated bus lanes project in a separate scenario from bus rapid transit lite and increased transit frequency. We recommend analyzing the transit time effectiveness of measures to enhance bus performance, individually and cumulatively.

Here are some potential features of enhanced bus service on this corridor in addition to the Measures listed in the UCS description (faster boarding; transit signal priority and queue jumping)

- Buses in curbside lane: eliminate parking at the curb during peak commute hours with effective enforcement
- Buses in median lane: eliminate left-turn or bidirectional left-turn median lanes and change the lane widths to allow buses to have an exclusive bus lane each direction in the median, where road width allows. Alternatively, a single lane in the median could be used for westbound traffic in the morning and eastbound traffic in the afternoon.
- Peak period cordon pricing for Soquel Drive, whereby vehicles that exit Hwy 1 to travel parallel to the highway are charged. Vehicles that exit Hwy 1 to reach a destination nearby would be exempt. Example: A southbound vehicle that exits at 41st Ave is exempt so long as it does not proceed south on Soquel Dr. past Porter Ave. This strategy could reduce congestion on Soquel Dr. to the point that a separate bus lane would not be needed.
- “Faster boarding” could include raised platforms; prepayment and entry at all doors.
- Visual styling for express bus stops and express buses
- Short headways during commute hours
- Consider bus models that can accommodate bicycles on board
- Storage on board for packages and folding bikes

---
The Campaign for Sensible Transportation
Sensibletransportation.org

• Provide lighting at the bus shelters (solar or utility-powered);
• Public education and outreach to promote use of the rapid bus
• Provide “Metro ambassadors” to promote the rapid bus and teach people how to use it

Guides to BRT:
• https://www.itdp.org/the-brt-standard/
• Bus Rapid Transit Practitioner’s Guide
• Lane Transit District: http://www.go-rts.com/files/brt/ltd-emx.pdf

Rail Corridor

CFST enthusiastically supports the potential for transit on the rail corridor. We have not
taken a position on what form of that transit should take. We hope the UCS will illuminate
that question. We believe that a thorough analysis of different modes of transit on the
corridor will address the questions that the community has raised about ridership
potential and cost.

The RTC staff report from December, 2016 indicates that more study is needed to be able
to evaluate the bus option. “A one-way bus way with pullouts could be considered but
additional analysis would be needed to determine feasibility, possible design options,
current and future demand, signaling requirements and costs.” We believe the UCS needs to
count this additional analysis so that the community can feel assured that the final
recommendations result from considering all the options. We suggest that the study
analyze two-way buses on wide portions of the corridor, with buses that exit the corridor
to connect to destinations such as Downtown Santa Cruz, Cabrillo College and UCSC.

We recommend that the UCS consider establishing a connection hub between transit on the
rail corridor and transit on Soquel Drive at Cabrillo College.

In the CFST there is considerable interest in personal rapid transit because of its energy
efficiency, safety and mobility advantages. We think that it would be beneficial for the UCS
consultants to report on the state of PRT development. What would it take to develop PRT
in our county and how long might it be before a PRT system might be viable? And, for
comparison, when could a light-rail system realistically become operational?

Highway 1 Projects

Mission St. intersection improvements (City of Santa Cruz)

The idea of accommodating growth at UCSC and the Westside by expanding vehicle
capacity at Mission St. intersections is part of the old paradigm of transportation planning
that has led to increased traffic and greenhouse gases. We hope the consultants’ recommendations on Transportation Demand Management and transit will offer effective alternatives to increasing auto capacity at Mission St. This criticism applies to the project to add lanes to the Hwy 1 bridge over the San Lorenzo River.

Hwy 1 HOV lanes

The Draft EIR on Hwy 1 reports that the HOV project would result in a 51% increase in vehicle miles traveled by 2035 (southbound relative to the No Build alternative). Since this is inconsistent with the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled, this project should be eliminated from consideration. Moreover, the Regional Transportation Plan indicates that this project is financially out of reach. “The cost of completing the entire HOV lanes project on Highway 1 (approximately $600 million) is beyond the amount of discretionary funding that can be used for highway projects in our county through 2035.”

Auxiliary lanes, metering of onramps

The Hwy 1 EIR also examined the “TSM Alternative” a smaller project than the HOV lanes project. The TSM Alternative includes auxiliary lanes from Soquel Dr. to Freedom Blvd, as well as metered onramps and reconstruction of seven overcrossings. The RTP also indicates that this project is financially out of reach. In spite of the large size of this project, the Draft EIR reports that, “the Tier I Corridor TSM Alternative would result in a very slight improvement in traffic congestion when compared to the No Build Alternative….The Tier I Corridor TSM Alternative would not achieve sufficient congestion relief to attract any substantial number of vehicles that had diverted to the local street system back to the freeway.”

Though it would not produce congestion relief, the TSM Alternative would result in a 29% increases in vehicle miles traveled (southbound relative to the No Build Alternative).

The UCS would perform a service to the community if it spells out the failure of this Hwy 1 strategy to meet community goals.

Self-driving cars

We suggest that the UCS recommend policies to direct the new technology in ways that meet community goals. For example, how can local governments prevent the scenario in which self-driving cars result in greater vehicle miles traveled, since riding in a vehicle will afford opportunities for work and leisure? How can our community make land use decisions that anticipate the autonomous vehicle revolution, e.g. avoid building more parking infrastructure? How can autonomous vehicles and ride services mesh with public transit?

Transportation Demand Management
We request that the UCS recommend a model trip reduction ordinance that would apply to employers as well as new residential construction.
Mr. Rosenberger asked that this be forwarded to the RTC as well

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kurt Rosenberger <rosenberger.kurt@gmail.com>
Date: August 8, 2017 at 1:44:21 AM PDT
To: zach.friend@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Subject: Rail Service in Santa Cruz County

Dear Mr. Friend,
I am writing to voice my support for new passenger rail service in the county on the existing coastal corridor. I cannot think of a better use of this valuable asset, as it will only advance the goals of reducing traffic and encouraging investment and small business startups within the county. As far as I'm concerned, this is the only solution to dealing with congestion on our roads. I've only lived in Santa Cruz for 11 years now, but I've seen traffic triple during that small window. I work in the Wrigley Building on the westside, and live in Soquel (we used to live in Capitola, but had to move farther out to get more bedrooms as our family expands), and it can take me nearly an hour to get home some days, mostly weaving through neighborhoods on backroads, as the highway is not an option. Our three kids will be going to the public schools in Soquel, and as much as I would love to bike to work, this is simply not realistic, as I have to drop my kids off. However, if we had rail service, I could drop them off, hop on the train in Capitola, and be at work in 15 minutes. Please, please, please build the rail and trail!

Sincerely

--

Kurt Rosenberger
Dear SCCRTC,

We are writing to express our support for the Coastal Rail Trail. We donated to support the rail trail and voted for Measure D last fall to secure needed funds. We are writing you at this time because we are confused by the opposition to our plan that has surfaced lately from Greenway and Trail Now. We read the opposition to be sure we are making well informed decisions. We find their stances to be misleading. The information is presented similar to political attack ads.

It seems improbable that re-engineering a trail, gaining public consensus, creating new legislation for tax based funding, passing regulatory review, re-applying for (less likely) government grants, raising private funds, tearing up the rail and building a 2/3 larger trail is faster or cheaper than building our 12’ trail. Additionally, practically removing the option for rail through the heart of our growing population centers is premature, in our view.

We do not think we should jeopardize our current rail trail plan by spending more money, over a longer period to chase an option-limiting hypothetical plan.

Sincerely yours,

Jill and Dan Dion

From: General Info [mailto:info@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2017 4:59 PM
To: ‘dandion1@mac.com’
Subject: Your email regarding Rail Trail Support

Dear Mr. Dion,

Thank you for your comments. Please note that 13 miles, of rail trail projects are either funded for upcoming implementation or in final design according to the approved, award-winning Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Master Plan. Projects in final design will be constructed within the next 2 years. Keeping options open for multiple uses of this key transportation corridor, including future consideration of potential rail service, does not preclude the trail project from moving forward, as is happening now. Keeping reliable transit and travel options open for the future is sound policy and paramount to providing mobility for all, regardless of ability or travel distance.

Measure D was approved by over 2/3 of Santa Cruz County voters (83,816!) in Nov 2016. Two of the five funding categories in Measure D are for projects in
the rail corridor: 17% for the “Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (Coastal Rail Trail),” and 8% the “Rail Corridor” including rail infrastructure maintenance and an environmental and economic analysis of the rail corridor for possible future transit and other transportation uses.

Please visit the RTC website (www.sccrtc.org) for more information about community benefits, the ability to move the trail project forward while leaving rail and transit options open for the future, and for insight into the public process that led to the RTC’s current policies.

Your comments will be made available to the Commission for their review. We have added your email to the RTC’s rail trail e-news list.

Thank you,

Virginia

Virginia Vaquero, 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: Contact Request Form [mailto:admin@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2017 12:55 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: New submission from Contact Form

This Contact Request Form has been submitted by a member of the public to http://sccrtc.org/contact-us/.
Name
RONALD L JR PERRIGO
Email
rperrigojr@gmail.com

Subject
Your rail line
Your Message
Good after noon, what would it take for Roaring Camp, as a fine, well established transportation organization for
them to be able to run a train up to Davenport? I would like to form a work party to clean the beach and surrounding areas up
there. It makes so much sense.

Thank you.

From: General Info [mailto:info@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2017 3:51 PM
To: 'rperrigojr@gmail.com'
Subject: Roaring Camp Railroad

Dear Mr. Perrigo,

Your comments to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) about passenger
rail service were received and will be made available to the RTC board for their consideration.

The RTC purchased the 32-mile branch rail line using Proposition 116 funds approved by both voters
in California and Santa Cruz County with the intent to expand the network of rail service throughout
the state. This under-used transportation corridor is an extremely valuable asset that connects north
and South County and parallels the congested Highway 1 corridor. This corridor has many potential
uses including: rail transit, goods movement, recreational trips and an adjacent bicycle/pedestrian
trail.

An initial Rail Transit feasibility study was completed in December 2015 which analyzed seven sample
scenarios to understand potential ridership, costs, and funding options. A copy of the Final Rail Transit
Study is online. Public interest in the rail corridor is high and we received volumes of comments on
the feasibility study. Many of the issues raised by the community would be answered in future phases
of analysis. The approved Transportation Improvement Plan that will be before voters as Measure D in
November 2016 currently does not include funds for new rail service, however it includes funds for a
comprehensive study of the rail corridor to determine the best use of this treasured asset to improve
mobility for all of us.

Your email has been added to the eNews group to receive information about projects on the rail line.

Thank you,

Virginia

Virginia Vaquero, 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
August 24, 2017

Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Sierra Club Requests Peer Review of the GSCTG Study

Dear Mr. Dondero and Commissioners:

We understand that the RTC recently received a request to provide a peer review of the Great Santa Cruz Trail Group (GSCTG) study from the Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail and Trail (FORT). The Sierra Club has reviewed FORT’s request and believes FORT has raised vital unanswered questions about the numbers and conclusions in the GSCTG study and agrees a peer review of the GSCTG study is warranted. Accordingly, the local Sierra Club supports FORT’s request for the RTC to obtain a peer review of the GSCTG study.

Sincerely,

Greg McPheeters
Chair, Santa Cruz Group, Sierra Club
District Director’s Report
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Roadside Safety and Aesthetics

Optimizing safety is the main purpose of the recently completed Caltrans roadside safety improvements project extending 15 miles along US 101 from Atascadero to Paso Robles. The $2.3 million project, and similar ones statewide, are reducing the exposure of maintenance workers on foot in high-speed traffic areas. Project features are:
- Thirty-nine paved gore areas with contrast surface treatment
- Paved slope areas underneath four bridges
- Installed:
  - Metal-beam guardrail with concrete barrier
  - Drainage system improvements
  - Upgraded safety cable railing

A second roadside safety project in San Luis Obispo County, currently under construction, will address an 18-mile segment of US 101 from Arroyo Grande to San Luis Obispo. The $2.5 million project is scheduled for completion in fall 2017. Currently, District 5 is implementing eight additional roadside safety projects—in different stages of project development on various highways—in Santa Cruz, Monterey and Santa Barbara counties. Two others were also recently completed in the latter two counties.

SB 1 Fix-it-First Funding

The Road Repair & Accountability Act of 2017

Fixing our roads, repairing aging bridges, reducing traffic congestion and improving goods movement are key goals for the recently passed Senate Bill 1 transportation funding bill. Statewide, Caltrans is committed to fixing more than 17,000 lane miles, 500 bridges, 55,000 culverts, and 7,700 traffic operating systems, which includes installing ramp meters, traffic cameras and electric highway message boards. Currently, Caltrans is expediting $200 million in pavement projects statewide and $150 million for restriping along the state highway system as well as identifying and prioritizing the most needed projects. The new funding, which begins in November 2017, includes the following statewide over the next 10 years:
- $1 billion – Active Transportation Program
- $7.5 billion – Transit and rail
- $3 billion – Trade corridor improvements
- $2.5 billion – Congestion relief

The new bill will generate $54 billion split between Caltrans and local agencies over the next decade—the largest transportation investment in more than 20 years. Each year, more than 180 billion vehicles travel on the state highway system. More information: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/msrsubmit/

CTP Guidelines Adopted


District Director

Timothy Gubbins

Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability.
Highway 17 Wildlife Connectivity Project

Providing habitat connectivity and safe passage is the purpose of the Highway 17/Laurel Road wildlife connectivity project, near Scotts Valley, in Santa Cruz County. The estimated $7 million project will connect two core habitat areas while protecting individual animals and ensuring long-term species survival. The California Transportation Commission recently approved $3 million in the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) for the project’s environmental, design and right-of-way costs. Construction funding is expected to come from local sources, including $5 million from Santa Cruz County’s recently approved Measure D sales tax.

After extensive environmental and biological review, the project site was identified as the highest priority for maintaining critical habitat with evidence of mule deer, mountain lions, bobcats and coyotes on both sides of the roadway. Highway 17 is an important link connecting the Santa Cruz Mountains with the Diablo Mountain Range and the Gabilan Range. Fragmented habitat is difficult for animal survival in finding adequate food, water and mates; raising their young; and establishing new territories. Challenges to wildlife mobility along the roadway include high traffic volumes, concrete median barriers and inefficient pathways at culverts or bridge under crossings.

A multi-agency partnership developed solutions for improving animal connectivity on the corridor. These included the following: Land Trust of Santa Cruz County, Caltrans, Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Pathways for Wildlife and U.C. Santa Cruz (Puma Study).

Complete Streets Projects

Kick-off

Creston Road Complete and Sustainable Streets Corridor Plan

The City of Paso Robles’ $185,000 grant will develop a Complete Streets Plan for Creston Road in Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County. It will include community involvement to identify strategies for a two-mile pedestrian, bicycle and transit-friendly throughway. It will also feature Complete Streets design for sidewalks and intersection changes supporting travel modes for all users, ages and abilities. A greening element will be added for natural drainage as well.

Highway 9 Complete Streets Plan

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s $249,000 grant will develop a Complete Streets Plan for 10 miles of Highway 9 in Santa Cruz County. The plan will identify, prioritize and implement multimodal improvements with a focus on asset management. It will address severe bicycle, pedestrian and transit gaps as well as collisions, congestion and system deterioration.

Advanced Mitigation Credits

The Highway 17 wildlife connectivity project in Santa Cruz County also provides a unique opportunity for Caltrans to partner with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife on a pilot for an innovative advanced mitigation credit agreement. The first of its kind in California, the agreement establishes mitigation credits that can be applied to future transportation projects.

Mitigation credits created by the Highway 17 wildlife project may be used by the Department or sold or transferred to other transportation agencies with projects in a specific service area. The pilot credit agreement may be used as a model for the California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s new statewide Regional Conservation Investments Strategies Program. More information:
https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Planning/Regional-Conservation

D5 Bicycle Champions

The San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) Rideshare Program recently recognized District 5 with the Defending Bike Month Challenge Champion Award. The District kept the 2016 title with 37 employees bicycling most every day in May for Bike Month. In addition to the golden handlebars trophy (inset), the District won a one-month free trial of riding an electric bicycle. Hats off to all participants!

Call for Projects Coming

A call for projects for the Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program is scheduled for September 2017. The program, funded through SB 4, includes:
- Sustainable Communities & Strategic Partnerships – $25 million annually
- Climate Adaptation Planning Grants—$20 million over three years

Successful projects support sustainable communities and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. More information:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tppl/grants.html
## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location/Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager ( Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Highway 17 Storm Water Mitigation (0Q600)</td>
<td>On SR 17 just north of the fishhook to Sims Road (PM 0.7-1.4)</td>
<td>Construct multiple storm water mitigation improvements</td>
<td>Winter 2017-Summer 2020</td>
<td>$7.4 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (DP)</td>
<td>Graniterock, Watsonville, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Highway 17 Shoulder Widening and Concrete Guardrail (0T980)</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley south of Sugarloaf Road to slightly south of Laurel Road (PM 8.3-9.4)</td>
<td>Widen shoulder and install concrete guardrail</td>
<td>Spring 2016-Fall 2017/Winter 2018</td>
<td>$6.2 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (DP)</td>
<td>Granite Construction, Watsonville, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Highway 129 Curve Realignment (0T540)</td>
<td>East of Watsonville between west of Old Chittenden Road and slightly 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Highway 152 Centerline Rumble Strip (1G400)</td>
<td>From the Casserly Road/Carlton Road intersection to the Santa Cruz/Santa Clara County line (PM 3.7-8.3)</td>
<td>Install centerline rumble strip</td>
<td>Fall 2016-Summer 2017</td>
<td>$9.6 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (SG)</td>
<td>Chrise Company, Fremont, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Highway 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-Summer 2017</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Kelly McClain (KB)</td>
<td>Graniterock, Watsonville, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location/ Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Highway 129 Open Grade Overlay and Metal Beam Guardrail Upgrade (1F030)</td>
<td>From just east of Watsonville to School Road (PM 1.8/9.9 &amp; Sbt PM 0.0/0.4)</td>
<td>Place open graded friction course and replace, raise, and update the existing metal beam guardrail and end treatments</td>
<td>Summer 2017 - Summer 2018</td>
<td>$5.5 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>Granite Rock Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location/ Post Mile (PM)</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>7.</td>
<td>Highway 1 Pavement Overlay (1C850)</td>
<td>From North Aptos underpass to State Route (SR) 9 (PM 10.2-17.5)</td>
<td>Pavement overlay</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$14.9 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Highway 1/Highway 17 Ramp Safety Improvements (1H060)</td>
<td>From just south of the fishhook to just south of Pasatiempo overcrossing (PM 16.7)</td>
<td>Construct ramp safety improvements</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$5.8 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Highway 9 Shoulder Widening, Guardrail Upgrades, and Center Rumble Strips (1C650)</td>
<td>In Castle Rock State Park, from 5 miles south of SR 35 to 3.3 miles south of SR 35 (PM 22.1-23.8)</td>
<td>Shoulder widening, guardrail upgrades, and center rumble strips</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$7.7 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Highway 17 Wildlife Habitat Crossing (1G260)</td>
<td>From Laurel Road to just north of Laurel Road (PM 9.442-9.692)</td>
<td>Construct wildlife undercrossing</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Aaron Henkel</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location/ Post Mile (PM)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Construction Timeline</td>
<td>Estimated Construction Cost</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Highway 129/ Lakeview Road Intersection Improvements (1G990)</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, at Lakeview Road (PM 1.4)</td>
<td>Construct roundabout and improve street lighting</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$4.5 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Highway 129/ Carlton Road Intersection Improvements (1F350)</td>
<td>Near Watsonville from slightly west to slightly east of Carlton Road (PM 3.2-3.5)</td>
<td>Realign Carlton Road 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Highway 152 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (1E020)</td>
<td>Near Watsonville from Wagner Avenue to south of Holohan Road (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>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

More Than $34 Million Awarded to 125 Projects Under Cap-and-Trade Fund
85 Percent of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funding Will Benefit Disadvantaged Communities

SACRAMENTO – Caltrans today announced that 125 local projects received $34.5 million in funding from the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program. These projects continue California’s effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve the sustainability of public transportation systems around the state.

“This program is one of the methods Caltrans is using to help the state meet its ambitious goals to address climate change,” said Caltrans Director Malcolm Dougherty. “Building a more sustainable public transportation system involves not only making it more climate friendly, but also more efficient and affordable to more Californians.”

The Low Carbon Transit Operations Program is one of several state programs which are funded through auction proceeds from the California Air Resources Board’s Cap-and-Trade Program into the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. Funding from this program goes toward direct investments in transit projects that reduce GHG emissions and benefit disadvantaged communities throughout California.

These projects are part of the California Climate Investments, which provide a variety of additional benefits to California communities. Some of the local projects that will benefit from these funding disbursements include:

- **Expanded Service on the 9R**: $3,764,725 to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to expand transit service on Route 9R San Bruno Rapid Line, increasing mobility and encouraging a greater use of transit.

- **New Gold Line Foothill Extension Operations**: $5,977,936 to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority to add service to six new stations that extend light rail transit service in the San Gabriel Valley.
• **Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B**: $683,459 to the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority to extend the Metro Gold Line light rail service from Azusa in Los Angeles County to the Montclair Transcenter in San Bernardino County. The project would improve mobility and access within the corridor by providing fast, convenient and reliable transit service.

• **Modesto Downtown Transit Center**: $255,849 to the City of Modesto to improve the Downtown Transit Center to increase the safety and comfort of Modesto Area Express public transit customers.

• **Watsonville Zero Emission Replacement Bus**: $243,290 to Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District to purchase one zero-emission, battery-electric public transit bus and related charging infrastructure to replace one diesel-fueled bus. This project will benefit the disadvantaged communities within Watsonville by reducing environmental impacts associated with public transit buses operating in the community.

A complete list of the 125 projects is attached. Eighty-six of the projects are targeted specifically to benefit disadvantaged communities. Of the $34.5 million in funding allocated, $29.6 million will benefit disadvantaged communities.

The program was created to provide operating and capital assistance for transit agencies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve mobility, with a priority on serving disadvantaged communities. Approved projects will support new or expanded bus or rail services, or expanded intermodal transit facilities. They may also include equipment acquisition, fueling, and maintenance and other costs to operate these services or facilities, with each project reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

The Cap-and-Trade Program is one of many programs developed under AB 32 to fight climate change. It is designed to reduce greenhouse gases from the largest sources of emission in California, and to drive innovation and steer the State toward a clean energy economy. For more information on the Cap-and-Trade Program visit: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/capandtrade/capandtrade.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/capandtrade/capandtrade.htm)

For more information on the State’s program to spend auction proceeds from the Cap-and-Trade Program visit: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/capandtrade/auctionproceeds/auctionproceeds.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/capandtrade/auctionproceeds/auctionproceeds.htm)

# # #
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Lead</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>DAC in Service Area</th>
<th>Disadvantaged Community Benefit Description</th>
<th>Total Project Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Santa Barbara County Association of Governments</td>
<td>North County Transit Marketing and Try Transit Program</td>
<td>Free transit passes will be distributed from the facility, weekly Farmers Market and at special events.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Benefits Disadvantaged Communities by expanding transit service thus improving access to public transportation, increasing mobility and encouraging greater use of transit.</td>
<td>$110,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District</td>
<td>SBMTD Ridership Development Marketing Plan</td>
<td>This project will distribute free transit vouchers, raise awareness of existing routes, and launch the promotion of a new zero-emissions electric fleet.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>$154,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District</td>
<td>Watsonville Zero-Emission Replacement Bus</td>
<td>This project will purchase one zero-emission, battery-electric public transit bus and related charging infrastructure to replace one diesel-fueled transit bus.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project benefits Disadvantaged Communities by making capital improvement that increase service efficiency, reliability, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>$243,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>South County Transit</td>
<td>SCT operating assistance for continuing new Route 27 &amp; 28 service.</td>
<td>This project will continue Route 27 and 28 which will provide hourly service.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>$134,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>City of Arvin</td>
<td>Arvin Free Ride and Low Fare in Support of Disadvantaged Community</td>
<td>The City of Arvin would like to offer 4-10 free ride days for all riders within the disadvantaged community in order to increase riders and reduce GHG.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Benefits Disadvantaged Communities by expanding transit service thus improving access to public transportation, increasing mobility and encouraging greater use of transit.</td>
<td>$9,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>City of Clovis</td>
<td>Route Improvement Project</td>
<td>The proposed project will purchase, construct, and install bus stops and enhancements along redesigned routes and a new transit hub near downtown Clovis.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project benefits Disadvantaged Communities by making capital improvement that increase service efficiency, reliability, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>$54,105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Anais Schenk, Transportation Planner
RE: Visualizing Sustainable Transportation Progress Report

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) receive an update on the Visualizing Sustainable Transportation in Santa Cruz County project.

BACKGROUND

Originally titled “Sustainable Transportation Prioritization Plan,” the Visualizing Sustainable Transportation in Santa Cruz County project (Visualization project) is funded through a Caltrans Transit Planning for Sustainable Communities grant. The project’s objectives include an emphasis on public engagement through the use of innovative visual mechanisms to create a deeper understanding of sustainable transportation options that meet the state’s goal of expanded accessibility and multimodal options.

The project is coordinated with other RTC projects through incorporation of transportation improvements under consideration in the long range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Unified Corridors Investment Study (UCS) using technologically advanced and effective techniques to engage the community. The final product will be a toolkit for public engagement that includes a review of these methods as well as a final plan that documents lessons learned and current public understanding of sustainable transportation systems in Santa Cruz County. The toolkit will be available for others throughout the state.

DISCUSSION

The Visualization project began with interviews of stakeholders, partner agencies, RTC staff and location-based interest groups, as well as research by the consultant. Focus groups and a design charrette were then held to ensure a well-rounded and representative discussion. They included city and county planners, representatives of local businesses, community non-profits and schools. The focus groups provided a forum for dialogue about how to best promote and help the community envision a more robust sustainable transportation system in Santa Cruz County. The charrette included a hands-on mapping exercise and discussion of specific improvements that would represent a sustainable transportation system. The findings from the focus group and charrette informed the placement, components, and details for the visual
simulations along with plans and projects currently under development or consideration by the cities and County.

**Visualization Tools**

One of the main goals of the Visualization project is to develop tools that effectively communicate complex transportation and land use concepts with the public. The primary technology chosen for this is a tool called an “Owl” viewer. It was developed in the Bay Area by a firm called Owlized. The viewer looks similar to the binocular units at scenic lookouts, but functions much differently. Looking into the viewer, the participant sees a photo-realistic three dimensional representation of proposed sustainable transportation improvements. This virtual reality technology will be used at four locations around the County: the County of Santa Cruz on Soquel Drive at Chanticleer Avenue, the City of Santa Cruz on Natural Bridges Drive at the railroad right-of-way, the County of Santa Cruz on 17th Avenue at the railroad right-of-way, and in the City of Watsonville on Walker Street at Beach Street (see map included as Attachment 1). Each visual will also be accessible through a “pocket owl” application for smart phones or other devices (see example images included as Attachment 2).

Participants will be able to provide feedback about the short and long term sustainable transportation and land use visualizations via a short survey which will be administered by the Owl and will be available on the RTC website. Contact information will be provided as part of the survey for the user to submit questions, comments or concerns not captured by the survey.

The Owls will be deployed in two phases. The Soquel Drive and Natural Bridges Drive Owl viewers are planned to be installed on September 20th and October 4th respectively. The second phase will occur in early spring 2018 after daylight savings time goes into effect and will include the 17th Avenue in Live Oak and Walker Street in Watsonville locations. The second phase is staggered to take advantage of the time of year when people are more likely to be outdoors and active. Each Owl will be up for approximately six weeks during which time staff will be conducting outreach to draw visitors to the viewers. Methods for raising awareness of the installations will include pop-up events, Instagram, Facebook and other social media posts, presentations to community groups and wayfinding from nearby points of interest. Commissioners’ assistance in sharing information about the Owls would be greatly appreciated.

**Relationship to Other RTC Projects**

The Visualization project will support other projects underway at the RTC and partner agencies by providing realistic demonstrations to raise public awareness of potential transportation options for advancing sustainable transportation goals. The land use changes demonstrated by each Owl are reflective of current County and City visioning exercises and/or approved plans that have undergone extensive community input. The visuals are intended to engage the community in a dialogue about what could be viable in the future, rather than reflect any definitive
conclusions from other concurrent RTC projects such as the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) or Regional Transportation Plan. Time and budget constraints for the Visualization project do not allow all scenarios that are being evaluated in the UCS to be demonstrated through the Owl viewers.

**SUMMARY**

The Visualization project will provide an educational experience and feedback opportunity for participants by demonstrating what terms such as “sustainable transportation,” “transit oriented development” and “infill development” could look like within the context of Santa Cruz County. Information, materials and lessons learned from the project will be summarized in an outreach toolkit and plan which will be used for future community engagement.

**Attachments:**
1. Map of Owl Locations
2. Example Images From Other Owl Projects
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SAMPLE IMAGES OF OWL

Images of Owl Kiosks

OWL VR Debuts @ Pearl Harbor
Images of Pocket Owls
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Call for Projects

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Issue a call for projects for projected new State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)/Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX) funds, supplemental Senate Bill 1 (SB1) population-formula State Transit Assistance (STA) funds, and SB 1 formula Local Partnership Program (LPP) funds; and

2. Approve evaluation criteria for this grant cycle, as summarized in Attachment 1.

BACKGROUND

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Santa Cruz County, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for selecting projects to receive certain state and federal funds, including State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)/Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX), Transportation Development Act (TDA), State Transit Assistance (STA), and, as the Measure D local transportation authority, SB 1 Local Partnership Program (LPP) funds.

The RTC typically selects projects to receive funds through a competitive application process, which includes evaluation of project benefits, review by the RTC’s advisory committees, and a public hearing. Approved projects are programmed in the RTC’s Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and/or included in the RTC budget. If projects are considered regionally significant, will impact air quality conformity, or are receiving federal funds, they are also amended into the Federal/Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (prepared by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)). Projects approved by the RTC for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds are subject to concurrence from the California Transportation Commission (CTC), which also makes the final determination on what year STIP funds are programmed after consideration of proposals from agencies statewide.
DISCUSSION

Summary Recommendations for the 2018 RTIP Process

In consideration of CTC priorities for STIP funds, past RTC commitments, changes in state legislation, 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) draft policies and targets, and construction cost increases being experienced by agencies statewide, staff recommends the following for the 2018 RTIP process.

- **Call for Projects:** Issue a consolidated call for projects for approximately $22 million that is expected to be available from the region’s formula shares of STIP, STBG/RSTPX, SB1 STA and LPP funds. Additional information on these funding programs is provided later in this report. The RTC has the option to issue separate calls for projects for each funding source, but combining the programs allows the RTC to develop a more comprehensive investment program and requires fewer staff resources. It also provides the flexibility to fund some individual projects with a combination of these funds.
  - **STIP:** $17 million target of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds through FY22/23.
  - **STBG/RSTPX:** $4 million in Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)/Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX) funds available through FY18/19.
  - **STA:** Select projects to receive supplemental State Transit Assistance funds that are the result of new FY17/18 SB1 taxes and fees, which the State Controller apportions to the region based on population formula. The State Controller is expected to provide estimates of the available increase in October.
  - **LPP:** Identify projects to receive the region’s formula share of SB1-Local Partnership Program (LPP) funds. The CTC is expected to provide estimates in the next few weeks. The amount is expected to be relatively small in comparison to the region’s STIP and STBG/RSTPX shares.

- **Evaluation Criteria for the 2018 RTIP:** The RTC selects projects to receive funds based on an evaluation of project benefits. The RTC considers how well projects address Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) goals, policies, and targets and federal and state criteria and guidelines when evaluating projects. Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) members discussed the proposed criteria at the August 17, 2017 ITAC meeting. Staff recommends that the RTC approve the evaluation criteria for the 2018 RTIP cycle (Attachment 1).

- **Match:** Require project sponsors to provide at least an 11.47% match. This is consistent with the minimum non-federal funding match required for STBG. Requiring a match increases the number of projects funded, leverages other funds, demonstrates local agency commitment to a project as a priority, and helps cover projects costs that may not be eligible for reimbursement by the state. For the LPP funds, the CTC requires at least a 1-to-1 match from qualifying local taxes and fees. The RTC and direct recipients (cities, the County, METRO, and Community Bridges/Lift Line) of Measure D funds could use their shares of Measure D funds to meet this LPP match requirement.
RTC indicate its intent to program $406,000 of STIP for three years of regional planning, programming and monitoring activities (PPM), per state legislation and the STIP Fund Estimate.

RTC indicate its intent to program $2 million in STIP previously reserved for the Highway 1 Soquel-41st Avenue Auxiliary to that project.

**Reserve:** While staff recommends issuing a call for projects for approximately $22 million in funds from several programs, the RTC could decide in December to keep some of the region’s shares in reserve to address future funding needs.

The RTC is likely to receive proposals for new projects and requests for additional funds for several previously programmed projects. As part of the 2018 RTIP, the RTC will also consider proposals to modify the schedule, scope, and funding information for projects previously approved by the RTC. Based on the current bid environment, agencies statewide are seeing significant increases in project costs. Additionally, as projects undergo environmental review, design, and community review, it is not uncommon for project costs to increase. For projects that maintain strong benefits in comparison to other proposals, it is not uncommon for the RTC to approve additional funds to cover previously unanticipated cost increases.

**Formal RTC action on programming funds to specific projects would take place following review of all of the project proposals received (including requests for additional funds on previously programmed projects) and a public hearing at the December 7, 2017 RTC board meeting.**

**Funding Programs**

As noted above, staff recommends a consolidated call for projects/application process for selecting projects to receive the region’s shares of formula funds from a variety of state and federal programs. This will allow the 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to serve as a comprehensive investment program.

**State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**

For the 2018 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) the region’s formula share of funds through FY22/23 is approximately $17 million (target); this includes $406,000 available for the RTC’s state-mandated planning, programming, and monitoring (PPM) activities, and the region’s past unprogrammed balances of over $9 million (which includes $6.4 million the CTC deleted from the Harkins Slough Road Interchange project in 2016 and $2 million the RTC previously reserved for the Highway 1 41st Ave-Soquel Auxiliary Lane). The RTC’s proposal for STIP funds is due to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) by December 15, 2018.

Though the RTC is responsible for selecting projects to receive the region’s share of STIP funds, the CTC makes the final decision on whether projects are included in the STIP and in what year. It is not uncommon for the CTC to program only some projects and to shift projects to later years than requested. While the region’s target for the 2018 STIP is $17 million, the CTC is only required to make $4.5 million in STIP funds
available for programming in this cycle (the county minimum). It seems that the CTC is working to make all regions “whole” in this cycle and will program to the County shares ($17 million for Santa Cruz County). If the RTC does not select projects for the full $17 million, it may be FY23/24 before the balance of the region’s STIP share would be made available, but it may give the RTC better flexibility to program funds to projects that do not receive funding from other sources (such as statewide competitions for SB1 or ATP funds) or for projects that are delayed and experience cost increases.

For STIP funds, the CTC has stated that it will prioritize funds to regions for state-mandated planning, programming and monitoring costs (PPM), cost increases on previously programmed projects and projects or project components deleted in the 2016 STIP due to statewide funding shortfalls. After those priorities, the CTC will consider new projects – with focus on RTIP proposals that meet state highway improvement and intercity rail needs. The CTC is also giving greater consideration to how well projects advance a wide range of performance measures and address climate preparedness and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

**Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)/Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX)**

In addition to STIP funds, the RTC is responsible for selecting projects to receive approximately $3 million per year in federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds, which the region is able to annually trade for state Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX) funds. The amount of these funds available to the region is determined based on California implementation of the federal transportation act. In addition to these funds, the County of Santa Cruz receives $224,813 of the region’s share of RSTPX funds directly each year, as set forth in state statute.

Approximately $4 million in STBG/RSTPX is available for programming to projects in Santa Cruz County through FY18/19. Staff recommends that the RTC select projects to receive these STBG/RSTPX funds as part of the consolidated 2018 RTIP Call for Projects. Unlike STIP funds, programming decisions for STBG/RSTPX funds are not subject to CTC approval.

STBG/RSTPX funds beyond FY18/19 would be available for projects in the (hopefully unlikely) event that the CTC programs less than $17 million to projects in Santa Cruz County or for programming to new projects in two years. Future STIP and STBG/RSTPX would also be available to maintain the RTC’s $6.4 million commitment for to a bicycle/pedestrian crossing over Highway 1 at Harkins Slough Road before it begins construction (estimated 2023), if the project does not successfully secure other funds. Especially given the infusion of $100 million per year from SB 1 to the Active Transportation Program (growing the program by 80%), the project is a strong candidate for ATP funds.

**SB 1 Formula Funds**

As reported at the August 17, 2017 RTC Transportation Policy Workshop, Senate Bill 1 (SB1) includes several new funding programs that will be available for projects in Santa Cruz County. As part of this, the RTC is now also responsible for selecting
projects to receive additional State Transit Assistance (STA) funds and new Local Partnership Program funds that are generated by new Senate Bill 1 taxes and fees. The state is expected to provide estimates about how much new funding is available for these programs soon. Staff anticipates that the region’s shares will be relatively small in comparison to the STIP and STBG/RSTPX programs. Rather than issuing a separate call for projects for those funds, staff recommends including them in the 2018 RTIP call for projects. Based on the CTC’s draft guidelines, LPP-funded projects are required to provide a 1-to-1 match of Measure D or other eligible local taxes and fees. The RTC’s proposal for FY17/18-18/19 LPP formula funds is due to the CTC by January 31, 2018.

**Deciding Color of Funds**

As project applications are evaluated and projects are approved by the RTC, staff will work with projects sponsors to confirm the most appropriate funding source (“color of funds”) for each. This may also include changing previously approved STBG/RSTPX to STIP for highway and other large projects, thereby freeing up more flexible STBG/RSTPX for smaller projects or projects that are not as high of a priority for the CTC.

**2018 RTIP Timeline**

The RTC’s proposal for STIP funds is due to the CTC by December 15, 2017. In order to meet that deadline, the proposed schedule for the 2018 RTIP development is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 17, 2017</td>
<td>RTC and ITAC receive updates on state funding programs and the 2018 RTIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 16-17</td>
<td>CTC adopts STIP Fund Estimate and Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7</td>
<td>RTC approves evaluation criteria and issues call for projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8</td>
<td>Application available on RTC website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20</td>
<td>Application workshop to review and respond to questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 23</td>
<td>Applications and amendment requests for previously approved projects due from project sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td>RTC Committees review proposals, make recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7</td>
<td>Public hearing, RTC adoption of program of projects, projects amended into the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and RTC budget as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>RTC’s 2018 RTIP proposal for STIP funds due to CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 2018</td>
<td>CTC STIP North Hearing on RTIP proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>CTC releases staff recommendations for STIP (based on review of proposals from Caltrans and regions statewide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21/22</td>
<td>CTC adopts 2018 STIP (final determination on which projects are included each year of the 2018 STIP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eligible Projects**

STIP, STBG, STA, and LPP funds can be used on a variety of projects, as outlined in CTC Guidelines, Article 19 of the California Constitution, the federal transportation act (Attachment 2), and Transportation Development Act (TDA) statute for each source. Collectively, eligible projects include a wide range of transportation projects: highway,
local street and road, transit, paratransit, and community transportation services, public mass transit guideways, grade separations, bicycle, pedestrian, transportation system management, transportation demand management, soundwalls, intermodal facilities, safety, and bridge projects. Cities, the County of Santa Cruz, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC), Santa Cruz Metro, Caltrans, and non-profit agencies (with public agency sponsorship) are among those eligible to apply for the funds. Non-capital costs for transportation system management or transportation demand management may be funded by the STIP or STBG where the regional agency finds the project to be a cost-effective substitute for capital expenditures. Other non-capital projects (e.g. ongoing maintenance) are not eligible; however, STA funds can be used for transit, paratransit, and community transportation services, operations or capital. Projects must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Evaluation Criteria

Given the large backlog of transportation needs in the region, it is important to ensure that available funds are used cost effectively to improve the region’s multimodal transportation network. In consideration of local, regional, state, and federal goals, policies, targets and performance measures, including those developed by the RTC for the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, staff recommends that criteria be used to evaluate projects and determine funding priorities for the 2018 RTIP, as shown in Attachment 1.

These criteria include only minor changes to those used by the RTC in past application cycles. Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) members reviewed these criteria at the August 17, 2017 ITAC meeting. The proposed criteria will be used to evaluate the benefits of proposed projects. As recommended by the ITAC in the past, the RTC has given the first four criteria (number of people served by a project, safety benefits, system preservation, air quality benefits) the greatest consideration when selecting projects to receive funds.

Regional Projects

RTC staff is currently evaluating the funding needs for regional projects and programs and anticipates submitting applications for some projects previously identified as priorities (Attachment 3). Those projects would be evaluated alongside projects submitted by other agencies.

As part of development of the 2018 RTIP, staff and project sponsors are also looking at opportunities to use these regional formula funds to leverage other competitive grants. This may include things like initiating pre-construction work with regional STIP funds, so that projects are “shelf ready” and able to compete for future SB 1 Solutions for Congested Corridors funds, or advancing projects which are partially funded by Measure D.
SUMMARY

The RTC is responsible for selecting projects to receive certain state and federal funds. Staff recommends that the RTC issue a consolidated call for projects for the region’s formula shares of STIP (approximately $17 million through FY22/23), STBG/RSTPX ($4 million through FY18/19), and new SB 1 STA and LPP funds, with applications due on October 23. A public hearing will be held in December to take final actions to program the funds.

Attachments:
1. Proposed Evaluation Criteria
2. Eligible Projects (set by federal law)
3. Priority Projects
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DRAFT 2018 RTIP Evaluation Criteria

The RTC is required by state and federal regulations to ensure programming decisions are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Given the very limited amount of funding available, it is important to ensure that funds are used cost effectively to improve the region’s multimodal transportation network. The following summarizes evaluation criteria used by the RTC and other agencies for past competitive grant programs. In 2016, the RTC identified the first four criteria as the most important; staff recommends that these continue to be given the greatest consideration. Because of the wide range of projects typically identified by the community and stakeholders, some criteria will not be applicable to certain projects, but that does not eliminate the project from consideration. For instance, the scope of some projects is limited to pavement preservation, while other projects may be focused on safety enhancements, making it challenging to make an apples-to-apples comparison of the two; however a project that includes multiple benefits (e.g. incorporates complete streets components) is more likely to be funded than a single purpose project.

Criteria used to evaluate projects and examples of type of information that could be used to demonstrate how a project is meeting those criteria.

1. Number of people served. Number of anticipated users of a facility, service or program. Data to support these estimates may include:
   - Current use of facilities/services (e.g. traffic volumes, transit ridership, bicycle and pedestrian counts if available, etc)
   - Work plan for a program and targeted number of people to use program
   - Destinations served by a project (e.g. employment centers, transit center, retail/commercial area, visitor destination)
   - Modeling information, if available

2. Safety
   - History of collisions in area and description of how proposed safety measure will reduce collisions
   - Demonstrated countermeasure to reduce collisions, especially fatalities or injuries
   - Eliminate perceived safety issues
   - Fill gaps in bicycle or pedestrian network in an area
   - Reduce speeding
   - Improve safety, especially for youth, vulnerable users, and transportation disadvantaged (low income, seniors, disabled, minorities)
   - Improve access to/for emergency services

3. System Preservation
   - Improve pavement condition
   - Extends useful life of a facility or program
   - Maintain state of good repair
   - Increase percentage of pavement in good condition
4. Change in vehicle miles traveled/air pollution/greenhouse gas emissions and/or fuel consumption
   - Shift automobile travel to alternative modes
   - Reduce need for travel
   - Reduce fuel consumption
   - Reduce emissions

5. Access for all modes, especially to and within key destinations (increase travel options, reduce number or distance of trips)
   - Increase walking (add new sidewalks, crosswalks, minimize obstacles)
   - Increase bicycle (add bicycle lanes/paths, fill gaps in network, add bicycle box at intersection)
   - Increase public transit access or quality of transit rider experience

6. Change in travel times and travel time reliability and efficiency of the transportation system, including transit
   - Reduce variability in travel times
   - Reduce peak hour travel times
   - Reduce congestion: Annual Hours of Excessive Delay Per Capita

7. Change in passenger, freight and goods movement efficiency
   - Increase throughput on existing facilities or services

8. Change in disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age, income, disability or minority status
   - Project location, destinations served, demographic information

9. If projects are shown as “constrained” on the draft 2040 RTP Project List, which implements the SB375-mandated Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)
   - RTP project number

10. Consistency with the Complete Streets Guidelines, approved by the RTC in 2013
    - Consideration of possible complete streets components appropriate for different street types

11. Health benefits

12. Public engagement
    - Information on how the project was identified a priority
    - Outreach that has occurred or will occur during project planning and/or implementation (e.g. outreach to stakeholder groups, advisory committees, other jurisdictions/agencies, transit, environmental groups, seniors, etc)
13. Funding
   - Demonstrate project would be fully funded and identify other funding that has been secured
   - Identify funding available if unanticipated cost increases

14. Risk Assessment and Deliverability
   - Schedule: Potential risks to project schedules
     i. Percent chance of delay/confidence in schedule
   - Risks associated with current and future environmental conditions such as climate change, extreme weather, and seismic activity
   - Financial risks: such as budget uncertainty
   - Operational risks: such as asset failure
   - Strategic risks: such as organizational compliance
   - Political risks: potential for public opposition
   - Risk mitigation for each, planned mitigation actions
ELIGIBILITY
2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) consolidated programming cycle

The type of funds designated to each project approved by the RTC in the 2018 RTIP cycle will be determined in consideration of eligibility for each funding source, consultation with project sponsors and consultation with CTC staff for STIP and LPP funds.

STBG (and RSTP Exchange)
Excerpts from FHWA “STBG Implementation Guidance”
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/160307.cfm#d

Funds must be used for projects as defined in Sections 133(b) and 133(c) of Title 23 of the United States Code (U.S.C)—Highways, and not otherwise excluded by Article XIX-Motor Vehicle Revenues of the CA State Constitute. Only direct project related costs are eligible. Local agency overhead and other non-direct charges are ineligible for STBG and RSTPX.

1. Eligible Projects and Activities:
   1. Location of Projects (23 U.S.C. 133(c)): STBG projects may not be undertaken on a road functionally classified as a local road or a rural minor collector unless the road was on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991, except-

      (1) For a bridge or tunnel project (other than the construction of a new bridge or tunnel at a new location);
      (2) For a project described in 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(4)-(11) and described below under "Eligible Activities" (b)(4) through (11);
      (3) For transportation alternatives projects described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) before enactment of the FAST Act (these are described in 23 U.S.C. 133(h) and in separate TA Set-Aside guidance.); and
      (4) As approved by the Secretary.

   2. Eligible Activities (23 U.S.C. 133(b)): Subject to the location of projects requirements in paragraph (a), the following eligible activities are listed in 23 U.S.C. 133(b):

      (1) Construction, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(4), of the following:

         i. Highways, bridges, and tunnels, including designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads under 40 U.S.C. 14501;

         ii. Ferry boats and terminal facilities eligible under 23 U.S.C. 129(c);

         iii. transit capital projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code;

         iv. Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements, including the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment;
v. Truck parking facilities eligible under Section 1401 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 137 note); and


(2) Operational improvements and capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs. Operational improvement is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(18).

(3) Environmental measures eligible under 23 U.S.C. 119(g), 328, and 329, and transportation control measures listed in Section 108(f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi) of that section) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408(f)(1)(A)).

(4) Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, including railway-highway grade crossings.


(7) Planning, design, or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

(8) Development and implementation of a State asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS) and a performance-based management program for other public roads.

(9) Protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events) for bridges (including approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels on public roads, and inspection and evaluation of bridges and tunnels and other highway assets.

(10) Surface transportation planning programs, highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs, and workforce development, training, and education under chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code.

(11) Surface transportation infrastructure modifications to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of a port terminal.
(12) Projects and strategies designed to support congestion pricing, including electronic
toll collection and travel demand management strategies and programs.

(13) Upon request of a State and subject to the approval of the Secretary, if Transportation
Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance is approved for an
STBG-eligible project, then the State may use STBG funds to pay the subsidy and
administrative costs associated with providing Federal credit assistance for the projects.

(14) The creation and operation by a State of an office to assist in the design,
implementation, and oversight of public-private partnerships eligible to receive funding
under title 23 and chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, and the payment of a stipend
to unsuccessful private bidders to offset their proposal development costs, if necessary to
encourage robust competition in public-private partnership procurements.

(15) Any type of project eligible under 23 U.S.C. 133 as in effect on the day before the
FAST Act was enacted. Among these are:

i. Replacement of bridges with fill material;

ii. Training of bridge and tunnel inspectors;

iii. Application of calcium magnesium acetate, sodium acetate/formate, or other
environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and deicing compositions for
bridges (and approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels;

iv. Projects to accommodate other transportation modes continue to be eligible pursuant to
23 U.S.C. 142(c) if such accommodation does not adversely affect traffic safety;

v. Transit capital projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, United States
Code, including vehicles and facilities (publicly or privately owned) that are used to
provide intercity passenger bus service;

vi. Approach roadways to ferry terminals to accommodate other transportation modes and
to provide access into and out of the ports;

vii. Transportation alternatives previously described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) and
described in 23 U.S.C. 213;

viii. Projects relating to intersections having disproportionately high accident rates, high
levels of congestion (as evidenced by interrupted traffic flow at the intersection and a level
of service rating of "F" during peak travel hours, calculated in accordance with the
Highway Capacity Manual), and are located on a Federal-aid highway;

ix. Construction and operational improvements for any minor collector if the minor
 collector and the project to be carried out are in the same corridor and in proximity to an
NHS route; the construction or improvements will enhance the level of service on the
NHS route and improve regional traffic flow; and the construction or improvements are more cost-effective, as determined by a benefit-cost analysis, than an improvement to the NHS route;

x. Workforce development, training, and education activities discussed in 23 U.S.C. 504(e);

xi. Advanced truck stop electrification systems. Truck stop electrification system is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(32);

xii. Installation of safety barriers and nets on bridges, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife;

xiii. Electric vehicle and natural gas vehicle infrastructure in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 137;

xiv. Data collection, maintenance, and integration and the costs associated with obtaining, updating, and licensing software and equipment required for risk-based asset management and performance based management, and for similar activities related to the development and implementation of a performance based management program for other public roads;

xv. Construction of any bridge in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 144(f) that replaces any low water crossing (regardless of the length of the low water crossing); any bridge that was destroyed prior to January 1, 1965; any ferry that was in existence on January 1, 1984; or any road bridge that is rendered obsolete as a result of a Corps of Engineers flood control or channelization project and is not rebuilt with funds from the Corps of Engineers. Not subject to the Location of Project requirement in 23 U.S.C. 133(c); and

xvi. Actions in accordance with the definition and conditions in 23 U.S.C. 144(g) to preserve or reduce the impact of a project on the historic integrity of a historic bridge if the load capacity and safety features of the historic bridge are adequate to serve the intended use for the life of the historic bridge. Not subject to the Location of Project requirement in 23 U.S.C. 133(c).

2. **Applicability of Planning Requirements (23 U.S.C. 133(d)(5)):** Projects must be identified in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)/Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and be consistent with the Long-Range Statewide Transportation Plan and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan(s). When obligating suballocated funding (discussed below), the State must coordinate with relevant metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) or rural planning organizations (23 U.S.C. 133(d)(3)). Programming and expenditure of funds for projects shall be consistent with 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135.

STBG projects for eligible planning purposes must be reflected in the statewide SPR work program or Metropolitan Unified Planning Work Program. Further, these projects must be in the STIP/TIP unless the State DOT or MPO agree that they may be excluded. (23 CFR 420.119(e))
3. **Applicability of 23 U.S.C. 217(i) for Bicycle Projects:** 23 U.S.C. 217(i) requires that bicycle facilities “be principally for transportation, rather than recreation, purposes.” However, 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(6) and 133(h) list “recreational trails projects” as eligible activities under STBG. Therefore, the requirement in 23 U.S.C. 217(i) does not apply to recreational trails projects (including for bicycle use) using STBG funds. Section 217(i) continues to apply to bicycle facilities other than trail-related projects, and Section 217(i) continues to apply to bicycle facilities using other Federal-aid highway program funds (e.g., NHPP, Highway Safety Improvement Program, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program). The transportation requirement under Section 217(i) is applicable only to bicycle projects; it does not apply to any other trail use or transportation mode.

**State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Eligibility:** (set by CTC STIP Guidelines)
- Projects that meet eligibility requirements for funds from the State Highway Account, in accordance with Article XIX of the California Constitution can receive STIP funds.
- Project planning, programming, and monitoring
- Capital projects (including project development costs). These projects generally may include, but are not limited to, improving State highways, local roads, public transit (including buses), intercity rail, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, grade separations, transportation system management, transportation demand management, soundwalls, intermodal facilities, and safety.
  - Rail rolling stock and buses may be funded only from the Federal revenues in the STIP.
- Non-capital costs for transportation system management or transportation demand management may be included where the regional agency finds the project to be a cost-effective substitute for capital expenditures.
- Not eligible: Road and transit maintenance are not eligible.

**Local Partnership Program Eligibility:** (criteria still under development by the CTC, the following reflects draft guidelines -8/17)

Eligible projects shall include all of the following:

A. Improvements to the state highway system including, but not limited to, all of the following:
  - Major rehabilitation of an existing segment that extends the useful life of the segment by at least 15 years;
  - New construction to increase capacity of a highway segment that improves mobility or reduces congestion on that segment; and
  - Safety or operational improvements on a highway segment that are intended to reduce accidents and fatalities or improve traffic flow on that segment.

B. Improvements to transit facilities, subject to the restrictions of Article XIX of the California Constitution, including guideways, that expand transit services, increase transit ridership, improve transit safety, enhance access or convenience of the traveling public, or otherwise provide or facilitate a viable alternative to driving.
C. Improvements to the local road system, including, but not limited to, both of the following:

- Major roadway rehabilitation, resurfacing, or reconstruction that extends its useful life by at least 15 years; and
- New construction and facilities to increase capacity, improve mobility, or enhance safety.

D. Improvements to bicycle or pedestrian safety or mobility with a useful life of at least 15 years.

E. Improvements to mitigate the environmental impact of new transportation infrastructure on a locality’s or region’s air quality or water quality, commonly known as “urban runoff,” including, management practices for capturing or treating urban runoff.

F. For purposes of the Local Partnership Program, a separate phase or stage of construction for an eligible project may include mitigation of the project’s environmental impacts, including, but not limited to, sound walls, landscaping, wetlands or habitat restoration or creation, replacement plantings, and drainage facilities.

G. Sound walls for a freeway that was built prior to 1987 without sound walls and with or without high occupancy vehicle lanes if the completion of the sound walls has been deferred due to lack of available funding for at least 20 years and a noise barrier scope summary report has been completed within the last 20 years.

H. Road maintenance and rehabilitation.

I. Other transportation improvement projects.

Preconstruction work will be allowed for the formulaic programs.

State Transit Assistance Public Utilities Code for Section 99313 Formula Fund Eligibility

- Public transportation purposes operated by a public transportation entity.

- Community transit services meeting requirements set forth in Section 99275. Community transit services include such services for those, such as the disabled, who cannot use conventional transit services and transportation services which link intracommunity origins and destinations.

- Funds are available to support local and regional transit operating and capital needs, within the limits set forth by applicable PUC codes.
**Priority Projects - Possible Candidates for State Funding**

This list includes priorities that have consistently been identified by project sponsors, the RTC, and/or its citizen advisory committee over the past 5 years that may be good candidates for submitting applications for state funding programs in 2017 or 2018. Some projects or portions of projects may also be funded from Measure D local or regional categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Potential State Fund Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Aux Lanes: 41st to Soquel Ave and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Bridge</td>
<td>Construction - STIP, SB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Aux Lanes: Park Ave and Bay/Porter (Capitola/Soquel Village)</td>
<td>Pre-construction - STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1: Auxiliary Lanes from State Park Dr to Park Ave</td>
<td>Pre-construction - STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1/Hwy 9 Intersection, City of SC</td>
<td>Construction - STIP, SB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 San Lorenzo River (SLR) Bridge, City of SC</td>
<td>Any costs not covered by city - STIP, SB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Bridge @ Harkins Slough Rd</td>
<td>ATP; RTC committed future regional funds if ATP not secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Xing @ Chanticleer (also included in 41st-Soquel Aux)</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Xing @ Mar Vista</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Corridor System Management Analysis - may include ramp metering, signal synchronization, impacts on local roads, other system management options</td>
<td>Planning grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 9 Corridor Improvements: Various bike, pedestrian, transit, intersection, and safety projects.</td>
<td>Bike/Ped - ATP; SHOPP; +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 17 Wildlife Crossing</td>
<td>Construction support SHOPP, SB 1 Adv. Mitigation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 129 Safety, Freight and Complete Streets study</td>
<td>Planning grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBBST) - Priority sections, including Construction of Sections 8 &amp; 9 (SLR-Live Oak) and the north coast</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street and Road Pavement Preservation</td>
<td>SB 1 formula funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Storm Damage Repair - Countywide</td>
<td>SB 1 formula funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Santa Cruz METRO bus replacements</td>
<td>TIRCP candidate, SB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Center - Pacific Station Renovation (downtown Santa Cruz)</td>
<td>TIRCP candidate, SB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParaCruz Operations Building</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges Lift Line Operations Building</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Station</td>
<td>TIRCP candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation and Safe Routes to Schools plans</td>
<td>ATP; planning grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety projects on high-injury corridors - considering Vision Zero priorities</td>
<td>SHOPP, ATP, HSIP, others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential Candidates for FUTURE Funding Cycles (not ready to submit applications in 2017 or 2018)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Potential State Fund Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unified Corridor Investment Study Priorities</td>
<td>TBD - SB 1 Corridor +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1/Mission St/Chestnut/King/Union Intersection Improvements, City of SC</td>
<td>TBD - requires a PID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1/Mission St/Bay St Intersection Improvements, City of SC</td>
<td>TBD - requires a PID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Operational Improvements for Transit</td>
<td>TBD - requires a PID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Interchange Reconfiguration: Soquel Avenue and Morrisey Blvd.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 NB Auxiliary Lane Larkin Valley Rd. to Freedom Boulevard</td>
<td>TBD - may require a PID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 9 Corridor Improvements: Operational Improvements</td>
<td>TBD - some require a PID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 17/Mt. Hermon Rd. Ramps/Interchange Operations; add lane to SB off-ramp, Scotts Valley</td>
<td>TBD - requires a PID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 17 Access Management Improvements</td>
<td>TBD - requires a PID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 129: Highway 101 to Hwy 1 Freight and Safety, includes improvements at Lakeview intersection, severe congestion at other intersections.</td>
<td>Trade Corridor, other? TBD - requires PID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lake Ave-(Hwy 152) Widening (Martinelli St-Holohan Rd) - Goods Movement</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Infrastructure Preservation</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide railroad crossing grade improvements</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acronyms:**

ATP: Active Transportation Program

PID: Project Initiation Document - required before a project can secure certain state funds

SHOPP: State Highway Operation and Protection Program

STIP: State Transportation Improvement Program

HSP: Highway Safety Improvement Program

SB 1: Senate Bill 1

TIRCP: Transit & InterCity Rail Capital Program
TO: Regional Transportation Commission  
FROM: Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner  
RE: Highway 1 Corridor Tiered Environmental Document - Status Report

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) receive information on the status of the Draft Tiered Environmental Document for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program.

BACKGROUND

The Draft Tiered Environmental Document for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program was released for public comment on November 4, 2015. The draft environmental document included a program level vision for the long term improvement of Highway 1, between Morrissey Boulevard and San Andreas/Larkin Valley Road (Tier I project), and project level analysis for the construction of auxiliary lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive and a bike/pedestrian overcrossing at Chanticleer Drive (Tier II project). The public comment period for the draft environmental document was extended over the holiday season closing on Monday, January 25, 2016, for a total 92 day public review period.

Caltrans received over 900 comments on the draft environmental document which were subsequently categorized by topic area and a determination made as to which technical studies completed as part of the draft environmental document required updating to properly respond to comments received and/or to address changes in regulatory guidelines.

In September 2016, the RTC programmed funds and amended the RTC’s FY 2016-2017 budget to advance completion of the environmental document. The funding will rollover into the FY 2017-18 budget.

DISCUSSION

Since the last project status report in May 2017, significant progress has been made in updating technical reports, and drafting responses to public comments, and drafting sections of the final environmental document consistent with the updated technical studies. Since the last status report the following studies have been updated and are currently under review by Caltrans:

- Biological Assessment
- Community Impact Assessment
• Cumulative Impact Assessment of protected environmental resources – through step 5 of an 8 step evaluation and documentation process.
• Traffic Operations Report, including an evaluation of induced traffic demand associated with providing additional capacity on Highway 1 and the cost of congestion
• Visual Impact Assessment

A significant number of the comments received on the draft environmental document focused on the validity of the travel demand analysis and the traffic performance measures of the proposed project alternatives. To be able to respond to those comments, updated traffic counts were taken on the freeway, ramps, and arterials for the purpose of comparing the validity of AMBAG’s 2005 travel demand model in projecting current and future traffic volumes versus AMBAG’s more recent 2014 model. The results of that analysis were incorporated into an addendum to the Traffic Operations Report approved in 2012. That information was been used in preparing draft language for the traffic section of the final environmental document and draft responses to public comments. As of this writing, all of that material is under review by Caltrans environmental staff.

Associated with this work, the consultant team is also updating the Growth Inducement Study prepared in 2008. This work will include an analysis of traffic patterns, and new population and employment data from AMBAG and discussions with land use planners and real estate professionals from Santa Cruz and surrounding counties and select cities.

Other outstanding work includes an update of the Air Quality Study using the current emissions model and completion of the 8-step Cumulative Impact Analysis, consistent with guidelines published after release of the draft environmental document in November 2016. Once this material is reviewed and approved by Caltrans, work can begin on preparing responses to all remaining comments on the draft environmental document and preparing the administrative draft of the final environmental document in its entirety. Caltrans environmental staff have agreed to review the work elements by topic area as they are developed to meet the project schedule.

As part of this process the project development team (PDT) will be reviewing all updated information against the project’s stated purpose and need with the goal of recommending a preferred project alternative. This decision and its supporting documentation will then be brought before the RTC for concurrence and recommendation to Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). This may be as soon as October 2017. Caltrans and FHWA are the lead agencies responsible for the completion of the environmental document in conformity with state and federal environmental laws and requirements.

These activities are expected to be completed by the end of 2017. The draft final environmental document (DFED) is then subject to review by Caltrans’ staff and various departments, including the legal division, responsible for and in support of the integrity of the final environmental document. This process is anticipated to
take 1 year to complete with the Final Tiered Environmental Document expected to be approved and published at the end of 2018. RTC and Caltrans management is meeting regularly to monitor the project schedule and address any issues as they arise. Completing the Tier I environmental document is a prerequisite to beginning project development activities on the other auxiliary lane projects included in Measure D (between State Park Drive and Park Avenue and Park Avenue and Bay/Porter).

The FY 2016-2017 budget allocated just over $715,000 for consultant services to complete Phases I and II described above, with an additional $348,000 reserved for future year expenses. Consistent with the estimate provided by the consultant in October 2016. Upon completion of the administrative draft final environmental document, expected in February 2018, staff will evaluate whether additional funds may be needed to complete the review cycle of the draft documents prior to approval and publishing the Final Environmental Document.

Accordingly, staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) receive information on the status of the Draft Tiered Environmental Document for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program.

SUMMARY

Since the last project status report in May significant progress has been made in updating technical reports and beginning work on drafting responses to the over 900 public comments received on the draft environmental documents. Work recently completed includes an update of the Traffic Operations Report, including an evaluation of induced traffic demand and the cost of congestion on Highway 1, and progress in completing the Cumulative Impact Assessment. Once work on other technical studies is completed, the project development team will review all updated information against the project’s stated purpose and need with the goal of recommending a preferred project alternative. This decision and its supporting documentation will then be brought to the RTC for its review and recommendation to Caltrans and the FHWA. Work can then begin on completing the draft final environmental document that is subject to review by Caltrans’ staff and various departments, including the legal division.