AGENDA

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

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
Watsonville City Council Chambers
275 Main Street, Suite 450
Watsonville, 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

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. Approve revised minutes of the September 7, 2017 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Accept draft minutes of the September 7, 2017 Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies meeting

6. Approve draft minutes of the October 5, 2017 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

7. Accept draft minutes of the October 10, 2017 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

8. Accept draft minutes of the October 12, 2017 Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee meeting

9. Approve draft minutes of the October 19, 2017 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

   **POLICY ITEMS**

   No consent items

   **PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS**

   No consent items
BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

10. Accept status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues
11. Accept status report on Measure D revenues and distribution

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

No consent items

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

12. Accept monthly meeting schedule
13. Accept correspondence log
14. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to the Director of the Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency Director, Giang Nguyen, regarding support of the City of Watsonville’s proposal called “Watsonville Complete Streets to School Planning Grant” to Caltrans
   b. Letter to the Chair of County of Santa Cruz Board of Supervisors, John Leopold, regarding Route 71 Inbound Bus Stop Relocation – Aptos Village Project
15. Accept miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues
16. Accept information items
   a. Letter dated September 19, 2017 from the President of the Special District Risk Management Authority, Jean Bracy, regarding the President’s Special Acknowledgement Award – Workers’ Compensation Program

REGULAR AGENDA

17. Commissioner reports on RTC related items – oral reports
18. Appoint nominating committee for 2018 RTC Chair and Vice Chair (Zach Friend, Chair)
19. Director’s Report – oral report (George Dondero, Executive Director)
20. Caltrans report and consider action items  
   a. District Director’s report  
   b. Santa Cruz County project updates  

21. 2018 California State Rail Plan  
   (George Dondero, Executive Director)  
   a. Staff report  
   b. 2018 California State Rail Plan Fact Sheet  
   c. Executive Summary  

22. Highway 1 Corridor Tiered Environmental Document – Selection of the Preferred Project Alternatives  
   (Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner)  
   a. Staff report  
   b. Highway 1 Tiered Environmental Document - Project’s Purpose and Need  
   c. Tier I and Tier II Alternative Project Attributes and Performance Matrix  

23. Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 Budget and Work Program  
   (Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director)  
   a. Staff report  
   b. Resolution approving the proposed amended FY 2017-2018 RTC Budget  
   c. TDA Estimates and Revenues  
   d. Measure D Revenues and Distribution  

24. Review of items to be discussed in closed session  

   **CLOSED SESSION**  

25. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Consider initiating litigation for one case pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9 (d)(4)  

26. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8  
   Property: Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line  
   Agency Negotiator: George Dondero and Luis Mendez
Negotiating Parties: SCCRTC, Steve Williams and Steve Douglas
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms

OPEN SESSION

27. Report on closed session

28. Next meetings
   The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 7, 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 is scheduled for Thursday, November 16, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

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

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

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

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

Agenda packets: Complete agenda packets are available at the RTC office, on the RTC website (www.sccrtc.org), and at 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 anticipo al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis.) Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance) by calling (831) 460-3200.

TITLE VI NOTICE TO BENEFICIARIES

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

AVISO A BENEFICIARIOS SOBRE EL TITULO VI

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

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

Members present:
Zach Friend
Norm Hagen
Ryan Coonerty
Bruce McPherson
John Leopold
Oscar Rios
Sandy Brown
Aileen Loe

Cynthia Chase
Greg Caput
Virginia Johnson
Randy Johnson
Jacques Bertrand
Ed Bottorff

Staff present:
George Dondero
Yesenia Parra
Amy Naranjo
Anais Schenk
Luis Mendez
Rachel Moriconi
Karena Pushnik
Cory Caletti

2. Oral communications

Mark Mesisti Miller, Board Chair of Friends of the Rail Trail (FORT) offered a rebuttal to Trail Now’s claims and requested the RTC subject their report to a technical peer review in order to refute the false statements made by Trail Now.

Brian Peoples, Trail Now, stated that Trail Now is a big force with 8,000 Facebook followers. He supports the Unified Corridor Study and thinks most
people are focused on getting the highway fixed. He stated if “we had opposed Measure D, it would have lost.”

Alex Yasbeck, Sierra Club Chapter, spoke in support of FORT and the request for the Peer Review. The Great Santa Cruz Trail Study study needs a peer review and asked that when decisions are made, please use scientific, rational information.

Barry Scott, Rio Del Mar resident and FORT Board Member, stated that Great Santa Cruz Trail Study cannot be taken seriously and it should either be tossed or peer reviewed due to many of its inaccurate claims.

Laura Cutter, resident of Santa Cruz, spoke in support of Greenway. She has safety concerns in particular through Capitola where her son was hit by a car on his bike ride to school. She supports using the trestle bridge for safe transportation for our children in lieu of a train.

Janneke Strauss, Bike Santa Cruz County, requested that the Great Santa Cruz Trail Study be peer reviewed and that it be a future item of discussion for upcoming RTC meetings.

Gail McNulty, Executive Director of Santa Cruz County Greenway, read a letter in support of Greenway’s plan to create a vibrant linear park that connects the corridors.

Bud Colligan, Board President of Santa Cruz County Greenway, distributed a document with 3,000 signatures of residents of Santa Cruz who are actively supporting Greenway. They also have recent endorsements by hospitals, 86% of the Santa Cruz Business Council Members, and ADA access supporters. He feels that the population does not want what the RTC is proposing.

Ted Burke, Santa Cruz Business Council, spoke to informed the RTC that the recent activity within 94% of the Santa Cruz Business Council voting members approved of the Greenway plan over the RTC plan for a trail on the rail line right-of-way and that he is one of the over 3,000 people who signed a petition endorsing the Greenway plan.

Monty Keonig, Civinomics, stated that after poling his neighbourhood, he determined that building a train should never happen. It is not common sense but based on politics to build a train.

Cynthia Manzo, a Resident of Santa Cruz, recently relocated from Tahoe, spoke on behalf of Greenway, she believes the Greenway plan will offer a safe place for her husband, children and dog walk and have a safe place to ride their bikes to school and to work.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Handouts for item #20 were distributed
CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner Leopold seconded the consent agenda. The motion passed with Commissioners Friend, Chase, Coonerty, Caput, McPherson, Johnson, Leopold, Rios Brown, Bottorff, and Hagen voting “aye” with Commissioner Bertrand abstaining from the August Transportation Policy Workshop (TPW) meeting minutes.

Commissioners directed staff to place the peer review of the Santa Cruz Great Trail report on a future agenda for a future meeting with an evaluation of cost for the peer review and what it would achieve.

MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS
14. Accepted monthly meeting schedule
15. Accepted correspondence log
16. Accepted 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. Accepted miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues
18. There were no information items.

REGULAR AGENDA
19. Commissioner reports on RTC related items – oral reports

   Commissioner Leopold reported that as the RTC representative to the Coast Rail Coordinating Council he attended the regular meeting in Marin County and was able to ride the Smart Train before it was made open to the Public and found it interesting to hear what hurdles there were before being able to open for service. Commissioner Leopold thought it was good information and suggested to the RTC’s Executive Director to really look at the issues of rail, trail, and funding and to take the next 2.5 years to take a deep dive into these different aspects in order to make a balanced presentation.

20. Director’s Report – oral report

   George Dondero gave an update on the Mar Vista Bike and Pedestrian Over Crossing. Staff and design consultants have held several meetings with residents and stake holders to look at some of the elements of aesthetics, cost efficiency, design measures as well as to enhance accessibility, safety and minimize impacts to parking. He noted that the Notice of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report for the north segment of the rail trail is scheduled to be released next week; the City of Santa Cruz is accepting poems to be set in cement on the rail trail with a deadline of October 1st.
He also reported that on August 24-26, RTC’s Executive Director and Deputy Director Luis Mendez joined 60 other community members; elected officials and business owners for a three-day, two-night tour of Bay Area cities with the intent to listen and learn about how these cities have re-invested in their infrastructure to build community and to understand success stories in building affordable housing and the supporting role played by a robust public transportation system in these areas. This tour was sponsored by Santa Cruz Area Chamber of Commerce.

Commissioner Leopold noted the change of dates for the upcoming Unified Corridor Study workshops.

21. Caltrans Report

Aileen Loe, District 5 Deputy Director, offered congratulations to Metro for receiving funding of over $200,000 for the purchase of a battery electric bus as one part of the allocation of funding to reduce green house gas emissions.

Caltrans will be performing a variety of Fix It First projects, a large scale improvement list of projects to improve infrastructure.

Commissioners discussed Caltrans projects in the south county

22. Visualizing Sustainable Transportation

George Dondero welcomed a new planner to the RTC team, Anais Schenk. Anais Schenk presented her report on the Visualizing Sustainable Transportation Project a project funded by a Caltrans grant for Sustainable Communities that focuses on engaging the community and the plan to use Owl viewers in different locations in Santa Cruz County as a means to engage and survey the public.

Commissioners discussed if there will be disclaimers stating that Owl viewer images are not necessarily a definite, decided plan. Also discussed was how the locations for the viewers are determined, the coordination within the cities and if they will be wheel chair accessible or available to people of different heights.

Planner Schenk noted that the viewers will be in position for 6 weeks and will be operational 24/7 and will include short term and long term visual examples.

Brian Peoples, Trail Now offered concerns about misinformation to the general public from the viewers.

Becky Steinbruner, Aptos Resident appreciated the viewers and noted the lack of cars shown in the example and had concerns as to their accessibility to people of different heights as well as the handicapped. She hoped that the viewers will remain within the county to be used in different sites after this project.
**Gail McNulty**, Greenway, gave praise as well as concerns if the viewers might present a slanted view of the future.

Executive Director Dondero responded to some of the Commissioner’s and Public Comments that these are to help the public see possibilities presented by the RTC, to aid public involvement and while he is not sure about the viewers’ accessibility he pointed out that the views will also be available via software as a mobile app. As a pilot project it was not originally intended to be part of the Unified Corridor study but it just happened to come into play at the same time.

Commissioner Rios and McPherson left the meeting. Commissioner Alternate Virginia Johnson stepped in for Commissioner McPherson.

23. **2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Call for Projects**

Senior Transportation Planner, Rachel Moriconi, presented her report and the action item to approve the Call for Projects reiterating that the RTC is responsible for selecting projects to receive certain state and federal funding sources. New for this year is SB1 which includes new funding that will go out by formula, including supplemental funds, and the local partnership program. The State Transportation Improvement Program has estimated 17 million dollars until 2023 available for projects. The RTC’s proposal for STIP Funds is due to CTC by December 15th, 2017.

Commissioners discussed if priority would be given to projects that the public can see happening, as well as maintenance of sidewalks.

**Alex Clifford**, CEO of Santa Cruz Metro, asked that when the RTC approves Item 23 that the State Transit Assistance (STA) funds not be included in the call for or projects. Instead that should be referred to a committee to meet with Santa Cruz Metro staff and discuss how the money will be allocated.

**Becky Steinbruner**, resident of Aptos, thanked the Commission for the presentation of this process and expressed her concern that this funding could be used for projects that should be funded by developers, as in the case of the Aptos Village Project. She urged the RTC not to pay for any further funding of this project. She also stated that the bus station there has been relocated for no good reason except to benefit the developers and states that it is now questionable if this new bus stop is ADA compliant.

Commissioner Botoroff made a motion to accept the staff recommendation without the STA funds and to direct RTC staff to meet with Santa Cruz Metro staff to work out some reasonable arrangement for STA funds and if that is not successful to develop an ad hoc committee to work out this funding. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bertrand
Commissioners Bertrand and Botorff volunteered to serve on the ad hoc committee. If needed the ad hoc committee will meet before the next RTC meeting.

Deputy Director Luis Mendez stated that in the past, according to RTC staff understanding of state law, only SC Metro could qualify for STA funds. Now as a result of a state wide discussion over the past couple of years associated with new law on STA, it has been clarified that other service providers may also qualify. Over the years RTC has been asked for funding from providers of these other services.

The motion was carried unanimously with Commissioners Friend, Chase, Coonerty, Caput, V. Johnson, R. Johnson, Leopold, Bertrand, Brown, Bottorff, Hagen voting “aye”.

24. Highway 1 Corridor Tiered Environmental Document-Status Report
   Senior Transportation Planner, Kim Shultz presented his report to the Commission

   Commissioner Johnson asked Aileen Loe, Caltrans Representative about studies on induced traffic. Loe replied that this is a complicated issue with no simple answers, suggesting that if the RTC wanted more information on this, that perhaps something could be put on an upcoming agenda. There were also questions on expediting this project. Planner Shultz stated that efforts to expedite the project are being made and that Caltrans recognizes that a significant portion of Measure D is for state highway projects, and they want to be a good provider of these projects. Also discussed was how much the future of transportation is informing our planning process so that the highway is equipped for the next century of transportation.

   **Rick Longinotti**, from the Campaign for Sensible Transportation, called into question the legality of only considering three options in the EIR. Longinotti stated that unless other options are studied this is not a legal document. The other question raised by the comments in the EIR was that it concluded that it would have negligible improvement. Longinotti called into question spending money on a project that isn’t going to achieve the goals that have been set out for it, and if the alternatives are not also considered then there is no legally defensible document

   **Michael Saint**, with The Campaign for Sensible Transportation, stated that aux lanes are not the answer to a sustainable transportation system. After spending 150 million dollars the work done will be obsolete in 3-5 years. He also referred to study from the US Department of Transportation from 2010 titled “Efficient Use of Highway Capacity Summary: A Report to Congress” which showed that more lanes for cars does not reduce congestion. He offered a handout with the website address of the study to the commissioners.

   **Becky Steinbruner**, resident of Aptos, said she would like to see a possibility of a monorail on Highway 1 which would allow people to see something going
faster as well as bus on shoulder. She pointed out that Metro is stuck in the same traffic as cars, and since the bus is less convenient than taking a car, we have to overcome its inconvenience by making it faster. There are some members of the community who cannot take advantage of public transportation and there does need to be relief on Highway 1 for those people.

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

The Regional Transportation Commission meeting adjourned at 11:28 a.m. to the SAFE Meeting.

26. The RTC Reconvened at 11:32 a.m. to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission meeting and adjourned immediately at 11:33 a.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra, Staff

**Attendees**

Mike Saint          Sensible Transportation  
Barry Scott          Rio Del Mar Resident and FORT Board Member  
Erich Friedrich     MBAG  
Alex Yasbek         Sierra Club  
Becky Steinbruner   Aptos  
Alex Clifford       CEO, Metro  
Bud Colligan        Greenway  
Lauren Cutter       Resident of Santa Cruz  
Gail McNulty        Executive Director, Greenway  
Janneke Strauss     Bike Santa Cruz County  
Ted Burke           Santa Cruz Business Council  
Monty Konig         Civinomics  
Lauren Cutter       Resident of Santa Cruz  
Mark Mesiti-Miller  Chair of Friends of the Rail Trail
Immediately following the completion of the regular RTC meeting

1. Oral communications
   
   There were no oral communications

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

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 SCCRTC SAFE or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members of the SCCRTC SAFE 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 SCCRTC SAFE member objects to the change.

No consent items

REGULAR AGENDA

3. California Highway Patrol (CHP) Statewide SAFE Call Box Coordination Contract

   The staff report was presented by Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner

   Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Brown seconded staff recommendation to approve resolution 47-17 authorizing the Executive Director to execute a new contract with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for the Santa Cruz County share of the Statewide CHP Callbox Coordinator Position. The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Friend, Chase, Coonerty, Caput, Leopold, R. Johnson, Bertrand, Brown, Bottorff, V. Johnson and Hagen voting “aye”.

4. Adjourned to RTC Meeting at 11:31
1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Vice Chair Cynthia Chase.

Members present:
Cynthia Chase- Vice Chair
Jacques Bertrand
Ed Bottorff
Sandy Brown
Greg Caput
Ryan Coonerty
Norm Hagen

Randy Johnson
Oscar Rios
Virginia Johnson- Alternate
Patrick Mulhearn- Alternate
Dave Reid- Alternate
Eileen Loe- (ex-officio)

Staff present:
George Dondero
Yesenia Parra
Karena Pushnik
Cory Caletti
Luis Mendez
Rachel Moriconi

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson, Retired Planner and Campaign for Sensible Transportation, extended an invitation to a presentation titled “What Makes a Walkable City,” and reported that CO2 parts per million is increasing which is a risk to our civilization.

Frank “Buzz” Anderson, City of Santa Cruz resident, read a letter that he previously emailed to the Regional Transportation Commission and added that
he is a proponent of trail only on the rail line right-of-way to accommodate ebikes and small driverless jitneys.

**Michael Saint**, Sensible Transportation and Aptos resident, expressed appreciation for the Unified Corridor Workshop and Mr. Dondero’s sensitivity to the guests that evening. He is concerned about the impacts to the environment and congestion by auxiliary lanes on Highway 1.

**Bill Smallman**, Santa Cruz resident, board member of the San Lorenzo Water District and civil engineer, expressed that he supports the Greenway plan and that the RTC should study it.

**Becky Steinbruner**, Aptos resident, thanked the RTC for funding the green bike lanes on 41st Avenue, and for the great UCS workshops. She expressed concern over the inbound Number 71 bus stop in Aptos Village and asked that the RTC not fund phase II of this project because it should be funded by the developer.

**Janneke Strauss**, Bike Santa Cruz County, wished the RTC a Happy Bike to Work Day and thanked RTC for funding the Green Bike Lanes on Soquel Drive. She invited the RTC to Open Streets Santa Cruz this Sunday and encouraged everyone to bike to the event.

**Josh Stevens**, resident of Santa Cruz County, thanked the RTC for the UCS workshop this week and he looks forward to continued progress. He invited the community to the Santa Cruz Mountain Brewing’s event “Rail/Trail Thursday” to raise funds for the Santa Cruz Land Trust to build the trail.

**Barry Scott**, resident of Aptos, thanked the RTC for work on the rail corridor because that is our future way to get around for the next several generations. Mr. Scott attended both UCS workshops where he calculated that out of the six scenarios being studied, the top three scores all had rail in the plan and the lowest three scores all did not have rail.

**Mark Messitti-Miller**, Civil Engineer, Chair of Friends of the Rail Trail and 34-year resident of the city of Santa Cruz, stated that an Advertisement by Greenway states that 86% of the Santa Cruz Business Council members support Greenway’s plan. Mr. Messiti-Miller presented facts to the contrary. He also noted that the statement by Greenway that the companies listed in their ad as voting in favour of the Greenway’s plan have in fact not voted in favour of Greenway but are still listed in the ad.

**Gail McNulty**, Executive Director of Greenway, said that she agrees with Becky that the painted bike lanes are helpful but are not protection. She said that Open Streets is a glimpse of the future and aligned with Greenway’s plan. She noted that the Unified Corridor Investment Study workshops were troubling as they did not include a trail only option. She added that a modern bus system is more flexible than a train system.
3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

   Item 21 was removed from the agenda and will return at a future date.

CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Chase moved Item 4 to the regular agenda as Item 17a. At the request of Commissioner Johnson, Chair chase placed Item 11 on the regular agenda as item 17b.

Becky Steinbruner, resident of Aptos noted her concerns that the September 12, 2017 Eldery and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee did not include a representative from the Santa Cruz County Public Works Department to discuss bust stop ADA compliance. She is also concerned that the Aptos Village project will use a work around instead of addressing the issue and asked that the Commission remove funding from the project.

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner Johnson seconded the consent agenda with the removal of Item 4 and 11. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Bertrand, Bottorff, Brown, Caput, Chase, Coonerty, Hagen, R. Johnson, Rios and Commissioner alternates Mulhearn, Reid and V. Johnson voting ‘aye’.

MINUTES

4. Approve minutes of the September 7, 2017 Regional Transportation Commission meeting. Item moved to Regular Agenda as item 17a.

5. Accepted draft minutes of the September 12, 2017 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

6. Accepted draft minutes of the September 18, 2017 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accepted draft minutes of the September 21, 2017 Interagency Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

No consent items

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS
9. Approved with State Department of Tax and Fee Administration designating RTC positions and selected consultant to receive confidential information for Measure D purposes (Resolution 01-18)

10. Approved the Regional Transportation Commission meeting schedule for 2018

11. The California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS) health benefit contribution rates for plan year 2018 item moved to the Regular Agenda as Item 17b

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

12. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

13. Accepted correspondence log

14. Accepted letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department, Director John Presleigh regarding hiring considerations for new Traffic Engineer from the Bicycle Advisory Committee
   b. Letter to City of Santa Cruz Public Works Department, Nathan Nguyen, Civil Engineer regarding comments on Segment 7 of the Rail Trail (Phase I) Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

16. Accepted information items
   a. Article from The Press Democrat-September 20, 2017: SMART reports higher-than-expected ridership over first three weeks of paid service

Becky Steinbruner, resident of Aptos shared concerns that the September 12, 2017 Eldery and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee did not include a representative from the Santa Cruz County Public Works Department to discuss bust stop ADA compliance. She is also concern that the project will use a work around instead of addressing the issue and asks that the Commission not continue with this project.

REGULAR AGENDA

17a. Approve minutes of the September 7, 2017 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

Commissioners directed staff to revise the minutes to better reflect the comments of Ted Burke.
17b. The California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS) health benefit contribution rates for plan year 2018 *(Resolution)*

Commissioner Randy Johnson asked if there would be any cost increases. Deputy Director Luis Mendez said that due to a decrease in premium costs, there would be a slight decrease.

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner Bottorff seconded to approve the staff recommendations to adopt two resolutions *(Attachments 1 and 2)* to continue providing CalPERS Health Benefits to RTC employees pursuant to the approved Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs). The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Chase, Rios, Bertrand, Bottorff, Brown, Caput, Coonerty, Hagen, R. Johnson and Commissioner Alternates Mulhearn, Reid and V. Johnson voting ‘aye’.

17. Commissioner reports on RTC related items – oral reports

Commissioner Bertrand requested that the Commission add the Aptos Bus Stop ADA concern on a future agenda.

18. Director’s Report – oral report

19. Executive Dondero noted that the SMART commuter line reported a higher than expected initial ridership.

Executive Dondero noted the media kickoff event for the Owl viewer which is part of the Visualizing Sustainable Transportation project; the RTP call for projects with a due date of October 22, 2017; and the update for the draft guidelines for SB1 local partnership program.

He also reported that the City of Santa Cruz has prepared a mitigated negative declaration for the segment of the rail trail between Swift Street and Bay Avenue and that tonight their planning commission will consider the adoption of the mitigated negative declaration; and the work being done by CALCOG to support SB1.

Executive Director George Dondero announced the retirement of Senior Transportation Planner Karena Pushnik. Ms. Pushnik has worked for the RTC for over 27 years. She will be greatly missed. A Resolution listing some of her numerous accomplishments was presented to Karena Pushnik.

Senior Planner Karena Pushnik expressed her deep gratitude for having the opportunity to work at the RTC as well as her pride in the agency which works extremely hard for the community. She pointed out that transportation touches everyone and that people care deeply about it. She is especially proud of the work being done for the elderly and people with disabilities. She acknowledged that there is no simple answer to transportation problems.
Commissioners expressed their appreciation for her dedicated service of 27 years to the Commission.

20. October 2017 Measure D Update

Executive Director Dondero presented an update on Measure D. Highlights include projects in Capitola and Scotts Valley which include green bike lane markings, related signs, the increase of space for vehicles making left turns, the improvements of sidewalks, curb ramps, striping and pavement markings. He noted that the RTC will be seeking applications from individuals interested in serving on the oversight committee in the next few months.

Commissioners asked that frequent updates be available to the Commission from the Unified Corridor Investment Study project.

21. Caltrans report

Eileen Loe reported that applications are being accepted for planning grants with a deadline of October 20, 2017.

Responding to a question, Ms. Loe said that information would be brought to the Commission in regards to Highway 17 and the Pasatiempo exit.

22. 2018 California State Rail Plan

a. 2018 California State Rail Plan Fact Sheet
   (This item was removed and will return on a future agenda)

23. City of Santa Cruz Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Allocation Claim for bikeway striping, minor improvements and bike parking

Cory Caletti presented her staff report and acknowledged Sr. Transportation Planner Karena Pushnik, and stated that on behalf of the RTC staff we will miss Karena. Her enthusiasm and humility has set the tone of dedication to the Commission and the community. She really looks out for the community much more than she looks out for herself.

Gail McNulty, thanked Cory Caletti for the work being done and said she is glad to see the letter from the bicycle advisory committee to the County of Santa Cruz asking that a traffic engineer with knowledge on bicycle infrastructure design be hired.

Commissioners Rios moved and Commissioner Bertrand seconded the staff recommendation to approve by resolution the following City of Santa Cruz Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Allocation Claim and request:

1. $32,000 in FY 17/18 TDA funds for bikeway striping and minor improvements and $2,000 for bike parking; and
2. Reallocation of $14,449.66 previously apportioned to the San Lorenzo River Trestle bike connection to the bikeway striping and minor improvements fund.

The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Chase, Rios, Bertrand, Bottorff, Brown, Caput, Coonerty, Hagen, R. Johnson, and Commissioner alternates Mulhearn, Virginia Johnson and Reid voting ‘aye’.

24. City of Scotts Valley Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim for the Mount Hermon Road/Scotts Valley Drive/Whispering Pines Intersection Project

Transportation Planner Grace Blakeslee presented the staff report. Jessica Kahn from the City of Scotts Valley communicated that the schedule for the project has been delayed due to the delay of delivery of the signal mast. So the project will begin in January.

Commissioner Rios moved and Commission Brown seconded to approve the staff recommendation to approve by resolution the City of Scotts Valley’s Transportation Development Act (TDA) claim in the amount of $93,963 for bicycle and pedestrian facilities included in the Mt. Hermon/Scotts Valley Rd/Whispering Pines Intersection Improvement Project.

The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Chase, Rios, Bertrand, Bottorff, Brown, Caput, Coonerty, Hagen, R. Johnson, and Commissioner alternates Mulhearn, Virginia Johnson and Reid voting ‘aye’.

25. State Transit Assistance Fund programming-oral report
Commissioner Bottorff gave a brief summary of the ad-hoc committee meeting’s discussions with staff of Santa Cruz METRO and RTC. He noted that the ad-hoc committee has settled on giving all of the STA funds to Santa Cruz METRO in the first two years and then weaning SC METRO from that so that funds can be available to others in the county. However, this should come back with the full ad-hoc committee recommendation for a discussion of the full commission. Commissioners clarified that the ad-hoc committee recommendation would return to the December RTC meeting to also see whether any other entities are interested in the funds and Commissioners directed staff to agendize the item accordingly.

Gail McNulty expressed concerns about the timing of reducing funding to Metro. That with careful planning and investment we could realistically improve our Metro system.

26. Next meetings
The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 2, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main Street, Suite 450, Watsonville, CA
The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 19, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA

Meeting adjourned at 10:41 a.m.

Attendees:
Micheal Saint- Sensible Transportation
Mark Mesiti-Miller FORT
Buzz Anderson Resident of Santa Cruz County
Jessica Kahn Scotts Valley
Thomas Hiltner Santa Cruz Metro
Gail McNulty Santa Cruz County Greenway
Debbie Kinslow Santa Cruz Metro
Barry Scott Resident of Aptos
Josh Stephens Resident of Santa Cruz
Jack Nelson Campaign for Sensible Transportation
Bill Smallman Resident of Santa Cruz County
Erick Friedrich AMBAG
Angela Aitken Santa Cruz Metro
Becky Steinbruner Resident of Aptos
Chris Schneider City of Santa Cruz
Marilyn Garrett Resident of Aptos
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (Also serves as the CA Social Service Transportation Advisory Council)

Draft Minutes

E&D TAC Meeting
1:30pm- 3:30pm, Tuesday, October 10, 2017

Regional Transportation Commission Santa Cruz Office
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA, 95062 (2nd Floor)

1. Call to Order

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Kirk Ance, Community Bridges/Lift Line/CTSA
Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA
John Daugherty, SCMTD
Tara Ireland, Volunteer Center
Cara Lamb, Potential Transit User

RTC Staff Present:
John Daugherty, SCMTD
Tara Ireland, Volunteer Center
Grace Blakeslee
Grace Blakeslee
Luis Mendez

Others Present:
Pete Rasmussen, SCMTD
Steve Wiesner, County of Santa Cruz
Tim Nguyen, County of Santa Cruz
Becky Steinbruner-Aptos Resident
Thomas Stumbaugh-Aptos Resident
Marilyn Garret, Santa Cruz County Resident
Stan Sokolow, Santa Cruz County Resident
Sean Vienna, AMBAG
Ciro Aguirre, SCMTD

Alternates Present:
None

Unexcused Absences:
Greta Kleiner, Potential Transit User Disabled

Excused Absences:
Pam Arnsberger, 2nd District
Dulce Lizarraga-Chagilla, Social Service Provider - Seniors
Lori Welch, 5th District
Clay Kempf, Social Services Provider - Seniors

3. Oral communications

- John Daugherty announced an event sponsored by the Santa Cruz County Commission on Disabilities on Saturday, October 21, 2017 at 1:00pm at the Santa Cruz Policy Community Room.
- Marilyn Garret called for a ban on cell phone use on buses and provided a handout describing the affects of cell phone service on bus riders.
- Becky Steinbruner reminded people of the opportunity to view potential future transportation and land uses through the OWL viewer, a project sponsored by the RTC, at Soquel Drive and Chanticleer Avenue and Natural Bridges near the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.
- Stanley Sokolow stated that he experienced difficulties using the OWL technology and informed the audience that he was interested in ways of enhancing bus service in Santa Cruz County. He announced an upcoming meeting to discuss bus rapid transit lite on Soquel Ave/Dr.
- Gail McNulty provided information about the subgroup “Inclusive Greenways” and invited attendees to contact her for more information. She also informed members about the Greenways open house at the Blitzer Gallery on Thursday, October 20. Ms. McNulty
expressed concern about references made by attendees at the City of Santa Cruz Planning Commission Meeting on October 13, 2017 that she stated suggested that rail transit service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line would reduce Highway 1 congestion between the City of Santa Cruz and the City of Watsonville.

- Veronica Elsea thanked the City of Santa Cruz and Granite Construction for responding to the transportation needs of Westside residents during construction on King Street. She informed attendees that the staff took time to train construction workers on the needs of people who are visually impaired and who are utilizing facilities in the construction zone.

4. Additions or deletions to the consent or regular agenda- None

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Approved minutes from September 12, 2017
6. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report
7. Received RTC Meeting Highlights
8. Recommended E&D TAC Reappointments
9. Received Information Items - None
10. Received Agency Updates (other than items on the regular agenda)
    a. Volunteer Center- TDA Claim 16/17 4th Quarter Report
    b. Community Bridges- none
    c. Santa Cruz Metro – none

Action: A motion (Berkowitz/Daugherty) was made to approve the minutes with the correction to the September 12, 2017 minutes requested by Marilyn Garret, member of the public, to indicate that her comments included reference to the impact of the exposure of wifi service provided on buses on causes of functional impairment. The motion passed with members Berkowitz, Daugherty, Elsea, Ance, Ireland voting in favor and Lamb abstaining.

Action: A motion (Daugherty/Ance) was made to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed with members Berkowitz, Daugherty, Elsea, Ance, Ireland voting in favor and Lamb abstaining.

REGULAR AGENDA

11. Reviewed Metro Route 71 Inbound Bus Stop Relocation- Aptos Village Project

Steve Wiesner, County of Santa Cruz Public Works staff and engineer, provided an overview of planned improvements to Soquel Drive near Aptos Village. He explained that the existing four way stop on Soquel Drive at Trout Gulch Road will be signalized, a new signalized intersection to provide access to a new road, Parade Street, will be constructed and a left hand turn lane on Soquel Drive to provide access to Parade Street for motorists traveling southbound on Soquel Drive will be provided. Mr. Wiesner explained that the current route 71 inbound bus stop will be moved south of its current location on Soquel Drive to a new location approximately 100ft south of Trout Gulch Road. Mr. Wiesner informed committee members that, in coordination with Santa Cruz Metro staff, County of Santa Cruz staff re-reviewed the bus stop design to ensure all aspects of the design meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations. Mr. Wiesner reviewed in detail the paths of travel
to the bus stop from two crosswalks, one crossing Trout Gulch and one crossing Soquel Drive, including curb cuts, ramps, and sidewalks. Mr. Wiesner reviewed the bus stop design including the bus pull out, ADA landing pad, bus shelter and lighting. Mr. Wiesner described slope and widths of the planned access to the bus stop and the bus stop and consistency with ADA regulations.

Committee members and members of the public asked for additional clarification about the widths and slopes of curb ramps and sidewalks that provide access to the bus stop and the bus stop design. Committee members and members of the public discussed how the bus will access the bus stop and concrete bus pad and deploy passengers. Committee members and members of the public expressed safety concerns about the new bus stop location and discussed alternate locations for the new bus stop including maintaining the bus stop at its current location, locating the bus stop north of its current location, and other sites that may have been considered as part of the Aptos Village Project planning effort. Members of the public expressed concern about the purpose for the bus stop relocation and asked questions about the need to signalize intersections in the project area and to construct a new roadway, Parade Street. Committee members asked about the construction timeline for the new bus stop and about the public involvement in the project design. Committee members and RTC staff discussed the E&D TAC’s role and responsibility in reviewing projects that request funding from the RTC.

Action: A motion (Daugherty/Lamb) to write a letter to the County of Santa Cruz Board of Supervisors to request additional information about why an alternative bus stop location close to the existing bus stop was not pursued and how the new bus stop design would mitigate potential safety conflicts and to encourage dialog between the County of Santa Cruz public works staff, Aptos residents and business owners in Aptos Village. The motion passed with members Elsea, Lamb, Daugherty, Berkowitz voting in favor. Members Armstrong and Ance abstained. No votes were cast in opposition.

12. Adjourn- 3:40pm

Next meeting: 1:30 pm, November 14, 2017 @ RTC Office, Santa Cruz
Chair Schiffrin and Vice Chair Leopold were absent. Deputy Director Luis Mendez opened the meeting. Commissioner Alternate Johnson moved and Commissioner Alternate Gregorio seconded that Commissioner Alternate Patrick Mulhearn serve as chair for this meeting. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioner Alternates Gregorio, Johnson and Mulhearn voting “aye.”

Chair Mulhearn called the meeting to order at 3:35pm.

Members Present
Commissioner Alternate Patrick Mulhearn
Commissioner Alternate Virginia Johnson
Commissioner Alternate Tony Gregorio

RTC Staff
George Dondero Daniel Nikuna
Luis Mendez Yesenia Parra

1. Introductions- self introductions were made

2. Additions or changes to consent and regular agenda
   Replacement pages for item 7 and a handout regarding Measure D was distributed.

3. Oral communications-Luis gave a brief report on Measure D revenues and distributions and distributed materials associated with the report.

CONSENT AGENDA
Commissioner Alternate Gregorio moved and Commissioner Alternate Johnson seconded the consent agenda. The motion carried unanimously with Commissioner Alternates Mulhearn, Gregorio, and Johnson voting ‘aye’

4. Accepted monthly TDA revenue report
5. Approved the May 11, 2017 Budget & Administration/Personnel Committee minutes

6. Accepted FY 16-17 Fourth quarter warrants and monthly credit card reports

7. Accepted FY 17-18 First quarter warrants and monthly credit card reports

**REGULAR AGENDA**

8. Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 Budget and Work Program
Deputy Director Luis Mendez presented the staff report noting that the budget was last amended in June to incorporate the 5-year plans for Measure D. He noted that TDA revenues for FY16-17 were slightly higher than expected. He also noted the funds for the approved compensation study as noted in the MOU’s; SAFE and FSP funds projected to be higher and that the State was proposing that FSP funds be allocated using a competitive process; the audit on the Auxiliary lanes project as requested by Caltrans is currently underway and that staffing budget is the same as previously approved by the RTC.

Commissioners discussed the Highway 9 project.

Commissioner Alternate Johnson moved and Commissioner Alternate Gregorio seconded the staff recommendation that the Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the proposed amended fiscal year (FY) 2017-18 Budget and Work Program.

The motion carried unanimously with Commissioner alternates Mulhearn, Gregorio and Johnson voting ‘aye.’

9. Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm

The next Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 9, 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

Attendees:
Debbie Kinslow       Santa Cruz Metro
Thomas Hiltner       Santa Cruz Metro
Ciro Aguirre         Santa Cruz Metro
1. Introductions

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

Members present:
Jacques Bertrand  Sandy Brown
Randy Johnson  Oscar Rios
Ryan Coonety  Zach Friend
John Leopold  Bruce McPherson
Ed Bottorff  Norm Hagen

Staff present:
George Dondero
Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra
Karena Pushnik
Anais Schenk
Grace Blakeslee
Cory Caletti

2. Oral communications

**Robert Singleton**- Santa Cruz Business Council, Executive Director clarified the votes taken to support the trail only option by the Business Council with 50 votes in favor, 3 votes against and 5 abstentions.

**Michael Saint**- Campaign for Sensible Transportation Stated that the urban state highway miles added since 1970 have added little in the way of service improvements. He added that autonomous vehicles would help, that it is time to make a decision between cars and mass transit and that auxiliary lanes only have a small initial relief effect.

**Brett Garrett**- Citizen of Santa Cruz, i feels that PRT and electric bicycles should be included in the UCS Study. A bike share is opening that will include
electric bikes, which can be used similar to a rapid transit system without harming the rail road by using the tracks as a support structure.

**Ryan Samataro** - Encourages the Commission to walk on the tracks from Seabright to Simpkins and he supports rail banking and trail.

**Tom Haid** - Resident of Santa Cruz senior coop community, noted that the residents in his community voted unanimously in favor of the trail only due to insufficient room for train and trail.

**David Giannini** - asked the Commission to please consider the rail banking and a wide trail with separate pedestrian path. He pointed out that Santa Cruz County is ranked one of the most dangerous places to ride a bicycle per capita while at the same time recognized as Gold Rated city among the League of American Bicyclists.

**Gail McNulty** - Greenway, Executive Director discussed the Greenway plan as a safer, more affordable trail that would require installation of county wide protected bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and would be a connected network to provide relief to highway congestion. It is Greenway’s opinion that the installation of a train would not improve traffic on Highway 1.

**Barry Scott** - Aptos resident attended the two UCS workshops where he noted that the voting showed more votes in favor of the rail plan than on any other scenarios. He said that tearing out the tracks would be to our future generations, a sin. He also stated that we need to grow our bike infrastructure and preserve the rail transit option.

**Claire Koenig** - Resident of Corralitos, supports the trail only option. She explained that in her case she would not take the train since driving is more effective for where she wants to go. However she does envision herself driving to Aptos, walking on the trail, taking her grandkids down there.

**Bruce Sawhill** - Friends of Rail and Trail, agrees with Barry Scott that most of the work for the rail corridor has been done and that this work was completed in 1875 with mules and shovels so engineering issues should not be insurmountable now.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

   No additions or deletions to the regular agenda

**CONSENT AGENDA**

   There was no consent agenda

**REGULAR AGENDA**

4. Visualizing Sustainable Transportation – Owl Viewer Available
Executive Director Dondero provided some background on the project and introduced Transportation Planner, Anais Schenk who provided a KION News broadcast announcing the Owl Viewers recently installed at Soquel Drive and Chanticleer. Transportation Planner Schenk noted that the Natural Bridges/Railroad crossing Owl Viewer opens this weekend. Two other locations will be available in the spring in Live Oak and in Watsonville.

Commissioners discussed length of time the Owlizers would be installed, location suggestions, participation from the public, clear instructions to the public, web version versus the physical owl, appreciation to staff for being creative on outreach methods and requested frequent updates.

**Stanley Sokolow** stated that his first impression as a member of the public was that the device presents blurry images and the text kept popping up with a questionnaire before he could see the scenarios and there was no narrative to explain the scenarios.

**Brett Garrett** stated that he is not sure that there was any advantage to the physical structure that he could not experience on a Smartphone application.

Anais Schenk added that this is a pilot project that fixes and updates have been developed that will be implemented to improve the user experience for these and upcoming Owl viewers.

5. **Highway 17 Access Management Plan Update**

CalTrans District 5 Transportation Planner Kelly McClendon presented a video which explains the proposed plan for Highway 17. He thanked Supervisors Leopold and McPherson and SCCRTC Executive Director Dondero for participating in the plan and participating in the steering committee. He stated that the full plan is available online at [http://www.ca-hwy17amp.org/](http://www.ca-hwy17amp.org/)

Commissioners thanked Mr. McClendon and Joe Erwin for the workshops. Commissioner noted that this is a long range plan that will address public safety for all residents.

Executive Dondero thanked Caltrans for their participation early on in the project which ensured that the public understood the needs and plans.

6. **Request to Conduct a Peer Review of the Great Santa Cruz Trail 2016 Report**

Executive Director Dondero presented the staff report and said that staff has no recommendation.
Stanley Sokolow stated that the peer review is perhaps a protection against a lawsuit that will come against RTC by Greenway if the RTC opposes their position.

Barry Scott, resident of Rio Del Mar, noted that his review of the Great Santa Cruz Trail report had many errors and is concerned that it would be used to influence public opinion.

William Menchine stated that leaving the railroad in the corridor diminishes the capacity for any bike pedestrian transportation in the corridor.

David Giannini encourages the RTC to have a 3rd party review RTC reports and the Great Santa Cruz Trail report to ensure fairness and openness.

Gail McNulty—Read a statement from the Greenway Board communicating support for a peer review as long as a communicated list of conditions can be met and if these cannot be implemented due to budget, independent management of the contract, or lack of scope, then they oppose any peer review unless both the MBSST and RTFS are also peer reviewed.

Bruce Sawhill stated that the report in question is being presented as factual yet contains many suspect statements. The public deserves to know if the points made in the Great Santa Cruz Trail report are correct. This is a private study for a private interest to sway public process.

Janneke Strauss of Bike Santa Cruz County is concerned about the Great Santa Cruz Trail report being used in a public process. Bike Santa Cruz County asked that the Commission either Peer Review the Santa Cruz Trail report or remove it from the UCS as source material.

Robert Singleton serving as the Executive Director of the Santa Cruz Business Council would prefer that the Unified Corridor Study be completed as fast as possible and not to have a delay due to a peer review.

Monty Koenig who represents Greenway’s outreach stated that Greenway does not currently use the Nelson Nygard study numbers in their outreach. If we are going to peer review any study we should peer review the Unified Corridor Investment Study.

Commissioners discussed that it is unusual to have a privately funded study as part of a public process, the cost of a peer review and what would be gained, and based on the evaluation of the study it is in essence public comment and carries the same weight as public comment. The Commissioners agreed that the real interest is in getting the Unified Corridor Study done as soon as possible. Also discussed was that a true Peer Review involves an expert in the specific field and is a complex, time intensive and costly scientific process.

Commissioner Bertrand moved and Commissioner McPherson seconded to not conduct a peer review and to move forward with the Unified Corridor Study.
Investment Study The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Bertrand, Brown, Johnson, McPherson, Rios, Coonerty, Friend, Leopold, Bottorff, and Hagen voting ‘aye’.

Meeting adjourned at 10:41 a.m.

The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 2, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main St., Ste. 400, Watsonville, CA.

The next meeting of the Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, November 16, 2015 at 9:00 am at the Regional Transportation Commission Offices.

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra
Administrative Services Officer

Attendees:

- Erich Friedrich, AMBAG
- Michael Saint, Campaign for Sensible Transportation
- Janneke Strauss, Bike Santa Cruz County
- Stanley Sokolow, Campaign for Sensible Transportation
- Bruce Sawhill, Friends of Rail Trail
- Tom Haid, Villa Santa Cruz
- Brett Garrett, Santa Cruz Resident
- David Giannini, Santa Cruz Resident
- Claire Koenig, Corralitos Resident
- Ryan Sarnataro, Live Oak, Santa Cruz County Resident
- Barry Scott, Rio Del Mar Resident
- Robert Singleton, Santa Cruz Business Council
- Gail McNulty, Greenway
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### TDA REVENUE REPORT
#### FY 2017-2018

<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>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % 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>
<td>91.59%</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>
<td>91.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>872,266</td>
<td>882,733</td>
<td>1,146,538</td>
<td>263,805</td>
<td>29.89%</td>
<td>105.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>657,500</td>
<td>665,390</td>
<td>665,500</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>104.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>876,700</td>
<td>887,220</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>632,900</td>
<td>646,849</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>911,051</td>
<td>781,837</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>834,900</td>
<td>763,397</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,101,315</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,186,458</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,173,538</strong></td>
<td><strong>138,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.51%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

I:\FISCAL\TDA\MonthlyReceipts\FY2018\[Copy of FY2018 TDA Receipts.xlsx]FY2017
### Summary Revenue Allocation by Month

**FY2018 ending June 30, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross</strong></td>
<td>1,146,700</td>
<td>1,529,000</td>
<td>2,455,390</td>
<td>1,231,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,362,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BE FEE</strong></td>
<td>1,146,700</td>
<td>1,529,000</td>
<td>2,455,390</td>
<td>1,231,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net</strong></td>
<td>1,146,700</td>
<td>1,529,000</td>
<td>2,404,870</td>
<td>1,231,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,312,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Administration & Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration - Salaries &amp; Benefits</strong></td>
<td>11,467.00</td>
<td>15,290.00</td>
<td>24,048.70</td>
<td>12,317.00</td>
<td>6,362.790</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,333.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O/H Administration</strong></td>
<td>11,581.67</td>
<td>15,442.90</td>
<td>24,289.19</td>
<td>12,440.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63,753.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries &amp; O/H Implementation &amp; Oversight</strong></td>
<td>8,333.33</td>
<td>16,666.67</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td>46,960.42</td>
<td>46,960.42</td>
<td>46,960.42</td>
<td>46,960.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>187,841.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>41,666.67</td>
<td>41,666.67</td>
<td>41,666.67</td>
<td>41,666.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>166,666.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### To Distribute to Investment Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>320,507.27</td>
<td>432,892.01</td>
<td>690,371.59</td>
<td>345,494.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,382,865.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLV SR9</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27,777.78</td>
<td>27,777.78</td>
<td>27,777.78</td>
<td>27,777.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>111,111.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HWY 17 Wildlife</strong></td>
<td>Fixed $</td>
<td>13,888.89</td>
<td>13,888.89</td>
<td>13,888.89</td>
<td>13,888.89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55,555.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>41,666.67</td>
<td>41,666.67</td>
<td>41,666.67</td>
<td>41,666.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>166,666.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Capitola</strong></td>
<td>5.6213%</td>
<td>15,674.47</td>
<td>21,991.95</td>
<td>36,465.65</td>
<td>17,079.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91,211.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Santa Cruz</strong></td>
<td>22.7041%</td>
<td>63,308.25</td>
<td>88,824.19</td>
<td>147,282.61</td>
<td>68,981.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>368,396.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Scotts Valley</strong></td>
<td>4.8992%</td>
<td>13,660.96</td>
<td>19,166.91</td>
<td>31,781.35</td>
<td>14,885.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59,494.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Watsonville</strong></td>
<td>15.1912%</td>
<td>42,359.23</td>
<td>59,431.82</td>
<td>98,546.06</td>
<td>46,155.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>246,492.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of Santa Cruz</strong></td>
<td>51.5842%</td>
<td>143,837.70</td>
<td>201,810.46</td>
<td>334,629.25</td>
<td>156,727.27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>837,004.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>278,840.61</td>
<td>391,225.34</td>
<td>648,704.92</td>
<td>303,828.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,622,598.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HWY Corridors</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>267,089.40</td>
<td>342,892.01</td>
<td>590,371.59</td>
<td>345,494.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,491,054.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit/Paratransit</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>213,671.52</td>
<td>288,594.67</td>
<td>460,247.73</td>
<td>239,329.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,192,843.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Cruz Metro (SCMTD) 16%</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>170,937.21</td>
<td>230,875.74</td>
<td>368,198.18</td>
<td>184,263.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>954,274.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Bridges - 4%</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42,334.30</td>
<td>57,718.93</td>
<td>92,049.55</td>
<td>46,065.96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>238,568.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Transportation</strong></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>181,620.79</td>
<td>245,305.47</td>
<td>391,210.57</td>
<td>195,780.34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,013,917.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail Corridor</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>85,468.61</td>
<td>115,437.87</td>
<td>184,099.09</td>
<td>92,131.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>477,137.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total to Distribute to Investment Categories</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,068,357.58</td>
<td>1,442,973.35</td>
<td>2,301,238.64</td>
<td>1,151,649.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,964,218.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Administration & Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration &amp; Implementation</strong></td>
<td>1,146,700</td>
<td>1,529,000</td>
<td>2,404,870</td>
<td>1,231,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,312,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE  

November 2017  
Through  
January 2018  

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/  

<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>11/2/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11/13/17     | Monday      | Bicycle Advisory Committee  
\* Note special meeting date | 6:00 pm      | Commission Offices |
| 11/14/17     | Tuesday     | Elderly & Disabled TAC  
\* Note special meeting date | 1:30 pm      | Commission Offices |
| 11/16/17     | Thursday    | Transportation Policy Workshop | 9:00 am      | Commission Offices |
| 11/16/17     | Thursday    | Interagency Technical Advisory Committee | 1:30 pm      | Commission Offices |
| 12/7/17      | Thursday    | Regional Transportation Commission | 9:00 am      | County Board of Supervisors Chambers |
| 12/11/17     | Monday      | Bicycle Advisory Committee | 6:00 pm      | Commission Offices |
| 12/12/17     | Tuesday     | Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee | 1:30 pm      | Commission Offices |
| 12/21/17     | Thursday    | Transportation Policy Workshop | 9:00 am      | Commission Offices |
| 12/21/17     | Thursday    | Interagency Technical Advisory Committee | 1:30 pm      | Commission Offices |
| 1/18/18      | Thursday    | Transportation Policy Workshop | 9:00 am      | Commission Offices |
| 1/18/18      | Thursday    | Interagency Technical Advisory Committee | 1:30 pm      | Commission Offices |

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>Format</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Brandow</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail NOD for DEIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>City Of Santa Cruz Comment on the Rail Trail EIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail NOD for DEIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Rosenberger</td>
<td>Rail Service in Santa Cruz County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Heath</td>
<td>Baron</td>
<td>Supporting the Rail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>Tosello</td>
<td>Rail trail EIR input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Debi</td>
<td>Bel</td>
<td>City Of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Della</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Seales</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2016</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bud</td>
<td>Colligan</td>
<td>Performance Measures of Unified Corridors Investment Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Comply with the North Coast Farmers proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Bonny Doomers, FYI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td>Lo</td>
<td>rail-trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Equestrian Trail in the North Coast area of the railroad corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mareille</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail and “scare tactics”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>Friend,</td>
<td>SCCRTC/S C</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Connolly</td>
<td>Usef ul RTC MBST Cost Analysis Explained to Commissioners Using Segment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Dimmick,</td>
<td>County Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1st project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez,</td>
<td>County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo of Trash &amp; Debris/Rail line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yesenia</td>
<td>Parra,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cc:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>La</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourette</td>
<td>Rebhan;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gonnie</td>
<td>Chavez;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Downing;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poco</td>
<td>Marshall;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Lindstrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail and “scare tactics”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Boutelle</td>
<td>review plans in RTC offices?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Myatt</td>
<td>Corridors study and north coast rail trail feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Coale</td>
<td>Rail trail open comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Nielsen</td>
<td>Unified Corridor Investment Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>Overton</td>
<td>rail trail planning-equestrian use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Namnette</td>
<td>Benedict</td>
<td>RTC-(horseback riding trails)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Comments related to your Trails Meeting held in Davenport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Lemas</td>
<td>Leave the Tracks!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Support for Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2017</td>
<td>email incoming</td>
<td>10/2/2017</td>
<td>VV</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gina Bliss</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2017</td>
<td>email incoming</td>
<td>10/2/2017</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sherni Macaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Type</td>
<td>Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Val</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Val</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Val</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Pushnik</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Fautsch</td>
<td>Gary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Josto</td>
<td>Saleri</td>
<td>Puddu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2017</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>Andresson</td>
<td>Stati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Roland</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>Stati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chante</td>
<td>Boller</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karena</td>
<td>Pushnik</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Moriarti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Anais</td>
<td>Schenk</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Nielsen</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Nacamuli</td>
<td>Nacamuli Plastic Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>Frey</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Rosewood</td>
<td>STRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Sokolow</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Engel</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Speer</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stefanie</td>
<td>Bourcier</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM First Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Patricia Newby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Third Alternative (rail-to-trail) for North Coast Rail-Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Aleah TRUE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Third Alternative (rail-to-trail) for North Coast Rail-Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email/Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pamela Silwood</td>
<td>Horan Lloyd</td>
<td>Comments to the NOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Kim Schultz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Denis Endsch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Daniel Spero</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Third Alternative (rail-to-trail) for North Coast Rail-Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nathan York</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great Santa Cruz Trail Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joe Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td>Third Alternative (rail-to-trail) for North Coast Rail-Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Elizabeth Clifton</td>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Doolin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Woutje Swets</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Coast Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joe Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Coast Farmers' alternative trail alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert Stephens</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark Swanson</td>
<td>North Coast Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ted Burke</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dean Morrow</td>
<td>north Coast Rail to rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Buzz &amp; Jennie Anderson</td>
<td>North coast rail corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Glenn Saltz MD</td>
<td>help ensure input from the North Coast Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sandrine Georges</td>
<td>Please consider North Coast Farmer's alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rebecca Moeller</td>
<td>Farmers need to farm, bikers don't need to bike through the middle of fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paul Hostetter</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sarcher Young</td>
<td>Rails to trails!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ruby Lipsenthal</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Enda Brennan</td>
<td>Farmer's Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nadene Thome</td>
<td>N. Coast Farmer's Alternative Trail Alignment Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Croswell</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Zachary Hill</td>
<td>Hear out the farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Martin Engel</td>
<td>Support Third Alternative (rail-to-trail) for North Coast Rail-Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>email/Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Juan Hidalgo, Agricultural Commissioner</td>
<td>Office of the Agricultural Commissioner</td>
<td>Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the North Coast Rail Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alan Romero</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the North Coast Rail Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Diane Koeng</td>
<td>Greenway, Inc.: &quot;...narrowly focused to serve a defined class of beneficiaries&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Steve Hambright</td>
<td>North Coast Farmers' alternative trail study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom Brandow</td>
<td>North Coast Farmers' alternative trail alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Helfman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Pais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Noel</td>
<td>Gann Bock</td>
<td></td>
<td>Davenport/North Coast Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Renner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2017</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Siri</td>
<td>Rodoni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Nunez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lavigne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Anne Marie</td>
<td>Hutchison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Braga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Moriconi</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>Leuty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Huskey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Moeller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Rachel/Cory</td>
<td>Moriconi/Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Richter</td>
<td>Giro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2017</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Castro-Anello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>Steinbruner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Homan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>Kremer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Owen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Broz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farm Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director California Coastal Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jerry &amp; Jan</td>
<td>Finney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Rahders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jenna</td>
<td>Schudson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cal Trans District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2017</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>McFarland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas McFarland PC-Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Bruffey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>Monica McGuire</td>
<td>The RTC Board funding requests of SCC Supervisors for more money for Aptos Village traffic lights and other mitigations, before Nov. 2 meeting, and Budget &amp; Administrative Committee meetings November 9, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Daniel Nikuna</td>
<td>Judy Kinst</td>
<td>Look to the Future: Travel through time with RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>Gary Lindstrom</td>
<td>No funding for traffic light at Aptos Creek Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>Dan Kembitsch</td>
<td>Look to the Future: Travel through time with RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2017</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>Ryan Manoney</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail Notice of Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Kim Schultz</td>
<td>David Urbanic</td>
<td>Message to Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner: Mar Vista H1 Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>10/24/2017 VV</td>
<td>Leslie Chow</td>
<td>Fw: Aptos mar vista overcrossing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>10/19/2017 LM</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>From Mary Connolly Oct 19: Our conversation and RTC contractor cleanup Fri, Oct 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Yesenia Parra</td>
<td>Mary Connolly</td>
<td>From Mary Connolly Oct 19: Our conversation and RTC contractor cleanup Fri, Oct 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/2017</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Yesenia Parra</td>
<td>Mary Connolly</td>
<td>From Mary Connolly Oct 19: Our conversation and RTC contractor cleanup Fri, Oct 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2017</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Pamela Silkwood</td>
<td>Horan/Lloyd</td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 2, 2017

Giang Nguyen
Health Services Agency Director
Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency
1080 Emeline Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA  95060

Dear Ms. Nguyen:

I’m writing on behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Bicycle Committee in support of Santa Cruz County’s “Santa Cruz County Complete Streets to School Planning Grant” proposal to lay the groundwork for increasing the frequency and safety of bicycling and walking among school students at 19 county schools. Although we have many bike and pedestrian amenities and school-based efforts in our county, this planning effort will lay the groundwork for increasing safe multi-modal usage by school students and will involve coordinated approach to integrated land use and transportation in planning and implementation.

The RTC’s Bicycle Committee serves to assist in the development and maintenance of a complete, convenient and safe regional bicycle and pedestrian network. Such a network increases the opportunity and attractiveness of bicycle and pedestrian trips for transportation purposes. This grant proposal complements the Bicycle Committee’s goals to increase the number of safe bicycle trips through safety awareness and education, including plans to distribute information to motorists about driving safely around more vulnerable road users.

We strongly support the County’s proposal that will provide a thorough and well thought out plan to increase safe and equitable multi-modal access to our school communities, as well as contribute towards the additional benefits of reduced congestion around schools and helping to reach state targets for improved air quality and greenhouse gas reduction. Thank you for your continued support of efforts to build a more livable community with all residents in mind. Please feel free to contact the RTC’s Bicycle Program Manager and staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org, for this and any other committee related matters.

Sincerely,

Amelia Conlen
Bicycle Advisory Committee Chair

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
October 25, 2017

John Leopold, Chair  
County of Santa Cruz Board of Supervisors  
701 Ocean Street  
Santa Cruz, California 95062  

Re: Route 71 Inbound Bus Stop Relocation- Aptos Village Project  

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) would like to thank the County of Santa Cruz and Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz Metro) staff for attending the October 10, 2017 meeting to provide information and respond to questions about the Route 71 inbound bus stop relocation and design included in the Aptos Village Project. The E&D TAC advises the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), Santa Cruz Metro, and other service providers on transportation needs for people with disabilities, seniors and persons of limited means. In 2013, the E&D TAC reviewed the County of Santa Cruz funding request for the Aptos Village Project. In June 2017, the E&D TAC contacted the County of Santa Cruz staff to inquire about the changes to the Route 71 bus stop relocation included in the Aptos Village Project and the bus stop design’s compliance with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA).

At the October 10, 2017 meeting, the County of Santa Cruz staff and representatives from Santa Cruz Metro described the Route 71 bus stop relocation included in the Aptos Village Project, explained how each aspect of the project design complied with ADA regulations including but not limited to the bus stop, the sidewalk and curb ramps and responded to questions from committee members and members of the public. Following the discussion, the E&D TAC approved a motion to write a letter to the County of Santa Cruz Board of Supervisors to request additional information about why an alternative bus stop location closer to the existing bus stop was not pursued, and how the new bus stop design would mitigate potential safety conflicts and to encourage dialog between the county public works staff, Aptos residents and local business owners. The E&D TAC requests that these items be addressed in a timely manner as construction is underway and that the E&D TAC is notified of your findings and of any action taken.

The E&D TAC would like to thank staff for continuing to work with the E&D TAC to meet the transportation needs of all county residents.

Sincerely,

Veronica Elsea  
E&D TAC Chair  

cc: Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
Hello

I was told this is who I write to send my support for bringing the train back to SC county

I've lived my whole life in Watsonville and have always dreamed of seeing the Watsonville train station put back into public use... not sure if this would be what's happening but I 100% support bringing back the train... it's not only historic but it's the last chance we have in bringing back rail as transportation

HWY1 traffic is a nightmare everyday regardless of what season it is, I think this would help that problem

thanks
Heath
Hi.
I have been very close attention to this topic and am slightly concerned. The data suggests a train will be prohibitively expensive and not utilized if it ever gets funded. Coming up with the $500 million or so to actually get a passenger train going seems unlikely, all the while hwy 1 congestion will only get worse.
I see more and more electrified bicycles on my bike commute across town(super sketchy in places I might add), please give us another viable option, a WIDE bike path. Please. No fence, no hilly diversions, no endless litigation with track neighbors as you battle in court to reclaim right of way . Please, please, please, listen to your constituents, the train will never work.
Thank you for listening, james cook
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Mr. Lemas,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review. Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you,

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

Hi,

I am writing to you today to show concern for the possible removal of the railroad tracks. The appeal to remove the tracks is a short term goal that is not fulfill long-term needs.

I am a Santa Cruz resident for eight years, originally born here, and have been studying sustainability for four years.

The tracks could be utilized to their highest potential if we decided as a community to build public transportation upon them. Trains are one of the fastest and most reliable ways of transportation, and in our booming city they may prove to be most efficient way of transportation, being able to carry large amounts of people while using relatively low amounts of energy (compared to single person vehicles), especially if a train is powered by the sun. This may be a long-term investment, but I am thinking of the future, five generations ahead.

Again, the appeal to remove the tracks is a short term goal that is not for fill long-term needs. Please leave the tracks.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Aaron Lemas

Sent from my iPhone
This Contact Request Form has been submitted by a member of the public to http://sccrtc.org/contact-us/.

Name
Gina Bliss

Email
gwater@cruzers.com

Subject
rail trail

Your Message
Dear Colleagues
I support the rail trail and have donated funds to the Santa Cruz Land Trust for this purpose. I am concerned that the "Greenway" advocates are disseminating incorrect information. I do not know whether they can be held to account.
I voted for Measure D. I support the work of the Regional Transportation. I hope Santa Cruz County will go ahead with bike/trail plans with the railroad tracks in place.

Thank you
Gina Bliss 126 Ladera Drive, Santa Cruz

From: General Info [mailto:info@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2017 1:37 PM
To: 'gbwater@cruzers.com'
Subject: FW: New submission from Contact Form

Dear Ms. Bliss,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review. Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you,
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
Hello,
My name is James Long. I am a Capitola resident.
I have some musings about this Rail Trail project.

Santa Cruz, a city and county, where people talk about equality for everyone, diversity there are quite a few folks that are taking a very narrow and discriminating view with regards to our Rail Trail opportunity. It is just that. An opportunity of various degrees. The Trail Now folks (a minority group) are only really interested in a bicycle riding path... period. They’ll make the argument that the tracks are unsightly, that they’re taking up space, etc. That removing the tracks for a trail only path is the best solution.

It’s not. Trail Now doesn’t speak for all people within the county. We can have both.

The Trail Now folks have a hobby where they like riding their bicycles long distances. The notion they put out that all these people will suddenly start riding bicycles or start walking along the pathway is not true either. Doctors will say this too but you would be hard pressed to get someone to stop looking at their cellphones for any length of time to go ride a bike or go for a walk for that matter.
The people that want to ride bikes and or walk are doing so now regardless of what a path looks like. I am one of those walkers.
I am sixty years old. It’s not uncommon for me to walk 8-10 miles on a Saturday or Sunday, and 5 miles on some week days. I consider myself lucky that I can get out and walk. Some folks cannot.

I think the Trail Now group has what I call the “Field of Dreams” mentality. If you build it (Trail Only) they will come. I’m sure after 6-10 months the novelty of the Trail Only path will wear off at which point people will think “we” made a big mistake.

A March 24, 2016 Santa Cruz Sentinel (1) article talks about Santa Cruz County’s elderly population ranking among the fastest growing in the US. As these folks start to retire they are going to be thinking about their finances, about the high cost of gas for their car, etc. They aren’t going to jump on their bicycle and ride to Aptos Village for lunch or to just get out and get fresh air.
They are going to want to get out no doubt but what would be a better way than to hop on a train that can take them beyond the city limits? I’m sure some of these folks will be living near the transit stations.

Connecting people is what the Rail Trail is going to do. The Human Connection.

My late mother used to live in Scotts Valley. From time to time my brother would drive my mother around the area or take a drive down to Monterey. I would drive down to Scotts Valley from Santa Rosa and drive mother around. She was at that time still able to drive her car. She was 85.

A few years prior to my mother moving to the east coast (2005) my sister and her two kids came out and the 5 of us rode the Steam Train at Roaring Camp. That train was a great connection and even better memory for us.

Natural Disasters

With regards to Rail Trail, Trail Only groups no one has mentioned anything about the need for our rail corridor open for emergency purposes.

As a commuter over the “Hill” I often think about the “what if” scenario if there’s a major natural disaster like the next big earthquake or major fire along the county borders where our roadways will be shutdown because of a disaster. Freeway and Highway overcrossings collapse. Reminds me of some of the scenes from the Bay Area where bridges collapsed after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. The anniversary of that is on the 17th.

SF BART ridership went up 124,000 riders days after the earthquake. (2)

An example if the Hwy 1 overcrossing at Bay/ Porter streets collapsed due to an earthquake how would emergency vehicles be able to respond through the area? How would goods and services be delivered if the roadways are closed due to inaccessibility? The public in their vehicles would be blocking every small street trying to get around. Think of other roadways where there is an overcrossing (Hwy 1 near Mission St. Pedestrian Overhead Walkway) Engineers would have to inspect these overcrossings before the public could drive under them.

Hwy 17. That was a mess earlier this year with all the rains that created landslides and made it so portions of Hwy 17 weren’t drivable. Same with Hwy 35, Hwy 9, Old Santa Cruz/ San Jose Rd. Before you know it we’d be boxed in.

Hwy 1 southbound was an option for me drive up to Hayward. But what if Hwy 1 in both directions got shut down and no vehicles allowed along the highways. How are we going to get emergency equipment into the areas? How are we going to get food trucked to the markets, etc? That’s where the railroad corridor would come to the rescue. Boxcars, flatcars bringing in equipment. Lots of farmers in the Davenport area that could use railcars to get their produce to market if needed.

I would think that business developers would jump at the idea that their developments could be right next to a railway station.

Aptos Village. New townhouses being built right next to the old Bay View Hotel just north of the existing tracks.
Not much in the way of shopping there but a half a mile west up Soquel Dr. is the Rio Del Mar shopping center and that’s getting a major make over soon.

The SF BART Richmond Station is a good example of residences adjacent to transit centers. Condos have been built right next to the station practically on the same real estate chunk.

(I happen to work for SF BART in Hayward as a Transit Vehicle Mechanic). I have friends that travel on Bart (they work for BART too) and being able to ditch the car and ride BART then walk to where they want to go is great. They can also walk to the station from their houses.

SMART up in the North Bay. How great that is in operation now.
Lots of small condos being built near the stations so people can commute to work, going shopping in Corte Madera, take the train to San Rafael, bus over to the Ferry Building then take the Ferry to a ballgame at AT&T Park. Or, ride up to Sonoma County and go wine tasting, or ride to the station on Airport Blvd. and take a plane out of Sonoma County Airport.
Here again the rail system connecting people and eliminating excessive cars on the roadway.
I drove up to Santa Rosa last weekend. Normally it’s a 3.50 hour drive to Capitola home. I think with the rail service up there the traffic was eased a bit. Only 2.5 hours going home.

Crime Activity
I have some thoughts about what would happen if the tracks were to be removed and the pathway become a trail only path. There would be more graffiti and criminal activity going on without the train presence especially in areas of town where there’s less population. Both sections of a bike path would become more homeless camps. Currently signage along the Santa Cruz Branch Line of “No Trespassing” keeps a lot of folks off the tracks and out of the area except for the homeless and graffiti taggers. I know this because I walk along side of the tracks or out in the bike lane (keeping my fingers crossed I don’t get hit by a cyclist) along Park Avenue in Capitola where I live. There are sections on the road where there is no sidewalk.

The county isn’t or hasn’t done much to pick up trash along the railroad tracks. Various volunteer groups in the county have as I have helped them. When you have trashy areas it gives criminals the idea that not many people come around and they don’t worry about committing crimes.
Areas that became bike paths in Los Angeles (3) for example have had several incidents over the years of people being mugged for their bikes and other crimes committed.

The Trail Now folks have painted this picture of our railroad track sections in a crummy part of a town versus this nice green pathway where there’s all these healthy looking people out biking, walking, etc. I have walked the railroad tracks in sections from the Wye over by Depot Park in Santa Cruz all the way to Aptos. Not too many people doing the same.

As I stated in the beginning only a few people will be able to take advantage of a green path bike trail but all of us in the county and beyond can benefit from having a railroad transit system operating with a trail. Would be great to one day connect with the folks in Monterey area.

What I would personally like to see is electric trolleys much like what the Union Traction
Trolley ran in Santa Cruz to Capitola from 1904-1927. Harnessing solar power in panels at remote locations around the county could power the trolleys with batteries. Less noise, cleaner. That type of technology is here. We could get Tesla Automotive company to get onboard with it. Think of Santa Cruz County being at the forefront of that type of technology?

There’s a video on YouTube titled, “sol train santa cruz”. Talks about solar powered cars and also talks and illustrates the use of solar powered trains. (4)

I do not think we need to have multiple trains running all day long. Frequency travel could be based on supply and demand. The weekends trains could bring people to and from the area, students have an option of not only going to UCSC, but to Cabrillo College in Aptos, or the CSU Monterey Bay. Students can study on the train, sleep, or just enjoy the scenery. Not to mention other folks that want to enjoy. Trail Only folks that ride their bikes to Monterey from Santa Cruz then realize the don’t have the energy to pedal back in a head wind can put their bikes on a car and enjoy the ride back home..

I understand that what’s going on now with the Coastal Trail is for that- a trail. I’m all for a trail. I’m also for our existing rail corridor that needs to stay in place.

Sincerely,

James F. Long
Capitola
malabar7@comcast.net

Rail with Trail References

(1) March 24, 2016 Santa Cruz Sentinel
http://www.santacruzsentinel.com/article/NE/20160324/NEWS/160329811

(2) Bart Ridership increased 124,000 after 1989 earthquake
http://www.spur.org/publications/urbanist-article/2010-07-06/transportation-and-rebuilding

(3) The Case Against Bike Paths
http://la.streetsblog.org/2010/01/05/the-case-against-bike-paths/

(4) sol train santa cruz (You Tube)
https://youtu.be/B3VgDexf_As
Dear RTC Board,

I and others believe that putting the future of the rail corridor in the hands of the voting public is the best course of action for the RTC to pursue. The corridor, for all intents and purposes, belongs to the citizens of Santa Cruz County. It is they who should decide whether a wide multi-use trail with no rail should be built or a narrower trail next to the tracks should be constructed. In the meantime no public money should be spent on building a narrower trail. November, 2018 should be the date set for a county-wide resolution on what direction the RTC should follow. The political will of the community should always be the driving force in a decision of this magnitude. Thank you for considering my opinion. Buzz Anderson
212 16th Ave, Santa Cruz
I have been asked to send the RTC the following words, drawn from a longer communication, for distribution:

Discussions about whether to run trains on the current rail corridor have become more frequent and more heated. Officialdom has taken a strong advocacy position, promoting a commuter train to run on the tracks, with or without additional walking or biking opportunities.

Apparently there seems to be some loose funding available for developing train use (and more is being sought), touted in the name of of public mass transit. Whenever a case can be made to extract such funding, government and related organizations quickly rise to the occasion by producing plans and proposals justifying funding expenditures. Needless to say, these funds are solicited and spent claiming the best interests of the community and public at large.

For just a few bucks, we can make life better, improve the environment, improve the economy, and get all those damn cars off the road. Those are the promises and inducements, to be obtained, of course, at a minimum of cost.

Yeah, right. When will we ever learn? It’s way past time for the rest of us to do some due diligence and homework in order to understand what all these rail projects are really all about.

One of the best authorities on rail-related budget exploitation is a professor at Oxford University named Bent Flyvbjerg (he’s Dutch). He has been researching and writing about rail projects and how their budgets inflate like a balloon. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bent_Flyvbjerg

https://search.yahoo.com/yhs/search?hspart=adk&hsimp=yhs-adk_sbnt&param2=7a4a3115-6447-49ad-8456-5a3785788bc2&param3=maps_1.17--US--appfocus84&param4=%7bsource%7d--Chrome--bent+flyvbjerg+megaprojects+and+risk+pdf&param1=20170929&p=bent+flyvbjerg+megaprojects+and+risk+pdf&type=ma_appfocus84_cr


[And here’s my old high-speed rail blog. I’ve been trying to make our case for many years. You can scroll back to get a sense of what I was attacking: http://high-speedtraintalk.blogspot.com] There are many obvious similarities in this more modest project.

I have been a follower of Flyvbjerg’s writing for a decade. His point can be explained simply: railroad projects, especially the larger ones, invariably have an ever increasing budget, both before the project begins and especially during the project. (High-Speed Rail in CA began at around $30 billion, is now $60 billion and will be at least twice as much when it is ever finished.)

Let me put that in more blunt language. Project advocates are usually politicians, bureaucrats and the related industries, consultants and lawyers that stand to benefit from contracts. Stretching out the project makes it ever more beneficial (and more costly) to the benefit of these advocates and promoters. (And, these projects look great on resumes as career builders!)

As I’ve put it for years: “It’s not about the train; it’s about the money.” Thus, ALL rail projects are an opportunity and vehicle for empire building. That is why they are so hard to fight, change or stop.

Despite all claims to the contrary, there is nothing charitable about these rail projects. None of the contentions offered that justify the development of the project hold water. In other words, they do not reduce traffic; they will not enhance the environment (to the contrary); they will be a source of jobs only for a few years and employ far fewer people than promised.

Ticket costs to ride these trains will be higher than promised. Only the affluent will use them on a regular, commuter basis. Those people who do your gardening, clean your house and do other hourly manual labor — if you see who I’m talking about -- won’t be able to afford them. It is safe to say that in the current situation, these commuter trains will not be public mass transit.
Operating costs cannot and will not be met through ticket sales. The train operation will have to be subsidized. Almost all commuter trains in the US such as AMTRAK (and in the rest of the world) are government subsidized. The taxpayer is doomed to pay for those operating costs (just as they were for the capital development costs) so that only the well-to-do can regularly ride the train -- since ticket costs will invariably be higher than promised.

The most obvious issue with reviving rail use is how much construction will be involved. Those of us living in La Selva Beach can see the brand new trestle ($5 million) which does not support trail use, and also see the rail corridor on the very edge of the Bluff. Any engineer will tell you that this is an extremely hazardous place, subject to continuous erosion and certainly not seismically acceptable. The rail corridor would need to be totally moved further away from the edge by many, many feet and, of course, reconstructed. The bluff, all along the beach, is obviously unstable. A regularly used passenger rail corridor there? Are they crazy?

Many of the other trestles are made of wood. They are very old. They would ALL need to be replaced. The fact is that the corridor is obsolete for modern passenger train use. Most of the ballast and ties are no longer safe and stable.

The other unspoken issue is that personal greed plays a big role in rail project promotion. Consultants love it. They write proposals to do studies, the final reports of which are — invariably — another proposal. Bureaucrats and their contractors become closely allied for mutual benefit. . . . at our expense.

The rail promoters like to compare their project with the Interstate Highway System, Boulder Dam, the Golden Gate Bridge and other former mega-projects. Projects like these were often brought in on time and under budget. That no longer happens with ANY project. Gross cost overruns are typical. My favorite example is the Boston Big Dig, which was initially budgeted at $2 to $3 billion and ended up costing well over $30 billion. A whole order of magnitude. Of course, this single rail corridor is a much more modest affair but, like the rest of them, will certainly inflate costwise significantly once it gets going.

The smartest, least expensive and most frequently used reconfiguring of the existing rail corridor will be for walking and biking. In and around Santa Cruz, it can be made into an attractive tourist attraction. For greater stretches, it will encourage the already dramatically increased use of bicycles. It can serve to cement communities and inhibit the urbanization and uncontrolled development that would be the passenger rail driven alternative.

If I have come to understand the spirit and character of the Santa Cruz County coast, passenger trains are not the way to go; walkways and bikeways can be, in fact, an intimate expression of the essence of our coastal region.

Martin Engel
La Selva Beach, CA.

---

From: General Info [mailto:info@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:37 AM
To: martinengel@sbcglobal.net
Subject: FW: The other side of the coin

Mr. Engel,

“Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review. Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.”

Thank you,
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
Dear George, et al

Given the long ago decision to borrow funds from the State of CA to purchase the rail ROW, its understandable that the Commissioner's Policy is to continue on with the endless HOPE of one day installing and operating a passenger rail line in SCC because it is the "right thing" to do. For many in the county, to sustain that mirage (or as you call it "policy) also means not widening Highway 1, it means reducing economic opportunity for a younger generation, and it means keeping our commitment to unsurpassed air quality.

My take on the frustration that arose tonight was that people are slowly beginning to realize the "doublespeak" that has become the norm with SCCRTC staff. An effective and tangible policy is defined as a course of action. By using the local politicians as policy cover, it has become apparent to the knowledgeable that SCCRTC continues to engage in yet another mind numbingly useless analysis of mobility in Santa Cruz County while that hopey things continues to waste the Measure D money. (How many report have we paid for sitting on the shelf?)

Not all is lost as I too have hope....I do hope that at least the less fortunate among us can continue to use the rail ROW as place to live out their lives as I would hate to see all the iron go to waste.

Regards,

Robert Schneider
Hi,
Just a suggestion to reroute the RR/trail at Park Avenue and up through Monterey Drive and Kennedy Drive and then back to New Brighton Beach?

The New Brighton Beach cliffs are quickly eroding ie... trees are falling off the cliffs.... and will probably not withstand the constant train weight and motion, not to mention the construction. What geologic engineering studies have been done to support this project along this section 11 of the Rail/trail? We would like to see these recent (within the past year since last winter) studies if possible...

Other than this, the RR/trail sounds like a fantastic idea for all of the reasons mentioned on your site! :)

Please also videotape any meetings regarding this project and also post the videos on your website - Unified Corridor Study... as we are unable to attend these meetings.

Thank you,,
Joni and Dan Steele
Hello,
I was glad to participate in the Watsonville workshop Oct 3.

I have a suggestion - I recommend you allot some time for staff, or recruit volunteers, to ride the bus back and forth between Watsonville and Santa Cruz and talk with commuters about the scenarios. Plenty of time and a captive audience.

I am quite concerned that the current options for input are not accessible to the majority of the population who a) don't have the time to attend meetings  b) don't see themselves represented in public meetings and are intimidated to participate  c) don't use the internet  d) can't access the meetings or internet site in Spanish.

I think it's really important to hear from people who use public transportation what they want.

Please consider this suggestion!
--
Nancy Faulstich
Regeneración Project Director

Follow us on Facebook! @regenerationpajarovalley

Your donation will help us develop a cadre of environmental justice leaders in the Pájaro Valley! Donate securely online at:

www.regenerationpajarovalley.org

Regeneración
Pájaro Valley Climate Action

Regeneración - Acción Climática del Valle de Pajaro

Communicating about Climate Change

Simple ideas to repeat over and over in ways that people can hear and remember

1. Climate change is real.

2. It's caused by people.

3. Experts agree it's happening.

4. It’s harmful to people - not just polar bears. All people are at risk, but especially people who are already vulnerable - children, elderly, low income people, people with disabilities and health conditions.

5. There are solutions!
From: Contact Request Form [mailto:admin@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2017 8:33 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/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Bruno Kaiser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brunokai@pacbell.net">brunokai@pacbell.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Primary problem/solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Message</td>
<td>Highway 1 between Aptos and Hwy. 17 seems to me to be the primary bottleneck for most people. Every day in both directions, for hours, the traffic slows to a crawl. My top priority would be to add the 3rd lane to the rest of that road. The piecemeal 3rd lanes don't help as long as any part of it is 2-lane. People need a car to get to the final destination, so public transit is not a solution that most people would use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: General Info [mailto:info@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2017 1:28 PM
To: 'brunokai@pacbell.net'
Subject: Primary problem/solution

Dear Mr. Kaiser,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Unified Corridor Investment Study project team and the Commission for their review. Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.
Dennis Speer 332 Union St Santa Cruz, CA 95060 831-234-7797 831-426-9276

From: Dennis Speer <dennis_speer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2017 4:29 PM
To: ccaletti@sccrtc.org
Subject: comments on north coast rail trail project

- Require all members of the Regional Transportation Commission that wish to vote on anything about public transit to use only public transit for one full month so they have some exposure to the masses they make decisions for but have no idea of the real world
- Cease and desist from devoting any more money to rail transit in this county as we have had many studies showing it is not viable at this time
- If you cannot get the Commission members to give up on rail commuting have them only spend time and no money on it by having them get buy in from every zoning commission and city government to convert all their plans to create the communities needed for rail transit to work
- If you want you can just pave over the existing old rails and once ready for big trains total rebuild/repackiing/reinforcing of rails will be needed should train be way to go
- Think People Mover type of commuter system instead of trains due to lower weight, rubber tires, shorter stopping distance for safety, ability to use Mover Pods to hook onto high speed "tractor"l that will pull commuters over 17.....which is just as viable an idea as having a train from Watsonville to Santa Cruz.....especially since many of the North on One commute traffic is coming from far away and are headed to San Jose
- Never again schedule a RTC meeting that is somewhere public transit does not serve, the Davenport hearing would have meant I leave Santa Cruz at 3pm for 5:30 meeting due to lack of bus runs, then I would have had to take a 1.5 hour ride to get back to Sanat Cruz due to lack of service...spend all the Rail money on increasing bus service instead of looking at pie in the sky choo choo trains

Dennis Speer 332 Union St Santa Cruz, CA 95060 831-234-7797 831-426-9276
From: denis.endisch@gmail.com [mailto:denis.endisch@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Denis Endisch
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2017 9:05 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: Susanne Endisch
Subject: Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing

Dear Kim Shultz,

We are very happy to learn about the the Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing project, we had just received an email and info flyer.
The project seems like a great way to connect adjacent communities and make the area more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. The connection using the Park Ave or State Park drive crossings are dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists and the added distance is a huge deterrent. For us accessibility by foot and bicycle has a big positive impact on the quality of life.
We own a property at Seacliff Drive which we have currently rented but we hope that we will live there by the time the project is completed.
Thanks,
Denis & Susanne Endisch
408-772-4274

From: denis.endisch@gmail.com [mailto:denis.endisch@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Denis Endisch
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2017 9:05 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: Susanne Endisch
Subject: Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing

Dear Kim Shultz,

We are very happy to learn about the the Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing project, we had just received an email and info flyer.
The project seems like a great way to connect adjacent communities and make the area more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. The connection using the Park Ave or State Park drive crossings are dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists and the added distance is a huge deterrent. For us accessibility by foot and bicycle has a big positive impact on the quality of life.
We own a property at Seacliff Drive which we have currently rented but we hope that we will live there by the time the project is completed.
Thanks,
Denis & Susanne Endisch
408-772-4274

From: Kim Shultz [mailto:kshultz@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2017 10:23 AM
To: denis.endisch@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing

Hello Denis and Susanne,

Thank you for your interest and support of the project. I have added your contact information to our community outreach data base to receive updates on the project and invitations to future public meetings.

- Kim

Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.460.3205
Direct 831.460.3208

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
The continued delay by RTC staff and leadership in promoting a passenger train instead of a walk, hike, and bike trail is unconcionable.

This county is quite simply too small and too lightly-populated, and has very few large employers, for a passenger rail service to ever attract sufficient ridership. A passenger train service would clearly be an enormously capital-intensive and unsustainable financial burden on area taxpayers, and a train jammed in next to a trail is impractical in neighborhoods which abut the existing rail lines from the Boardwalk to Rio Del Mar, Seascape, and La Selva.

Highway 1 is clogged by traffic, and this causes small businesses like mine considerable expenses in lost productivity every single day, sitting in traffic jams.

The repeated studies, polls, and surveys (as well as common sense) have shown that a passenger train is not feasible and will not reduce jammed traffic on Highway.

Why are you continuing to waste staff resources and time on this passenger rail service folly?

Why have you delayed working with CalTrans to come up with other more viable solutions such as widening Highway 1, which daily carries many more vehicles than it was originally designed for, and needs expansion to improve traffic flow?

Get with the program.

Implement a world-class trail-only solution, and start now.

Work with CalTrans now to expedite widening the widening of Highway 1, pronto.

Start now by spending limited taxpayer funds far more wisely and efficiently than you have demonstrated thus far.

Stop wasting your staff time and management efforts (and our limited taxpayer resources) on a train that will not attract sufficient ridership to ever be viable in a county with few employers and few potential riders.

Regards,
Michael Lavigne, Capitola resident, Capitola voter, and Capitola business owner

Broker Realtor License 01782392
Michael Lavigne Real Estate Services
MLRES & Associates Inc
331 Capitola Ave Ste B
Capitola, CA 95010
831-689-9784 cell
831-475-6410 office
Mike@FineMontereyBayHomes.com
Trains are needed between big population centers with good local transportation and high density. We have neither of these characteristics. But we do have an old train corridor which can be repurposed into a trail. Many examples of this type of repurposing can be found in the USA. Let us get going on this!

Scott Owen
Santa Cruz, Ca
Hello Kim!

Very eager to see the Mar Vista H1 overcrossing proceed! I live on Lotus Way - off Mar Vista on the wrong side of the freeway.

Actually sat on the RTC as an alternate back in...'87. Wanted the bridge built then and was told it was supposed to be done when the freeway was built because kids weren't supposed to be separated from their school - but other budget priorities then and ever since.

I very much want to attend the Monday meeting but I will be in Portland for a critical work trip. (Side note: I don't see the meeting on this https://sccrtc.org/calendar/ - wrong calendar or wrong date?)

Please know that my neighbors and all the avid beach goers on the inland side of the freeway want this! And thank you for your work on this!

David Urbanic
7250 Lotus Way
Aptos

---

From: Kim Shultz [mailto:kshultz@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 19, 2017 2:25 PM
To: david@urbanic.org
Cc: Oscar Tsai
Subject: RE: Message to Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner

Hello David,

Thank you for your past service to the RTC and continued support and patience for this project to get underway. At this point we are purposely conducting "focused stakeholder" meetings on the project to get some qualitative input to identify the various issues and sensitivity of the community towards this project. There will be larger, advertised public meetings shortly after the first of the year and I am copying the consultant team on this message that your name and contact information can be added to the roster of engaged community members for notification of upcoming project meetings.

Travel safely,
-Kim

Kim Shultz, Highway 1 Project Manager
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Dear Commissioners:

It’s a nightmare! Since we don’t have a three lane for the entire length of highway between Santa Cruz and Watsonville it is park and go during most of the day. It’s no longer limited to just the regular commute times. The infrastructure of our highway 1 and all backroads were never designed to handle the number of cars traveling them.

Our muni-system means extra hours on the bus. Most full time working folks don’t have time to indulge in adding hours to the work day. With the housing crunch being what it is commuters are traveling from Monterey and San Benito counties daily and then need to go home again.

For decades I have heard about a train line. Where is it? Why isn’t this being developed? We need reliable and efficient mass transit in this county. There has got to be a way to get this project up and running before more folks die in a wreck on the over congested roads.

I must be singing to choir on this however, do any of you commute to an 8-5 job in this county from one end to the other? Imagine less gas cars on the roads and how much better the quality of our air would be as well. We can’t all drive electric cars and there aren’t enough charging stations to do so regardless.

Please do something about the abysmal condition of our commute system in this county. I know I would prefer to take a train to work rather than drive. Our little fishing village has outgrown its’ infrastructure to the point of being ridiculous and unsafe.

Please hear my voice and make a progressive change

Tamera Norman
Commuter in Santa Cruz County
September 19, 2017

Mr. Zach Friend
Commission Chair
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, California 95060-3911

Re: President's Special Acknowledgement Award - Workers' Compensation Program

Dear Mr. Friend:

This letter and enclosed certificate are to formally acknowledge the dedicated efforts of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Governing Body, management and staff towards proactive loss prevention and workplace safety for earning the President’s Special Acknowledgement Award! The Award is to recognize members with no “paid” claims during the prior five consecutive program years in the Workers' Compensation Program.

A “paid” claim for the purposes of this recognition represents the first payment on an open claim during the prior program year. Your agency’s efforts have resulted in no “paid” workers’ compensation claims for the prior 5 consecutive program years including 2016-17. This is an outstanding accomplishment that serves as an example for all SDRMA members!

It is through the efforts of members such as Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission that SDRMA has been able to continue providing affordable workers’ compensation coverage to over 439 public agencies throughout California. While 270 members or 61% in the workers’ compensation program had no “paid” claims in program year 2016-17, 127 members or 29% had no paid claims for the prior 5 consecutive years.

In addition to this annual recognition, members with no “paid” claims during 2016-17 earned 2 credit incentive points (CIPs) reducing their annual contribution amount and members with no “paid” claims for the prior 5 consecutive program years earned 3 additional bonus CIPs. Also, members without claims receive a lower “experience modification factor” (EMOD) which also reduces their annual contribution amount.

Included with this letter and certificate is your press release template so your agency may showcase this important accomplishment.

On behalf of the SDRMA Board of Directors and staff, it is my privilege to congratulate your Governing Body, management and staff for your commitment to proactive loss prevention and safety in the workplace.

Sincerely,
Special District Risk Management Authority

Jean Bracy, President
Board of Directors
Congratulations on your excellent claims record. In an open claim during the last period, you have demonstrated your commitment to securing the best possible outcomes for our claims. Your efforts have resulted in a significant reduction in the number of claims processed.

The Presidents' Special Recognition Award is presented to recognize outstanding performance in the field of claims management. Your dedication and hard work have not gone unnoticed.

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

Hereby gives special recognition to

The President of the Special District Risk Management Authority

President's Special Recognition Award

Special District Risk Management Authority
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
RE: Nominating Committee for 2018 RTC Chair and Vice Chair

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Chair appoint a nominating committee to nominate the RTC Chair and Vice Chair for 2018 and assist the RTC in choosing a Chair and Vice Chair at the RTC’s December 7, 2017 meeting.

BACKGROUND

Under Section II the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Rules & Regulations states:

“The Commission shall, at its regular meeting in December of each year, choose one of its members to serve as Chair and one of its members to serve as Vice Chair, to serve for one year, beginning in January, or until the election of their successors.

... The Chair shall preside at the meeting of the Commission. If s/he is absent or unable to act, the Vice Chair shall serve until the Chair returns or is able to act. The Vice Chair has all the powers and duties of the Chair while acting as Chair. The Vice Chair shall preside at the TPW meetings and if the Vice Chair is absent, the Chair shall preside at the TPW meetings. If both the Chair and Vice Chair are absent from a meeting, the Executive Director shall open the meeting and the Commission shall elect a Chair to preside only at that meeting.”

DISCUSSION

In preparation for choosing a Chair and Vice Chair, at the November RTC meeting, the RTC Chair appoints a nominating committee to nominate a Chair and Vice Chair at the RTC’s December meeting. Generally, the nominating committee is composed of three commissioners and meets once between the November and December RTC meetings to decide on whom to nominate.

The current RTC Chair is Commissioner Zach Friend, Santa Cruz County Supervisor and Commissioner Cynthia Chase, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District is the current RTC Vice Chair. Staff recommends that the RTC Chair appoint a nominating committee to nominate the RTC Chair and Vice Chair for 2018.
and assist the RTC in choosing a Chair and Vice Chair at the RTC’s December 7, 2017 meeting.

SUMMARY

Per the RTC’s Rules & Regulation an RTC Chair and Vice Chair are elected at its December meeting; therefore, staff recommends that a nominating committee be appointed by the RTC Chair to nominate a chair and vice chair for 2018 at the RTC’s December meeting.
District Director’s Report
A quarterly publication for our transportation partners

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.catc.ca.gov/programs/SB1.html

CTP Guidelines Adopted

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

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 1, 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/tpp/grants.html

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

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.

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!
### 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><strong>Highway 17 Storm Water Mitigation (0Q600)</strong></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>
<td>Periodic closures will occur in the right southbound lane mostly during overnight hours. Work is expected daily from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. from September through May 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 17 Shoulder Widening and Concrete Guardrail (0T980)</strong></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>
<td>Project is scheduled for completion in fall 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 236 Resurfacing (1F340)</strong></td>
<td>From Boulder Creek to Waterman Gap (PM 0.0-16.0)</td>
<td>Resurface the existing roadway</td>
<td>Fall 2016-Winter 2017</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Kelly McClain (KB)</td>
<td>Graniterock, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Punch list work may continue for the next month or two. Work is scheduled for completion by December 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 129 Open Grade Overlay and Metal Beam Guardrail Upgrade (1F030)</strong></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 (KB)</td>
<td>Graniterock, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Project is scheduled to begin in October 2017.</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>5. <strong>Highway 1 Pavement Overlay</strong> (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>
<td>Project is on schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Highway 1/Highway 17 Ramp Safety Improvements</strong> (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>
<td>Project is on schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Highway 9 Shoulder Widening, Guardrail Upgrades, and Center Rumble Strips</strong> (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>
<td>Project is scheduled to advertise for construction in summer 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Highway 129/Lakeview Road Intersection Improvements</strong> (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>
<td>Project is on schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Highway 129/Carlton Road Intersection Improvements</strong> (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>
<td>Project is scheduled to advertise for construction in spring 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>Highway 152 Americans with Disabilities Act</strong> (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>
<td>Project is on schedule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director
RE: California State Rail Plan

THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND

On October 11 Caltrans released the new 2018 California State Rail Plan. This plan represents one aspect of significant changes in the state’s approach to meeting future transportation needs. Consistent with state policies on climate change and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, this strategic plan provides a framework to plan and implement California’s rail network for the next 20 years and beyond. The plan provides operating and capital investment strategies leading to a coordinated, statewide travel system. Caltrans says that “by 2040, Californians will have access to an integrated, state-of-the-art rail system that will revolutionize personal mobility and enhance quality of life.” A Fact Sheet is provided as Attachment 1, and the Executive Summary as Attachment 2. The link to the full report is provided above.

DISCUSSION

There are some notable differences between this draft strategic plan and prior state rail plans. First, this plan takes an integrated approach to rail service statewide. Service will be developed on a hub system, similar to the way airlines schedule service. Coordinated schedules will be timed to make transfer times brief and predictable. Express bus and urban rail components are included as essential links in the network.

Second, the plan is consistent with state goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Third, with the passage of SB 1 new funding for rail investment is now available. Programs include: State Rail Assistance, Transit and Intercity Rail Capital program, Congested Corridor program, and State Transit Assistance.

Fourth, the plan is bold. By 2040 the plan projects that trips by rail will grow from a current 110,000 daily trips to 1.3 million daily trips in 2040.
Kyle Gradinger, Acting Division Chief of Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transportation, will provide a presentation and lead a discussion on the plan. Caltrans is accepting public comments on the plan until December 11, 2017.

SUMMARY

Caltrans has issued a draft 2018 California State Rail Plan. A presentation and discussion will be provided.

Attachments:
   1. Fact Sheet
   2. Executive summary
The Rail Plan establishes a long-term vision for prioritizing state investment in an efficient, effective passenger and freight rail system, which supports the goals and policies of the California Transportation Plan 2040. The Rail Plan identifies service goals, capital costs, and a phased strategy for achieving the Vision. This ambitious plan identifies a coordinated, statewide passenger rail network that will get Californians where they want to go, when they want to go, and enhance the movement of goods by rail to support California’s industries and the economy.

**PASSENGER RAIL:** Rail Plan investments will open the door for travelers to glide past traffic on reliable trains and buses in dedicated lanes; transfer quickly and easily with timed transfers; and to plan an entire, door-to-door trip, even on different trains, using a single ticket.

**FREIGHT RAIL:** The Rail Plan establishes state priorities for freight: improving trade corridors, yards and terminals, and access for businesses; and enhancing the competitiveness of California’s ports and intermodal transfer facilities.

**WHAT IS THE 2018 CALIFORNIA STATE RAIL PLAN?**

**The Short-Term Plan (2022)**
- Caltrain electrification
- Committed rail improvements/extensions
- More bus connections to fill gaps
- Elimination of existing rail freight bottlenecks
- Statewide service planning – connect train routes

**The Ten Year Plan (2027)**
- High Speed Rail – Central Valley to Silicon Valley
- More frequencies using available capacity
- Timed connections between services
- Fully operational integrated ticketing
- Rail freight – shared passenger lines, trade corridors

**The Vision (2040)**
- High Speed Rail – Anaheim to San Francisco by 2029
- High Speed Rail connections – Sacramento, Inland Empire, San Diego
- New regional rail system connections
- Regular frequencies & fast services

**IMPLEMENTATION HIGHLIGHTS**

**contact us**

For more information, or to view the Rail Plan and submit comments, please visit our website at [www.CaliforniaStateRailPlan.com/comments.html](http://www.CaliforniaStateRailPlan.com/comments.html) or email RailPlan@dot.ca.gov.
Rail Plan Vision:
California has a premier, customer-focused, integrated rail system that successfully moves people and products while enhancing economic growth and quality of life.
Building California’s Future

California is the world’s sixth-largest economy, and home to nearly 40 million people. California supports world-class cities, universities, research centers, and the world’s most valuable, innovative, and technologically advanced companies. The State’s landscapes include productive agricultural areas and spectacular natural beauty—from the shoreline to the mountains to the deserts. This natural beauty, alongside thriving communities, draws visitors and residents alike to support the State’s innovative economy, spur its entrepreneurial spirit, and sustain its creative culture.

To continue to compete and thrive on the cutting edge of global technology, to lead the State’s efforts to curb climate change, and to grow sustainably and resiliently in a fast-changing world, Californians must invest in and build a high-performance statewide rail system befitting their needs and ambitions.
Recent events have added significant new momentum that will lead to a renaissance of rail transportation throughout the State. At the local level, many counties have passed sales tax measures that add tremendous resources to the development of passenger rail—most notably in Los Angeles, Santa Clara, and Alameda Counties. At the State level, the passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) (the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017) provides the long-term resources to invest in the State’s rail system. We have the opportunity to grow service in congested corridors, launch new rail services and extensions, develop customer-friendly connections, provide statewide integrated ticketing and trip planning, reduce delays and travel times, and attract new riders to the statewide rail network. This is an opportunity to transform how we travel throughout the state.

By 2040, Californians will have access to an integrated, state-of-the-art rail system that will revolutionize personal mobility and enhance quality of life. Passenger rail will be the option of choice for a large share of regional and long-distance travel in the state. It will help Californians achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) and air quality goals while boosting economic growth and helping to create more livable communities. Passenger rail trips are expected to increase more than ten-fold to over 1.3 million per day, while mode shift to rail increases six-fold over the current share.

California’s rail system will expand its ability to move freight cleanly and efficiently, benefiting Californians and California’s businesses, as well as supporting national competitiveness. Freight rail capacity will significantly increase to handle a more than doubling of demand, almost entirely within existing rail corridor rights-of-way. Federal, State, and local agencies will partner with privately owned freight railroads to support this growth.
California State Rail Plan Overview

The 2018 California State Rail Plan (Rail Plan) is a strategic plan with operating and capital investment strategies that will lead to a coordinated, statewide travel system. The Rail Plan is an important element in the comprehensive planning and analysis of statewide transportation investment strategies detailed in the California Transportation Plan 2040 (CTP 2040). In concert with CTP 2040 and other plans, it will help clear the air, invigorate our cities, and provide the mobility Californians need in the future. Regional plans will build on the Rail Plan as they make use of new regional rail capacity, develop transit networks, and set land use recommendations that benefit from enhanced connectivity. Federal and State grant awards and funding decisions will consider project alignment with the 2040 Vision and strategies reflected in the Rail Plan.

This Rail Plan is more ambitious than previous rail plans. In compliance with Federal and State laws, it proposes a unified statewide rail network that better integrates passenger and freight service, connects passenger rail to other transportation modes, and supports smart mobility. The Rail Plan acknowledges the need for expanded freight capacity to support future economic needs.

The Rail Plan aims to capture an increasing percentage of travel demand by rail. California’s population will be 48 million by 2040, a 30 percent increase from 2010. Jobs are expected to grow at similar rates, with a 31 percent increase by 2040.

California has already built the best statewide rail and bus system in the country—the result of concentrated efforts starting in the 1990s. Intercity and regional ridership is booming, as services that didn’t even exist 25 years ago play a vital role throughout the state. In total, current intercity and regional ridership exceeds 110,000 per day and provide connections to the wide local transit network.

The rail system can still provide more service within potential latent capacity, and more efficient performance. With longer trains, more frequent services, better connectivity, and ease of access, the number of riders will grow, reducing average costs per passenger. More trains, more often, with faster travel times will be auto- and air competitive, and motivate travelers to use rail and transit for more daily trips. The user-friendly, high-performance statewide system described in the 2040 Vision will carry more than 1.3 million daily trips by 2040. It will do so at a lower cost, allowing fares that encourage additional ridership and reduced public subsidies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Ridership</th>
<th>110,000 Daily Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business as Usual (2040)</td>
<td>161,000 Daily Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Vision</td>
<td>1,313,000 Daily Trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. For full ridership numbers, see Section 2.1.1 in the 2018 California State Rail Plan.
A great deal of implementation planning by State and local agencies, in partnership with each other, will be guided by the vision and strategies in the Rail Plan. Although clear investment priorities are indicated between now and 2040, the exact nature of the specific capital investments needed, as well as the phasing of network improvements, requires further input from local communities, current and future rail system users, and businesses to ensure that impacts of network development are acceptable, costs are justifiable, and benefits are wide-spread.

The Rail Plan was developed by Caltrans with extensive input from stakeholders and public outreach. The final plan is approved by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), and will be reviewed and accepted by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). Caltrans also receives advice from the California Transportation Commission (CTC), and will submit the final approved Rail Plan to the Legislature, the Governor, the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), and the CTC.
California’s Vision for an Integrated Statewide Rail Network

The integrated passenger rail system described in the 2040 Vision is comprised of high-speed, intercity and regional train services connecting at hubs to enable smooth transfers between trains, express buses, local transit, and even ferry boats. To facilitate efficient service and market-driven growth, the rail system can continue to expand capacity, largely on existing rights-of-way, while being sensitive to existing communities. This Vision will extend the significant benefits of high-speed rail and multimodal connectivity to residents across the state.

The 2040 Vision will allow people to:

- Travel seamlessly across urban, suburban, and rural areas of the state with more trains, more often: Departures at least every hour – and every 30 minutes or better in most markets;
- Save time with significantly faster trips;
- Enjoy the journey on modern, safe, clean, and comfortable trains;
- Glide past traffic congestion on reliable trains and express buses in dedicated lanes;
- Transfer quickly and easily between high-speed, intercity, and regional trains, express buses, and transit at hub stations with coordinated arrivals and departures with significantly reduced wait times;

And plan entire door-to-door trips, and purchase a single ticket using a streamlined trip-planning portal.

2 Some low-density areas of the state may have bi-hourly or every-4-hour service until the market matures.
Additionally, shippers will benefit from more reliable and environmentally-friendly shipping options as freight rail capacity grows and freight train operations benefit from many fewer delays from passenger train movements. Coordinated planning and investments among public agencies and private railroads will ensure that freight rail operators will benefit from the strategies in this plan.

Coordinated and ongoing planning allows State and regional agencies responsible for rail services to have a conversation with communities about how best to meet diverse needs. Investing in rail will increase the mode share of freight and passenger rail, support a growing economy while lowering statewide transportation costs, integrating rail travel network with existing state highways and airports, improving safety, lowering greenhouse gas emissions, and enhancing livability. Highways and local roads will benefit from having their capacity used for high-value trips that cannot be made by rail, and airports will benefit from having their capacity available for higher-profit long-distance flights. Locally, California cities and towns will benefit from the private investment that follows station-area development.

“California has a premier, customer-focused, integrated rail system that successfully moves people and products while enhancing growth and quality of life.”
The 2040 Vision for passenger rail introduces new services and expands the State’s rail network into new areas of California and across State borders, including the congested international border into Mexico.

The passenger component of the California rail vision includes several key elements:

**Statewide System** – Passenger rail service will tie together urban, suburban, and rural areas of the state.

**Integrated Services** – Multimodal hubs will connect all levels of service with a common fare system, which allows trips to be made on a single ticket.

**Coordinated Schedules** – Services will be coordinated in a ‘Pulsed’ schedule across the network to reduce wait times and allow direct transfers.

**Frequent Service** – Service frequency will make rail a timely option for travelers, meeting trip demands throughout the day.

**Customer Focus** – Enhanced ticketing, scheduling, and passenger information will be supported by coordinated services.
2040 Integrated Network – Northern California

Service Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail Service - Operating Speed Over 125 Miles Per Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Service - Operating Speed Up To 125 Miles Per Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express Bus / Urban Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amtrak Long Distance Trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Boat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2040 Integrated Network – Southern California
California is the sixth-largest economy in the world, with an annual gross domestic product of over $2.4 trillion. California businesses export roughly $162 billion worth of goods to more than 225 foreign countries annually. The State’s extensive rail network supports California’s economy, while minimizing impacts on air quality compared to other modes. Rail is an efficient, safe, and cost-effective way to move goods, because energy consumption and GHG emissions per ton carried are far lower than diesel trucks.

The ability of the State’s freight railroads to deliver these benefits depends on fluid traffic conditions on the railroads’ main lines. By 2040, the State’s freight railroad loads will increase 38 percent, compared to 2013. Investments to address bottlenecks, improve operations, and increase capacity throughout the network will reduce congestion and delays. In turn, an improved freight rail network will help shift goods movement away from congested roadways, which have a limited ability to expand.

Improvements in California’s rail system are investments that will pay off with greater economic activity: new construction, more jobs, and growing tax revenues. The goods movement industry creates valuable jobs at California’s ports and intermodal transfer facilities, warehouses, and distribution centers. Investment in the rail system supports diverse industries by making California’s businesses more efficient and competitive.
The Rail Plan **freight investment strategy** envisions an evolving partnership between the State, regions and the freight railroads to:

Eliminate bottlenecks and use existing corridors more intensively, enhancing the capabilities of both freight and passenger trains in the short term;

Utilize significant new federal and state funding programs, such as FASTLANE and TCEA, to implement corridor investment programs for freight improvements;

Make shared investments that improve the performance and utility of freight and passenger operations through strategic identification of infrastructure projects that provide benefits to all operators, and

Implement quiet zones and grade separations, as well as foster the use of cleaner and quieter locomotives that will make railroads better neighbors.

The Rail Plan identifies $40.8 billion of direct expenditures planned by private railroads and regional agencies, resulting in total economic output of nearly $77.5 billion by 2040—a payout of nearly two dollars for every dollar invested. The expenditures will result in nearly 463,000 full-time jobs, and labor income surpassing $28 billion across industries. By 2040, State and local tax revenues anticipated from the expenditures will be close to $2 billion, and Federal tax revenues will be $5.4 billion. New Federal and State trade corridor funding will accelerate many of these investments, bringing the economic benefits sooner. In addition to these planned expenditures, many of the projects that bring about passenger rail expansion will deliver significant capacity and operational benefits for freight rail as well.
Ensuring Economic Competitiveness

The 2040 projections show significant intermodal growth from 2013—more than double the goods moving through the transcontinental routes. **Ensuring the State’s economic competitiveness has been the guiding principle behind California’s Trade Corridor Investment Fund program.** Strategic investments, such as the Colton Crossing grade separation, eliminated bottlenecks for Union Pacific Railroad and BNSF Railway traffic at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. The new Trade Corridor Enhancement Account (TCEA), created through SB 1, will provide new opportunities to address strategic investments in highway and rail trade corridors, with additional funding of almost $300 million annually for the coming decade and beyond.

**Projected Intermodal Growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2013 Growth (Millions of Tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest and Northwest</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit: Millions of Tons
The freight component of the Rail Plan includes several key elements:

First, a **premier system** requires improved trade corridors, yards and terminals, upgraded track conditions for short lines; and innovative service concepts that have efficiency and safety benefits for all users.

Second, a **customer-focused** system will lead to improved access to the rail network (Class I and short lines), with competitive cost and service (improved speeds and service options), enhancing options for the State’s shippers.

Third, an **integrated system** requires improved intermodal terminal and transload connections to smooth transfers between modes.

Fourth, the Rail Plan is focused on supporting development of a rail network that moves both **people and products**, and on addressing strategies and improvements for coordinating passenger and freight service and preserving freight capacity as passenger services grow.

Fifth, **economic growth** will be achieved through trade corridor improvements and the availability of competitive modal options for California’s industries.

Finally, the Rail Plan supports improvements in California’s **quality of life** through modal energy/ emissions benefits associated with movement of freight by rail and mode-shift to rail where feasible. The Rail Plan also addresses grade crossing impacts.
Shifting from Highway to Railway

The 2040 Vision improvements make it possible for people to drive less. Reducing automobile passenger trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduces roadway congestion, GHG, and vehicle emissions, and supports the State’s Assembly Bill 32 Scoping Plan target of 80 percent reduction of GHG emissions from 1990 levels by 2050.

The 2040 Vision projects 88 million daily passenger miles diverted to rail from highways and an increase of 92 million daily passenger miles on rail as a result of the investments outlined in the Rail Plan.

A reduction of that volume would:

- **Eliminate over 13 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalence annually,**3 comparable to planting more than 166 million urban trees every year.

- **Decrease highway congestion,** resulting in fewer hours lost commuting, less damage to roads, and providing more efficient travel of goods and people.

Compared to air travel, the projected 1.3 million rail riders per day is 3 times the number of passengers boarding flights at California’s 7 largest airports (LAX, SFO, SAN, OAK, SNA, SJC, and SMF)4. It would take nearly 3,000 Boeing 747 Jumbo Jets to carry the same number of daily passengers.

**Rail Mode Share**

- Current: 0.34%
- 2040 No Build: 0.52%
- 2040 Vision: 6.8%

Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Mitigate roadway congestion
Reduce vehicle emissions

---

3 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Greenhouse Gases Equivalencies Calculator.
4 U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Table 1-44, Passengers Boarded at the Top 50 U.S. Airports.
Advancing Sustainability and Livability

The Rail Plan advances the State’s commitment to reduce GHG and other pollutants by providing a competitive alternative to private vehicle travel and diesel-truck transport. California high-speed rail (HSR) will be fully electrified, and powered by 100 percent renewable energy. Many intercity, regional, and urban transit passenger services will benefit from electrification or other zero emission technology, often through sharing infrastructure with the growing HSR network.

By 2040, more than half of passenger trips and the majority of passenger miles of travel will take place on electrified trains in California. Diesel-electric and other alternative clean technology passenger and freight locomotives will reduce GHG emissions, making rail a greener mode of transportation.

- Offer a convenient and reliable alternative to private vehicle travel
- Increase electric and zero emission trains
- Provide alternative to truck transport of containerized cargo

![CO₂ per Passenger Mile (in grams)](chart.png)
Improving Safety

Emerging technologies offer opportunities to increase the safety and capacity of passenger and freight rail. Positive Train Control is capable of preventing train-to-train collisions, monitoring train speed, and stopping a train in an emergency. New technology can improve train operations in environmentally sensitive or dense urban areas to further reduce potential accidents.

Passenger rail is considered a far safer mode of travel and risk of personal injuries and deaths are currently 17 times lower than traveling in auto and even safer on high speed trains. An anticipated reduction of 74 million daily VMT away from highways can potentially eliminate 250 fatalities and 19,000 transportation related injuries in California by 2040, supporting the State’s goal of adopting a “Toward Zero Deaths” practice, in coordination with local Vision Zero programs.

The most dangerous element of the rail network is grade crossings. Combined with new funding sources, such as the Federal FAST Act and State TCEA, Federal railroad crossing safety programs and Caltrans-administered State programs, including the Section 130 Railroad/Highway At-Grade Crossing Improvement and the Section 190 Grade Separation programs, will continue to upgrade safety devices or eliminate rail/highway grade crossings throughout the state.
Rail funding in California is a unique partnership among Federal, State, regional, and private sources. Newly passed SB 1 provides a significant enhancement of the funding available to State and regional agencies responsible for many of the rail services. Future improvements in intercity and regional services, as well as HSR, will allow operating revenues to provide significant resources to invest in rail corridor improvements.

2040 Vision
Overall Capital Program (in Billions) Time Horizon

Key rail funding sources and programs:

- Local Transportation Fund
- Local Sales Tax
- State Transit Assistance
- Intercity Rail Program Funding
- State Transportation Improvement Program
- California Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund
- Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program
- HSR Funding:
  » Proposition 1A bonds
  » Additional funding and program enhancements guided by SB1
    » State Transit Assistance
    » State Rail Assistance
    » Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program
    » Congested Corridor Program
    » Trade Corridor Enhancement Account
- Federal Discretionary Programs
  » TIGER
  » FASTLANE/INFRA
  » FTA’s Capital Investment Grants
  » FRA’s FAST Act grants
- Federal Formula Programs

5 Estimated costs in 2018 dollars. These costs are planning-level estimates and require further study in implementation.
Implementation Goals: A Phased Approach

To achieve the 2040 Vision, the Rail Plan identifies phased investments to reach frequency and connectivity goals. Strategic implementation plans, most developed between now and 2022, will guide investments and implementation planning, to avoid redundancy and deliver enhancements sooner.

Statewide Service Highlights

2022

The statewide plan for 2022 or earlier identifies service improvements that will lay the foundation for improving and integrating the passenger rail network. Advancing projects allow expansion of service, including Caltrain electrification, expansion of rail service to Redlands Salinas and Larkspur, and increased frequencies on segments of intercity and regional rail corridors. These efforts include programmed funding, or funding expected to be awarded in 2018, and identified capacity within host railroad agreements.

Additional efforts include:

- Assisting communities statewide in better connecting transit systems to rail, and enhancing station area functions;
- Land use planning and development to cluster jobs and housing at station hubs;
- Strategic planning for fleet management, replacement, and expansion; and
- Conducting targeted investments in integrated ticketing and travel planning.
The 2027 or earlier service goals focus on initial high speed rail services; targeted improvements for integrating intercity and regional rail with HSR; and maximizing service in existing rail corridors. Key components of the 2027 plan include expansion of service to the San Francisco Transbay Terminal, Merced, Coachella Valley, and Las Vegas; with significant growth in intercity and regional rail frequencies on all existing corridors, including the Central Coast.

Additional efforts include:

- Initiation of statewide pulse-hub operations;
- Full use of programmed passenger corridor capacity statewide;
- Full use of negotiated passenger service capacity on existing freight corridors;
- Targeted investments at hubs to connect to HSR
- Fully developed and operational integrated ticketing; and
- Implementation of a new fleet strategy.

The 2040 or earlier Vision represents the full build-out of the long-term planning goals for the integrated statewide rail network.

The 2040 Vision highlights include:

- HSR expanded and integrated service to Sacramento, the Inland Empire, and San Diego;
- Completion of a new Transbay tube, allowing fast service between Sacramento, San Francisco, and throughout the Bay Area;
- Completion of many complementary corridor investments in the Los Angeles Basin;
- Significant new regional services in the Central Valley, on the Central Coast, and in the North Bay;
- Expansion of network capacity in full realization of the integrated service goals; and
- Intensification of services implemented during the 2022 and 2027 horizon years.
Statewide Rail Stakeholders

We would like to thank the following agencies and consultants:

**California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA)**
Brian Kelly, Secretary  
Chad Edison, Deputy Secretary for Transportation  
Brian Annis, Undersecretary  
Ben De Alba, Assistant Secretary for Rail and Ports  
Kate White, Deputy Secretary for Environmental Policy and Housing Coordination

**Prepared by**

**California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans)**
Andrew Cook, Chief, Rail Planning Branch  
Emily Burstein, Chief, Office of Rail Planning and Operations Support  
Shannon Simonds, Transportation Planner  
Shalini Chandra, Transportation Planner  
Denise Cross, Associate Transportation Planner  
Clem Bomar, Retired Annuitant  
Kyle Gradinger, Acting Division Chief

**With assistance from**

AECOM  
Cambridge Systematics  
Arellano Associates  
Center for Collaborative Policy  
Kimley-Horn Associates  
SMA Rail Consulting + IT  
Steer Davies Gleave  
T. Kear Transportation Planning & Management

**State & Federal Agency Partners**

- CalSTA
- California Air Resources Board
- California Freight Advisory Committee
- California High Speed Rail Authority
- California Public Utilities Commission
- California Transportation Commission
- Federal Railroad Administration
- Governor’s Office of Business & Economic Development (GoBiz)
- National Railroad Passenger Corporation / Amtrak
- State of Arizona Department of Transportation
- State of Nevada Department of Transportation / XpressWest

**Intercity Passenger Rail and Rail Transit**

- Bay Area Rapid Transit / BART
- Capital Corridor Joint Powers Authority / Northern California Rail Partners
- Los Angeles – San Diego – San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency Joint Powers Authority
- Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- North County Transit District
- Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board / Caltrain
- Sacramento Regional Transit / SacRT
- San Diego Metropolitan Transit System
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency / MUNI
- San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority / Altamont Corridor Express
- Sonoma Marin Area Regional Transit
- Southern California Regional Rail Authority / Metrolink
- Valley Transportation Authority
Regional Planning Agencies
California Association of Councils of Governments
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
San Benito Council of Governments
San Bernardino Association of Governments
San Diego Association of Governments
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Southern California Association of Governments
Riverside County Transportation Commission
Transportation Agency for Monterey County

Freight Rail
California Shortline Railroad Association
California Association of Port Authorities / California Airports Council
BNSF Railway
Genesee & Wyoming Inc.
Pacific Merchants Shipping Association
Union Pacific Railroad

Advocates
California Transit Association
California Farm Bureau Federation
Local Government Commission
The Nature Conservancy

Tribal Representation
Native American Advisory Committee
Northern California Chairman’s Association
Central California Chairman’s Association
Southern California Chairman’s Association
AGENDA: November 2, 2017

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Highway 1 Corridor Tiered Environmental Document – Selection of the Preferred Project Alternatives

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) support the decision of the Project Development Team in selecting the HOV Lane Alternative as the preferred Tier I project alternative and the Build Alternative as the preferred Tier II alternative in the Tiered Environmental Document for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program.

BACKGROUND

On November 4, 2015, Caltrans released the Draft Tiered Environmental Document for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program with the following tiers:

- Tier I - a program level vision for the long term improvement of Highway 1, between Morrissey Boulevard and San Andreas/Larkin Valley Road, and
- Tier II - project level analysis for the construction of auxiliary lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive and a bike/pedestrian overcrossing at Chanticleer Avenue.

During the 92-day public comment period Caltrans received over 900 comments. The comments were categorized and evaluated to determine if technical studies completed as part of the draft environmental document required updating to properly respond to comments and/or to address regulatory changes after the preparation of the draft environmental report. The key issues identified through this review process included traffic, air quality, green house gases, biological resources, cumulative impacts, and growth inducement. Over the past two years the Project Development Team (PDT) has overseen the update of pertinent studies and preparation of draft responses to the more significant comments to ensure that all issues were properly identified and addressed.

DISCUSSION

The PDT is essentially the steering committee for the project. Participants in the PDT include a wide range of disciplines as determined by the challenges presented by a specific project and phase of development. On large complex projects the PDT includes representatives from outside agencies that have a stake in the outcome of
a project. The PDT for the environmental phase of the Highway 1 Corridor Project includes Caltrans, the RTC, Santa Cruz County and all of the cities in the county, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, and the California Highway Patrol.

An initial, critical task of the PDT is building consensus on a project’s purpose and need to guide the project’s preliminary design and environmental analysis phase. A project’s purpose and need is used in the identification of project alternatives to be evaluated and helps provide a basis from which a preferred alternative is ultimately selected. The purpose and needs of the Tier I and Tier II projects are listed in Attachment 1 and include reducing congestion, improving safety, promoting and encouraging alternative transportation and addressing “cut-through” traffic on local streets.

The consultant team will provide an overview of the project including a description of the project alternatives and project phasing, and the status of environmental studies leading to the selection of preferred alternatives by the PDT. To guide the decision process of selecting the preferred Tier I and Tier II project alternatives the consultant team prepared a comparative matrix of various project attributes and performance measures by the respective alternatives (see Attachment 2).

The PDT used this matrix in selecting the HOV Lane alternative as the preferred Tier I project and the Build Alternative as the preferred Tier II project. In making its unanimous decision, the PDT cited the following reasons for making their recommendations:

- The HOV Lane and Tier II Build Alternative best meet the stated purposes and needs of the respective projects;
- The HOV Lane alternative provides more options for future Tier II projects than would be provided by the Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative to better respond to any changes in future travel patterns;
- The HOV Lane alternative would reduce cut-through traffic on local streets and roads, which is important to the community, and which in turn is expected to further reduce the production of greenhouse gases beyond the Highway 1 Corridor as measured in the environmental studies;
- The HOV Lane alternative provides more incentives for carpooling and travel time savings and efficiencies in providing transit services, as well as improved bike and pedestrian facilities; and,
- The Tier II Build Alternative is consistent with the Measure D transportation sales tax measure recently approved by the voters.

While Caltrans is ultimately responsible for selecting the preferred alternatives the majority of funding beyond normal maintenance and operation of Highway 1 falls within the authority of the RTC. Therefore, RTC’s action is significant and based on the results of the comprehensive environmental evaluation staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) support the decision of the Project Development Team in selecting the HOV Lane Alternative as the preferred Tier I project alternative and the Build Alternative as the
preferred Tier II alternative in the Tiered Environmental Document for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program.

SUMMARY

The Project Development Team (PDT) has completed the update of technical studies in response to changes in regulatory guidelines and public comments on the draft environmental document to ensure that all issues have been properly identified and addressed. In accordance with the project development process it is the PDT’s responsibility to evaluate the findings of this analysis against the project’s purpose and need (Attachment 1) in making a recommendation as to the preferred project alternatives. To guide the decision process the consultant team prepared a comparative matrix of various project attributes and performance measures by the respective Tier I and Tier II project alternatives (see Attachment 2). Staff recommends the RTC support the decision of the PDT in selecting the HOV Lane Alternative and the Build Alternative as the preferred Tier I and Tier II project alternatives, respectively, as best meeting the stated projects’ goals.

Attachment:
1. Highway 1 Tiered Environmental Document - Project’s Purpose and Needs
2. Tier I and Tier II Alternative Project Attributes and Performance Matrix
Attachment 1

Highway 1 Corridor Tiered Environmental Document

Project’s Purpose and Needs

Tier I – Highway 1 Corridor Project

Purpose

- Reduce congestion.
- Promote the use of alternative transportation modes as a means to increase transportation system-capacity.
- Encourage carpooling and ridesharing.

Need

- Several bottlenecks along Highway 1 in the southbound and northbound directions cause recurrent congestion during peak hours.
- Travel time delays due to congestion are experienced by commuters, commerce, and emergency vehicles.
- “Cut-through” traffic, or traffic on local streets, occurs and is increasing because drivers seek to avoid congestion on the highway.
- Limited opportunities exist for pedestrians and bicyclists to safely get across Highway 1 within the project corridor.
- Insufficient incentives to increase transit service in the Highway 1 corridor because congestion threatens reliability and cost-effective transit service delivery.
- Inadequate facilities to support carpool and rideshare vehicles over single-occupant vehicles, reducing travel time savings and reliability.

Tier II - 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing

Purpose

- Reduce congestion.
- Improve safety.
- Promote the use of alternative transportation modes as means to increase transportation system capacity

Need

- Same as above Tier I Needs, and
- Improve operational safety to address accident rates in excess of the statewide average.
### Tier I Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>Right of Way</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Purpose and Need</th>
<th>Landscaping / Visual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier I HOV Alternative</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reconstruct 2 RR bridges</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>Highest cost between permitting challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier I TSM Alternative</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Same as HOV</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>Moderate cost between schedule efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Build</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Assessment: Tier I</td>
<td>Other Resources</td>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>FEI Circulation Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tier I HOV Alternative

- **Carbon monoxide**: 0.183 
- **Particulate matter (PM) less than 10 microns in diameter**: 0.02 acres 
- **Particulate matter (PM) less than 2.5 microns in diameter**: 0.03 acres

### Tier I TSM Alternative

- **Carbon monoxide**: 0.373 
- **Particulate matter (PM) less than 10 microns in diameter**: 0.02 acres 
- **Particulate matter (PM) less than 2.5 microns in diameter**: 0.01 acres

### No Build

- **Particulate matter (PM) less than 10 microns in diameter**: 0.00 acres 
- **Particulate matter (PM) less than 2.5 microns in diameter**: 0.00 acres
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives Assessment: Tier II</th>
<th>Right of Way</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Purpose and Need</th>
<th>Landscaping / Visual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier II Auxiliary Lane and Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing Alternative</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$17.9</td>
<td>Eliminate existing bottleneck between Soquel Avenue and 41st Avenue interchanges (northbound)</td>
<td>Moderate to moderately high visual impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Increases in traffic congestion for northbound and southbound directions during AM and PM peak hours</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose and Need**

- **Bottlenecks along Route 1**: Operational Safety
- **Pedestrian and Bicyclist Crossing of Route 1**: Operational Safety

**Landscaping**

- **Improve traffic operations along northbound corridor in AM peak hour**
- **Provide speed reduction warning signs at 41st Avenue southbound off-ramp**
- **Provide curve warning signs at northbound ramp to Soquel Drive**

**Visual**

- **Create bicycle and pedestrian safety crossings of Route 1**
- **Reduce congestion and improve mainline weaving maneuvers on Route 1**
- **No bike and ped crossing improvements other than replacement of La Fonda Avenue overcrossing**
- **No safety improvements at 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive interchanges**
## TIER II ALTERNATIVES

### Tier II Auxiliary Lane and Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Assessment: Tier II</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>4(f) Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Other Waters of the US</th>
<th>Wetlands</th>
<th>Protected Species</th>
<th>Hazardous Waste</th>
<th>Water Quality</th>
<th>Floodplain / Hydrology</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Paleo</th>
<th>Coastal and Other Permitting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tier II Build Alternative was prioritized due to its potential to relieve congestion and minimize traffic "hot spots".

- **Permanent Impacts to built environment:***
  - None
- **Hazardous Waste Implications:***
  - None
- **Air Quality Implications to 4(f) Resources:***
  - None
- **Water Quality Implications to 4(f) Resources:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources due to Air Quality:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources due to Other Waters:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources due to Wetlands:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources due to Protected Species:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources due to Hazardous Waste:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources due to Water Quality:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources due to Floodplain / Hydrology:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources due to Noise:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources due to Paleo:***
  - None
- **Implications to 4(f) Resources due to Coastal and Other Permitting:***
  - None

### No Build

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Assessment: Tier II</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>4(f) Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Other Waters of the US</th>
<th>Wetlands</th>
<th>Protected Species</th>
<th>Hazardous Waste</th>
<th>Water Quality</th>
<th>Floodplain / Hydrology</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Paleo</th>
<th>Coastal and Other Permitting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No soundwalls are feasible and reasonable; noise abatement will be considered for one house where the future predicted traffic noise level is higher than 70 dBA.

**Permitting Implications:**

- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None

---

**Environmental Conditions:**

- **Four Recognized Environmental Conditions:**
  - None
- **Environmental Implications:**
  - None
- **Additional Acres of Imperious Surface:**
  - None
- **General Change to Floodplains / Floodways:**
  - None
- **Risk of Anticipated Impacts:**
  - None

**Permitting Implications:**

- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None

---

**Permitting Implications:**

- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None

---

**Permitting Implications:**

- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None

---

**Permitting Implications:**

- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None

---

**Permitting Implications:**

- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None

---

**Permitting Implications:**

- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None

---

**Permitting Implications:**

- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None

---

**Permitting Implications:**

- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)  
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director  
RE: Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 Budget and Work Program

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1):

1. Approving the proposed amended fiscal year (FY) 2017-18 Budget and Work Program (Exhibit A to Attachment 1); and

2. Exchanging federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds for state Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX) funds as shown on page 17 of Exhibit A to Attachment 1.

BACKGROUND

In March of each year, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approves a budget and work program for the upcoming fiscal year. In the fall, the RTC amends the budget and work program to incorporate information from prior year end balances, new projects or funds, updated estimates, and other necessary changes. The budget is also amended as necessary during other times of the budget year. The fiscal year 2017-18 budget and work program were last amended on June 1, 2017 to incorporate Measure D funding approved by the RTC through the 5-year programs of projects. The currently proposed budget and work program amendments were considered by the RTC’s B&A/P Committee at their October 12, 2017 meeting and the committee recommends approval.

DISCUSSION

The proposed amended FY2017-18 budget is balanced and implements the RTC’s priority projects, on-going programs, Measure D funding, projects and activities. Some proposed budget changes are discussed below. Explanations for specific line items in the budget are included as notes in the budget document (Exhibit A of Attachment 1).
Transportation Development Act (TDA) (pp. 1, 2 & 17 of amended budget)

One of the main sources of funding for transportation in Santa Cruz County is the TDA, which established that ¼% of the state sales tax would go to transportation. Consistent with the RTC rules and regulations, most of the TDA revenue received by the RTC is allocated to Santa Cruz METRO for transit operations. Some of the funds are used for the RTC’s operations, some are used for bicycle and pedestrian education, promotion and safety programs, some are apportioned to specialized transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities and the remainder is apportioned to the local jurisdictions by population for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

FY 2016-17 TDA Estimates and Actual Revenues - As required by state law, the RTC obtains TDA revenue estimates from the County Auditor-Controller and uses those estimates for budgeting purposes. As shown on Table 1 below, the total of actual revenues and interest received in FY 2016-17 was $52,217 higher than estimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016-17 Estimate</th>
<th>Actual Received</th>
<th>Difference of Revenue to Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>9,059,403</td>
<td>9,101,315</td>
<td>41,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>22,305</td>
<td>10,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,071,403</td>
<td>9,123,620</td>
<td>52,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2017-18 TDA Estimates - In March 2017, the RTC approved a FY 2017-18 budget, which was amended in June 2017, with the TDA revenue estimates provided by the County Auditor Controller in January 2017, as shown in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016-17 Final Budget</th>
<th>FY 2017-18 Budget Approved June 2017</th>
<th>Proposed Amended FY 2017-18 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue estimate from Auditor Controller</td>
<td>9,059,403</td>
<td>9,186,458</td>
<td>9,186,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated interest</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior FY revenue &amp; interest</td>
<td>346,350</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To replenish TDA reserve &amp; meet 8% target</td>
<td>-133,244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To replenish &amp; build RTC reserve toward goal</td>
<td>-74,997</td>
<td>-52,217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apportioned to TDA recipients</td>
<td>9,209,512</td>
<td>9,200,458</td>
<td>9,200,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The additional revenues received in one fiscal year are typically used by the RTC to replenish or build up TDA reserves and RTC reserves, and/or to make additional apportionments to recipients. In this budget the additional revenues received in FY
2016-17 are proposed to be used to build up the RTC reserve for the following reasons:

- The TDA reserve for FY 2017-18 is already just above the 8% goal established in the RTC rules and regulations;
- TDA recipients will be receiving additional revenues from Measure D and Senate Bill 1 (with the only exception being the Volunteer Center); and
- The RTC reserve has not yet met the goal established in the RTC rules and regulations of 30% of the RTC’s main operating budget. The RTC reserve was 20.21% in the FY 2016-17 budget approved by the RTC in October 2016 and would be at 25.92% in this proposed budget.

TDA revenues can vary significantly from month to month. RTC staff will continue to monitor TDA revenues, and if it seems that apportionments to TDA recipients should be revised, staff will return to the B&A/P Committee and the RTC with appropriate recommendations.

**State Transit Assistance (STA) funds (pp. 1 & 2 of amended budget)**

As a result of a two-year statewide discussion over what entities can qualify to receive STA funds, some clarification has resulted. The portion of STA funds that are assigned to RTC based on population per the California Public Utilities Code (CA PUC) § 99313 may be allocated by the RTC to Santa Cruz METRO and other entities that provide public or community transportation services. The funds that are assigned base on transit revenues per CA PUC § 99314 may only go to Santa Cruz METRO, as the public transportation operator, operating a public transportation system in Santa Cruz County per AB1113.

Senate Bill (SB) 1 adds a new category of funding under STA known as the State of Good Repair (SGR) program. SGR funds are also assigned by population and transit revenue formulas but SGR may only be used for capital expenditures. SB1 also significantly increased the total amount of STA funds available. The State Controller’s Office (SCO) issued the FY 2017-18 STA funds estimates on October 20, 2017 nearly doubling the amount of STA funds available compared to FY 2016-17. These estimates are shown in this proposed budget on page 1 and are divided by category so that the RTC can see which funds may only go to SC METRO and which funds may only be used for capital expenditures.

Because RTC staff previously understood that only Santa Cruz METRO qualified to received any STA funds available in Santa Cruz County, the RTC has historically provided (at least since 1995) all of the STA funds to Santa Cruz Metro. Based on discussions with an ad-hoc committee of the RTC board and Santa Cruz METRO, this proposed budget assumes that all of the STA available to Santa Cruz County in this fiscal year will be appropriated to Santa Cruz METRO. The RTC is expected to consider the recommendation of the ad-hoc committee along with specific funding applications from Santa Cruz METRO and other entities at the RTC’s December 7, 2017 meeting.
Other Proposed Budget Amendments

Unspent funds from prior year projects have been carried over in the proposed amended budget, as explained by notes throughout Attachment 1. Several expenditure and funding lines have also been updated to reflect current estimates and incorporate secured grants.

Administration Budget (p. 4) - The administration budget includes additional funds for the fixed assets line for the purchase of a new copy machine. The current copy machine is nearly ten years old and breaks down often. It has also become more challenging to have packets for RTC meetings printed by outside vendors; therefore, a more robust machine that can handle even large packets for RTC meetings will improve efficiency. The administration budget also includes additional funds to conduct a compensation study as required by the RTC labor agreements.

CRUZ511 (p. 5) - The budget for the RTC’s CRUZ511 program includes carryovers of funding and expenditures from FY 2016-17.

Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) and Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) (pp. 6 & 7) – For the SAFE budget the estimate for the DMV revenues is updated based on recent trends. The FSP budget includes carryover from FY 2016-17 and updated revenues from Caltrans consistent with the state formula. Senate Bill (SB) 1 doubled the amount of state funds available for FSP programs. Discussions are underway to determine whether the new FSP funds will be distributed by established state formulas or via competitive grants.

Rail/Trail Authority Budget (p. 8) – The Rail/Trail Authority budget includes updated carryovers in funding and expenditures from FY 2016-17.

Highway 1 Projects (pp. 9 & 10) – The budgets for highway projects include updated carryover and estimates in both funding and expenditures. The Highway 1 Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project was closed out last year, after legal settlement with the contractor. However, work on the project associated with required state audits continues, including work with Caltrans to fulfill requests for information and provide documents as necessary.

Countywide Bike Signage (p. 11) – The Countywide Bike Signage project includes carryovers from the prior fiscal year.

MBSST Network Projects (p. 12) – The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network (a.k.a. rail trail) projects were previously included with the planning program. In this budget they are moved to their own budget page for better tracking and management.

Planning Program Budget (pp. 13, 14 and 15) - The budget for the planning program includes carryovers from FY 2016-17, updated estimates of staffing resources among specific projects based on work completed in the last fiscal year.
and work anticipated in this fiscal year, and addition of previously programmed funds.

Staffing resources – The proposed budget does not add any staff to what was already approved by the RTC in April and August of 2017. The RTC approved adding a transportation engineer and a communications specialist and converting an accounting technician position to an accountant position. These are fully included in the proposed budget.

The RTC also approved accelerated payments toward the sidefund liability and accrued unfunded liability for retirement benefits. The required payment toward these unfunded liabilities will be increased as a result of reduction in the discount rate by CalPERS. The accelerated payments will help to stave off the required increased payments, ensure that the liabilities are retired sooner and save money to the RTC. The unfunded liabilities for retirement as of June 30, 2017 per the latest actuarial report total about $1.9 million. If this liability is paid in 15 years, as opposed to 30 years as assumed in the actuarial report, the RTC would save over $1 million. In April 2017, the RTC approved an additional payment of $134,285 toward the retirement liabilities. Due to greater carryover than anticipated from FY 2016-17, additional funding sources for FY 2017-18 and salary savings as result of unexpected staff vacancies that have taken some time to fill, the RTC can increase this additional payment by $150,000 to $284,385 and this is included in the budget for staffing resources.

Measure D (p. 16) – In June the RTC approved the Measure D 5-year plans and approved incorporating those plans into the RTC budget. There are no proposed changes to what the RTC approved in June for Measure D. Attachment 3 shows the Measure D revenues received to date and how they have been distributed consistent with the approved measure and RTC decisions. The initial payments were significantly lower than estimated but the quarterly “wrap-up” provided by the state with the September payment brought the total thus far in line with the estimate for this fiscal year.

RSTP Exchange (p. 17) – After the RTC programs federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds to projects on a competitive basis through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the state provides an option to exchange those federal funds for state RSTP Exchange funds. Most of the RSTP Exchange funds included in the budget are carried over from the prior fiscal year with the exception of two projects – Ecology Action’s Safe Routes to Schools Education and the RTC’s Cruz511 program. Federal funds previously programmed by the RTC to these projects would be exchanged for state funds through this budget amendment.

The B&A/P Committee and staff recommend that the RTC adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the proposed amended FY2017-18 Budget and Work Program (Exhibit A to Attachment 1) and exchanging federal STBG funds for state RSTPX funds as shown on page 17 of the budget document. Staff will continue to monitor all revenues, including
TDA, seek additional revenues, and manage costs to maintain a sound budget. Staff will return to the B&A/P Committee and the RTC with recommendations as necessary, if budget changes are needed.

**SUMMARY**

The proposed amended FY 2017-18 Budget (Exhibit A to Attachment 1) incorporates information from FY 2016-17 year end balances, carryovers from the previous fiscal year, updated revenue and cost estimates, and other necessary changes. The B&A/P Committee and staff recommend that the RTC approve the proposed amended FY 2017-18 Budget and Work Program.

**Attachments:**
1. Resolution approving the proposed amended FY 2017-18 RTC Budget
2. TDA Estimates and Revenues
3. Measure D Revenues and Distribution
ATTACHMENT 1

RESOLUTION NO.

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

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2017-18 BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM FOR
THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND EXCHANGING FEDERAL
FUNDS FOR STATE FUNDS FOR TWO PROJECTS

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

WHEREAS, the RTC is responsible for programming state and federal
transportation funds, adopting the Regional Transportation Improvement Program
(RTIP), and exchanging federal funds for state funds consistent with state and
federal requirements;

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

1. The FY 2017-18 Budget and Work Program for the Santa Cruz County
Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) are hereby amended as shown in
Exhibit A; and

2. The Executive Director is authorized to adjust Transportation Development
Act (TDA) revenue payments consistent with the amended FY 2017-18 RTC
budget; and

3. The 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program for Santa Cruz
County is hereby amended to exchange federal Surface Transportation Block
Grant (STBG) funds for state RSTP Exchange funds for the Countywide Safe
Routes to Schools Education Program and the CRUZ511 program.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS
Exhibit A - SCCRTC FY 2017-18 Budget and Work Program as amended
Distribution: RTC Fiscal
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EXHIBIT A

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (SCCRCTC)

FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 BUDGET

PROPOSED NOVEMBER 02, 2017
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## PROJECTED REVENUE SUMMARY

### FY 2017-2018 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>APPROVED 06/01/17</th>
<th>PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Development Act (TDA):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor's 1/4 Cent Sales Tax Estimate</td>
<td>9,186,458</td>
<td>9,186,458</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- Revenues above estimate in FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous FY Revenues Budgeted</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Estimate</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TDA Apportioned</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,200,458</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,252,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,217</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **State Transit Assistance (STA)** | | | | |
| State Transit Assistance (99313-RTC) | 937,639 | 1,640,602 | 702,963 | - Per State Controller's Office estimate of October 2017 |
| State Transit Assistance (99314-SC METRO) | 937,638 | 1,355,381 | 417,743 | - Per State Controller's Office estimate of October 2017 |
| STA State of Good Repair (99313-RTC) | 367,417 | 367,417 | 0 | - Per State Controller's Office estimate of October 2017 |
| STA State of Good Repair (99314-SC METRO) | 303,541 | 303,541 | 0 | - Per State Controller's Office estimate of October 2017 |
| **Total STA** | **1,875,277** | **3,666,941** | **1,791,664** | |

| **Measure D** | | | | |
| | | | | |
| **Planning Grant Funds/Others:** | | | | |
| State planning funds (RPA and STIP PPM) | 512,000 | 516,666 | 4,666 | - Carryover from FY 2016-17 |
| RSTP Exchange | 25,000 | 25,000 | 0 | |
| Measure D | 400,000 | 481,694 | 81,694 | - Carryover from FY 2016-17 |
| Transit & Transportation Planning grants | 690,802 | 357,176 | -333,626 | - Carryover from FY 2016-17 |
| RTC Funds Budgeted | 242,981 | 528,975 | 285,994 | - Carryover from FY 2016-17 & updated estimates |
| **Planning/Other Total** | **1,845,783** | **1,909,511** | **63,728** | |

| **Cruz511/Rideshare:** | | | | |
| **RSTP Exchange** | | | | |
| **RTC Funds (SAFE & Measure D)** | | | | |
| **Service Authority for Freeway Emergency (SAFE):** | | | | |
| DMV Fees and interest | 241,000 | 253,000 | 12,000 | - Updated estimate based on recent trend |
| Other - MTC SAFE, RTC SAFE & Measure D | 153,300 | 141,300 | -12,000 | - Less reserves needed |
| **Freeway Service Patrol (FSP):** | | | | |
| State Funds (Caltrans, STIP, & RSTPX) | 426,352 | 315,983 | -110,369 | - RSTPX carryover rolled into FSP Reserve |
| RTC funds (Measure D, FSP Reserves & Interest) | 1,000 | 94,517 | 93,517 | - RSTPX carryover from prior year |

| **Rail/Trail Authority:** | | | | |
| Rail Line Funds (Reserves, Leases, Licenses, etc) | 147,768 | 147,768 | 0 | |
| RSTP Exchange and TC Planning | 522,242 | 670,064 | 147,822 | - Carryover from FY 2016-17 |
| Measure D | 960,500 | 960,500 | 0 | |

| **Highway 1:** | | | | |
| RSTP Exchange | 1,073,980 | 1,359,856 | 285,876 | - Carryover fro FY 2016-17 |
| CMIA, STIP & Other | 0 | 85,731 | 85,731 | - Carryover from prior fiscal year |

| **Bike Signage Project:** | | | | |
| Active Transportation Program Funds | 265,000 | 320,000 | 55,000 | - Carryover from prior fiscal year |
| RSTP Exchange and RTC Funds | 50,096 | 29,535 | -20,561 | - Carryover from prior fiscal year |

| **MBSSST Network** | | | | |
| Measure D | 3,019,250 | 3,019,250 | 0 | |
| RSTPX and Land Trust | 277,473 | 369,473 | 92,000 | - Carryover from FY 2016-17 |

| **RSTP Exchange Program** | | | | |
| | | | | |
| **TOTAL** | **40,446,728** | **56,895,286** | **16,448,559** | |
# APPORTIONMENT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED 06/01/17</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act (TDA):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Reserve Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Build up reserves toward goal RTC Rules and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Reserve Fund</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC: Administration Planning</td>
<td>571,646</td>
<td>571,646</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,094,747</td>
<td>1,094,747</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike to Work Bike &amp; Pedestrian Safety (CTSC)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO Specialized Transit (Community Bridges/CTSA) Volunteer Center</td>
<td>6,767,933</td>
<td>6,767,933</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit City of Scotts Valley City of Watsonville County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>79,157</td>
<td>79,157</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>7,915,711</td>
<td>7,915,711</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TDA APPORTIONED</td>
<td>9,200,458</td>
<td>9,252,675</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td>Revenues above estimate in FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA) - to SC METRO</td>
<td>1,875,277</td>
<td>3,666,941</td>
<td>1,791,664</td>
<td>Per State Controller's Office estimate of October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D Planning Grant Funds/Others: Rideshare SAFE</td>
<td>19,847,749</td>
<td>19,847,749</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) Rail/Trail Authority Highway 1 Bike Signage Project MBSST Network RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>427,352</td>
<td>410,500</td>
<td>-16,852</td>
<td>-63,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>40,446,728</td>
<td>56,895,286</td>
<td>16,448,559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**FY 2017-2018 BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONS PROGRAMS</th>
<th>FY16-17 ADOPTED DETAIL</th>
<th>FY17-18 ADOPTED DETAIL</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>FY 16-17</td>
<td>FY 17-18</td>
<td>FY 17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOPTED</td>
<td>06/15/17</td>
<td>06/01/17</td>
<td>11/02/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>792,590</td>
<td>693,500</td>
<td>600,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUZ511/Rideshare</td>
<td>381,422</td>
<td>281,100</td>
<td>302,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>399,300</td>
<td>394,300</td>
<td>394,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>379,500</td>
<td>410,500</td>
<td>410,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>3,667,685</td>
<td>2,437,030</td>
<td>2,445,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>433,525</td>
<td>19,842,749</td>
<td>19,842,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations Programs</strong></td>
<td>6,054,022</td>
<td>24,059,179</td>
<td>24,196,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>905,010</td>
<td>1,630,510</td>
<td>1,778,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Env Docs &amp; Design</td>
<td>2,011,805</td>
<td>1,073,980</td>
<td>1,359,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Construction</td>
<td>1,195,823</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Bike Signage</td>
<td>370,096</td>
<td>349,535</td>
<td>349,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Network</td>
<td>3,296,723</td>
<td>3,296,723</td>
<td>3,296,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Programs</strong></td>
<td>4,482,734</td>
<td>6,350,748</td>
<td>6,962,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>10,536,756</td>
<td>30,409,927</td>
<td>31,158,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUDGET COMPARISON

**PRIOR YEAR AND BUDGET YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>FY 16-17 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY 16-17 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY 16-17 ACTUAL LESS</th>
<th>FY17-18 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY17-18 ADOPTED VS FY16-17 ACTUAL LESS</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED VS FY17-18 ADOPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>792,590</td>
<td>(792,590)</td>
<td>(99,090)</td>
<td>693,500</td>
<td>(693,500) - (792,590)</td>
<td>800,717 - 693,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUZ511/Rideshare</td>
<td>381,422</td>
<td>(381,422)</td>
<td>(100,322)</td>
<td>281,100</td>
<td>(281,100) - (381,422)</td>
<td>302,522 - 281,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>399,300</td>
<td>(399,300)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>394,300</td>
<td>(394,300) - (399,300)</td>
<td>394,300 - 394,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>379,500</td>
<td>(379,500)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>410,500</td>
<td>(410,500) - (379,500)</td>
<td>410,500 - 410,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>905,010</td>
<td>(905,010)</td>
<td>(725,500)</td>
<td>1,630,510</td>
<td>(1,630,510) - (905,010)</td>
<td>1,778,332 - 1,630,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Env Docs &amp; Design</td>
<td>2,011,805</td>
<td>(2,011,805)</td>
<td>(937,825)</td>
<td>1,073,980</td>
<td>(1,073,980) - (2,011,805)</td>
<td>1,359,856 - 1,073,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Construction</td>
<td>1,195,823</td>
<td>(1,195,823)</td>
<td>(1,195,823)</td>
<td>1,630,510</td>
<td>(1,630,510) - (1,195,823)</td>
<td>1,778,332 - 1,630,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Bike Signage</td>
<td>370,096</td>
<td>(370,096)</td>
<td>(20,561)</td>
<td>349,535</td>
<td>(349,535) - (370,096)</td>
<td>349,535 - 349,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Network</td>
<td>3,296,723</td>
<td>3,296,723</td>
<td>(92,000)</td>
<td>3,296,723</td>
<td>(3,296,723) - (3,296,723)</td>
<td>3,296,723 - 3,296,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>433,525</td>
<td>(433,525)</td>
<td>(19,409,224)</td>
<td>19,842,749</td>
<td>(19,842,749) - (433,525)</td>
<td>19,842,749 - 19,409,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>3,667,685</td>
<td>(3,667,685)</td>
<td>(1,230,655)</td>
<td>2,437,030</td>
<td>(2,437,030) - (3,667,685)</td>
<td>2,445,758 - 2,437,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td>10,536,756</td>
<td>- (10,166,660)</td>
<td>30,409,927</td>
<td>10,536,756</td>
<td>30,873,171</td>
<td>31,158,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** (1) Includes staffing shown on page 16
## ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #102</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/17</td>
<td>11/02/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 TDA Administration</td>
<td>571,646</td>
<td>623,863</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td>- Revenue above estimate from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 RTC Funds</td>
<td>121,854</td>
<td>176,854</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>- To cover anticipated expenses shown below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>693,500</td>
<td>800,717</td>
<td>107,217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and Supplies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Telephone</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Liability Insurance</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Utilities</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Office Rent</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>- To replace existing copy machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 General Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Duplicating</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Postage</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Membership</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Sponsorship</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Advertisement/Publication</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Office Equipment Repair/Maintenance</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Contingency/Special Expense</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 County Mainframe/Intranet</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Computer Software</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Commissioners' Stipend</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Fiscal &amp; Triennial Performance Audit</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Annual Report/Fact Sheets</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Accounting, Payroll and Auditing Fees</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Human Resources/Employee Relations</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>- To produce compensation study per labor agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Administrative Consulting Services</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Legal Counsel</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Computer/website support, service &amp; programming</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Custodial - Janitorial Services</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision for RTC reserves</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td>- RTC reserve fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>455,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>562,717</strong></td>
<td><strong>107,217</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>693,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>800,717</strong></td>
<td><strong>107,217</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

### CRUZ511 - RIDESHARE

#### FY 2017-2018 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #179</th>
<th>APPROVED 06/01/17</th>
<th>PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>83,422</td>
<td>33,422</td>
<td>- Carryover form prior fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 SAFE funds</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 RSTP/STBG</td>
<td>359,500</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-59,500</td>
<td>- Less carryover than estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>509,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>483,422</strong></td>
<td><strong>-26,078</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and Supplies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Telephone</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Membership</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Postage</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Other - Office Expense</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Transportation/Travel/Education</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Advertisement &amp; Promotion Materials</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Technical Support/Programming</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Bicycle Map Production and Printing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Cruz511 Technical Support</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>- Carryover form prior fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Park &amp; Ride Lot Project</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>63,422</td>
<td>13,422</td>
<td>- Carryover form prior fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,522</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,422</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unappropriated Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>228,400</td>
<td>180,900</td>
<td>-47,500</td>
<td>- Less carryover than estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>509,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>483,422</strong></td>
<td><strong>-26,078</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #178 and #175</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED 06/01/17</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 DMV Fees</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Interest</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Measure D</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Local Financial Assistance (MTC SAFE)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SAFE Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>78,300</td>
<td>66,300</td>
<td>-12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>394,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>394,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVENUES:**

**EXPENDITURES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services and Supplies:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>269,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>269,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>394,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>394,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- Updated estimate based on recent trend
- Less reserves needed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #177</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED 06/01/17</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>160,702</td>
<td>165,983</td>
<td>5,281</td>
<td>- Updated estimate from Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX and STIP</td>
<td>265,650</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-115,650</td>
<td>- RSTPX carryover rolled into FSP Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>93,517</td>
<td>93,517</td>
<td>- RSTPX carryover from prior year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>427,352</strong></td>
<td><strong>410,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>-16,852</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Mobile Device Service</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Travel/Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/Special Expense</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towing</td>
<td>313,500</td>
<td>313,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>330,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>330,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues:</td>
<td><strong>16,852</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,852</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>- Lower carryover than estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>427,352</strong></td>
<td><strong>410,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>-16,852</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #682</th>
<th>REVENUES:</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/01/17</td>
<td>11/02/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Measure D</td>
<td>960,500</td>
<td>960,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Leases, Licenses &amp; Other Revenues</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Transfer from TC Funds</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>412,242</td>
<td>560,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rail Line Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>62,768</td>
<td>62,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,630,510</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,778,332</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>238,035</td>
<td>238,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,630,510</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,778,332</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- Carried over from FY 2016-17
### HWY 1 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT & Design: 722200

#### FY 2017-2018 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #683</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED 06/01/17</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 RSTP Exchange - HOV Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 RSTP Exchange (STBG 2016) - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>554,537</td>
<td>723,177</td>
<td>168,640</td>
<td>Carryover fro FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 RSTP Exchange - Mar Vista Overcrossing</td>
<td>519,443</td>
<td>636,679</td>
<td>117,236</td>
<td>Carryover fro FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>1,073,980</td>
<td>1,359,856</td>
<td>285,876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services and Supplies:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>1,073,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unappropriated Revenues:

| | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES** | 1,073,980 | 1,359,856 | 285,876 |
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### HIGHWAY 1 CONSTRUCTION
#### FY 2017-2018 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #683</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED 06/01/17</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 STIP Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CMIA Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other Revenues</td>
<td>85,731</td>
<td>85,731</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Carryover from prior fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85,731</td>
<td>85,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>To complete Caltrans CMIA audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,731</td>
<td>60,731</td>
<td>Carryover from prior fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85,731</td>
<td>85,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
COUNTYWIDE BIKE SIGNAGE
FY 2017-2018 BUDGET

COUNTYWIDE BIKE SIGNAGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #615</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED 06/01/17</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Active Transportation Program Funds</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>Carryover from prior fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>42,096</td>
<td>21,535</td>
<td>-20,561</td>
<td>Carryover from prior fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 RTC Funds</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>315,096</td>
<td>349,535</td>
<td>34,439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services and Supplies:</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Construction with contingency</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Engineering Activity - including PS&amp;E, counts and permits</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Public Outreach</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Future Year Expenses</td>
<td>32,596</td>
<td>67,035</td>
<td>34,439</td>
<td>Carryover from prior fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>265,096</td>
<td>299,535</td>
<td>34,439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>315,096</td>
<td>349,535</td>
<td>34,439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Projects</td>
<td>FY17-18</td>
<td>FY17-18</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>NOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ELEMENT #683</td>
<td>06/01/17</td>
<td>11/02/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>242,000</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>3,019,250</td>
<td>3,019,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Trust</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>3,296,723</td>
<td>3,388,723</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>427,473</td>
<td>409,473</td>
<td>-18,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Technical Assistance</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor encroachment &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>519,250</td>
<td>489,250</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast Segment 5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documents and Design</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Asst (envl, legal, surveying, EHS, etc.)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz Segments 7, 8 &amp; 9:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Asst (envl, legal, surveying, EHS, etc.)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-10,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seg 7 Construction Phase 2 to City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seg 8 San Lorenzo River trestle Construction to City of Scruz</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville Segement 18:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seg 18 Construction - to City of Watsonville</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Asst (envl, legal, surveying, EHS, etc.)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>2,889,250</td>
<td>2,979,250</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>3,296,723</td>
<td>3,388,723</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURCES</td>
<td>FY17-18 APPROVED 06/01/17</td>
<td>FY17-18 PROPOSED 11/02/17</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>NOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>713,101</td>
<td>713,101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>341,666</td>
<td>4,666</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning Grants</td>
<td>550,073</td>
<td>289,716</td>
<td>-260,357</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>481,694</td>
<td>81,694</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant</td>
<td>140,729</td>
<td>67,460</td>
<td>-73,269</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Funds previously programmed to this project by the RTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>121,127</td>
<td>352,121</td>
<td>230,994</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17 &amp; updated estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,437,030</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,445,758</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,728</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### PLANNING EXPENDITURES
#### FY 2017-2018 BUDGET

**PLANNING EXPENDITURES:** 721600/721700/721750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead by Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Regional Planning Coordination</td>
<td>97,918</td>
<td>97,918</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Unified Corridor Study Phase II</td>
<td>156,031</td>
<td>156,031</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Work Program</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Public Information</td>
<td>41,914</td>
<td>41,914</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>62,936</td>
<td>62,936</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>64,158</td>
<td>64,158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>66,527</td>
<td>28,236</td>
<td>-38,291</td>
<td>Most work completed in FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>63,135</td>
<td>93,928</td>
<td>30,793</td>
<td>Updated estimate based on work for first phase of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Highway 9 Study</td>
<td>81,473</td>
<td>81,971</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>Updated estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Regional Transportation Plan for MTP</td>
<td>210,291</td>
<td>210,291</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>220,487</td>
<td>220,487</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Highway &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>85,297</td>
<td>85,297</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Staff and Overhead</strong></td>
<td>1,184,702</td>
<td>1,177,702</td>
<td>-7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Bike &amp; Ped Safety (Comm. Traffic Safety Coalition)</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Ecology Action - Countywide SR2S Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Funds previously programmed to this project by the RTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Open Streets - County HSA/Bike SCC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25** Professional Services (contracts)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Washington Assistant</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Environmental Documents for RTP/MTP</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>94,066</td>
<td>158,108</td>
<td>64,042</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17 and funds for Phase II of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Highway 9 study consultant</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>96,589</td>
<td>-8,411</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 SC METRO &amp; DPW for Hwy 9 study</td>
<td>24,262</td>
<td>24,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Unified Corridor Study Consultant</td>
<td>532,400</td>
<td>442,497</td>
<td>-89,903</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35** RTC Work Element Related Items**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Traffic Monitoring services</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Printing Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Planning projects currently underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning Materials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td>1,252,328</td>
<td>1,268,056</td>
<td>15,728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>2,437,030</td>
<td>2,445,758</td>
<td>8,728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### PLANNING FUNDS SOURCE DETAIL
#### FY 2017-2018 BUDGET

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>TDA</th>
<th>RTC FUND</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>Meas D</th>
<th>Sust Transp Plng</th>
<th>FTA5304 SustComm Plng</th>
<th>FTA5304 SustComm Plng</th>
<th>FTA5304 Trust for SustComm</th>
<th>STIP PPM</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead by Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Regional Planning Coordination</td>
<td>97,918</td>
<td>11,501</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Unified Corridor Study Phase II</td>
<td>156,031</td>
<td>12,162</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>93,869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Work Program</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Public Information</td>
<td>41,914</td>
<td>25,214</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>62,936</td>
<td>32,936</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>64,158</td>
<td>57,627</td>
<td>6,331</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>28,236</td>
<td>7,630</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>93,928</td>
<td>7,242</td>
<td>19,226</td>
<td></td>
<td>67,460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Highway 9 Study</td>
<td>81,971</td>
<td>9,345</td>
<td>23,105</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Regional Transportation Plan for MTP</td>
<td>210,291</td>
<td>85,139</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125,152</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>220,487</td>
<td>8,371</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67,116</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Highway &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>85,297</td>
<td>22,316</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Staff &amp; Overhead</strong></td>
<td>1,177,702</td>
<td>314,218</td>
<td>75,362</td>
<td>341,666</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>67,460</td>
<td>93,869</td>
<td>49,521</td>
<td>10,606</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Bike &amp; Ped Safety (Comm. Traffic Safety Coalition)</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Ecology Action - Countywide SR2S Education</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Open Streets - County HSA/Bike SCC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Washington Assistant</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>45,168</td>
<td>34,832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Environmental Documents for RTP/MTP</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>158,108</td>
<td>158,108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Highway 9 study consultant</td>
<td>96,589</td>
<td>5,934</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 SC METRO &amp; DPW for Hwy 9 study</td>
<td>24,262</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Unified Corridor Study Consultant</td>
<td>442,497</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>431,694</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTC Work Element Related Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Traffic Monitoring services</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>11,897</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Printing Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>12,218</td>
<td>37,782</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning Materials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td>1,268,056</td>
<td>398,883</td>
<td>276,759</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>431,694</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,803</td>
<td>114,917</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>2,445,758</td>
<td>713,101</td>
<td>352,121</td>
<td>341,666</td>
<td>481,694</td>
<td>67,460</td>
<td>104,672</td>
<td>164,438</td>
<td>20,606</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEASURE D: Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element</th>
<th>FY17-18 Approved 06/01/17</th>
<th>FY17-18 Proposed 11/02/17</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D Funds</td>
<td>19,842,749</td>
<td>19,842,749</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>19,847,749</td>
<td>19,847,749</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>498,839</td>
<td>498,839</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services &amp; Supplies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Fiscal Year Costs</td>
<td>433,525</td>
<td>433,525</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Services</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and supplies</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td>563,525</td>
<td>563,525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apportionments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Projects (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 9 Projects and Hwy 17 Wildlife Xing</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>288,604</td>
<td>288,604</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>1,165,655</td>
<td>1,165,655</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>251,531</td>
<td>251,531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>779,934</td>
<td>779,934</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>2,648,392</td>
<td>2,648,392</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Neighborhood Projects</strong></td>
<td>5,634,115</td>
<td>5,634,115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Projects (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO (16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation (17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor (8%)</td>
<td>1,502,431</td>
<td>1,502,431</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services, Supplies &amp; Apportionments</strong></td>
<td>19,343,910</td>
<td>19,343,910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>19,847,749</td>
<td>19,847,749</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** As stated in Measure D funds will be distributed at least quarterly to cities and the County of Santa Cruz based on their proportional share of the countywide population (29%), lane miles of roadway (39%) and the site where the measure revenue from the transactions and use tax is generated (32%). Population, road mile and tax site generation will be updated each year based on the latest available data. Site of tax revenue generation is estimated from existing T&U taxes in the county. Each year after the RTC obtains the data specific to this T&U tax adjustments will be made based on actual data for site of tax revenue generation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #101</th>
<th>FY17-18 APPROVED 06/01/17</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RSTP EXCHANGE PROGRAM:</strong> 722000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 State RSTP Exchange Funds</td>
<td>3,023,985</td>
<td>3,023,985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Interest</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 RSTP Exchange Funds Budgeted - Carryover</td>
<td>10,914,026</td>
<td>10,914,026</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>13,968,011</td>
<td>13,938,011</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 City of Capitola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 City of Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Santa Cruz METRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>7,911,333</td>
<td>7,911,333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unobligated Funds</strong></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>6,056,678</td>
<td>6,026,678</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>13,968,011</td>
<td>13,938,011</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION FUND BALANCES AND RESERVES FY 2017-2018 BUDGET

### FUND BALANCES & RESERVES: 11/02/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TDA FUND (1)</th>
<th>RTC FUND (2)</th>
<th>RIDESHARE FUND (3)</th>
<th>RAIL/TRAIl AUTHORITY FUND (4)</th>
<th>HWY 1 PA/ED &amp; ENG FUND (4)</th>
<th>HWY 1 CONSTR FUND (4)</th>
<th>SAFE OPERATING FUND (5)</th>
<th>FSP FUND (5)</th>
<th>RSTP EXCHANGE FUND (4)</th>
<th>STA FUND (6)</th>
<th>TOTAL ALL FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Fund Balance 7-01-17</td>
<td>2,384,016</td>
<td>1,334,465</td>
<td>19,237</td>
<td>180,013</td>
<td>723,177</td>
<td>85,731</td>
<td>401,509</td>
<td>103,720</td>
<td>10,914,026</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>16,146,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 FY 2016-17 Revenues budgeted</td>
<td>(52,217)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>636,679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(52,217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Anticipated Revenues &amp; Carryover Funds</td>
<td>(753,420)</td>
<td>(607,302)</td>
<td>(19,237)</td>
<td>(6,276)</td>
<td>(1,359,856)</td>
<td>(65,731)</td>
<td>(159,258)</td>
<td>(66,300)</td>
<td>(93,517)</td>
<td>(7,918,109)</td>
<td>(1,539,217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Revenues From Prior Fiscal Year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td></td>
<td>636,679</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>636,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Restricted Reserve carried over</td>
<td>(1,578,389)</td>
<td>(528,975)</td>
<td>(19,237)</td>
<td>(62,768)</td>
<td>(1,359,856)</td>
<td>(65,731)</td>
<td>(159,258)</td>
<td>(66,300)</td>
<td>(93,517)</td>
<td>(7,918,109)</td>
<td>(1,539,217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Budgeted Carryover from FY 2016-17</td>
<td>(1,169,636)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>636,679</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>636,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Subtotal Fund Balance (1)</td>
<td>250,405</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,245</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175,951</td>
<td>10,203</td>
<td>2,995,917</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>3,550,179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 To Cashflow Reserve (198,188)</td>
<td>180,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118,039</td>
<td>10,203</td>
<td>2,995,917</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>3,422,763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 To Restricted Reserve Fund</td>
<td>(52,217)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175,951</td>
<td>10,203</td>
<td>2,995,917</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>3,248,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td>180,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118,039</td>
<td>10,203</td>
<td>2,995,917</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>3,121,890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Total Fund Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180,900</td>
<td>117,245</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>118,039</td>
<td>10,203</td>
<td>2,995,917</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>3,422,763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reserve Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TDA/Fund (1)</th>
<th>RTC/Fund (2)</th>
<th>RIDESHARE FUND (3)</th>
<th>RAIL/TRAIl AUTHORITY FUND (4)</th>
<th>HWY 1 PA/ED &amp; ENG FUND (4)</th>
<th>HWY 1 CONSTR FUND (4)</th>
<th>SAFE OPERATING FUND (5)</th>
<th>FSP FUND (5)</th>
<th>RSTP EXCHANGE FUND (4)</th>
<th>STA FUND (6)</th>
<th>TOTAL ALL FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Target (8% target for TDA fund; 30% target for others)</td>
<td>740,214</td>
<td>992,699</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>217,170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,950,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashflow Reserve (0% target for TDA fund; 8% target for others)</td>
<td>198,188</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Reserve (8% target for TDA fund; 22% target for others)</td>
<td>753,419</td>
<td>659,519</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>159,258</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,572,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reserve Funds</td>
<td>753,419</td>
<td>857,707</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>217,170</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,826,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reserve Fund Difference from Target | 13,205 (134,992) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | (121,787) |

### Notes:

- Numbers in parentheses are negative numbers. All other numbers are positive numbers.
- Funds within each category (column) are restricted for use on projects/programs within that category.
- **Fund Balance (7-01-17)** = Balances of funds not used at the end of prior fiscal year.
- **Budgeted Carryover** = Portion of Fund Balance used in current fiscal year budget.
- **Unappropriated Revenues** = Amount of revenues designated for specific projects/programs that likely will not be expended in the current fiscal year, but will be needed in future years.

- 8% reserve established in RTC Rules and Regulations for the TDA Fund; 8.14% available in this proposed budget
- 3.6 month (or 30%) operating reserve target established in RTC Rules and Regulations for the RTC Fund; 3.11 months (or 25.92%) available in this proposed budget
- Reserve for the Rideshare fund is included with the RTC Fund
- Reserve funds not proposed for capital project funds
- 3.6 month (or 30%) operating reserve target approved for the SAFE Fund to cover SAFE, FSP and Cruz511 operations
- This is a pass-through fund, all receipts are paid to Santa Cruz Metro.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>FY17-18 06/01/17</th>
<th>FY17-18 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Officer SCCRTC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services Officer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Engineer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planner I-IV</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Specialist</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Approved by RTC on August 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant I-III</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Technician</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>Approved by RTC on August 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant I-III</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Technician</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Intern</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POSITIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>FY17-18 06/01/17</th>
<th>FY17-18 11/02/17</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Officer SCCRTC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services Officer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Engineer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planner I-IV</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Specialist</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Approved by RTC on August 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant I-III</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Technician</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>Approved by RTC on August 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant I-III</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Technician</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Intern</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POSITIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FTE= full-time equivalent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>FY17-18 PROPOSED 11/02/17</th>
<th>UNSPENT PRIOR ALLOCATIONS</th>
<th>ADJUSTMENT</th>
<th>AVAILABLE FUNDS 11/02/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Administration</td>
<td>623,863</td>
<td>623,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>713,101</td>
<td>713,101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,336,964</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>1,336,964</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>6,767,933</td>
<td>6,767,933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit</td>
<td>664,920</td>
<td>664,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
<td>79,157</td>
<td>79,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>14,852</td>
<td>184,521</td>
<td></td>
<td>199,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>94,570</td>
<td>323,725</td>
<td></td>
<td>418,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>17,768</td>
<td>109,993</td>
<td></td>
<td>127,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>77,390</td>
<td>424,762</td>
<td></td>
<td>502,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>199,122</td>
<td>535,379</td>
<td></td>
<td>734,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,252,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,578,380</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>10,831,055</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Allocations for the Cities and the County use the most recent population figures from the Department of Finance; Unspent prior allocations include only the amounts not allocated to specific projects as of 03/31/2017.
Glossary of Transportation Funding Terms Used in the SCCRTC Budget

AB2766: This bill authorized a Department of Motor Vehicles vehicle registration fee of up to $4.00 to be used by air pollution control districts for planning and incentive programs to reduce motor vehicle emissions. The Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) annually conducts a grant program to distribute approximately $1.5 million in AB2766 funds in Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito counties for this purpose. The SCCRTC has received AB2766 funds for some of its own programs, in addition to serving as a pass-through agency for grants used by some local non-profit organizations.

AB3090 Loan: Loan secured with an AB3090 designation from the CTC to be paid with funds eventually available to a project from the STIP.

Active Transportation Program: The ATP consolidated federal and state programs including the Transportation Alternatives Program, the Bicycle Transportation Account and Safe Routes to Schools into one program (ATP) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation such as bicycling and walking.

ARRA: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act passed by Congress and signed by the President in 2009 as an economic stimulus package with funds for transportation projects

ATP: Active Transportation Program

CMAQ: see Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program

CMIA: Corridor Mobility Improvement Account – a $4.5 billion program for highway improvements authorized by Proposition 1B, a transportation bond measure approved by California voters in November 2006.

Coastal Conservancy Funds: State bond funds available for Coastal Conservancy projects through state ballot measures.

Commission Reserves: The SCCRTC maintains a Reserve Fund for its operations. Commission Reserve funds are budgeted as necessary to fully fund the operating budget or for special projects.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program: A federal funding program specifically for projects and programs which contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard. The SCCRTC programs CMAQ funds for Santa Cruz County. CMAQ funds for planning projects appear in the SCCRTC budget.
c/o  Carryover. Funds carried over from prior fiscal years.

DMV Fees:  Department of Motor Vehicles revenue, used by the SCCRTC for the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE), see Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies funds for more detail.

Federal Earmark:  Funds for specific projects secured by members of congress through federal legislation.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Planning (PL) Funds from AMBAG:  Funds derived from one percent "off the top" of the funds available to each State for federal highway projects. Funds are used by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and allocated by a formula established by Caltrans in consultation with the MPOs.

FHWA:  Federal Highway Administration

Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) Grants:  Caltrans annually grants funds to the SCCRTC to operate FSP services - a roving tow truck service which helps clear incidents on Highway 17 during peak travel periods. The SCCRTC has a Memorandum of Understanding with the San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission to contract for the FSP service for Santa Cruz County.

FSP:  Freeway Service Patrol

FSP Funds:  Funds designated in the annual state budget for FSP programs and distributed by a formula established in the FSP statutes.

Measure D:  The Santa Cruz County Transportation Improvement Plan Measure passed by a supermajority of Santa Cruz County voters in November 2016 to institute a ½-cent transactions and use tax to raise local funds for transportation to be distributed among five different categories of projects.

Proposition 116:  Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act of 1990 passed by the voters in November 1990, provided bond funds for passenger rail and other projects including $11 million for Santa Cruz County.
Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP): A federal funding program established by ISTEA to fund mass transit, highway, bicycle, pedestrian and local streets and roads projects. The SCCRTC programs STP funds for Santa Cruz County. Sometimes called RSTP for Regional Surface Transportation Program.

Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX): The annual Federal Apportionment Exchange Program, administered by Caltrans, allows the SCCRTC the option to exchange all or a portion of its annual apportionment of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds for non-federal (State) funds. State funds have fewer oversight requirements than Federal funds. The funds pass through the SCCRTC to the local jurisdictions and other eligible public agencies, and therefore appear in the SCCRTC budget.

Rideshare Funds: Funds specifically designated for the Rideshare program, oftentimes through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program: Transportation funding program created by the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 through Senate Bill 1 to address deferred maintenance on the state highway system and local street and road system.

Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017: California transportation law established by Senate Bill 1 in April 2017 and adding a variety of new revenues to fund transportation.

RPA: Rural Planning Assistance

RSTP: Regional Surface Transportation Program

RSTPX: Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange

Rural Planning Assistance (RPA): These state funds are allocated annually to regional transportation planning agencies in rural areas to support planning programs.

SAFE: Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Senate Bill (SB) 1: California Senate bill authored by Senator Jim Beall signed into law in April 2017 and establishing the Road
Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 with a variety of new revenues to fund transportation

**Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) Funds:** Under the provisions of state enabling legislation, the Santa Cruz County SAFE collects a $1-per-year addition to the vehicle registration fee (listed as DMV Fees in the budget) to fund the capital, planning, maintenance, and operation of a call box system on Highways 1, 9, 17, 129, and 152 in Santa Cruz County. SAFE funds can also be used for changeable message signs (CMS), freeway service patrol (FSP) and other selected motorist aid systems.

**SGC:** Strategic Growth Council established in 2008 by SB732 and responsible for allocating grant funds used to implement AB32 and SB375

**SGR:** State of Good Repair Program

**STA:** State Transit Assistance

**State of Good Repair (SGR) Program:** Funding program established under the State Transit Assistance (STA) program by the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (SB 1). Funds in this program may only be used for transit capital expenditures.

**State Planning and Research Funds:** These funds are awarded by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) annually on a discretionary basis.

**State Transit Assistance (STA):** State Transit Assistance funds are derived from statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel as part of the Transportation Planning and Development (TP&D) program. Transit operations and capital improvement projects are eligible uses of STA funds. The SCCRTC receives State Transit Assistance funds and allocates 100 percent annually to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD).

**State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP):** A portion of State Transportation Improvement Program funds are allocated to our region for programming by the SCCRTC. STIP regional share funds programmed for SCCRTC projects, such as the Freeway Service Patrol, the Rideshare Program and Planning activities, appear in the SCCRTC budget.

**STIP:** State Transportation Improvement Program
**STP:** Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)

**STP Exchange:** Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX)

**TDA:** Transportation Development Act

**Transportation Development Act (TDA):** State law enacted in 1971. Local TDA funds are generated from a State tax of one-quarter of one percent on all retail sales in the county. Revenues are allocated annually by the SCCRTC to support transportation planning and administration, bus transit, transportation for the elderly and handicapped, and bikeway and pedestrian projects.

**Transportation Development Act (TDA) Reserves:** This reserve fund is maintained in order to provide the full TDA allocations to TDA recipients in the event there is a shortfall in actual versus projected TDA revenues. Occasionally some TDA Reserve funds are allocated to a special project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY 07-08 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 08-09 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 10-11 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 11-12 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 13-14 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 14-15 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 15-16 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 16-17 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 17-18 Actual Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>543,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>410,500</td>
<td>499,800</td>
<td>533,900</td>
<td>556,100</td>
<td>591,100</td>
<td>601,300</td>
<td>629,500</td>
<td>637,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>724,300</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>547,300</td>
<td>666,400</td>
<td>711,800</td>
<td>741,500</td>
<td>788,200</td>
<td>801,800</td>
<td>839,400</td>
<td>849,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>863,255</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>819,955</td>
<td>699,895</td>
<td>718,257</td>
<td>818,354</td>
<td>791,871</td>
<td>872,384</td>
<td>872,266</td>
<td>882,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>599,500</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>458,300</td>
<td>486,400</td>
<td>556,500</td>
<td>596,900</td>
<td>616,700</td>
<td>617,500</td>
<td>657,500</td>
<td>665,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>799,300</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>611,000</td>
<td>648,500</td>
<td>742,000</td>
<td>795,900</td>
<td>822,300</td>
<td>823,300</td>
<td>876,700</td>
<td>887,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>638,280</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>776,432</td>
<td>804,308</td>
<td>733,930</td>
<td>732,985</td>
<td>719,449</td>
<td>917,127</td>
<td>813,479</td>
<td>823,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN</td>
<td>583,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>465,300</td>
<td>502,700</td>
<td>510,100</td>
<td>534,300</td>
<td>557,700</td>
<td>601,300</td>
<td>631,600</td>
<td>632,900</td>
<td>646,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td>778,200</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>620,400</td>
<td>670,300</td>
<td>680,100</td>
<td>712,400</td>
<td>728,800</td>
<td>801,800</td>
<td>842,100</td>
<td>843,800</td>
<td>862,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>543,629</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>607,400</td>
<td>651,760</td>
<td>625,667</td>
<td>632,278</td>
<td>802,890</td>
<td>739,331</td>
<td>763,406</td>
<td>911,051</td>
<td>781,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>494,300</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>385,100</td>
<td>412,600</td>
<td>441,300</td>
<td>475,600</td>
<td>504,100</td>
<td>524,400</td>
<td>559,000</td>
<td>626,200</td>
<td>572,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>659,000</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>562,700</td>
<td>605,300</td>
<td>588,400</td>
<td>634,100</td>
<td>672,100</td>
<td>699,200</td>
<td>745,400</td>
<td>834,900</td>
<td>763,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>652,069</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>605,859</td>
<td>631,912</td>
<td>756,557</td>
<td>759,038</td>
<td>780,261</td>
<td>853,689</td>
<td>795,139</td>
<td>563,619</td>
<td>814,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7,878,633</td>
<td>7,200,133</td>
<td>6,631,837</td>
<td>6,957,059</td>
<td>7,407,427</td>
<td>7,744,102</td>
<td>8,287,590</td>
<td>8,549,340</td>
<td>8,970,056</td>
<td>9,101,315</td>
<td>9,186,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Chg | -2.11% | -8.61% | -7.89% | 4.90% | 6.47% | 4.55% | 7.02% | 3.16% | 4.92% | 1.46% | 0.94% |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY/OBJECT</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOVEMBER</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROSS</td>
<td>729000/40186</td>
<td>1,146,700.00</td>
<td>1,529,000.00</td>
<td>2,404,870.28</td>
<td>1,231,700.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,312,270.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOE FEES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50,520.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,312,270.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** ADMINISTRATION & IMPLEMENTATION: 729000/62315 **

- **ADMINISTRATION - SALARIES & BENEFITS**: 1%
  - 11,467.00
  - 15,290.00
  - 24,048.70
  - 12,317.00
  - 63,122.70

- **O/H ADMIN**: 8,333.33
  - 8,333.33
  - 8,333.33
  - 8,333.33
  - 33,333.33

- **SERVICES & SUPPLIES**: 46,960.42
  - 46,960.42
  - 46,960.42
  - 46,960.42
  - 187,841.67

** Subtotal **

- 78,342.42
- 86,026.65
- 103,631.64
- 80,050.92
- 348,051.63

** TO DISTRIBUTE TO INVESTMENT CATEGORIES **

- 1,068,357.58
- 1,442,973.35
- 2,301,238.64
- 1,151,649.08
- 5,964,218.65

** 1. NEIGHBORHOOD - 729200/71232 **

- **SLV SR9** Fixed $ 27,777.78
  - 27,777.78
  - 27,777.78
  - 27,777.78
  - 111,111.11

- **HWY 17 Wildlife** Fixed $ 13,888.89
  - 13,888.89
  - 13,888.89
  - 13,888.89
  - 55,555.56

** City of Capitola **

- 5.6213%
  - 15,674.47
  - 21,991.95
  - 36,465.65
  - 17,079.09
  - 91,211.15

- **City of Santa Cruz** 22.7041%
  - 63,308.25
  - 88,824.19
  - 147,282.61
  - 68,981.43
  - 368,396.48

- **City of Scotts Valley** 4.8992%
  - 13,660.96
  - 19,166.91
  - 31,781.35
  - 14,885.17
  - 79,494.37

- **City of Watsonville** 15.1912%
  - 42,359.23
  - 59,431.82
  - 98,546.06
  - 46,155.13
  - 246,492.25

- **County of Santa Cruz** 51.5842%
  - 143,837.70
  - 201,810.46
  - 334,629.25
  - 156,727.27
  - 837,004.68

** 100% **

- 278,840.61
- 391,225.34
- 648,704.92
- 303,828.06
- 1,622,598.93

** 2. HWY Corridors - 729500/62856 **

- **Santa Cruz Metro (SCMTO) 16%**
  - 213,671.52
  - 288,594.67
  - 450,247.73
  - 230,329.82
  - 1,192,843.73

- **Community Bridges - 4%**
  - 42,734.30
  - 57,718.93
  - 92,049.55
  - 46,065.96
  - 238,658.75

** 4. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION - 729500/62856 **

- **Santa Cruz Corridor** 17%
  - 181,620.79
  - 245,305.47
  - 391,210.57
  - 195,780.34
  - 1,013,917.17

** 5. RAIL CORRIDOR - 729600/62857 **

- **Community Bridges** 8%
  - 85,468.61
  - 115,437.87
  - 184,099.09
  - 92,131.93
  - 477,137.49

** DISTRIBUTED TO INVESTMENT CATEGORIES **

- 1,068,357.58
- 1,442,973.35
- 2,301,238.64
- 1,151,649.08
- 5,964,218.65

** TOTAL ADMIN & IMPEL & INVESTMENT CATEGORIES **

- 1,146,700.00
- 1,529,000.00
- 2,404,870.28
- 1,231,700.00
- 6,312,270.28

---
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