AGENDA

Thursday, March 03, 2022
9:00 a.m.

REMOTE MEETING

Community TV Zoom
Web: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84973090402
Dial-in: +1 669 900 6833
Webinar ID: 849 7309 0402

Accessibility: See last page for details.
En Español: Para servicios de traducción al español, diríjase a la última página.
Agendas Online: Click below to receive notification via e-mail.
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     Eduardo Montesino
County of Santa Cruz     Greg Caput
County of Santa Cruz     Ryan Coonerty
County of Santa Cruz     Zach Friend
County of Santa Cruz     Manu Koenig
County of Santa Cruz     Bruce McPherson
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Kristen Petersen
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Alta Northcutt
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Mike Rotkin

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, it may not take action on items that are not on the agenda.

Speakers are requested to state their name clearly so that it 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 draft minutes of the February 03, 2022 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Accept draft minutes of the February 07, 2022 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

6. Accept draft minutes of the February 08, 2022 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

**POLICY ITEMS**

7. Adopt the 2022 State and Federal Legislative Programs

**PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS**

8. Approve authorizing the Executive Director to enter into sole-source contracts with Miller-Maxfield, Inc. and Ecology Action for GO Santa Cruz County TDM services and amending the fiscal year (FY) 2021-22 budget (Resolution)
9. Approve authorizing the Executive Director to award a contract to Community Tree Service for vegetation control along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail corridor (Resolution)

10. Approve authorizing the Executive Director to amend the contract with CASE Systems, Inc. for call box maintenance and site improvements and amend the fiscal year (FY) 2021-22 budget (Resolution)

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

12. Accept status report on Measure D revenues

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

13. Adopt Assembly Bill 361 Findings for Virtual and Hybrid Meetings

14. Approve appointment of Commissioners to the RTC’s Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee, California Association of Councils of Government (CALCOG), and the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)

15. Approve appointments to fill vacancies on the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&DTAC)

16. Approve nominations and appointments to the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)

17. Approve appointments to the Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

18. Accept monthly meeting schedule

19. Accept correspondence log

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

21. Accept information items - none

REGULAR AGENDA

22. Commissioner reports – oral reports
23. Director’s Report – oral report
   (Guy Preston, Executive Director)
   
a. Resolution: Sr. Transportation Planner, Ginger Dykaar Retirement

24. Caltrans report
   
a. Santa Cruz County project updates
b. Update of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) for District 5

25. City of Santa Cruz Presentation
   (Nathan Nguyen, City Engineer)

26. Final Draft 2045 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
   (Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner)
   
a. Staff report
b. Final Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan – Download full document at sccrtc.org/2045rtp
c. Summary of revisions to draft 2045 RTP
d. Updates to the Financial Revenue Estimates
e. 2045 RTP Comments Received

**CLOSED SESSION**

27. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS pursuant to Government Code 54957.6

   Commission Negotiators: Thomas Manniello, Lozano and Smith and Yesenia Parra, RTC

   Bargaining Units: Mid-Management Unit and Community of RTC Employees (CORE)

**OPEN SESSION**

28. Report on closed session

29. Next meetings

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 07, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. See agenda for location.
The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 17, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. by Zoom teleconference.

**HOW TO REACH US**
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250  Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
phone: (831) 460-3200 / email: info@sccrtc.org

**LIVE BROADCASTS**
*Note:* Due to technical difficulties, Community Television of Santa Cruz will be unable to broadcast the RTC meeting live. The meeting will be recorded and can be viewed later at [www.communitytv.org](http://www.communitytv.org). For questions, call (831) 425-8848.

**AGENDA PACKETS**
Complete agenda packets and all documents relating to items on the open session are posted online at [https://sccrtc.org](https://sccrtc.org) at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Sign up for E-News updates at [sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/](https://sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/)

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
*Items on the agenda:* Written comments received by 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday before the meeting will be posted to the RTC website by 2:00 p.m. that same afternoon to allow time for Commissioner review. The opportunity to make oral comments is offered prior to the discussion period of each item.  
*Items not on the agenda:* Written comments on topics within the RTC’s jurisdiction, but not on the agenda, that are received during the monthly correspondence period will be posted to a public document. The correspondence period cut-off is 12:00 p.m. on the second Monday prior to the RTC meeting. A link to that document is provided in the Correspondence Log of that month’s meeting. The opportunity to make oral comments to the Commission on such topics is offered during Oral Communications.

**COVID-19 REMOTE MEETING UPDATE**
On September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed AB 361 into law, which allows the RTC to hold virtual and/or hybrid meetings so long as the RTC makes findings that the state of emergency continues to directly impact its ability to meet safely in person. Information needed to log into the virtual meeting is listed on the first page of the meeting’s agenda. Download the Zoom app: [https://zoom.us/download](https://zoom.us/download).

**ACCESSIBILITY**
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 persons 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 call (831) 460-3200 at least three days in advance to make advance arrangements.

**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 by contacting the RTC at (831) 460-3200 or 1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250, 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) 460-3200 o 1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250, 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.
Draft MINUTES

Thursday, February 03, 2022
9:00 a.m.

NOTE: Teleconference
Community TV Zoom
Web: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88417962384
Dial-in: +1 669 900 6833
Webinar ID: 884 1796 2384

1. Roll call.

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

Members present:
Sandy Brown
Kristen Petersen          Andy Schiffrin (Alt)
Randy Johnson           Robert Quinn (Alt)
Greg Caput              Felipe Hernandez (Alt)
Manu Koenig             Jacques Bertrand
Eduardo Montesino       Bruce McPherson
Alta Northcutt          Scott Eades (Caltrans Ex-Officio)
Mike Rotkin

Staff present:
Guy Preston             Tracy New
Luis Mendez             Sarah Christensen
Yesenia Parra           Brianna Goodman
Shannon Munz            Amy Naranjo
Krista Corwin           Eric Hocky (RTC Railway Counsel)
Cindy Convisser         Steven Mattas (RTC General Counsel)
2. Oral communications.

Received public comment from:
Barry Scott
Judy Gittelsohn
Brian Peoples, Trail Now
Mark Mesiti-Miller
Linda Wilshusen
David Dean
Michael Saint
John Erdcamp
Terri Fagan
Luke Lindroth
Todd Marco, Nicene Rio Gateway
Rebecca Downing
Lani Faulkner
Warwick Boulton
Sean

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas.

Attachment 2 for item 21, a replacement page for item 22, and handouts for items 8, 22, and 23 were posted to the website.

CONSENT AGENDA

RTC Counsel Steve Mattas communicated that a request was received to amend the January 13, 2022 minutes to include the votes cast during closed session.

Commissioners discussed: desire for transparency and procedures for amending an item on the consent agenda.

In response to a question from a Commissioner, Deputy Director Luis Mendez provided more information about the design plans and funding in the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Master Plan for the Pajaro River Bridge.

Commissioner Rotkin motioned and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin seconded the motion to approve the consent agenda as amended. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Bertrand, Brown, Johnson, Montesino, Caput, Koenig, McPherson, Petersen, Northcutt, Rotkin, and Commissioner Alternates Schiffrin and Quinn voting “aye.”

Received public comment from:
Brian Peoples, Trail Now
MINUTES

4. Accepted draft minutes of the January 11, 2022 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee special meeting

5. Approved draft minutes as amended of the January 13, 2022 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

6. Accepted draft minutes of the January 20, 2022 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items.

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

7. Approved authorizing the Executive Director to amend the cooperative agreement with Caltrans to increase funding for completion of a Highway 9/San Lorenzo Valley (SLV) Complete Streets Project Initiation Document (Resolution 32-22)

8. Approved authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a Master Agreement with Caltrans to administer grant funding for the Pajaro River Bridge Rehabilitation Project (Resolution 33-22)

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

9. Approved amending the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-22 Budget and Work Program (Resolution 34-22)

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

11. Accepted status report on Measure D revenues

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

12. Approved authorizing the Executive Director to amend the contract for technical support services with User Friendly Computing (Resolution 35-22)

13. Adopted Assembly Bill 361 Findings for Virtual and Hybrid Meetings
INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

14. Accepted monthly meeting schedule.

15. Accepted correspondence log.

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

17. Accepted information items. - none

REGULAR AGENDA

18. Commissioner reports - none

19. Director’s Report

Executive Director Guy Preston announced that there will be a Transportation Policy Workshop on February 17, 2022 beginning at 9:00 a.m. focused on Coastal Rail Trail Segments 8 Through 12 (Pacific Avenue to Rio Del Mar Boulevard) project updates.

20. Caltrans report

Caltrans District 5 Deputy Director Scott Eades delivered updates on the Adopt-a-Highway program noting the new stipends available for volunteers and the impacts to Boulder Creek traffic amidst Highway 9 construction projects.

Commissioners expressed appreciation for Caltrans’ participation in the North Coast Multiagency Working Group for their coordination efforts to make improvements in transportation along Santa Cruz County’s North Coast.

Received public comment from:
Elaine Rohlfes

In response to a question from a member of the public, Commissioner Eades provided more information on how residents and groups can participate in the Adopt-a-Highway program and apply for the stipends.

21. Watsonville to Santa Cruz Multimodal Corridor Program Update

Senior Transportation Engineer Sarah Christensen delivered the staff report.

Commissioner Caput departed the meeting and Commissioner Alternate Hernandez replaced him.
Commissioners discussed: appreciation for Measure D voters & importance of self-help county status in obtaining project funding; graphics make presentation accessible; inclusion of zero emission buses; Caltrans’ appreciation for joint efforts between agencies; seeking funding for passenger rail service and to provide a cost estimate for an Environmental Impact Report; need for equity for Watsonville workers and freight users; understanding the Greenway initiative and any possible impacts on RTC rail planning; rail lines play a part in equity, environment, and economy; use of data to achieve goals.

In response to questions from Commissioners, staff will follow up with public works staff regarding improvements along school routes; Ms. Christensen provided more clarity on funding matches, grant competitiveness, and cost estimates; Executive Director Preston explained how projects are packaged strategically to make them more competitive; lane closures and traffic mitigation efforts during construction; lack of an Environmental Impact Report for passenger rail prevents the RTC from applying for funds; findings of the TCAA business plan and their impact on the development of an EIR; recent history of freight on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (SCBRL).

Received public comment from:
Brian Peoples, Trail Now
Judy Gittelsohn
Trink Praxel
Barry Scott
Marian Malatesta
Michael Saint
Lani Faulkner
Todd Marco, Nicene Rio Gateway
Elaine Rohlfes
Linda Wilshusen
Jack Brown
Sally Arnold
Tina Andreatta
Sean
Henry Hooker

In response to questions raised by members of the public, staff confirmed that Ms. Christiansen’s presentation will be made available on the RTC website on the Highway projects page; clarification on the span of the bridges & compatibility with potential future HOV lanes; Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to include rehabilitation of railroad bridges; cycle 3 application due in December 2022; unable to apply for funds for passenger rail service without an EIR; clarification that the project has been nominated for consideration of a joint application with Caltrans for cycle 3; eligibility of highway projects for Measure D funding.
22. Informational Report on the Potential Preservation of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (SCBRL) by Railbanking including Future Potential Adverse Abandonment Actions for Heavy Freight Rail Only & Termination of the ACL Agreement

Executive Director Guy Preston delivered the staff report.

Commissioners discussed whether Roaring Camp’s equipment can be transported by truck; the Greenway as described in the ballot initiative appears to require removal of the tracks; viability of sections of the rail track in their current condition for future use; next steps for RTC staff.

RTC General Counsel Steve Mattas and RTC Railway Counsel Eric Hocky responded to questions about litigation exposure resulting from abandonment of the freight easement; liability risk with & without filing for abandonment on the SCBRL & Felton lines; appraisers look at the encumbrances on the property when making an evaluation.

Commissioners discussed: divisiveness makes it difficult to move forward; desire for a market analysis of continuing freight on the rail corridor from RTC and from Roaring Camp; request staff to continue discussions with Roaring Camp; background on railbanking, abandonment, and easements on the SCBRL; the Greenway ballot initiative and its possible effects on rail planning; possibility to find an arrangement of ways to realign the track in some segments; preservation of the rail line serves workers and businesses in South County; fiduciary responsibility; need to rely on data to make decisions; benefits and pitfalls of freight service; request staff to analyze options for trucking Roaring Camp’s locomotives; businesses utilizing freight service in South County; desire for controversial rail-related discussions to occur in public; spirit of transparency and efficacy.

Received public comment from:
Michael Conneran, Roaring Camp
Rosemary Sarka, Roaring Camp
Kyle Kelley
Gina Cole
David Date
Jack Brown
David Schonbrunn, Train Riders Association of California
Brian Peoples, Trail Now
Linda Wilshusen
David Dean
Jim Harville, Placerville and Sacramento Valley Railroad
Brad Wilson, Agron
Lani Faulkner
Barry Scott
Colin Miller
Stacey
Sally Arnold, Friends of the Rail and Trail
David van Brink
Tina Andreatta
Jacob Wysocki
John E
Charles Hicks
Patrick Weismann
Christina LoFranco
Deborah Still
Saladin Sale
Buzz Anderson
Rebecca Downing
Faina Segal
Judy Gittelsohn
Sean
Bud Colligan
Charles Hicks
Mary Offerman
Cheyenne Hauk
Eric Hansen
Richard Murphy
Salvador Allen
Adrian Brandt
Todd Marco, Nicene Rio Gateway

23. Ballot Measure Regarding Rail and Trail

Deputy Director Luis Mendez delivered the staff report.

Commissioners Rotkin and Montesino delivered introductory comments clarifying the Commissioners’ intentions in bringing the item forward on the RTC agenda.

Commissioner Rotkin, with the concurrence of Commissioners Brown and Montesino, withdrew the proposal from consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 2:37 p.m.
24. Next meetings

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 03, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. See agenda for location.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 17, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. by Zoom teleconference.

Respectfully Submitted,

Yesenia Parra
Administrative Services Officer

Attendees:
(408)***-1292 Austin Sherwood
(510)***-3796 B. Young
(510)***-9833 Barry Scott
(530)***-4414 Ben Vernazza
(831)***-6133 Beth Hollenbeck
(831)***-7377 Bill
(831)***-2198 Bill Buchanan
(831)***-7812 Bill McGowan
(831)***-7812 Bob Berlage
(916)***-2220 BobFi
(916)***-5466 Bodey De Nault
(936)***-7630 Brad Wilson with Agron
Aaron Brunckhurt Brett Garrett
Adamczak, Mark (FRA) Brian (Trail Now)
Adrian Brandt Bruce Sawhill
Alex Mahshi(western railway Bud Colligan
museum) Buzz Anderson
Ali Wolf Cajpitola Wine Bar
Alisan Andrews Call-In User_1
Alvaro Romero Call-in User_2
ANAT Lewis Call-in User_3
Andreas Dunn carolrosenoff
Andrew Leporini Casey Beyer
Ann Benham CC
Anna G. Eshoo Cchristman
annlkaplan Charles Hicks
Anonymous Charlie DeFilippis
anonymous1 Chelsea George
Cheyenne and Colin
Chris
Chris Berry - SCWD
Chris Neklason
Christina LoFranco
Christina Watson, TMC Director of Planning
Cliff Walters
Colin Miller - San Lorenzo Valley
Connie Croker
Dan Evans
Dan Lauritson
Dan Slavin
Daniel Zaragoza
david <3 public transit
David Carlson
David Date
David Dean
David Morris
David Rangel
David Schonbrunn, TRAC
David Wade
Deb
Deborah Still
Deltadawn211
Denise Holbert
Diane McClish
Dick Vennerbeck
dmori
dorothy young
Doug Huskey
D-R Martin
Dr. Casey KirkHart
Duncan N
EB
EK
Elaine Rohlfes
Enda
Eric
Eric Olds
Eva Brunner
F. Meschi
Felix Ko
FORT Zoom host
Garret Rosslow
George Reagan
Giancarlo
Gina Cole
ginny314
gk
Gloria Garing
Grace Stetson (she/her)
Heather
Heather Adamson, AMBAG
Heather Woodson
Henry Hooker
hgarygreene
Hoda Emam
Howard Cohen
J T Verbeck
J.M. Brown
Jack Brown - YES Greenway!
Jacob Wysocki
James Sandoval
Janie
Jared
Jason Hoppin
Jayme Ackemann
jbkingsquaire
Jeannie
Jen
Jenna Coura
Jenni
Jennie Dusheck
Jerimiah Oetting
Jesse Bridges
Jeseka
Jessica Martinez-Mckinney
Jessie B.
Jillian Ritter
Jim Harville
Jim Jensen
Jim MacKenzie
Jim warner
Jo Ann Allen
Joe Williams
John Compton
John E.
John McCormick
John Walbridge
Robin McGinnis
Robin Musitelli
Rod Morimoto
Ron Pomerantz
ronperrigojr
Rosemary Sarka
Russell Chen
Ryan
Ryan Sarnataro
Saladin Sale - Rail & Trail
Sally for Rail and Trail
Salvador Allen
Sarah Ringler
Scott Lewis
Sean
Shane Mckeeithen
Silverbirder
Simone Aponte
Skye Herrick
Slavin
Sonja Brunner (she/her/hers)
Stacey
Steve Hill
Steve Wiesner
Stu Wilson
Sue Green
susan brutshcy
takawiseman
Teresa Buika
Terye Balogh
Tess Fitzgerald
Tess Waldo
Thomas Berthold
Tim Brattan
Tina Andreatta
Todd Guild
Todd Manoff
Todd Marco
Tom Rath
Tony Calcagno
Tony Russomanno
Trevor Park
Trink Praxel
Trvor Park
Tyler

Vicki Miller
Vini Carter
Warwick Boulton
Wendy_Sigmund
Will Mayall
Zoom Host2
Zoom user
1. Call to Order: Chair Amelia Conlen called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
Scott Roseman, District 1  
Corrina McFarlane, District 1 (Alt.)  
Peter Scott, District 3  
Anna Kammer, District 4  
Rick Hyman, District 5  
Theresa Rogerson, District 5 (Alt.)  
Paula Bradley, City of Capitola  
Matt Farrell, City of Santa Cruz  
Grace Voss, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)  
Richard Masoner, City of Scotts Valley  
Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville  
Amelia Conlen, Bike-to-Work, Chair  
Leo Jed, CTSC  
Arnold Shir, CTSC (Alt.)

**Unexcused Absences:**
Kathleen Bortolussi, District 2  
John Hunt, District 2 (Alt.)  
Sally Arnold, District 3 (Alt.)  
Liz Hernandez, District 4 (Alt.)  
Michael Moore, City of Capitola (Alt.)  
Drew Rogers, City of Watsonville (Alt.)  
Matt Miller, Bike-to-Work (Alt.)

**Vacancies:**
City of Scotts Valley – Alternate

**Staff:**
Tommy Travers, Transportation Planner  
Rachel Moriconi, Sr. Transportation Planner

**Guests:**
Kailash Mozumder, City of Capitola  
Joshua Spangrud, City of Santa Cruz

3. Staff announcements – Staff announced that Caltrans staff will discuss their complete streets implementation plan at the March ITAC meeting, that the Caltrans District 5 Active Transportation Plan will be released this month, that Committee chair and vice
chair elections will be held in April, and that presentations of concept design plans for coastal rail trail segments 8/9, 10/11, and 12 will be given either at a special meeting in March or at the Committee meeting in April.

4. Oral communications – Murray Fontes announced that Watsonville staff does not support the proposal of the Vision Zero Task Force to revise city code regarding bicycle riding on sidewalks. Matt Farrell stated that the ad-hoc subcommittee created in December did not compose a letter to comment on the draft Regional Transportation Plan.

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – digital handout pertaining to the meeting is posted on the Committee webpage

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion (Roseman/Farrell) was made to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with members Roseman, Scott, Kammer, Hyman, Bradley, Farrell, Masoner, Fontes, Conlen, and Jed voting in favor.

6. Approved draft minutes of the December 13, 2021 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accepted summary of hazard reports

8. Accepted update on expiring Committee seats

9. Accepted correspondence between Committee and County staff regarding Soquel Drive multimodal project

10. Accepted e-bike subsidy flyer

REGULAR AGENDA

11. Clares Street Traffic Calming Improvements – Kailash Mozumder, Capitola Public Works project manager, presented a project on the eastern portion of Clares Street to improve pavement condition, improve pedestrian safety, and improve bicyclist safety. He described features including narrowed vehicle lanes, a new buffered treatment for the bike lanes, speed tables, and green bike lane treatment near intersections. Members of the Committee requested improvement of the connection from the Clares/Wharf intersection to the path which goes to the Soquel Creek bike/ped bridge due to the fact that many bicyclists do not use the wheelchair ramp and requested consideration of improvements for bicycle left turns onto side streets. There was discussion of further improvement to the Clares Street-41st Avenue intersection by moving the westbound bike lane to the inside of the right-turn pocket, adding a bike box for westbound approaching bikes heading south, studying future restoration of the crosswalk at the north segment of the intersection, and adding sharrows on westbound Clares Street on the west side of the intersection.

12. Chestnut Street Storm Drain Replacement and Pavement Rehab Project – Joshua Spangrud, City of Santa Cruz engineer, presented a project on Chestnut Street to replace a stormwater system, the full pavement surface, and about 31 pedestrian ramps. The project will also include the addition of some marked crosswalks across
Chestnut, and there is expected to be a related project soon following to install rectangular rapid-flashing beacons for crossing Chestnut at Church Street. Members of the committee requested further improvement to the Chestnut/Church intersection due to the speed of vehicles on Chestnut in that area and difficulty turning left from Church to Chestnut, markings improvements at the Chestnut St/ Chestnut St Extension intersection so that bicyclists heading north onto Chestnut Extension can cross the railroad tracks at a safer angle and motorists are aware of this maneuver that bicyclists are making, and buffered bike lanes to help discourage speeding.

13. RTC 2022 State and Federal Legislative Program – Rachel Moriconi, Sr. Transportation Planner, presented the draft legislative priorities of the RTC for 2022. The priorities are generally related to improving funding, project deliverability, and safety, and might be ongoing needs or might be in response to legislative changes. She highlighted the portions of the Legislative Program related to bicycling such as the active transportation section, shared mobility, and streamlining regulations for emissions-reducing projects, and mentioned Brown Act modifications to allow continued remote participation in meetings. Members of the Committee requested the RTC support legalization of bicyclists treating stop signs as yield signs, requested an update from staff in 2022 as to how jurisdictions can utilize 2021’s AB43 to reduce speed limits, and requested staff continue supporting options enabling the state to collect steady transportation funding in spite of the decrease of gas tax revenues.

14. County Draft Active Transportation Plan – Amelia Conlen, Ecology Action planner, presented an introduction to the process for updating the Active Transportation Plan for the unincorporated County, including a summary of public outreach performed and the methodology for the project team’s corridor analysis including objective scoring criteria. She presented many of the maps and recommendations that have changed since the preliminary draft presented at the November Committee meeting and directly addressed the comments that the Committee had made previously. She suggested how best Committee members will be able to review the recommendations when the draft plan is released later in February.

15. Updates related to Committee functions – Arnold Shir announced the progress of the Community Traffic Safety Coalition’s Vision Zero Work Plan and other work. Rick Hyman announced that Caltrans is planning on installing rumble strips on state highways in Santa Cruz County and asked staff to seek details from Caltrans and report to the Committee. Amelia Conlen, as a member of the ad-hoc subcommittee providing input for the County’s Soquel Drive multimodal project, walked through the design team’s responses to the Committee (item 9) and also stated that the portion of the road proposed to include separated bike lanes has increased in the most recent early designs.

16. Adjourn – 8:30 pm

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for April 11, 2022 from 6:00pm to 8:30pm. The meeting will be held via teleconference.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:
Tommy Travers, Transportation Planner
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s

**Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee**
*(Also serves as the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council)*

---

**Draft MINUTES**

1:30pm - 3:30pm

Tuesday, February 8, 2022

NOTE: Meeting was held as teleconference

---

1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m.

**Members present:**
- Patty Talbott, Social Services Provider — Seniors
- Tara Ireland, Social Service Provider—Persons of Limited Means
- Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA (Community Bridges)
- Jesus Bojorquez, CTSA (Lift Line)
- Eileen Wagley, SCMTD (Metro)
- Daniel Zaragoza SCMTD (Metro) Alternate
- Michael Pisano, Potential transit User (60+)
- Caroline Lamb, Potential Transit User (Disabled)
- Janet Edwards, 1st District
- Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
- Patricia Fohrman, 4th District

**Unexcused absences:**
- Alex Weske, Social Service Provider – Disabled
- Paul Elerick, 2nd District
- Ed Hutton, 5th District

**RTC staff present:**
- Amanda Marino, Transportation Planner
- Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

**Others present:**
- Becky Steinbruner, Cabrillo Host Lions Club
- Daniel Young, Member of the Public
- Sean Shrum, Member of the Public
- Joshua Spangrud, City of Santa Cruz
- Alex Yasbek, City of Watsonville
Kailash Mozumder, City of Capitola
Gus Alfaro, Caltrans D5
Abraham Carmona, Caltrans D5
Dan Estranero, City of Santa Cruz
Amelia Conlen, Ecology Action Planner

2. Introductions

3. Oral communications

Daniel Young, disabled veteran senior citizen, expressed his opposition for the Greenway initiative.

Committee Member Janet Edwards announced the opportunity to provide input on the aesthetic design elements for Highway 1 Bay Ave/Porter Street to State Park Dr. Auxiliary Lanes Project.

Sean Shrum, member of the public, stated the need for freight and emergency services on the rail line.

Becky Steinbruner, member of the public representing Cabrillo Host Lions Club, expressed interest in partnering with the E&D TAC and serving on the committee, as well as providing assistance with funding pedestrian projects. Ms. Steinbruner contacted Erik Riera, Behavioral Health Director County of Santa Cruz, regarding providing wheelchair accessible taxi service.

4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

*Move Item 17. Caltrans D5 Hybrid Beacons on Mission St. before Item 11.*

**CONSENT AGENDA**

5. Approved minutes from January 11, 2022

*A motion (Edwards, Berkowitz) was made to approve the minutes with corrections to the spelling of “Talbott” and revising oral communications. The motion passed with members Patty Talbott, Tara Ireland, Lisa Berkowitz, Jesus Bojorquez, Michael Pisano, Caroline Lamb, Janet Edwards, Veronica Elsea, and Patricia Fohrman voting in favor.*

6. Received RTC Meeting Highlights
7. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report

8. Received FY 22-23 TDA Claims Calendar

9. Received Notice of Chair and Vice Chair Election

10. Received Information Items
    a. Regional E-Bike Rebate Summary Flyer

A motion (Pisano/Edwards) was made to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed with members Patty Talbott, Tara Ireland, Lisa Berkowitz, Jesus Bojorquez, Michael Pisano, Caroline Lamb, Janet Edwards, and Veronica Elsea voting in favor. Patricia Fohrman was not present for the vote.

REGULAR AGENDA

17. (Item moved before Item 11.) Caltrans D5 Hybrid Beacons on Mission St.

Gus Alfaro and Abraham Carmona, Caltrans D5 Staff, presented to the E&D TAC information to replace and upgrade the existing pedestrian flashing beacons at Mission & Olive / Mission & Berkshire with Pedestrian Hybrid Flashing Beacons (PHFB). The committee provided input that includes ensuring that the cabinet location allows sidewalk wheelchair access and audible accessible features on beacons.

No action taken.

11. Received Program Updates
    a. Volunteer Center

Tara Ireland announced that volunteers are required to wear K-N95 masks while transporting participants in personal vehicles as well as providing K-N95 masks to participants in the programs.

    b. Community Bridges

Jesus Bojorquez provided a program update that Lift Line is continuing their program providing free rides to Covid-19 vaccinations sites. Drivers and participants are required to wear a mask.

    c. Santa Cruz Metro

Eileen Wagley informed the committee that Metro is currently in the
process of evaluating applicants for a CEO. Additionally, ParaCruz ridership has reached 80% of pre-Covid ridership levels, hired three new drivers, and one dispatcher.

d. SCCRTC

Amanda Marino, Transportation Planner, notified the committee of the date of the next Budget and Administration/Personnel (BAP) Committee that will meet on March 10th as requested at the last E&D TAC meeting. Ms. Marino informed the committee that the E&D TAC may need to hold a special meeting in March to provide input on the Coastal Rail Trail.

e. Pedestrian Ad-Hoc Subcommittee
   i. Pedestrian Hazard Report
   ii. Letter to the City of Santa Cruz Public Works Department

Chair Veronica Elsea communicated that the subcommittee continues to regularly review the pedestrian hazard reports and will be scheduling another meeting in the next few weeks.

Committee member Janet Edwards announced that the Kaiser project has been delayed and will be continuing in the Spring of 2022. This project will involve rezoning for housing, sidewalk, and signal improvements. Ms. Edwards additionally provided an update on the Chanticleer Bridge and Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes and Bus-on-Shoulder Project.

12. Committee Appointments

Amanda Marino, Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the eight applicants expressing interest to fill vacancies on the E&D TAC shown in the February 2022 membership roster.

A motion (Edwards/Lamb) was made to recommend approval to the RTC to appoint new members to the E&D TAC. The motion passed with members Patty Talbott, Tara Ireland, Lisa Berkowitz, Jesus Bojorquez, Michael Pisano, Caroline Lamb, Janet Edwards, and Veronica Elsea voting in favor. Patricia Fohrman was not present for the vote.

13. Preliminary Draft 2022 Unmet Needs List

Chair Veronica Elsea and Amanda Marino, Transportation Planner, provided a background and importance of identifying Unmet Transit and Paratransit Needs. The Unmet Needs List is used to support recommendations for funding prioritization, and to provide input to
service providers. The committee provided input on the Preliminary Draft 2022 Unmet Needs List.

*No action taken.*

14. City of Santa Cruz Regional Bike Share Program

Alex Yasbek, staff from the City of Watsonville, shared information on the status of the City of Santa Cruz in partnership with the Cities of Capitola and Watsonville, the County of Santa Cruz, UCSC, and Cabrillo College Electric Bike Share Program. The E&D TAC provided input on bike parking including recommendations on how to ensure pedestrians and individuals with disabilities navigate the bikes properly.

*No action taken.*

15. City of Santa Cruz TDA Funded Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons

Dan Estranero, staff from the City of Santa Cruz, provided updated information on the Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) and informed the committee that they are looking for future funding to upgrade the beacons installed to include audible functions. The City of Santa Cruz is installing six more RRFBs and will consider adding audible functions.

*No action taken.*

16. City of Santa Cruz’s Chestnut Storm Drain and Pavement Rehabilitation Project

Joshua Spangrud, staff from City of Santa Cruz gave an overview of the Chestnut Street Storm Drain Replacement and Pavement Rehabilitation Project highlighting improvements to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. The E&D TAC asked questions on topics regarding pedestrian accessibility.

*No action taken.*

18. Capitola’s Draft Design for Clares & 41st Ave Projects

Kailash Mozumder, City of Capitola, presented Capitola’s Draft Design for Clares & 41st Ave Projects emphasizing the complete streets elements. The committee asked questions and provided input including the need for Rapid Flashing Beacons to have audible components and accessible placement of push buttons. Additionally, the committee provided comments on the need to improve sidewalk condition and accessibility for pedestrians using mobility devices.
No action taken.

19. Draft Santa Cruz County Active Transportation Plan

Due to time constraints this item will be solicited for input via email aconlen@ecoact.org.

No action taken.

20. Draft 2022 RTC Legislative Program

Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner delivered an overview of the Draft 2022 RTC Legislative Program to the committee. Committee members provided input and are encouraged to review the preliminary draft 2022 Legislative Program and email rmoriconi@sccrtc.org by February 11, 2022 any changes the RTC should consider.

No action taken.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:07 pm.

The next E&D TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 12, 2022 at 1:30 p.m. NOTE: Teleconference may be necessary due to COVID-19.

Respectfully submitted, Amanda Marino, Staff
RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) receive updates on state and federal legislative issues and adopt the RTC’s legislative program (Attachment 1) to assist in analyzing the transportation impacts of legislative activities in 2022.

BACKGROUND

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

DISCUSSION

The State and Federal legislative platforms guide RTC staff and board member comments on legislative and administrative proposals that may arise throughout the year. The platforms are used to advance regional projects and key goals and targets in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan, which focuses on sustainability to improve multimodal access and mobility in ways that improve health, reduce pollution and retain money in the local economy; reduce collisions and improve safety; maintain existing transportation infrastructure and services; and deliver improvements cost effectively, equitably and responsive to the needs of all...
users of the transportation system and the natural environment.

Staff recommends that the RTC review draft legislative priorities, identify any additional issues that the RTC should consider, monitor or pursue, and approve the 2022 legislative program (Attachment 1). New items that were not included in the 2021 Legislative Programs are underlined. In preparing the 2022 state and federal legislative platforms, staff took into consideration input received from members of the Bicycle Committee, Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC), and Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC).

Generally, the RTC’s legislative program covers legislative and administrative actions that:
- Involve funding or a funding mechanism for transportation projects and programs
- Involve the implementation of transportation and greenhouse gas emission reduction policies and programs
- Involve transportation and land use
- Involve project implementation and the environmental review process
- Affect the Commission directly (e.g. Commission responsibilities, policies or operations)

2022 Focus
In 2022, a key focus area at the state and federal level will be on implementation of the multiyear federal transportation act (Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA)). RTC and Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) staff sit on several implementation working groups organized by CalSTA, which will influence how funds are distributed. Notably, Congressional “continuing resolutions” (rather than a full new FY21/22 federal budget) have left many programs stuck at pre-IIJA levels. Staff will also continue monitoring federal negotiations around stimulus and federal “Build Back Better” Act.

At the state level, key issues will include modernization of the Brown Act related to remote/virtual meetings, state budget and other transportation funding proposals, and resiliency programs. Governor Newsom’s January Budget proposal includes an additional $9 billion for transportation projects, including:
- $500 million augmentation for the Active Transportation Program;
- $3.75 billion for the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) ($2 billion for transit and rail projects; $1.25 billion for specific transit projects in Southern California; $500 million for rail grade separations);
- $400 million Climate Adaptation Projects for state and local projects that support climate resiliency and reduce risks from climate impacts;
- $150 million Reconnecting Communities/Highways to Boulevards Pilot to turn underutilized highways into multimodal corridors that support affordable housing and complete streets in DACs; and
- $100 million for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) bike and ped safety projects that reduce severe injuries and fatalities.
- $1.2 billion for port, freight, and goods movement infrastructure; $1.1 billion workforce training and ZEV equipment related to supply chain (trucks, port equipment);
- Zero-Emission Vehicles: $10 billion over six years for investments in zero-emission vehicles and infrastructure to accelerate the state’s progress toward meeting its climate and transportation goals established in Executive Order N-79-20 and advance California’s Zero-Emission Vehicle Market Development Strategy;
- Clean California: Additional $100 million General Funds to continue Local Grants to cities, counties, transit agencies, and other government agencies to remove trash and debris through FY23/24.

The Legislative Program includes the following positions on the state budget:

- **Oppose** the Governor’s proposal and bills that would delay the indexing of the gas tax this year (about 3 cents per gallon). The RTC, legislators, and transportation stakeholders worked hard to pass SB1 (2017) and provide more stability to transportation funding. Existing transportation funding continues to be insufficient to operate, maintain, and improve the transportation system and it would be short sided to reduce funding for local street and road, state highway safety, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects.

- **Support** making more than just $9 billion of the projected state surplus (estimated at $30-60 billion) available for transportation projects and programs – including an Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) request for additional funds for system preservation.

In 2021, the State Legislature introduced more than 2500 bills, resolutions and constitutional amendments. A few of the bills RTC staff tracked last year and the result of those bills included:

- AB 43 (Friedman) Traffic Safety: setting speed limits. – Chaptered.
- AB 361 (Rivas, Robert) Open meetings: state & local agencies: teleconferences. – Chaptered.
- AB 339 (Lee) Local government: open and public meetings. - Vetoed
- AB 122 (Boerner Horvath) Vehicles: required stops: bicycles. - Vetoed
- AB 1147 (Friedman) Regional transportation plans. (sustainable communities strategies) - Vetoed
- SB 261 (Allen) Regional transportation plans: sustainable communities strategies. 2-Year Bill
- SB 475 (Cortese) Transportation planning: sustainable communities strategies. 2-Year Bill

**Next Steps**
Staff will monitor legislative proposals throughout the year and advocate for transportation-related statutes and guidelines that advance RTC priorities, consistent with the RTC’s adopted legislative program. Staff will periodically provide updates to the RTC board on major state and federal legislative and administrative proposals and will meet with legislators and state and federal agencies departments to discuss actions which could support implementation of transportation priorities. The RTC Chairs will also participate in the Central Coast Coalition’s annual Sacramento Advocacy Day this month to highlight key issues on the Central Coast.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

Through the RTC’s legislative program, the RTC tracks and provides input on state and federal legislative and administrative actions that could impact the amount of funding available for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County or the cost to implement projects. The RTC budget includes some funding for staff to monitor and provide input on legislation. The RTC is receives some assistance tracking and providing input on legislation as a member of Central Coast Coalition, California Council of Governments (CalCOG), the Self Help County Coalition (SHCC), and the California Special District Associations. While the RTC does not currently have a contract with federal or state consultants to provide assistance tracking and implementing this work, staff may recommend contracting with consultants to provide assistance in the future.

**SUMMARY**

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopts legislative priorities to guide its analysis of state and federal legislative or administrative actions that could impact transportation projects in Santa Cruz County. The legislative program (Attachment 1) is used to support transportation-related statutes and guidelines that recognize Santa Cruz County’s significant transportation funding, traffic congestion, maintenance, safety, active transportation, and transit system needs and sustainability goals.

Attachments:
1. Draft 2022 State and Federal Legislative Programs
Focus Areas in 2022
Proposed changes from 2021 highlighted in underline/strikeout.

- Implementation of the federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). Maximize funding available for priority projects in Santa Cruz County.

- State Budget. Maximize General Fund surplus funds for local system preservation, Active Transportation Program (ATP), and local/regional priority transportation projects. Oppose efforts which could reduce transportation funding, especially for local streets and roads and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

- Support modifications to the Brown Act to enhance public and committee member participation in virtual meetings.

- Ensure legislative and administrative actions support implementation of priority transportation projects and programs in Santa Cruz County, including projects identified in the Measure D Expenditure Plan. Maintain and increase funding for RTC projects and programs, support streamlining and other actions which could expedite delivery of projects, and oppose efforts which could hinder implementation of RTC priorities.

- Support efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve mobility through increased funding for pedestrian, bicycle and transit projects, increased equitable access to zero emission vehicles and infrastructure. Pursue changes to SB375 Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that support GHG emission reduction and reduce bureaucratic burdens.

- Support efforts related to adaptation, resilience and response to natural hazards and the impacts of climate change, including extreme storms, sea level rise and wildfires.

- Support legislative and administrative actions that will improve safety on state highways and local roads, including AB43 implementation (speed limit reductions) and Caltrans Director’s order related to complete streets, especially where state highways serve as main streets.

- Support Transportation Development Act (TDA) program modifications which reduce the burden of outdated performance measures and eliminate the farebox recovery penalty for public transportation systems.

- Support state and federal COVID-19 relief and stimulus funding to support economic recovery and make up for state, local and transit agency transportation revenue losses.

- Support new transportation funding mechanisms to replace gas and diesel taxes, considering vehicle fuel economy and zero-emission vehicle adoption.
Ongoing Priorities

Transportation Funding

- **Protect Transportation Funding:** Preserve existing and new funding for transportation projects, maximize funding for Santa Cruz County transportation projects, and preserve regional discretion and priority-setting.
  
  o Stable, formula funding is essential for addressing the backlog of transportation infrastructure repairs and improvements in Santa Cruz County. Protect current and future taxes and fees and other transportation funds (including Highway Users Tax Account (HUTA), Transportation Development Act (TDA), State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Active Transportation Program (ATP), and other funds) from elimination or diversion to other State programs, General Fund loans, general obligation bond debt service, or to other non-transportation purposes.

  o Support actions that preserve the intent of Senate Bill 1 (SB1) and local measure funding to allow the State, regions and local agencies to maintain, protect and improve existing transportation funds dedicated to transit, congestion management on the state highway system, lifeline arterials, and goods movement routes while also addressing immediate and long-term unmet funding needs.*

  o Monitor implementation efforts of Executive Order N-19-19, which directs the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) to invest its annual $5 billion portfolio to help reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions, and to ensure that state funds, specifically SB 1 funds, continue to be used for transportation purposes. Ensure that state regulations do not negatively impact implementation of the voter-approved Measure D Expenditure Plan.

  o With increased emphasis on vehicle fuel economy and zero-emission vehicle adoption, explore and support new funding mechanisms to replace gas and diesel taxes for transportation investments. Monitor proposals such as pay-by-the-mile user fees, public private partnerships, vehicle registration fees, or wholesale energy taxes. Ensure that proposals are equitable to disadvantaged and rural areas.*

  o Oppose proposals that could tie transportation fund availability to local jurisdictions, to non-transportation and development projects.

- **COVID Recovery:**
  
  o Support state and federal COVID-19 relief and stimulus legislation to provide funding to address adverse funding impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on transit and other local agencies and to expedite project implementation.

  o Temporarily **adjust maintenance of effort and performance criteria requirements**, for SB1 Local Streets and Roads Program, local sales tax measure funds, and fare-box recovery requirements for transit given impacts on local revenues from COVID-19.
**Ensure Fair Distribution of Funding:**
- Ensure state and federal funds are made available for projects in Santa Cruz County, are distributed equitably, and are not disproportionately distributed to large regions. Ensure competitive programs make funding reasonably available for multimodal projects in Santa Cruz County, that address local and regional priorities.
- **Local Role:** Ensure a strong role for regional and local agencies in planning and determining transportation investment priorities. Support legislation that respects local authority, protecting or expanding local decision-making in programming expenditures of transportation funds, rather than the State making top-down funding decisions that are not community-based. Project and increase direct funding to regions through both federal and state programs; and reinforce and build upon the structure of SB45 that provides regions a strong voice in the programming of state funds.
- **State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP):** Ensure equitable programming and allocation of STIP funds.
- **“Disadvantaged Communities” Definition:** Ensure that legislation and programs aimed at benefiting disadvantaged communities use a definition of “disadvantaged communities” (DACs) that ensures that projects that benefit low-income and other transportation disadvantaged residents of Santa Cruz County are not excluded from funding opportunities that support sustainable communities, transportation choices, and investments in alternative modes of transportation. Ensure that the definition does not rely exclusively on communities defined as DACs by CalEnviroScreen, which disproportionately excludes many low-income communities in Santa Cruz County.

**Increase Funding for All Transportation Modes:** Support measures that increase funding for and support implementation of transportation projects in Santa Cruz County, including funds for ongoing system maintenance, congestion reduction, safety, complete streets, active transportation bike, pedestrian, transit projects, transit-oriented development, and specialized transportation for seniors and people with disabilities in Santa Cruz County.
- **New funding systems:** Phase in new funding systems which are tied to system use, rather than fuel consumption or fuel prices. May include new user fees, such as a Road User Charge or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) fee and other alternative funding mechanisms.
- **Expand local revenue-raising opportunities** and innovative financing options to address the significant backlog of transportation needs. Provide locals with the ability to supplement and leverage state funding for investments that protect state and local transportation assets.
- **Expand the authority of the RTC and local entities to increase taxes and fees** for transportation projects, such as new gas taxes, vehicle registration fees, property-tax financing, and infrastructure financing districts.
Support clarifying amendment to Government Code Section 65089.20 that will give RTPAs equal treatment with Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to seek voter approval for a local vehicle registration fee. *(SB83 cleanup)*

**Lower Vote Threshold:** Support efforts to amend the California constitution to lower the voter threshold for local transportation and affordable housing funding measures, such as local sales tax or vehicle registration fee ballot measures, from the 2/3 supermajority to a simple majority or 55% vote. Support actions which would broaden eligibility in existing and/or new transportation funding streams to enable their use as a subsidy for low-income transportation system users (e.g. discounted fares for public transportation or shared mobility service).

**Active Transportation Program (ATP):** Increase ATP funding and ensure potential reforms to the Active Transportation Program (ATP) do not reduce the proportion available for Santa Cruz County agencies to compete for, including funds to the competitive statewide, small urban and rural funding pots. Support efforts to simplify the Active Transportation Program (ATP) application and project delivery, build local capacity to deliver transformative projects, and provide regions greater flexibility to innovate and strategically invest funds to meet local needs.*

**Cap & Trade:**
- Increase percent of Cap & Trade revenues allocated to transportation projects and programs that help reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Santa Cruz County.
- Support increases in Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) appropriations.
- Support policy changes to the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities program (AHSC) that increase funding opportunities for projects in Santa Cruz County.
- Ensure continued funding for low and zero emission transit deployment. Ensure regulatory and legislative requirements related to transit electrification provide flexibility, consider cost and available technology, and do not place an undue burden on transit agencies.
- Support legislation to devote a permanent Cap-and-Trade funding allocation to the Active Transportation Program.

Support legislation to increase the availability of funding for cities, counties, and regions to support economic development, affordable housing, and implementation of sustainable community strategies, as well as policy tools to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel in a manner that ensures equitable policy outcomes.

Support innovative projects such as a new state-supported intercity passenger rail service on the planned Coast Route between the Bay Area and Goleta *(previously called the Coast Daylight)*.*
Increase and Preserve Funding for Priority Projects in Santa Cruz County:
- Projects on Highway 1
- Local Street and Roadway Preservation
- Transit projects
- 511 implementation
- Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities, including the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) and in San Lorenzo Valley
- Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line preservation
- Soquel Avenue-Freedom Boulevard Corridor

Transportation Development Act (TDA):
- Monitor potential modifications to the TDA. Ensure funding for transit, planning, administrative, and other TDA purposes in Santa Cruz County are not reduced. Oppose efforts that would reduce TDA funds which are essential for RTC administration and planning. Support the development of greater efficiencies within the TDA while streamlining and updating performance metrics and eliminating penalties associated with farebox recovery. Support development of alternative performance measures that are focused on incentivizing transit agency actions that improve transit service and increase ridership, consistent with state and regional climate and equity goals.
- Ensure discount fares aimed at boosting ridership and improving social equity do not result in reduced state funding. Pursue relief from TDA audits and performance criteria during the current economic downturn.

Project Implementation
Streamlining, Expediting, Facilitating Project Delivery: Support administrative and/or legislative efforts which may be required to implement or expedite delivery of priority projects. Includes actions that streamline funding applications, simplify program administration, efforts that modernize and accelerate project delivery.
- Support the development of greater efficiencies of transportation project implementation, including California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) reform, storm water runoff regulations, CA Fish and Wildlife, CA Water Quality Control Board and California Public Utilities Commission permit and approval processes, to streamline both project development and delivery for priority transportation and transit projects, including the Scotts Creek Bridge Replacement and implementation of the Regional Conservation Investment Strategy (RCIS), and eliminating any unnecessary, overly burdensome and/or duplicative mandates.
- Support legislative and administrative actions required to secure permits that may be required to implement priority projects.
- Opportunities to expedite transportation project delivery may include increasing contracting and financing options, increased flexibility in early allocation of programmed funds and initiating reimbursable work with local funds in advance of CTC allocation of all projects, efforts that expedite the Caltrans design review process, opportunities to expedite locally-sponsored projects on the state highway system, and increase in encroachment permit limits.
- Support environmental streamlining measures for bike, pedestrian, transit, and infrastructure preservation within existing public rights of way, and other measures that expedite project delivery. Support efforts that provide for streamlined project delivery for transit projects that fulfill the goals of AB 32 and
DRAFT

SB 375, as well as other state and federal air quality mandates and mobility performance measures.
- Support delegation of fund allocation responsibilities to Caltrans.
- Allow advance payment of programmed funds, in order to expedite project delivery and resolve cash flow challenges faced especially by small agencies.

- **Advanced Mitigation:** Support implementation of “advanced mitigation” environmental programs, including approving up-front environmental mitigation funding for projects, such as the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing. Support creation of a low-interest loan program to support advance mitigation and habitat conservation plans that mitigate the impacts of transportation infrastructure and make project implementation more efficient.

- **Safety:** Support legislation and programs that improve transportation safety for all users and support programs aimed at eliminating all traffic-related serious injuries and fatalities.
  - **Speed limits:** Support proposals that would implementation of AB43(2021) which allows local jurisdictions and Caltrans to reduce motor vehicle speed limits on both local roads and state highways and work with state representatives to modify the California Vehicle Code to allow for prima facie Caltrans to reduce speed limits of 25 mph on state highways that function as main streets, especially in business and school zones to address findings, and support implementation of to address other recommendations of the AB2363 Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force report.
  - **Traffic Laws & Enforcement:** Support proposals to increase enforcement and modification of traffic laws to better protect pedestrians and bicyclists, including proposals to authorize automated speed enforcement on a pilot program basis, and modifications to vehicle code to allow vehicles to cross a double-yellow line when passing cyclists.
  - **Education:** Support commercial driver, bus driver, motorist, bicyclist, and Safe Routes to Schools training and education programs which reduce collisions.

- **Active Transportation Facilities:** Support modification to rules, regulations, and government codes that will make roadways more bicycle and pedestrian-friendly, including: laws associated with sharing the road; ensuring complete streets components (e.g. accessible pedestrian signals) are considered during the design of all projects; increasing funds for pedestrian, bicycle, and new micro-mobility devices and services (e.g. bike share), and safety countermeasures (e.g. buffered or protected bike lanes, flashers and lighting at crosswalks); increasing funds to provide resources necessary for First/Last Mile improvements; Safe Routes to School Programs; making it legal for people on bikes to treat stop signs as yields (bike safety stop); and providing additional direction and consistency for accessible pedestrian design.

- **Land Use/Housing/Transportation Coordination:**
  - Support efforts to reduce vehicles miles traveled and promote job-housing balance which also protect locally-driven land use planning that implements broad policy goals set by the state to provide affordable housing in transit-rich areas.
Encourage new developments to incentivize active transportation and transit use. Ensure SB743 (Steinberg, 2013) implementation supports infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and expedites transportation project delivery. Support innovative measures to mitigate growth in vehicle miles traveled, such as regional mitigation banks.

- Support state goals to reduce homelessness. Monitor implementation of Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-23-20 which requires Caltrans to develop a model lease template to allow counties and cities to use Caltrans property adjacent to highways or state roads for short-term emergency homelessness shelter; and requests that special districts, cities, counties, and transit agencies, and others to examine their ability to provide shelter and house homeless individuals.
- Support efforts to streamline SB375 implementation and extend the timeframe between required Regional Transportation Plan updates.

- **Federal Transportation Act Implementation:** Support legislation and administrative strategies to implement the federal authorization bill (Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA)), in a way that ensures the best possible outcome for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County.

- **SHOPP Program:**
  - Support Caltrans’ efforts to provide more outreach regarding State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects and to include measurable targets for improving the state highway system. Support clarification of existing laws to permit the expenditure of SHOPP funds for operational projects on state highways.
  - Support inclusion of complete streets within SHOPP projects, as appropriate, but especially in areas where state highways serve as main streets, such as Highway 1/Mission St, Highway 9 through San Lorenzo Valley, and Highway 152 in Santa Cruz County.

- **Commuter Programs:** Support policies and legislation aimed at reducing trips and vehicle miles traveled and associated traffic congestion, including, but not limited to, employer-based programs to help reduce the share of commuting by single-occupant vehicles, expanding broadband and incentives to facilitate telecommuting, expanding park and ride lots, and a regional commuter benefits ordinance. Support dedicated funding for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs and strategies.

- **Shared Mobility Systems:** Support policies that enable technological innovations to improve mobility, while protecting the public’s interest. Monitor legislation and regulations related to shared mobility, such as transportation network companies (TNCs) and real-time carpooling, to ensure that mobility benefits are maximized, especially for underserved populations, and access to critical data for transportation and land-use planning and operational purposes is assured. Support measures that allow for local control and regulation of shared mobility systems such as scooters, bikes, and other fleets.
Connected and Autonomous Vehicles: Monitor and engage in legislation and regulations to facilitate deployment of connected vehicles and autonomous vehicles. Oppose federal efforts to preempt local authority over the use of autonomous vehicles in their communities. In partnership with California cities and counties, transit agencies, the business community, and other transportation organizations, engage in regulatory and legislative efforts related to connected and autonomous vehicles with the goal of accelerating their safety, mobility, environmental, equity and economic benefits. Similar to the “shared mobility” strategy, support access to critical data for transportation and land use planning and operational purposes.

Electrification and Zero Emission vehicle fleets: Support funding and coordination, including policy, planning, and infrastructure, for low and zero emission vehicles.
- Support additional dedicated funding to help transit operators and colleges convert their bus and van fleets to zero-emission in order to meet the state’s Innovative Clean Transit rule and accelerate the decarbonization of the transportation system. Support reduced utility pricing for public transit electric vehicle fleets.
- Support proposals that provide funding for regions and localities to build infrastructure (including chargers, trenching, upgrading electrical capacity) and provide incentives for zero-emission vehicle and other modal device purchases, considering cost of increased usage of electricity, electric power storage capacity, proper safety protocols and access for lower-income households.

Resilience: Monitor and support legislation that invests in projects and programs to improve resilience to the impacts of climate change on transportation infrastructure and utilization of public transit in emergencies that address scenarios such as severe storm events, public safety power shut off events, wildfires, and sea level rise.

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

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

Central Coast Representation: Advocate for Central Coast representatives to be appointed to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and other state boards and committees in order to ensure that the complexities of small, coastal, and rural jurisdictions addressing their infrastructure and mobility needs are considered.

Modernization of the Brown Act: Enact legislation to expand public and board participation in public meetings. In order to maximize participation and access by board and committee members, modify the Brown Act to enhance participation and eliminate requirement to notice of all remote board or committee member locations.
Support legislative clean-up of AB 361 (Rivas) to provide greater flexibility to local and regional agencies to hold meetings virtually without the requirement to renew findings every 30 days.

Monitor and support legislation to provide long-term flexibility for regional and multijurisdictional agencies to conduct their business remotely outside of emergency conditions as a means of increasing public participation and board and committee member participation while also reducing the time and expenses associated with travel, vehicle miles traveled and the greenhouse gas and other tailpipe emissions from driving.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
2022 FEDERAL Legislative Program

**Priority Projects:** Seek and preserve funding for priority transportation projects and programs in Santa Cruz County, including:

- Projects on Highway 1
- Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line preservation
- Transit operations and capital projects
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST/Rail Trail)
- Local street and roadway preservation
- 511 implementation
- Highway 1 Scotts Creek Bridge Replacement
- Highway 9/SLV Corridor Complete Streets

**Transportation Act Reauthorization Implementation**

- Support implementation of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) in a manner that maximizes funding for implementation of priority projects in Santa Cruz County, including formula and discretionary funding and policies.
- As Congress works on reauthorization of the FAST Act, which expires in September 2021, support California’s reauthorization principles for a long-term, fully funded transportation authorization that supports local agencies achieving national, state and regional goals related to infrastructure condition, safety, mobility, and air quality.

**Transportation Funding**

- **Raise New Revenues & Grow Existing Programs:** Support raising and indexing federal gas taxes and development of new funding mechanisms to ensure the financial integrity and solvency of the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) and Mass Transportation Account. Increase federal transportation investment all modes to bring transportation infrastructure up to a good state of repair and meet growing transportation needs in Santa Cruz County.
- **Increase funding:** Support a reauthorization bill and other legislative actions that increase funding for priority projects in Santa Cruz County, including:
  - **Active Transportation:** Bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility projects, such as the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP).
  - **Transit:** Small Transit Intensive Cities Program (STIC), funding for acquisition of transit capital (Bus and Bus Facilities, and Low and No Emissions Bus Programs), Capital Investment Grants, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) implementation, state of good repair, and other transit programs. Support tax credits for the purchase of electric buses.
  - **Local Roads and Highways:** Support robust funding for core programs such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and bridge programs needed for local entities to address the backlog of bridge and roadway projects.
  - **Self-Help Counties:** Support programs that reward areas which have approved self-help revenue measures like Measure D and the METRO dedicated sales taxes.
  - **Planning:** Federal planning funds to address increased planning, performance measure, monitoring, and model requirements.
Transit Oriented Development (TOD): Grants or pilot programs for comprehensive planning and infill development to connect housing, jobs, and mixed-use development with transportation options.

Support COVID Relief and Economic Recovery: Support federal funding to support economic recovery, local and state responses to the public health crisis, and backfill any transportation revenue losses due to COVID-19.

Infrastructure Initiative: If an infrastructure package, such as the “Moving Forward Act” or Climate and social spending bills: If a funding package, such as the “Build Back Better” bill, advances, support inclusion of funding for sustainable transportation and system preservation to ensure that the initiative increases transportation investment opportunities for projects in Santa Cruz County and addresses principles for reauthorization of the transportation act. Any infrastructure package should ensure projects in Santa Cruz County are not disadvantaged in accessing those funds. The initiative should also include a significant investment of new federal funds for transportation, stabilize the Highway Trust Fund and not be offset by reductions to other federal programs serving Santa Cruz County residents.

Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Climate Resiliency: Strengthen federal partnership to improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and make our communities and transportation networks resilient to a changing climate.

Funding: Support development of new resources to support climate adaptation and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation (similar to those included in the Senate FAST Act reauthorization bill (S. 2302)), expand eligibility for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and other funding programs to Santa Cruz County.

Electrification: Support federal funding, tax credits, and coordination of vehicle electrification purchase (including buses), planning and infrastructure.

Mitigation: Defend against rollbacks of California’s air quality and climate change laws and regulation, such as fuel efficiency standards and cap-and-trade programs.

Resiliency: Support resiliency and climate change preparedness and efforts that could support local efforts to improve resiliency, respond to new or worsening storm, fire, and other environmental hazards and meet regional climate goals. Support efforts to increase planning funds that help regional governments address climate change and make regional transportation infrastructure more resilient.

Disaster Recovery: Ensure the federal government provides sufficient emergency relief appropriations and federal agency resources to support rebuilding and recovery efforts for wildfire, storm, and other natural disasters. Support legislative efforts to extend the timeframe for road projects qualifying for federal disaster reimbursement to move to the construction phase from two years to six years.

Federal Authorization Implementation: Support legislation and administrative strategies to implement federal transportation authorization bills in a way that ensures the best possible outcome for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County. Ensure that U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) implementation of MAP-21, FAST Act, IIJA and any new transportation act rules and regulations do not have a negative impact on local projects and programs.
DRAFT

- **Discretionary Grants:** Advocate for discretionary transportation grant awards for priority transportation projects in Santa Cruz County, including the Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD, formerly TIGER) and Capital Investment Grant program.

- **Innovative Financing:** Ensure proposals for public-private partnerships and innovative financing are favorable for project implementation in Santa Cruz County. Support and expand the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) program and make the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (RRIF) program more accessible to smaller public agencies.

- **Department of Transportation Budget and Annual Appropriations.** Ensure that Congress appropriates funding consistent with amounts authorized in federal transportation authorizations (e.g. FAST ActIIJA), even if Continuing Resolutions (CR) are needed to keep transportation programs running each fiscal year.

- **Oppose rescissions or arbitrary cuts** that could reduce funding for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County.

- **Support transparent congressionally-directed spending** (earmarks) to allow for Congressional support of priority projects in Santa Cruz County.

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

- **Performance Measures:** Support development of performance measures which are consistent with RTC approved goals, policies, and targets and which recognize data limitations of many regions. Support open collaboration, data sharing and funding to successfully implement state and federal performance-based planning and management requirements.

- **Protect and expand transportation fringe benefits.** Reinstate the commuter benefit, which was eliminated under the tax reform bill. In addition, advocate for expanding pre-tax transportation fringe benefit eligibility to include shared mobility options, such as bike-share and shared ride carpool services.

- **Shared Mobility:** Advocate for federal legislative and regulatory updates that support shared mobility options such as bike-share, shared rides, carpooling, and shared scooters. Support expanding pre-tax transportation fringe benefit eligibility to include shared mobility options. This change would support the now-permanent Bay Area Commuter Benefits program by expanding federal tax incentives utilize alternatives to single occupancy travel to commute to work.

- **Autonomous Vehicles:** Oppose federal efforts to preempt local authority to regulate the use of autonomous vehicles in their communities.

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

FROM: Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner

RE: GO Santa Cruz County Outreach and Marketing Contracts

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a sole-source contract with Miller-Maxfield, Inc. for GO Santa Cruz County TDM marketing services, in an amount not to exceed $30,000 (Attachment 2); and

2. Authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a sole-source contract with Ecology Action for GO Santa Cruz County TDM employer outreach services, in an amount not to exceed $40,000 (Attachment 3); and

3. Approving a fiscal year (FY) 2021-22 budget amendment as shown in Exhibit A of Attachment 1.

BACKGROUND

For more than 40 years, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has offered transportation demand management (TDM) services to Santa Cruz County with the goal of using the existing transportation system more effectively by assisting travelers to use various modes of transportation, especially sustainable transportation modes. All RTC TDM programs and services fall under the Cruz511 brand and GO Santa Cruz County is one component of the program.

In mid-2019, the RTC partnered with the City of Santa Cruz to license an online commute management and rewards platform for commuters and employers. In October 2019, the City of Santa Cruz initially launched a pilot program (GO Santa Cruz) limited to employees and employers within the downtown parking district. After the successful pilot of GO Santa Cruz, and in an effort to serve commuters countywide, the RTC launched GO Santa Cruz County in April 2021. The program is now open to commuters and employers throughout the County.

GO Santa Cruz County is a key part of RTC’s ongoing effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and play an active role in addressing climate change. The program is partially funded by voter-approved Measure D, which provides a balanced vision to improve, operate and maintain Santa Cruz County’s transportation network. More information about GO Santa Cruz County and ways to participate can be found
online at www.gosantacruzcounty.org or @gosantacruzcounty on Facebook and Instagram.

**DISCUSSION**

Throughout 2021, the RTC contracted with Miller-Maxfield and Ecology Action staff to provide marketing and employer outreach services for the GO Santa Cruz County countywide expansion. Miller Maxfield developed and implemented a marketing plan, including creating a new logo design, producing program brochures and custom flyers, designing a new website landing page, and creating content and custom graphics for social media channels. In addition, Miller-Maxfield facilitated media appearances with local news and radio stations, distributed press releases related to the countywide expansion, and coordinated outreach and tabling opportunities at community events.

Ecology Action led outreach efforts with major employers throughout the county and facilitated one-on-one meetings to encourage employer participation in GO Santa Cruz County. In addition, Ecology Action staff facilitated bike safety trainings and commuter workshops with topics including urban cycling, eBikes, and bike commuting basics. All workshops were held virtually due to COVID-19 related restrictions for in-person events. Most recently, Ecology Action staff coordinated a pop-up outreach event and e-bike demonstration for employees at Dominican Hospital.

**Staff recommends approving the attached resolution in Attachment 1 which approves a FY 2021-22 budget amendment as shown in Exhibit A of Attachment 1 to authorize the Executive Director to enter sole-source contracts with Miller-Maxfield and Ecology Action in support of the GO Santa Cruz County transportation demand management (TDM) program.**

The total contract value for Miller-Maxfield’s marketing services shall not exceed $30,000 (Attachment 2). The total contract value for Ecology Action’s employer outreach services shall not exceed $40,000 (Attachment 3). The recommendation for sole sourcing the employer outreach and marketing contracts is consistent and justified under current RTC procurement policies (section 5.3.3), as described below.

**Ecology Action**

*Category: Only one contractor/consultant/vendor can provide unique/highly specialized item/service*

Ecology Action currently operates the only Transportation Demand Management association in the county and offers specialized services such as an Emergency Ride Home program, zero interest bike loan, coordination of the Bike to Work program, Green Business & Energy Efficiency, and the Bike Challenge/Love to Ride program. Ecology Action has 25 years of experience working with large and small employers throughout the county and is currently working with the City of Santa Cruz and marketing firm Miller-Maxfield to support the downtown GO Santa Cruz program.
Contracting with Ecology Action will ensure operational continuity on transportation projects with employers countywide.

**Miller-Maxfield**

*Category: Economy or efficiency supports award to existing contractor/consultant as a logical follow-on to work already in progress under a competitively awarded contract*

Public outreach consultant Miller-Maxfield was selected by the City of Santa Cruz based on a competitive bid process in 2019 to build and run a marketing and outreach campaign to support the GO Santa Cruz campaign. Adding on to the existing competitively-bid contract with the City of Santa Cruz will provide economies of scale and dovetail with marketing components already developed and underway.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The adopted SCCRTC FY 2021-22 Budget and Work Program includes $200,000 in Measure D funds from the Highways Corridors bucket for Cruz511/GO Santa Cruz County. Currently, only $50,000 is programmed for Transportation Demand Management services and another $20,000 is needed to complete the scope of work related to these contracts. Since funds have already been programmed by the RTC to Cruz511, this will not impact any other RTC projects or programs. A fiscal year FY 2021-22 budget amendment is necessary to transfer funds from staff, benefits and overhead into the professional and special services budget line within the Cruz511 budget (Exhibit A of Attachment 1).

**SUMMARY**

GO Santa Cruz County is an online commuter management and rewards platform administered by the RTC and City of Santa Cruz (for downtown employees). Miller-Maxfield and Ecology Action provide support services for both the countywide and downtown programs. Staff recommends continuing work with both consultants and by amending the current FY 2021-22 budget and authorizing the Executive Director to enter a contract with Miller-Maxfield for TDM marketing services in an amount not to exceed $30,000; and enter a contract with Ecology Action for TDM employer outreach services in an amount not to exceed $40,000. A fiscal year FY 2021-22 budget amendment is necessary to move funds within the Cruz 511 budget into the appropriate budget line to cover these proposed contracts.

**Attachments**

1. Resolution authorizing the Executive Director to enter sole-source contracts with Miller-Maxfield, Inc. and Ecology Action for GO Santa Cruz County transportation demand management marketing and employer outreach services and to amend the FY 2021-22 Budget and Work Program for the Regional Transportation Commission.
2. Draft contract with Miller-Maxfield, Inc for TDM Marketing
3. Draft contract with Ecology Action for TDM Employer Outreach
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of March 03, 2022
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO
CONTRACTS WITH MILLER-MAXFIELD INC AND ECOLOGY ACTION FOR GO SANTA
CRUZ COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT MARKETING AND
EMPLOYER OUTREACH SERVICES AND TO AMEND THE FY 2021-22 BUDGET AND
WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

WHEREAS the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
(SCCRTC) operates Cruz511, a county-wide transportation demand management
(TDM) program to facilitate alternatives to single occupancy vehicle travel within its
communities; and

WHEREAS GO Santa Cruz County is a new component of Cruz511 and utilizes
an online platform where commuters throughout the county are incentivized to
track their sustainable transportation trips and earn rewards; and

WHEREAS Miller-Maxfield has an existing competitively-bid contract with the
City of Santa Cruz to provide marketing services for the downtown-based GO Santa
Cruz program; and

WHEREAS Ecology Action has an existing agreement with the City of Santa
Cruz to provide specialized employer services for the downtown-based GO Santa
Cruz program including emergency ride home coordination, zero interest bike loans,
commuter safety workshops, and annual Bike Challenge/Love to Ride events; and

WHEREAS adding on to the existing TDM marketing and employer outreach
work performed by Miller-Maxfield and Ecology Action will provide economies of
scale and dovetail with marketing components already developed and underway
ensures operational continuity on transportation projects with employers
countywide; and

WHEREAS the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
adopts and periodically amends the budget and work program as necessary during
the budget year.

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

1. The Executive Director is authorized to enter into a contract with Miller-
Maxfield Inc for GO Santa Cruz County TDM marketing and outreach
services, in an amount not to exceed $30,000; and
2. The Executive Director is authorized to enter into a contract with Ecology Action for GO Santa Cruz County TDM employer outreach services, in an amount not to exceed $40,000; and

3. The FY 2021/22 RTC Budget and Work Program are hereby amended as shown in Exhibit A; and

4. The Executive Director is authorized to execute contract amendments for each contract up to $50,000.

5. The Commission Chair is authorized to execute contract amendments for each contract up to an additional $50,000 for a maximum total of $130,000 for Miller Maxfield and $140,000 for Ecology Action.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

______________________________
Sandy Brown, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Exhibit A: SCCRTC FY 2021-22 Budget and Work Program as amended

Distribution: RTC Fiscal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>FY2021/22</th>
<th>FY2021/22</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cruz 511 Rideshare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>2/3/22</td>
<td>3/3/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>40186</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>40430</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RSTP Exchange/STBG</td>
<td>40761</td>
<td>68,663</td>
<td>68,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contr from Other Funds</td>
<td>42367</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td>322,663</td>
<td>322,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Allocated Labor Costs</td>
<td>51070</td>
<td>111,865</td>
<td>101,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Allocated Overhead</td>
<td>62354</td>
<td>101,798</td>
<td>92,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Total Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td>213,663</td>
<td>193,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Telephone &amp; Mobile Device</td>
<td>61221</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>62020</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>62221</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>General Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>62223</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Special Serv</td>
<td>62381</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Adv &amp; Promo Materials</td>
<td>62801</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Contingency/Special Exp</td>
<td>62856</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>62890</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Transp/Travel/Educ</td>
<td>62914</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Total Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,100</td>
<td>170,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Total Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td>363,763</td>
<td>363,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>To/(From) Reserves:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(41,100)</td>
<td>(41,100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit A
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT (hereinafter referred to as to the “Agreement”) is hereby entered on this date ________________, by and between the SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, hereinafter referred to as “COMMISSION,” and MILLER MAXFIELD, INC., hereinafter referred to as “CONSULTANT”. The parties agree as follows:

1 DUTIES.

A. CONSULTANT agrees to exercise special skill to develop and implement a transportation demand management marketing campaign and provide outreach support for GO Santa Cruz County, as specified in Attachment A: Scope of Services, which by this reference is incorporated herein.

B. CONSULTANT shall provide the personnel listed below to perform the above-specified services, which persons are hereby designated as key personnel under this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Maxfield</td>
<td>Miller Maxfield</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Stone</td>
<td>Miller Maxfield</td>
<td>Project Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Yuen-Ruan</td>
<td>Miller Maxfield</td>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Baker</td>
<td>Miller Maxfield</td>
<td>Social-Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Martinez</td>
<td>Miller Maxfield</td>
<td>Social-Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. No person named in paragraph B of this Article or in the Fee Schedule (Exhibit B), or his or her successor, shall be removed or replaced by CONSULTANT, nor shall his or her agreed-upon function hereunder be changed, without prior written consent of the Commission’s Contract Manager. Such consent shall not be unreasonably withheld.

D. CONSULTANT progress reports and/or meetings

i) The CONSULTANT shall prepare written progress reports prior to submitting invoice or with each invoice. The report should be sufficiently detailed for the Contract Manager to determine if the CONSULTANT is performing to expectations or is on schedule; to provide communication of interim findings; and to sufficiently address any difficulties or special problems encountered, so remedies can be developed.

ii) The CONSULTANT’s Project Manager shall meet with the COMMISSION’s Contract Manager, as needed, to discuss progress on the agreement.

2 COMPENSATION. In consideration for CONSULTANT accomplishing work to be performed under this Agreement (as described in Exhibit A: Scope of Services), COMMISSION shall compensate CONSULTANT in accordance with the approved Fee Schedule, dated
DRAFT

___________, attached hereto (Exhibit B) and incorporated by reference. COMMISSION agrees to pay CONSULTANT as follows:

A. Total payment is not to exceed $30,000 for Time and Materials at the rates and conditions set forth in Attachment B: Fee Schedule, which by this reference is incorporated herein.

B. Reimbursable expenses will be billed and processed for payment upon approval of the Contract Manager.

C. Progress payments will be made no less than monthly in arrears based on services provided in accordance with this Agreement, and actual allowable incurred costs. If CONSULTANT fails to submit the required deliverable items according to the schedule set forth in the Scope of Services, the COMMISSION may delay payment and/or terminate this Agreement in accordance with the provisions of Section 4 of this Agreement.

D. No payment will be made prior to approval of any work, nor for any work performed prior to approval of this Agreement.

E. This Agreement is valid and enforceable only if sufficient funds are made available to COMMISSION for the purpose of this agreement. It is mutually agreed that if sufficient funds are not appropriated, this Agreement may be amended to reflect any reduction in funds.

F. CONSULTANT shall not exceed the total payment outlined in Section 2(a), except with the prior written approval of the Contract Manager and with such additional costs memorialized in a written amendment to this Agreement.

G. The CONSULTANT will be paid for work performed under this Agreement after receipt by the COMMISSION’s Contract Manager of itemized invoices. Invoices shall be submitted no later than 45 calendar days after the performance of work for which the CONSULTANT is billing. Invoices shall be mailed to the COMMISSION’s Contract Manager at the following address:

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Attn: Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Email to: accountspayable@sccrtc.org

The invoices must include the following information:
- Labor (staff name, hours charged, hourly billing rate, current charges, and cumulative charges) performed during the billing period by task
- Itemized expenses incurred during the billing period, if any
- Total invoice/payment requested
- Total amount previously paid under this Agreement
- Written progress report
• CONSULTANT’s final invoice must be submitted within 60-calendar days after acceptance of CONSULTANTS work by the Contract Manager

3 TERM. The term of this Agreement shall be ________________ to 6/30/2023.

4 EARLY TERMINATION. Either party hereto may terminate this Agreement at any time by giving thirty (30) days written notice to the other party.

5 INDEMNIFICATION FOR DAMAGES, TAXES AND CONTRIBUTIONS. To the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, CONSULTANT shall exonerate, indemnify, defend, and hold harmless COMMISSION (which for the purpose of paragraphs 5 and 6 shall include, without limitation, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers) from and against:

A. Any and all claims, demands, losses, damages, defense costs, or liability of any kind or nature which COMMISSION may sustain or incur or which may be imposed upon it as a result of, arising out of, or in any manner connected with the CONSULTANT’S performance under the terms of this Agreement, excepting any liability arising out of the sole negligence of the COMMISSION. Such indemnification includes any damage to the person(s), or property(ies) of CONSULTANT and third persons. Such obligations to defend, hold harmless and indemnify the COMMISSION shall not apply to the extent that such Liabilities are caused by the sole negligence, active negligence, or willful misconduct of the COMMISSION.

B. Any and all Federal, State and Local taxes, charges, fees, or contributions required to be paid with respect to CONSULTANT and CONSULTANT’S officers, employees and agents engaged in the performance of this Agreement (including, without limitation, unemployment insurance, social security and payroll tax withholding). COMMISSION shall provide timely notice to CONSULTANT of third-party claims relating to this Agreement, as required by applicable law.

6 SAFETY.

A. The CONSULTANT shall comply with OSHA and all other regulations applicable to CONSULTANT regarding necessary safety equipment or procedures. The CONSULTANT shall comply with safety instructions issued by the COMMISSION Safety Officer and other Commission representatives.

B. Any subcontract entered into as a result of this contract, shall contain the provisions of this Article.

7 INSURANCE. CONSULTANT, at its sole cost and expense, for the full term of this Agreement (and any extensions thereof), shall obtain and maintain at minimum compliance with all the following insurance coverage(s) and requirements. Such insurance coverage shall be primary coverage as respects COMMISSION and any insurance or self-insurance maintained by COMMISSION shall be excess of CONSULTANT’s insurance coverage and shall not contribute to it.
A. Types of Insurance and Minimum Limits

i) Worker's Compensation in the minimum statutorily required coverage amounts.

ii) Automobile Liability Insurance for each of CONSULTANT’s vehicles used in the performance of this Agreement, including owned, non-owned (e.g. owned by CONSULTANT’s employees), leased or hired vehicles, in the minimum amount of $1,000,000 combined single limit per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage. This insurance coverage shall not be required if vehicle use by the CONSULTANT is not a material part of performance of this Agreement and CONSULTANT and COMMISSION both certify to this fact by initialing here _____ / _______.

iii) Comprehensive or Commercial General Liability Insurance coverage at least as broad as ISO form CG 00 01, with a minimum limit of $2,000,000 per occurrence, and $4,000,000 in the aggregate, including coverage for: (a) products and completed operations, (b) bodily and personal injury, (c) broad form property damage, (d) contractual ability, and (e) cross-liability.

iv) Professional Liability Insurance in the minimum amount of $1,000,000 combined single limit, if, and only if, this Subparagraph is initialed by CONSULTANT and COMMISSION ____/____.

If CONSULTANT normally carries insurance in an amount greater than the minimum amount required by the COMMISSION for this Agreement, that greater amount shall become the minimum required amount of insurance for purposes of this Agreement. Therefore, CONSULTANT hereby acknowledges and agrees that any and all insurances carried by it shall be deemed liability coverage for any and all actions it performs in connection with this Agreement.

B. Other Insurance Provisions

i) If any insurance coverage required in this Agreement is provided on a “Claims Made” rather than “Occurrence” form, CONSULTANT agrees that the retroactive date thereof shall be no later than the date first written above (in the first paragraph on page 1), and that it shall maintain the required coverage for a period of three (3) years after the expiration of this Agreement (hereinafter "post Agreement coverage") and any extensions thereof. CONSULTANT may maintain the required post Agreement coverage by renewal or purchase of prior acts or tail coverage. This provision is contingent upon post Agreement coverage being both available and reasonably affordable in relation to the coverage provided during the term of this Agreement. For purposes of interpreting this requirement, a cost not exceeding 100% of the last annual policy premium during the term of this Agreement in order to purchase prior acts or tail coverage for post Agreement coverage shall be deemed to be reasonable.
ii) If CONSULTANT utilizes umbrella or excess policies, these policies must "follow form" and afford no less coverage than the primary policy.

iii) All policies of Comprehensive or Commercial General Liability Insurance shall be endorsed to cover the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, its officials, employees, agents and volunteers as additional insureds with respect to liability arising out of the work or operations and activities performed by or on behalf of CONSULTANT, including materials, parts or equipment furnished in connection with such work or operations. Endorsements shall be at least as broad as ISO Form CG 20 10 11 85, or both CG 20 10 10 01 and CG 20 37 10 01, covering both ongoing operations and products and completed operations.

iv) All required insurance policies shall be endorsed to contain the following clause: “This insurance shall not be canceled until after thirty (30) days’ prior written notice (10 days for nonpayment of premium) has been given to:

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Attn: Yesenia Parra
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

v) CONSULTANT agrees to provide its insurance broker(s) and COMMISSION with a full copy of these insurance provisions on or before the effective date of this Agreement with Certificates of Insurance for all required coverages. All Certificates of Insurance shall be delivered or sent to: Should CONSULTANT fail to obtain such an endorsement to any policy required hereunder, CONSULTANT shall be responsible to provide at least thirty (30) days’ notice (10 days for nonpayment of premium) of cancellation of such policy to the COMMISSION as a material term of this Agreement.

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Attn: Yesenia Parra
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Email: contracts@sccrtc.org

vi) CONSULTANT agrees to provide its insurance broker(s) with a full copy of these insurance provisions and provide COMMISSION on or before the effective date of this Agreement with Certificates of Insurance and endorsements for all required coverages. However, failure to obtain the required documents prior to the work beginning shall not waive the CONSULTANT’s obligation to provide them. All Certificates of Insurance and endorsements shall be delivered or sent to:

C. Deductibles and Self-Insured Retentions.

i) CONSULTANT shall disclose to and obtain the approval of COMMISSION for the self-insured retentions and deductibles before beginning any of the services or
work called for by any term of this Agreement. Further, if the CONSULTANT’S insurance policy includes a self-insured retention that must be paid by a named insured as a precondition of the insurer’s liability, or which has the effect of providing that payments of the self-insured retention by others, including additional insureds or insurers do not serve to satisfy the self-insured retention, such provisions must be modified by special endorsement so as to not apply to the additional insured coverage required by this Agreement so as to not prevent any of the parties to this agreement from satisfying or paying the self-insured retention required to be paid as a precondition to the insurer’s liability. Additionally, the certificates of insurance must note whether the policy does or does not include any self-insured retention and also must disclose the deductible.

8 FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAWS.

A. CONSULTANT warrants that in the performance of this Agreement, it shall exercise usual and customary professional care in its efforts to comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, statutes and ordinances and all lawful orders, rules and regulations promulgated thereunder. In the event of a conflict between the laws and lawful regulations of any government entities having jurisdiction over the project, the CONSULTANT shall notify Commission of the nature and impact of such conflict. The COMMISSION agrees to cooperate and work with CONSULTANT in an effort to resolve any conflict.

B. Those laws, statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations and procedural requirements that are imposed on COMMISSION as a recipient of federal or state funds are imposed on CONSULTANT.

9 NON-DISCRIMINATION AND COMPLIANCE PROVISIONS. During and in relation to the performance of this Agreement, CONSULTANT agrees as follows:

A. The CONSULTANT shall not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer related), marital status, sexual orientation, age (over 18), veteran status, gender, pregnancy, or any other non-merit factor unrelated to job duties. Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: recruitment; advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training (including apprenticeship), employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer. The CONSULTANT agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notice setting forth the provisions of this non-discrimination clause.

B. Consultant and subconsultants shall ensure that the evaluation and treatment of their employees and applicants for employment are free from such discrimination and harassment. Consultant and subconsultants shall comply with the provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act (Gov. Code §12990 et seq.) and the applicable regulations promulgated thereunder (California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Section 8113 et seq.). The applicable regulations of the Fair Employment and Housing
Commission implementing Government Code Section 12990 (a-f), set forth in Chapter 5 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations, are incorporated into this Contract by reference and made a part hereof as if set forth in full. Consultant and its subconsultants shall give written notice of their obligations under this clause to labor organizations with which they have a collective bargaining or other Agreement.

C. Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: recruitment; advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training (including apprenticeship), employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer. The CONSULTANT agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notice setting forth the provisions of this non-discrimination clause.

D. CONSULTANT shall comply fully with all federal, State and local laws and regulations which prohibit discrimination. The CONSULTANT's signature affixed herein, and dated, shall constitute a certification under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the CONSULTANT has, unless exempt, complied with, the nondiscrimination program requirements of Government Code Section 12990 and Title 2, California Administrative Code, Section 8103.

E. Consultant and its subconsultants shall permit access to all records of employment, employment advertisements, application forms, and other pertinent data and records by the State Fair Employment Practices and Housing Commission or any other agency of the State of California designated by STATE to investigate compliance with this Article.

F. In the event of CONSULTANT'S non-compliance with the non-discrimination clauses of this Agreement or with any of the said rules, regulations or orders the COMMISSION may cancel, terminate, or suspend the Agreement in whole or in part. CONSULTANT may also be declared ineligible for further agreements with the COMMISSION.

10 CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

A. CONSULTANT shall disclose any financial, business, or other relationship with COMMISSION that may have an impact upon the outcome of this contract, or any ensuing COMMISSION construction project. CONSULTANT shall also list current clients who may have a financial interest in the outcome of this contract, or any ensuing COMMISSION construction project, which will follow.

B. CONSULTANT hereby certifies that it does not now have, nor shall it acquire any financial or business interest that would conflict with the performance of services under this contract.

C. Any subcontract in excess of $25,000 entered into as a result of this contract, shall contain all of the provisions of this Article.
11 **LICENSES.** If a license of any kind is required of CONSULTANT, its employees, agents, or subcontractors by Federal or State law, CONSULTANT warrants that such license has been obtained, is valid and in good standing, that CONSULTANT shall keep it in effect at all times during the terms of this Agreement, and that any applicable bond has been posted in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

12 **INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT STATUS.** CONSULTANT and COMMISSION have reviewed and considered the principal test and secondary factors below and agree that CONSULTANT is an independent contractor and not an employee of COMMISSION. CONSULTANT is responsible for all insurance (workers compensation, unemployment, etc.) and all payroll related taxes. CONSULTANT is not entitled to any employee benefits. COMMISSION agrees that CONSULTANT shall have the right to control the manner and means of accomplishing the result contracted for herein.

A. **PRINCIPAL TEST:** The CONSULTANT rather than COMMISSION has the right to control the manner and means of accomplishing the result contracted for.

B. **SECONDARY FACTORS:**

   i) The extent of control which, by agreement, COMMISSION may exercise over the details of the work is slight rather than substantial.

   ii) CONSULTANT is engaged in a distinct occupation or business.

   iii) In the locality, the work to be done by CONSULTANT is usually done by a specialist without supervision, rather than under the direction of an employer.

   iv) The skill required in the particular occupation is substantial rather than slight.

   v) The CONSULTANT rather than the COMMISSION supplies the instrumentalities, tools and workplace.

   vi) The length of time for which CONSULTANT is engaged is of limited duration rather than indefinite.

   vii) The method of payment of CONSULTANT is by the job rather than by the time.

   viii) The work is part of a special or permissive activity, program, or project, rather than part of the regular business of COMMISSION.

   ix) CONSULTANT and COMMISSION believe they are creating an independent contractor relationship rather than an employer-employee relationship.

   x) The COMMISSION conducts public business.

It is recognized that it is not necessary that all secondary factors support creation of an independent contractor relationship, but rather that overall there are significant secondary factors which indicate that CONSULTANT is an independent contractor.
By their signatures to this Agreement, each of the undersigned certifies that it is his or her considered judgment that the CONSULTANT engaged under this Agreement is in fact an Independent Contractor.

13 **NONASSIGNMENT.** CONSULTANT shall not assign the Agreement without the prior written consent of the COMMISSION.

14 **ACKNOWLEDGMENT.** CONSULTANT shall acknowledge in all reports and literature the COMMISSION funding to the CONSULTANT.

15 **RETENTION AND AUDIT OF RECORDS.**

A. For the purpose of determining compliance with Public Contract Code 10115, et seq. and Title 21, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 21, Section 2500 et seq., when applicable and other matters connected with the performance of the contract pursuant to Government Code 8546.7; CONSULTANT, subconsultants, and COMMISSION shall maintain and make available for inspection all books, documents, papers, accounting records, and other evidence pertaining to the performance of the contract, including but not limited to, the costs of administering the contract. All parties shall make such materials available at their respective offices at all reasonable times during the contract period and for four years from the date of final payment under the contract. The state, State Auditor, COMMISSION, FHWA, or any duly authorized representative of the Federal Government shall have access to any books, records, and documents of CONSULTANT and it's certified public accountants (CPA) work papers that are pertinent to the contract and indirect cost rates (ICR) for audit, examinations, excerpts, and transactions, and copies thereof shall be furnished if requested. If any action has occurred relative to the records, the records must be retained until completion of the action and resolution of all issues that arise from it.

B. Subcontracts in excess of $25,000 shall contain this provision.

C. Contractor and subcontractors shall establish and maintain, an accounting system conforming to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GMP) to support Requests for Reimbursement which segregate and accumulate the costs of work elements by line item (i.e. direct labor, other direct costs, subrecipients/subcontractor, etc.) and enable the determination of incurred costs at interim points of completion, and provide support for reimbursement payment vouchers or invoices. **PRESENTATION OF CLAIMS.** Presentation and processing of any or all claims arising out of or related to this Agreement shall be made in accordance with the provisions contained in Chapter 1.05 of the Santa Cruz County Code, which by this reference is incorporated herein.

16 **MISCELLANEOUS.** This written Agreement, along with any attachments, is the full and complete integration of the parties’ agreement forming the basis for this Agreement. The parties agree that this written Agreement supersedes any previous written or oral agreements between the parties, and any modifications to this Agreement must be
made in a written document signed by all parties. The unenforceability, invalidity or illegality of any provision(s) of this Agreement shall not render the other provisions unenforceable, invalid or illegal. Waiver by any part of any portion of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of any other portion thereof. Any arbitration, mediation, or litigation arising out of this Agreement shall occur only in the County of Santa Cruz, notwithstanding the fact that one of the contracting parties may reside outside of the County of Santa Cruz. This Agreement shall be governed by, and interpreted in accordance with, California law.

17 **INSPECTION OF WORK.** The CONSULTANT and any subconsultant shall permit the COMMISSION and/or the STATE to review and inspect the project activities and files at all reasonable times during the term of this Agreement including review and inspection on a daily basis, to the extent reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with this Agreement.

18 **ACKNOWLEDGMENT.** CONSULTANT shall acknowledge in all reports and literature that the material is prepared for and on behalf of the COMMISSION.

19 **WORK PRODUCTS/OWNERSHIP OF DATA.** All material, data, information, and written, graphic or other work produced under this Agreement is subject to the unqualified and unconditional right of the COMMISSION to use, reproduce, publish, display, and make derivative use of all such work, or any part of it, free of charge and in any manner and for any purpose; and to authorize others to do so.

A. Upon completion of all work under this contract, ownership and title to all custom letters, reports, documents, plans, specifications, and estimates and other products produced as part of this Agreement (herein "deliverables") will automatically be vested in the COMMISSION; and no further agreement will be necessary to transfer ownership to the COMMISSION. The CONSULTANT shall furnish the COMMISSION all necessary copies of data needed to complete the review and approval process.

B. Applicable patent rights provisions regarding rights to inventions shall be included in the contracts as appropriate (48 CFR 27, Subpart 27.3 - Patent Rights under Government Contracts for federal-aid contracts).

C. The COMMISSION may permit copyrighting reports or other contract products, subject to its rights in Section D below. If copyrights are permitted, the agreement shall provide that the FHWA/FTA and Department shall have the royalty-free nonexclusive and irrevocable right to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use; and to authorize others to use, the work for government purposes.

D. If any of the work is subject to copyright, trademark, service mark, or patent, CONSULTANT now grants to the COMMISSION a perpetual, royalty-free, nonexclusive and irrevocable license to use, reproduce, publish, use in the creation of derivative works, and display and perform the work, or any part of it, and to grant to any third party a comparable and coextensive sublicense.
E. Any subcontract in excess of $25,000 entered into as a result of this contract, shall contain all of the provisions of this Article.

F. Any modification or reuse by COMMISSION of any deliverables for any project other than the project which is the subject of this Agreement without CONSULTANT’S prior written consent shall be at the sole risk of COMMISSION and COMMISSION agrees to indemnify and hold harmless CONSULTANT’S from all costs, losses, and expenses, including legal fees, incurred as a result of any such use or decision by COMMISSION.

20 **CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA.**

A. All financial, statistical, personal, technical, or other data and information relative to COMMISSION's operations, which are designated confidential by COMMISSION and made available to CONSULTANT in order to carry out this contract, shall be protected by CONSULTANT from unauthorized use and disclosure.

B. Permission to disclose information on one occasion, or public hearing held by COMMISSION relating to the contract, shall not authorize CONSULTANT to further disclose such information, or disseminate the same on any other occasion.

C. CONSULTANT shall not comment publicly to the press or any other media regarding the contract or COMMISSION's actions on the same, except to COMMISSION's staff, CONSULTANT's own personnel involved in the performance of this contract, at public hearings or in response to questions from a Legislative committee.

D. CONSULTANT shall not issue any news release or public relations item of any nature, whatsoever, regarding work performed or to be performed under this contract without prior review of the contents thereof by COMMISSION, and receipt of COMMISSION'S written permission.

E. Any subcontract entered into as a result of this contract shall contain all of the provisions of this Article.

F. The preceding restriction shall not apply to information which is in the public domain, was previously known to CONSULTANT, was acquired by CONSULTANT from others who have no confidential relationship to COMMISSION with respect to same, or which through no fault of CONSULTANT, comes into the public domain. CONSULTANT shall not be restricted from releasing information, including confidential information, in response to a subpoena, court order, or other legal process. CONSULTANT shall not be required to resist such subpoena, court order, or legal process, but shall promptly notify COMMISSION in writing of the demand for information before CONSULTANT responds to such demand.

21 **SUBCONTRACTING.**
A. Nothing contained in this contract or otherwise, shall create any contractual relation between COMMISSION and any subconsultant(s), and no subcontract shall relieve CONSULTANT of its responsibilities and obligations hereunder. CONSULTANT agrees to be as fully responsible to COMMISSION for the acts and omissions of its subconsultant(s) and of persons either directly or indirectly employed by any of them as it is for the acts and omissions of persons directly employed by CONSULTANT. CONSULTANT's obligation to pay its subconsultant(s) is an independent obligation from COMMISSION'S obligation to make payments to the CONSULTANT.

B. The CONSULTANT shall perform the work contemplated with resources available within its own organization; and no portion of the work pertinent to this Agreement shall be subcontracted without prior written authorization by the COMMISSION'S Contract Manager, except that, which is expressly identified in the approved Fee Schedule.

C. CONSULTANT shall pay its subconsultants within seven (7) calendar days from receipt of each payment made to CONSULTANT by COMMISSION.

D. All subcontracts entered into as a result of this contract shall contain all the provisions stipulated in this contract to be applicable to subconsultants.

E. Any substitution of subconsultants must be approved in writing by the COMMISSION's Contract Manager prior to the start of work by the subconsultant.

F. The CONSULTANT hereby agrees that neither CONSULTANT, nor any firm affiliated with the CONSULTANT, will bid on or enter into any construction contract, or on any contract to provide construction inspection for any construction project resulting from this contract. An affiliated firm is one which is subject to the control of the same persons through joint-ownership, or otherwise.

G. Except for subconsultants whose services are limited to providing surveying or materials testing information, no subconsultant who has provided design services in connection with this Agreement shall be eligible to bid on or enter into any construction contract, or on any contract to provide construction inspection for any construction project resulting from this contract.

H. Any subcontract in excess of $25,000 entered into as a result of this contract, shall contain all the provisions required by this Agreement to be applicable to those subconsultants.

22 REBATES, KICKBACKS OR OTHER UNLAWFUL CONSIDERATION. The CONSULTANT warrants that this Agreement was not obtained or secured through rebates, kickbacks, or other unlawful consideration, either promised or paid to any COMMISSION employee. For breach or violation of this warranty, COMMISSION shall have the right in its discretion; to terminate the Agreement without liability; to pay only for the value of the work actually performed; or to deduct from the contract price; or otherwise recover the full amount of such rebate, kickback or other unlawful consideration.
23 **BROKERAGE OR OTHER FEES.** CONSULTANT warrants that s/he has not employed or retained any company or person, other than a bona fide employee working for the consultant, to solicit or secure this agreement, and that s/he has not paid or agreed to pay any company or person, other than a bona fide employee, any fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift, or any other consideration, contingent upon or resulting from the award or formation of this agreement. For breach or violation of this warranty, the COMMISSION shall have the right to annul this agreement without liability, or at its discretion to deduct from the agreement price or consideration, or otherwise recover, the full amount of such fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or contingent fee."

24 **COMPLETE AGREEMENT.**

A. **AGREEMENT:** The two parties to this Agreement, who are the before named CONSULTANT and the before named COMMISSION, hereby agree that this Agreement constitutes the entire Agreement which is made and concluded in duplicate between the two parties. Both of these parties for and in consideration of the payments to be made, conditions mentioned, and work to be performed; each agree to diligently perform in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement as evidenced by the signatures below.

B. **COMMISSION DESIGNEE:** The Executive Director of COMMISSION, or his or her designee, shall have the authority to act for and exercise any of the rights of COMMISSION as set forth in this Agreement subsequent to, and in accordance with the authorization granted by the COMMISSION.

C. **COMPLETE AGREEMENT. INCLUDING ATTACHMENTS.** This Agreement includes all exhibits, attachments, and documents incorporated herein and made applicable by reference, constitutes the complete and exclusive statement of the terms and conditions of the Agreement between COMMISSION and CONSULTANT, and supersedes all prior representations, understandings and communications. The invalidity in whole or in part of any term or condition of this Agreement shall not affect the validity of other terms or conditions. The COMMISSION’s waiver of CONSULTANT’s performance of any term(s) or condition(s) of this Agreement shall not be construed as a waiver for any future performance of such term(s) or conditions.

Attachments are:

Attachment A: Scope of Services
Attachment B: Fee Schedule
Attachment C: Certificate of Insurance
IN WITNESS WHEREOF the Parties have executed this Agreement as of the date signed by the COMMISSION.

MILLER MAXFIELD, INC.  

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Bill Maxfield, Principal  
Guy Preston, Executive Director  

Company: Miller Maxfield, Inc.  
Address: 133 Mission Street, Suite 101  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Email: bill@millermaxfield.com

Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer  
Steven Mattas, Commission Counsel

Distribution: Administrative Services Officer; Accounting; Contractor; Planner
Exhibit A

SCOPE OF SERVICES

Background
The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) operates Cruz511, a county-wide transportation demand management (TDM) program, with a focus on reducing the number of drive-alone trips to, from or through Santa Cruz County. The goal is to help residents and commuters find alternatives to driving alone that are less stressful, less costly and better for the environment. Cruz511 key services include carpool and vanpool matching, transit trip planning, real-time traffic information, park and ride lot coordination, biking/walking resources, and employer assistance for workplace-based commute programs. Cruz511 traffic map and commute resources are available online at https://cruz511.org.

GO Santa Cruz County is web-based component of Cruz511 that uses RideAmigos’ commuter management platform to connect commuters, provide transportation options, and reward sustainable travel. GO Santa Cruz County offers users advanced rideshare and carpool matching capabilities and includes a personalized dashboard to log trips, view achievements, track commute statistics, and claim incentives and rewards. Users can learn more about GO Santa Cruz County and create a commute profile at www.gosantacruzcountr.org.

The CONSULTANT will develop a multi-faceted marketing plan to strategically reach employers and employees throughout Santa Cruz County and develop awareness and support for GO Santa Cruz County transportation demand management platform. The goals of the marketing and outreach activities are to increase awareness of the overall TDM program and program elements, generate interest in the expanded TDM program, and drive participation of countywide employers and employees using GO Santa Cruz County.

CONSULTANT tasks will include, but are not limited to:

Task 1 – Strategy, Messaging, and Branding
- Update campaign plan, including roles, timeline, budget, etc.
- Revamp campaign core messages and talking points
- Develop messaging that distinguishes between MyCruz511 and other local/regional programs using the RideAmigos platform

Task 2 – Outreach Materials
- Design physical and digital marketing collateral and deliver source files
- Prepare sample social media posts
- Prepare digital assets for web/landing pages
- Create branded materials as needed

Task 3 – Social Media
- Generate social media content and manage publishing schedule

Task 4 – Media Relations
- Develop opportunities for media coverage
• Write and distribute press release
• Write and coordinate op-ed

Task 5 – Speaking opportunities
• Develop and coordinate opportunities to present campaign messages to key audiences, including major employers, business groups, and other partners

Task 6 – Strategic council
• Collaborate with transportation team throughout the contract term

The CONSULTANT will be responsible for
• Monthly summary reports of previous months activities, reach, and impact to the contract manager
• Completion of a summary report of marketing activities and presentation to the Regional Transportation Commission at the conclusion of the contract period.
Miller Maxfield, Inc. 2022 Fees

- Graphic Design: $125/hour
- Social Media: $150/hour
- Account Management/Project Management: $150/hour
- Principals: $175/hour
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT (hereinafter referred to as to the "Agreement") is hereby entered into _______________, by and between the SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, hereinafter referred to as “COMMISSION,” and ECOLOGY ACTION, hereinafter referred to as "CONTRACTOR". The parties agree as follows:

1) DUTIES.

a) CONTRACTOR agrees to exercise special skill to develop and implement countywide employer outreach activities intended to reduce single occupancy vehicle commute trips and promote enrollment in GO Santa Cruz County, as specified in Attachment A: Scope of Services, which by this reference is incorporated herein.

b) CONTRACTOR shall provide the personnel listed below to perform the above-specified services, which persons are hereby designated as key personnel under this Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piet Canin</td>
<td>Ecology Action</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Miller</td>
<td>Ecology Action</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawn Kennedy</td>
<td>Ecology Action</td>
<td>Project Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) In the event that COMMISSION or CONTRACTOR, at any time during the term of this Agreement, desires the reassignment of personnel, the parties shall meet and discuss in good faith to address the issue of concern, including but not limited to reassigning such person or persons. After said consultation, CONTRACTOR, within its sole authority, shall assign a replacement advisor to perform the agreed upon scope of services.

d) CONTRACTOR progress reports and/or meetings

i) The CONTRACTOR shall prepare written progress reports prior to submitting invoice or with each invoice. The report should be sufficiently detailed for the Contract Manager to determine if the CONTRACTOR is performing to expectations or is on schedule; to provide communication of interim findings; and to sufficiently address any difficulties or special problems encountered, so remedies can be developed.

ii) The CONTRACTOR’s Project Manager shall meet with the COMMISSION's Contract Manager, as needed, to discuss progress on the agreement.

2) COMPENSATION. In consideration for CONTRACTOR accomplishing work to be performed under this Agreement as described in the Scope of Services, COMMISSION shall compensate CONTRACTOR an amount not to exceed $40,000 for time and materials at
the rates set forth in Attachment B: Fee Schedule, which by this reference is incorporated herein.

a) In no event, will the CONTRACTOR be reimbursed for overhead costs at a rate that exceeds the overhead rate set forth in the Fee Schedule.

b) Progress payments will be made no less than quarterly in arrears based on services provided in accordance with this Agreement, and actual allowable incurred costs. If CONTRACTOR fails to submit the required deliverable items according to the schedule set forth in the Scope of Services, the COMMISSION may delay payment and/or terminate this Agreement in accordance with the provisions of Section 4 of this Agreement.

c) No payment will be made prior to approval of any work, nor for any work performed prior to approval of this Agreement.

d) This Agreement is valid and enforceable only if sufficient funds are made available to COMMISSION for the purpose of this agreement. It is mutually agreed that if sufficient funds are not appropriated, this Agreement may be amended to reflect any reduction in funds.

e) CONTRACTOR shall not exceed the total cost, except with the prior written approval of the Contract Manager.

f) The CONTRACTOR will be reimbursed after receipt by the COMMISSION’s Contract Manager of itemized invoices. Invoices shall be submitted no later than 45 calendar days after the performance of work for which the CONTRACTOR is billing. Invoices shall be mailed to the COMMISSION’s Contract Manager at the following address:

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Attn: Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Email to: accountspayable@sccrtc.org

The invoices must include the following information:
- Labor (staff name, hours charged, hourly billing rate, current charges, and cumulative charges) performed during the billing period by task;
- Itemized expenses incurred during the billing period;
- Total invoice/payment requested;
- Total amount previously paid under this Agreement;
- Written progress report;
- CONTRACTOR’s final invoice must be submitted within 60-calendar days after acceptance of CONTRACTORS work by the Contract Manager.

3) **TERM.** The term of this Agreement shall be ____________ to 6/30/2023.
4) **EARLY TERMINATION.** Either party hereto may terminate this Agreement at any time by giving thirty (30) days written notice to the other party.

5) **INDEMNIFICATION FOR DAMAGES, TAXES AND CONTRIBUTIONS.** To the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, CONTRACTOR shall exonerate, indemnify, defend, and hold harmless COMMISSION (which for the purpose of paragraphs 5 and 6 shall include, without limitation, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers) from and against:

   a) Any and all claims, demands, losses, damages, defense costs, or liability of any kind or nature which COMMISSION may sustain or incur or which may be imposed upon it as a result of, arising out of, or in any manner connected with the CONTRACTOR’S performance under the terms of this Agreement, excepting any liability arising out of the sole negligence of the COMMISSION. Such indemnification includes any damage to the person(s), or property(ies) of CONTRACTOR and third persons. Such obligations to defend, hold harmless and indemnify the COMMISSION shall not apply to the extent that such Liabilities are caused by the sole negligence, active negligence, or willful misconduct of the COMMISSION.

   b) Any and all Federal, State and Local taxes, charges, fees, or contributions required to be paid with respect to CONTRACTOR and CONTRACTOR’S officers, employees and agents engaged in the performance of this Agreement (including, without limitation, unemployment insurance, social security and payroll tax withholding). COMMISSION shall provide timely notice to CONTRACTOR of third-party claims relating to this Agreement, as required by applicable law.

6) **INSURANCE.** CONTRACTOR, at its sole cost and expense, for the full term of this Agreement (and any extensions thereof), shall obtain and maintain at minimum compliance with all the following insurance coverage(s) and requirements. Such insurance coverage shall be primary coverage as respects COMMISSION and any insurance or self-insurance maintained by COMMISSION shall be excess of CONTRACTOR’s insurance coverage and shall not contribute to it.

   a) **Types of Insurance and Minimum Limits**

      i) Worker’s Compensation in the minimum statutorily required coverage amounts.

      ii) Automobile Liability Insurance for each of CONTRACTOR’s vehicles used in the performance of this Agreement, including owned, non-owned (e.g. owned by CONTRACTOR’s employees), leased or hired vehicles, in the minimum amount of $1,000,000 combined single limit per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage.

      iii) Comprehensive or Commercial General Liability Insurance coverage at least as broad as ISO form CG 00 01, with a minimum limit of $2,000,000 per occurrence, and $4,000,000 in the aggregate, including coverage for: (a) products and completed operations, (b) bodily and personal injury, (c) broad form property damage, (d) contractual ability, and (e) cross-liability.
iv) Professional Liability Insurance in the minimum amount of $2,000,000 combined single limit, if, and only if, this Subparagraph is initialed by CONTRACTOR and COMMISSION ____/____.

b) Other Insurance Provisions

i) If any insurance coverage required in this Agreement is provided on a “Claims Made” rather than “Occurrence” form, CONTRACTOR agrees that the retroactive date thereof shall be no later than the date first written above (in the first paragraph on page 1), and that it shall maintain the required coverage for a period of three (3) years after the expiration of this Agreement (hereinafter "post Agreement coverage") and any extensions thereof. CONTRACTOR may maintain the required post Agreement coverage by renewal or purchase of prior acts or tail coverage. This provision is contingent upon post Agreement coverage being both available and reasonably affordable in relation to the coverage provided during the term of this Agreement. For purposes of interpreting this requirement, a cost not exceeding 100% of the last annual policy premium during the term of this Agreement in order to purchase prior acts or tail coverage for post Agreement coverage shall be deemed to be reasonable.

ii) If CONTRACTOR utilizes umbrella or excess policies, these policies must “follow form” and afford no less coverage than the primary policy.

iii) All policies of Comprehensive or Commercial General Liability Insurance shall be endorsed to cover the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, its officials, employees, agents and volunteers as additional insureds with respect to liability arising out of the work or operations and activities performed by or on behalf of CONTRACTOR, including materials, parts or equipment furnished in connection with such work or operations. Endorsements shall be at least as broad as ISO Form CG 20 10 11 85, or both CG 20 10 10 01 and CG 20 37 10 01, covering both ongoing operations and products and completed operations.

iv) All required insurance policies shall be endorsed to contain the following clause: “This insurance shall not be canceled until after thirty (30) days’ prior written notice (10 days for nonpayment of premium) has been given to:

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Attn: Yesenia Parra  
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

v) CONTRACTOR agrees to provide its insurance broker(s) and COMMISSION with a full copy of these insurance provisions on or before the effective date of this Agreement with Certificates of Insurance for all required coverages. All Certificates of Insurance shall be delivered or sent to: Should CONTRACTOR fail to obtain such an endorsement to any policy required hereunder, CONTRACTOR shall be responsible to provide at least thirty (30) days’ notice (10 days for
nonpayment of premium) of cancellation of such policy to the COMMISSION as a material term of this Agreement.

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Attn: Yesenia Parra
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Email: contracts@sccrtc.org

vi) CONTRACTOR agrees to provide its insurance broker(s) with a full copy of these insurance provisions and provide COMMISSION on or before the effective date of this Agreement with Certificates of Insurance and endorsements for all required coverages. However, failure to obtain the required documents prior to the work beginning shall not waive the CONTRACTOR’s obligation to provide them. All Certificates of Insurance and endorsements shall be delivered or sent to:

c) Deductibles and Self-Insured Retentions.

i) CONTRACTOR shall disclose to and obtain the approval of COMMISSION for the self-insured retentions and deductibles before beginning any of the services or work called for by any term of this Agreement. Further, if the CONTRACTOR’S insurance policy includes a self-insured retention that must be paid by a named insured as a precondition of the insurer’s liability, or which has the effect of providing that payments of the self-insured retention by others, including additional insureds or insurers do not serve to satisfy the self-insured retention, such provisions must be modified by special endorsement so as not to apply to the additional insured coverage required by this Agreement so as to not prevent any of the parties to this agreement from satisfying or paying the self-insured retention required to be paid as a precondition to the insurer’s liability. Additionally, the certificates of insurance must note whether the policy does or does not include any self-insured retention and also must disclose the deductible.

7) EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY. During and in relation to the performance of this Agreement, CONTRACTOR agrees as follows:

a) The CONTRACTOR shall not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer related), marital status, sexual orientation, age (over 18), veteran status, gender, pregnancy, or any other non-merit factor unrelated to job duties. Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: recruitment; advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training (including apprenticeship), employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer. The CONTRACTOR agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notice setting forth the provisions of this non-discrimination clause.
b) If this Agreement provides compensation in excess of $50,000 to CONTRACTOR and if the CONTRACTOR employees fifteen (15) or more employees, the following requirements shall apply:

i) The CONTRACTOR shall, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the CONTRACTOR, state that all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer related), marital status, sexual orientation, age (over 18), veteran status, gender, pregnancy, or any other non-merit factor unrelated to job duties. Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: recruitment; advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training (including apprenticeship), employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer. In addition, the CONTRACTOR shall make a good faith effort to consider Minority/Women/Disabled Owned Business Enterprises in CONTRACTOR’s solicitation of goods and services.

ii) In the event of the CONTRACTOR’s non-compliance with the non-discrimination clauses of this Agreement or with any of the said rules, regulations, or orders said CONTRACTOR may be declared ineligible for further agreements with the COMMISSION.

iii) The CONTRACTOR shall cause the foregoing provisions of this Subparagraph 7B to be inserted in all subcontracts for any work covered under this Agreement by a subcontractor compensated more than $50,000 and employing more than fifteen (15) employees, provided that the foregoing provisions shall not apply to contracts or subcontracts for standard commercial supplies or raw materials.

8) INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR STATUS. CONTRACTOR and COMMISSION have reviewed and considered the principal test and secondary factors below and agree that CONTRACTOR is an independent contractor and not an employee of COMMISSION. CONTRACTOR is responsible for all insurance (workers compensation, unemployment, etc.) and all payroll related taxes. CONTRACTOR is not entitled to any employee benefits. COMMISSION agrees that CONTRACTOR shall have the right to control the manner and means of accomplishing the result contracted for herein.

a) PRINCIPAL TEST: The CONTRACTOR rather than COMMISSION has the right to control the manner and means of accomplishing the result contracted for.

b) SECONDARY FACTORS:

i) The extent of control which, by agreement, COMMISSION may exercise over the details of the work is slight rather than substantial;

ii) CONTRACTOR is engaged in a distinct occupation or business;
iii) In the locality, the work to be done by CONTRACTOR is usually done by a specialist without supervision, rather than under the direction of an employer;

iv) The skill required in the particular occupation is substantial rather than slight;

v) The CONTRACTOR rather than the COMMISSION supplies the instrumentalities, tools and workplace;

vi) The length of time for which CONTRACTOR is engaged is of limited duration rather than indefinite;

vii) The method of payment of CONTRACTOR is by the job rather than by the time;

viii) The work is part of a special or permissive activity, program, or project, rather than part of the regular business of COMMISSION;

ix) CONTRACTOR and COMMISSION believe they are creating an independent contractor relationship rather than an employer-employee relationship; and

x) The COMMISSION conducts public business.

It is recognized that it is not necessary that all secondary factors support creation of an independent contractor relationship, but rather that overall there are significant secondary factors which indicate that CONTRACTOR is an independent contractor.

By their signatures to this Agreement, each of the undersigned certifies that it is his or her considered judgment that the CONTRACTOR engaged under this Agreement is in fact an Independent Contractor.

9) NONASSIGNMENT. CONTRACTOR shall not assign the Agreement without the prior written consent of the COMMISSION.

10) ACKNOWLEDGMENT. CONTRACTOR shall acknowledge in all reports and literature the COMMISSION funding to the CONTRACTOR.

11) RETENTION AND AUDIT OF RECORDS. CONTRACTOR shall retain records pertinent to this Agreement for a period of not less than five (5) years after final payment under this Agreement or until a final audit report is accepted by COMMISSION, whichever occurs first. CONTRACTOR hereby agrees to be subject to the examination and audit by the Santa Cruz County Auditor-Controller, the Auditor General of the State of California, or the designee of either for a period of five (5) years after final payment under this Agreement.

12) PRESENTATION OF CLAIMS. Presentation and processing of any or all claims arising out of or related to this Agreement shall be made in accordance with the provisions contained in Chapter 1.05 of the Santa Cruz County Code, which by this reference is incorporated herein.
13) **MISCELLANEOUS.** This written Agreement, along with any attachments, is the full and complete integration of the parties’ agreement forming the basis for this Agreement. The parties agree that this written Agreement supersedes any previous written or oral agreements between the parties, and any modifications to this Agreement must be made in a written document signed by all parties. The unenforceability, invalidity or illegality of any provision(s) of this Agreement shall not render the other provisions unenforceable, invalid or illegal. Waiver by any part of any portion of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of any other portion thereof. Any arbitration, mediation, or litigation arising out of this Agreement shall occur only in the County of Santa Cruz, notwithstanding the fact that one of the contracting parties may reside outside of the County of Santa Cruz. This Agreement shall be governed by, and interpreted in accordance with, California law.

14) **COUNTERPARTS.** This Agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, each of which shall be an original and all of which together shall constitute one agreement.

15) **ATTACHMENTS.** This Agreement includes the following attachments which are incorporated into and made a part of this Agreement by this reference:

- Attachment A: Scope of Services
- Attachment B: Fee Schedule
- Attachment C: Certificate of Insurance

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the Parties have executed this Agreement as of the date signed by the COMMISSION.

**ECOLOGY ACTION**

Kirsten Liske,
Vice-President Community Programs
Ecology Action
877 Cedar St, Suite 240
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

**SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

Guy Preston,
Executive Director

**APPROVED AS TO INSURANCE**

Yesenia Parra,
Administrative Services Officer

**APPROVED AS TO FORM**

Steven Mattas,
Commission Counsel

Distribution: Administrative Services Officer; Accounting; Contractor; Planner
Exhibit A - Scope of Services

Background

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) operates Cruz511, a county-wide transportation demand management (TDM) program, with a focus on reducing the number of drive-alone trips to, from or through Santa Cruz County. The goal is to help residents and commuters find alternatives to driving alone that are less stressful, less costly and better for the environment. Cruz511 key services include carpool and vanpool matching, transit trip planning, real-time traffic information, park and ride lot coordination, biking/walking resources, and employer assistance for workplace-based commute programs. Cruz511 traffic map and commute resources are available online at https://cruz511.org.

GO Santa Cruz County is web-based component of Cruz511 that uses RideAmigos’ commuter management platform to connect commuters, provide transportation options, and reward sustainable travel. GO Santa Cruz County offers users advanced rideshare and carpool matching capabilities and includes a personalized dashboard to log trips, view achievements, track commute statistics, and claim incentives and rewards. Users can learn more about GO Santa Cruz County and create a commute profile at www.gosantacruzcounty.org.

The CONSULTANT will develop a multi-faceted marketing plan to strategically reach employers and employees throughout Santa Cruz County and develop awareness and support for GO Santa Cruz County transportation demand management platform. The goals of the marketing and outreach activities are to increase awareness of the overall TDM program and program elements, generate interest in the expanded TDM program, and drive participation of countywide employers and employees using GO Santa Cruz County. Social distancing and restrictions on in-person gatherings may continue into the term of this Agreement and the CONTRACTOR shall adapt any outreach activities to conform with local rules and regulations.

CONTRACTOR tasks include, but are not limited to:

Task 1 – Employer Outreach
The CONTRACTOR will leverage its existing relationships with Santa Cruz County employers to assist RTC with direct employer outreach. The CONTRACTOR will enroll Major Employers (with more than 100 full-time employees) in the GO Santa Cruz County platform and facilitate employee enrollment in the employer’s commute network. The CONTRACTOR will provide information to major employers to help support commuters returning to work during COVID-19 and to and encourage all sustainable commute modes including carpooling, taking transit, bicycling, walking, and teleworking.

Task 2 – Commuter Workshops and Safety Trainings
The CONTRACTOR will develop and facilitate monthly interactive commuter workshops and safety trainings facilitated by League of American Bicyclists Certified Instructors. The
CONTRACTOR will provide local businesses and organizations with in-depth educational workshops, interactive engagement with cycling experts, and introduction to new technologies and essential tools for ongoing behavior change to sustainable transportation. CONTRACTOR will facilitate distribution of bicycle helmets and lights to workshop participants upon request.

Task 3 – Commuter Challenges
The CONTRACTOR will promote and integrate GO Santa Cruz County platform with existing commuter challenges (e.g. Love to Ride, Strava).

Task 4 – Reporting/ Deliverables
The CONTRACTOR will be responsible for:
- Quarterly summary reports with invoices of previous quarter activities, reach, and impact.
- Completion of a summary report of employer outreach activities and presentation to the Regional Transportation Commission at the conclusion of the contract period.
Table 1: Commuter Workshop Menu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Bicycling</strong></td>
<td>Focus on best practices for cyclists at all skill levels. Includes pre-ride preparation, traffic safety and rules of the road, route planning, etiquette with other street users, proper locking, etc. Introduction to MyCruz511 commute rewards platform and local bike challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction to E-bikes</strong></td>
<td>E-bikes offer the greatest growth opportunity for bike commuting as they go faster and further with less effort. Workshop includes a review of different e-bike technologies, costs, benefits, and investigate if eBikes can really replace cars. Introduction to MyCruz511 commute rewards platform and local bike challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike Commuting 101</strong></td>
<td>Focus on making the shift to a bike commute. Includes information on wayfinding, gear selection, bike types, night riding, bike storage, clothing, commute cost comparison, and Santa Cruz County bike commuter spotlights. Introduction to MyCruz511 commute rewards platform and local bike challenges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit B – Fee Schedule

Ecology Action 2022 Rates - Measure D TDM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Wage</th>
<th>Benefits 38%</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>OH 58%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Billing rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt Miller</td>
<td>$32.05</td>
<td>$ 12.18</td>
<td>$ 44.23</td>
<td>$25.65</td>
<td>$ 69.88</td>
<td>$ 70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawn Kennedy</td>
<td>$25.20</td>
<td>$ 9.58</td>
<td>$ 34.78</td>
<td>$20.17</td>
<td>$ 54.95</td>
<td>$ 55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piet Canin</td>
<td>$45.67</td>
<td>$ 17.35</td>
<td>$ 63.02</td>
<td>$36.55</td>
<td>$ 99.58</td>
<td>$ 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiana Burdiak</td>
<td>$50.03</td>
<td>$ 19.01</td>
<td>$ 69.04</td>
<td>$40.04</td>
<td>$109.09</td>
<td>$ 109.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Hollingsworth</td>
<td>$40.87</td>
<td>$ 15.53</td>
<td>$ 56.40</td>
<td>$32.71</td>
<td>$ 89.11</td>
<td>$ 89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Seward</td>
<td>$67.31</td>
<td>$ 25.58</td>
<td>$ 92.89</td>
<td>$53.87</td>
<td>$146.76</td>
<td>$ 147.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Lloyd</td>
<td>$38.20</td>
<td>$ 14.52</td>
<td>$ 52.72</td>
<td>$30.58</td>
<td>$ 83.29</td>
<td>$ 83.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Pay Rate * Benefits = (Subtotal) * Overhead = Billing Rate
AGENDA: March 3, 2022

TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director, and Tommy Travers, Transportation Planner
RE: Contract award for vegetation control along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Corridor

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with Community Tree Service (Exhibit to the resolution) for a total amount not to exceed $163,200 for vegetation control along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail corridor that includes mowing, trimming, and hand-application of herbicides.

BACKGROUND

Significant progress was made in 2020 to address the majority of the deferred vegetation, drainage, storm damage, and erosion control maintenance along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (SCBRL). In 2021, extensive vegetation control was performed in the form of mowing and trimming branches back from the tracks, and out of several drainage ditches. Currently, there remain certain areas with vegetation overgrowth limiting visibility and maintenance vehicle access, particularly 1.8 miles that were not trimmed in 2021 and have several years of overgrowth. In addition, in recent years highly invasive pampas grass has spread in some areas and cannot be fully mowed due to its dense solid base. Although most of the line is out of service, it remains important to keep access open so that maintenance vehicles and law enforcement can more efficiently and safely reach challenging portions of the corridor. The RTC is responsible for maintaining the track north of milepost 7.0 and for maintaining the corridor along the SCBRL per the current phase of the Administration, Coordination, and License (ACL) Agreement with St. Paul & Pacific Railroad (SPPR) and therefore is required to maintain all vegetation.

In 2019, by resolution, the RTC elected to become subject to the procedures of the California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act (CUPCCAA), which allows the RTC to procure construction contractors for public projects up to $200,000 through an informal bidding process.

After going through an informal bidding process for two potential approaches to vegetation control, at the January 2021 RTC meeting, staff presented to the RTC for consideration a recommendation for vegetation control on the rail line that included the application of three herbicides. The RTC directed staff to re-consider one of the products due to its hazard warning related to prolonged exposure. At the February 2021 RTC meeting, the RTC approved a vegetation control project with mowing and
application of two herbicides that are not considered hazardous under federal
criteria.

In February 2022, the RTC utilized goats for vegetation control as a pilot project
along approximately 2.1 miles of track as well as a wide property adjacent to the
tracks. This work along the tracks reduced the area needing mowing and trimming
by machinery. Although, the goats do not eat some vegetation such as pampas
grass and scotch broom, they seem to be effective. Staff will fully evaluate the
effectiveness of using goats for vegetation control and will incorporate accordingly
for future vegetation control work.

DISCUSSION

Staff held pre-bid site visits with three parties but only one valid bid was received
on time. Considering the quality of the firm’s past performance with RTC contracts,
the fact that the project scope requires more labor than the similar 2021 vegetation
control project, and that the bid price is only 16% higher than the 2021 vegetation
control project, staff believes it is responsible to award the contract to the single
bidder.

The project will involve mowing and trimming, removal of woody trimmings, and
followed by herbicide application by hand for 15 miles of track to a distance of 6
feet from the track. For the general track bed herbicide application, the same two
products (Method 240SL and Milestone) that the RTC approved in 2021 would be
applied using required best management practices as droplets close to ground.
These products are not considered hazardous under OSHA Hazard Communication
Standard 29 CFR 1910.1200. For the invasive pampas grass, which unfortunately
was unaffected by the herbicides used in 2021 and is spreading rapidly, the product
Imazapyr 4 SL is recommended by the contractor. It would only be applied by hand
as a direct drip onto the bases of each trimmed pampas grass plant. Imazapyr 4 SL
is less hazardous than many herbicides. It has a “category 5” health hazard
warning of “may be harmful if swallowed or in contact with the skin.” It is colored
blue to discourage disturbance. Furthermore, due to the sharp blades of the
pampas grass plant, it is highly unlikely that a trespassing individual or pet would
be able to touch the product. The reason for recommending this product is that the
other two products previously approved by the RTC were ineffective with pampas
grass plants, and many of these plants continue to grow large with solid, woody
bases that cannot be mowed. More than one application may be necessary on the
pampas grass. In consulting with vegetation contractors, due to the density of the
woody bases, and proximity to the rails, advice has been that to remove them from
the tracks will require either the proposed herbicide followed by relatively easy
removal of the dead plants, or extensive hard manual labor with pickaxes.

How does this compare to what was done in 2021?
In 2021, after mowing and trimming, Method 240SL and Milestone were sprayed as
droplets out of a track-mounted truck up to 8 feet out from tracks, as well as up to
18 feet out from tracks along certain drainage ditches that were dry, following best
management practices.
Staff will still use social media and other internet tools to notify the community when the herbicide application will be done, because trespassers should not disturb the product. The Agricultural Commissioner has requirements for posting notices when certain herbicides are used. Staff will ensure that requirements of the Agricultural Commissioner for posting of notices for the herbicides used by RTC’s contractor are met, including bilingual notices.

**Staff recommends adopting a resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with Community Tree Service (Exhibit to the resolution) for a total amount not to exceed $163,200 for vegetation control along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail corridor that includes mowing, trimming, and hand-application of herbicides.**

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The RTC’s budget for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line provides funds for corridor encroachments and preventative maintenance activities. The FY 20/21 budget includes $1,496,588 for corridor property management and maintenance. There is enough capacity remaining in this fiscal year’s budget, therefore there are no new fiscal impacts associated with the proposed contract to maintain vegetation along the SCBRL.

**SUMMARY**

Staff procured contractors to maintain vegetation along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail corridor through the RTC’s informal bidding process. One valid bid was received. Staff recommends entering into a contract with Community Tree Service for the needed vegetation control along the SCBRL corridor.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Resolution
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission on the date of March 3, 2022 on the motion of Commissioner duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE LOWEST RESPONSIVE BID AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT WITH COMMUNITY TREE SERVICE IN THE AMOUNT OF $163,200 FOR VEGETATION CONTROL ALONG THE SANTA CRUZ BRANCH RAIL LINE

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) purchased the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (SCBRL) in October 2012;

WHEREAS, the agreement with the rail operator obligates the RTC to maintain the Santa Cruz Branch Rail corridor, until certain repairs are completed;

WHEREAS, staff solicited bids for two project options, one including herbicide and one including additional mowing; and

WHEREAS, 1 valid on-time bid was received in the amount of $163,200;

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

1. The RTC accepts the lowest responsive bid in the amount of $163,200; and

2. The Executive Director is authorized to enter into an agreement with Community Tree Service for vegetation control along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail corridor with a bid amount of $163,200 for vegetation control along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line corridor

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

______________________________
Sandy Brown, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Exhibit A: Draft Agreement

Distribution: RTC Project Manager, RTC Fiscal, Construction Contractor
RTC Standard Independent Contractor Agreement for Construction by Informal Bidding

This contract for independent contractor services (the “Contract”) is entered into this (enter date) by and between the SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, hereinafter called COMMISSION, and COMMUNITY TREE SERVICE, INC. hereinafter called CONTRACTOR. The parties agree as follows:

1. SERVICES. In accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in this Contract, CONTRACTOR agrees to perform all services described in the Scope of Services, attached as Exhibit A, which is incorporated herein for the benefit of the COMMISSION (hereinafter “the project”). In the event of a conflict in or inconsistency between the terms of this Contract and Exhibit A, this Contract shall prevail.

2. COMPENSATION. In consideration for performing the Scope of Services in a manner acceptable to the Commission, the Commission shall pay the Contractor for such services on a lump sum basis. The total lump sum price paid to CONTRACTOR will include compensation for all work and incidentals, including travel and equipment described in Exhibit A Scope of Work of this contract. No additional compensation will be paid to CONTRACTOR, unless there is a change in the scope of the work. In the instance of a change in the scope of work, adjustment to the total lump sum compensation will be negotiated between CONTRACTOR and COMMISSION based on the unit costs provided in the Bid Sheet, included as Exhibit B. The total amount payable by COMMISSION shall not exceed $163,200.

A. Invoices. CONTRACTOR shall submit invoices once a month, based on the cost for services performed and reimbursable costs incurred prior to the invoice date. CONTRACTOR shall have ninety (90) days after the completion of work to invoice COMMISSION for all amounts due and outstanding as governed by this Contract. In the event CONTRACTOR fails to invoice COMMISSION for all amounts due within such ninety (90) day period, CONTRACTOR shall waive its right to collect payment from COMMISSION.

B. Payment. COMMISSION shall make monthly payments, based on invoices received, for services satisfactorily performed, and for authorized reimbursable costs incurred.

C. Reimbursable Expenses. No expenses, costs, or liabilities of CONTRACTOR shall be reimbursable unless the obligation and manner of reimbursement is expressly set forth in the Scope of Work (Exhibit A) and in the Bid Sheet (Exhibit B).

D. Payment of Taxes. CONTRACTOR is solely responsible for the payment of employment taxes incurred under this Contract and any similar federal or state taxes.

E. Retention. If this Contract is for the creation, construction, alteration, repair or improvement of any public structure, building, road or other improvement of any kind and the total compensation payable under this Contract will exceed $5000, five percent (5%) retention shall be withheld from progress payments and released as provided by Public Contract Code sections 9203 and 7107.
3. **TERM.** The term of this Contract shall be through (last date of contract). If this Contract is placed on the RTC’s Continuing Agreement List before the Contract term expires, the parties agree to extend the terms and conditions of the Contract as set forth herein, and as reflected in any executed amendment hereto, until the Contract is thereafter terminated.

4. **EARLY TERMINATION.** COMMISSION may terminate this Contract at any time by giving thirty (30) days’ written notice to the CONTRACTOR. CONTRACTOR may terminate this Contract for cause, after providing COMMISSION thirty (30) days’ written notice and opportunity to cure, specifying in detail the cause for termination.

5. **INDEMNIFICATION FOR DAMAGES, TAXES AND CONTRIBUTIONS.** To the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, CONTRACTOR shall exonerate, indemnify, defend, and hold harmless COMMISSION (which for the purpose of paragraphs 5 and 6 shall include, without limitation, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers) from and against:

   A. Any and all claims, demands, losses, damages, defense costs, or liability of any kind or nature which COMMISSION may sustain or incur or which may be imposed upon it as a result of, arising out of, or in any manner connected with the CONTRACTOR’S performance under the terms of this Contract, excepting any liability arising out of the sole negligence of the COMMISSION. Such indemnification includes any damage to the person(s), or property(ies) of CONTRACTOR and third persons. Such obligations to defend, hold harmless and indemnify the COMMISSION shall not apply to the extent that such Liabilities are caused by the sole negligence, active negligence, or willful misconduct of the COMMISSION.

   B. Any and all Federal, State and Local taxes, charges, fees, or contributions required to be paid with respect to CONTRACTOR and CONTRACTOR’S officers, employees and agents engaged in the performance of this Contract (including, without limitation, unemployment insurance, social security and payroll tax withholding). COMMISSION shall provide timely notice to CONTRACTOR of third party claims relating to this Contract, as required by applicable law.

6. **INSURANCE.** CONTRACTOR, at its sole cost and expense, for the full term of this Contract (and any extensions thereof), shall obtain and maintain, at minimum, compliance with all of the following insurance coverage(s) and requirements. Such insurance coverage shall be primary coverage as respects COMMISSION and any insurance or self-insurance maintained by COMMISSION shall be considered in excess of CONTRACTOR’S insurance coverage and shall not contribute to it. If CONTRACTOR normally carries insurance in an amount greater than the minimum amount required by the COMMISSION for this Contract, that greater amount shall become the minimum required amount of insurance for purposes of this Contract. Therefore, CONTRACTOR hereby acknowledges and agrees that any and all insurances carried by it shall be deemed liability coverage for any and all actions it performs in connection with this Contract. Insurance is to be obtained from insurers reasonably acceptable to the COMMISSION.

If CONTRACTOR utilizes one or more subcontractors in the performance of this Contract, CONTRACTOR shall obtain and maintain Contractor’s Protective Liability Insurance as to each subcontractor or otherwise provide evidence of insurance coverage from each subcontractor
equivalent to that required of CONTRACTOR in this contract, unless CONTRACTOR and COMMISSION both initial here: / 

**A. Types of Insurance and Minimum Limits**

1. Worker’s Compensation in the minimum statutorily required coverage amounts. This insurance coverage shall be required unless the CONTRACTOR has no employees and certifies to this fact by initialing here: ____________.

2. Automobile Liability Insurance for each of CONTRACTOR’S vehicles used in the performance of this Contract, including owned, non-owned (e.g. owned by CONTRACTOR’S employees), leased or hired vehicles, in the minimum amount of $1,000,000 combined single limit per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage. This insurance coverage is required unless the CONTRACTOR does not drive a vehicle in conjunction with any part of the performance of this Contract and CONTRACTOR and COMMISSION both certify to this fact by initialing here __ / __.

3. Comprehensive or Commercial General Liability Insurance coverage at least as broad as the most recent ISO form CG 00 01, with a minimum limit of $2,000,000 per occurrence and $4,000,000 aggregate, including coverage for: (a) products and completed operations; (b) bodily and personal injury, (c) broad form property damage, (d) contractual liability, and (e) cross-liability.

4. Railroad Protective Liability insurance, or equivalent Commercial General Liability Insurance that does not exclude work on railroads, naming only SCCRTC and St. Paul & Pacific Railway as the insured with a combined single limit of $2,000,000 per occurrence with a $4,000,000 aggregate. A binder stating the policy is in place must be submitted to the SCCRTC until the original policy is forwarded to the SCCRTC.

5. Professional Liability Insurance in the minimum amount of $____________combined single limit, if, and only if, this Subparagraph is initialed by CONTRACTOR and COMMISSION __ / __.

**B. Other Insurance Provisions**

1. If any insurance coverage required in this Contract is provided on a “Claims Made” rather than “Occurrence” form, CONTRACTOR agrees that the retroactive date thereof shall be no later than the date first written above (in the first paragraph on page 1), and that it shall maintain the required coverage for a period of three (3) years after the expiration of this Contract (hereinafter “post Contract coverage”) and any extensions thereof. CONTRACTOR may maintain the required post Contract coverage by renewal or purchase of prior acts or tail coverage. This provision is contingent upon post Contract coverage being both available and reasonably affordable in relation to the coverage provided during the term of this Contract. For purposes of interpreting this requirement, a cost not exceeding 100% of the last annual policy premium during the term of this Contract in order to purchase prior acts or tail coverage for post Contract coverage shall be deemed to be reasonable.
(2) All policies of Comprehensive or Commercial General Liability Insurance shall be endorsed to cover the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, its officials, employees, agents and volunteers as additional insureds with respect to liability arising out of the work or operations and activities performed by or on behalf of CONTRACTOR, including materials, parts or equipment furnished in connection with such work or operations. Endorsements shall be at least as broad as ISO Form CG 20 10 11 85, or both CG 20 10 10 01 and CG 20 37 10 01, covering both ongoing operations and products and completed operations.

(3) All required insurance policies shall be endorsed to contain the following clause:

“This insurance shall not be canceled until after thirty (30) days’ prior written notice (10 days for nonpayment of premium) has been given to:

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Attn: Risk Manager
1101 Pacific Ave. Ste. 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Should CONTRACTOR fail to obtain such an endorsement to any policy required hereunder, CONTRACTOR shall be responsible to provide at least thirty (30) days’ notice (10 days for nonpayment of premium) of cancellation of such policy to the COMMISSION as a material term of this Contract.

(4) CONTRACTOR agrees to provide its insurance broker(s) with a full copy of these insurance provisions and provide COMMISSION on or before the effective date of this Contract with Certificates of Insurance and endorsements for all required coverages. However, failure to obtain the required documents prior to the work beginning shall not waive the CONTRACTOR’s obligation to provide them. All Certificates of Insurance and endorsements shall be delivered or sent to:

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Attn: Risk Manager
1101 Pacific Ave. Ste. 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

(5) CONTRACTOR hereby grants to COMMISSION a waiver of any right of subrogation which any insurer of said CONTRACTOR may acquire against the COMMISSION by virtue of the payment of any loss under such insurance. CONTRACTOR agrees to obtain any endorsement that may be necessary to affect this waiver of subrogation, but this provision applies regardless of whether or not the COMMISSION has received a waiver of subrogation endorsement from the insurer.

(6) **Deductibles and Self-Insured Retentions.** CONTRACTOR shall disclose to and obtain the approval of COMMISSION for the self-insured retentions and
deductibles before beginning any of the services or work called for by any term of this Agreement. Further, if the CONTRACTOR’S insurance policy includes a self-insured retention that must be paid by a named insured as a precondition of the insurer’s liability, or which has the effect of providing that payments of the self-insured retention by others, including additional insureds or insurers do not serve to satisfy the self-insured retention, such provisions must be modified by special endorsement so as to not apply to the additional insured coverage required by this agreement so as to not prevent any of the parties to this agreement from satisfying or paying the self-insured retention required to be paid as a precondition to the insurer’s liability. Additionally, the certificates of insurance must note whether the policy does or does not include any self-insured retention and also must disclose the deductible.

7. **EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY.** During and in relation to the performance of this Contract, CONTRACTOR agrees as follows:

A. The CONTRACTOR shall not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, medical condition (including cancer-related and genetic characteristics), marital status, sexual orientation, age (over 18), veteran status, gender, pregnancy, or any other non-merit factor unrelated to job duties. Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: recruitment, advertising, layoff or termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, selection for training (including apprenticeship), employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer. The CONTRACTOR agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notice setting forth the provisions of this non-discrimination clause.

B. If this Contract provides compensation in excess of $50,000 to CONTRACTOR and if CONTRACTOR employees fifteen (15) or more employees, the following requirements shall apply:

1. The CONTRACTOR shall, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the CONTRACTOR, state that all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, medical condition (including cancer-related and genetic characteristics), marital status, sexual orientation, age (over 18), veteran status, gender, pregnancy, or any other non-merit factor unrelated to job duties. Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: recruitment; advertising, layoff or termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, selection for training (including apprenticeship), employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer. In addition, the CONTRACTOR shall make a good faith effort to consider Minority/Women/Disabled Owned Business Enterprises in CONTRACTOR’S solicitation of goods and services.

2. In the event of the CONTRACTOR’S non-compliance with the non-discrimination clauses of this Contract or with any of the said rules, regulations, or orders said CONTRACTOR may be declared ineligible for further contracts with the COMMISSION.
(3) The CONTRACTOR shall cause the foregoing provisions of subparagraphs 7B(1) and 7B(2) to be inserted in all subcontracts for any work covered under this Contract by a subcontractor compensated more than $50,000 and employing more than fifteen (15) employees, provided that the foregoing provisions shall not apply to contracts or subcontracts for standard commercial supplies or raw materials.

8. **INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR STATUS.** CONTRACTOR and COMMISSION have reviewed and considered the principal test and secondary factors below and agree that CONTRACTOR is an independent contractor and not an employee of COMMISSION. CONTRACTOR is responsible for all insurance (workers compensation, unemployment, etc.) and all payroll related taxes. CONTRACTOR is not entitled to any employee benefits. COMMISSION agrees that CONTRACTOR shall have the right to control the manner and means of accomplishing the result contracted for herein.

PRINCIPAL TEST: The CONTRACTOR rather than COMMISSION has the right to control the manner and means of accomplishing the result contracted for.

SECONDARY FACTORS: (a) The extent of control which, by agreement, COMMISSION may exercise over the details of the work is slight rather than substantial; (b) CONTRACTOR is engaged in a distinct occupation or business; (c) In the locality, the work to be done by CONTRACTOR is usually done by a specialist without supervision, rather than under the direction of an employer; (d) The skill required in the particular occupation is substantial rather than slight; (e) The CONTRACTOR rather than the COMMISSION supplies the instrumentalities, tools and work place; (f) The length of time for which CONTRACTOR is engaged is of limited duration rather than indefinite; (g) The method of payment of CONTRACTOR is by the job rather than by the time; (h) The work is part of a special or permissive activity, program, or project, rather than part of the regular business of COMMISSION; (i) CONTRACTOR and COMMISSION believe they are creating an independent contractor relationship rather than an employer-employee relationship; and (j) The COMMISSION conducts public business.

It is recognized that it is not necessary that all secondary factors support creation of an independent contractor relationship, but rather that overall there are significant secondary factors that indicate that CONTRACTOR is an independent contractor.

By their signatures on this Contract, each of the undersigned certifies that it is his or her considered judgment that the CONTRACTOR engaged under this Contract is in fact an independent contractor.

9. **SUBCONTRACTING.** CONTRACTOR shall not subcontract any portion of the performance contemplated and provided for herein without prior written approval of the COMMISSION. Where written approval is granted by the COMMISSION, CONTRACTOR shall supervise all work subcontracted by CONTRACTOR in performing the Services; shall be responsible for all work performed by a subcontractor as if CONTRACTOR itself had performed such work; the subcontracting of any work to subcontractors shall not relieve CONTRACTOR from any of its obligations under this Contract with respect to the Services; and CONTRACTOR
is obligated to ensure that any and all subcontractors performing any Services shall be fully insured in all respects and to the same extent as set forth under Section 6, to COMMISSION’s satisfaction.

10. **RIGHT OF ENTRY AGREEMENT.** CONTRACTOR shall obtain a right of entry agreement with St. Paul & Pacific Railway (SPPR) in which 30-45 days are needed for SPPR to process this request. SPPR guidelines for obtaining a right of entry agreement are included as Exhibit C. CONTRACTOR will contact St. Paul & Pacific Railway representative to provide notice of the date, time, location, duration and nature of activity to be done.

11. **SAFETY TRAINING.** CONTRACTOR agrees to abide by all safety laws, regulations and requirements associated with working on and in the vicinity of a railroad track, and all conditions of entry that may be required by St. Paul & Pacific Railway to avoid interference with its rights, including but not limited to all terms and conditions set forth in the attached Exhibit C, incorporated herein. CONTRACTOR, subcontractors, and/or authorized agents shall be required to complete the paid railroad safety training prior to commencing work within the right of way.

12. **NONASSIGNMENT.** CONTRACTOR shall not assign the Contract without the prior written consent of the COMMISSION.

13. **ACKNOWLEDGMENT.** CONTRACTOR shall acknowledge in all reports and literature that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission has provided funding to the CONTRACTOR.

14. **RETENTION AND AUDIT OF RECORDS.** CONTRACTOR shall retain records pertinent to this Contract for a period of not less than five (5) years after final payment under this Contract or until a final audit report is accepted by COMMISSION, whichever occurs first. CONTRACTOR hereby agrees to be subject to the examination and audit by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, the Auditor General of the State of California, or the designee of either for a period of five (5) years after final payment under this Contract.

All reports, data, maps, models, charts, studies, surveys, photographs, memoranda, plans, studies, specifications, records, files, or any other documents or materials, in electronic or any other form, that CONTRACTOR prepares or obtains in accordance with this Agreement and that relate to the matters covered under the terms of this Contract shall be the property of the COMMISSION.

During the term of this Agreement, either party (the “Disclosing Party”) may disclose confidential, proprietary or trade secret information (the “Information”), to the other party (the “Receiving Party”). The Receiving Party shall hold the Disclosing Party’s Information in confidence and shall take all reasonable steps to prevent any unauthorized possession, use, copying, transfer or disclosure of such Information. CONTRACTOR understands that COMMISSION is a public agency and is subject to the laws that may compel it to disclose information about CONTRACTOR’s business.

15. **PRESENTATION OF CLAIMS.** Presentation and processing of any or all claims arising out of or related to this Contract shall be made in accordance with the provisions
contained in Chapter 1.05 of the Santa Cruz County Code, which by this reference is incorporated herein.

16. **ATTORNEY’S FEE.** If a Party to this Contract brings any action, including an action for declaratory relief, to enforce or interpret the provision of this Contract, the prevailing Party shall be entitled to reasonable attorneys’ fees in addition to any other relief to which that Party may be entitled. The court may set such fees in the same action or in a separate action brought for that purpose.

17. **VENUE.** In the event that either Party brings any action against the other under this Contract, the Parties agree that trial of such action shall be vested exclusively in the state courts of California in the County of Santa Cruz or in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

18. **ATTACHMENTS.** This Contract includes the following attachments:

Exhibit A: Scope of Work
Exhibit B: Rate Sheet
Exhibit C: St. Paul & Pacific Railway Right of Entry Agreement Guidelines

19. **PREVAILING WAGE.** This agreement is covered under Prevailing Wage provisions if this section is initialed by COMMISSION ____________.

This agreement is subject to the Prevailing Wage provisions and provisions relating to certified payroll records and apprenticeship of the Labor Code of California and Department of Industrial Relations regulations. There shall be paid to each worker of the CONTRACTOR, or any of his subcontractors engaged in work on the project, not less than the prevailing wage rate regardless of any contractual relationship that may be alleged to exist between the Contractor or subcontractor of such worker. Holiday and overtime work, when permitted by law, shall be paid at a rate of at least one and one-half (1 ½) times the above specified rate of per diem wages, unless otherwise specified. Non-compliance during the term of the contract will be considered a material breach and may result in termination of the Agreement or pursuit of other legal or administrative remedies. To the fullest extent permitted by law, CONTRACTOR shall indemnify and hold COMMISSION harmless against any claims, or demands, or liability arising from failure to comply with all applicable requirements under the Prevailing Wage and related requirements.

20. **LICENSE, REGISTRATION, AND CLSB NOTICE.** CONTRACTOR shall maintain all required licenses throughout the term of this Contract. CONTRACTOR shall be registered with the Department of Industrial Relations pursuant to Labor Code section 1725.5. **NOTICE:** Contractors are required by law to be licensed and regulated by the Contractors’ State License Board which has jurisdiction to investigate complaints against contractors if a complaint regarding a patent act or omission is filed within four years of the date of the alleged violation. A complaint regarding a latent act or omission pertaining to structural defects must be filed within 10 years of the date of the alleged violation. Any questions concerning a contractor may be referred to the Registrar, Contractors’ State License Board, P.O. Box 26000, Sacramento, California 95826.
21. **WARRANTY.** In addition to any and all warranties provided or implied by law or public policy, CONTRACTOR warrants that all Services (including but not limited to all equipment and materials supplied in connection therewith) shall be free from defects in design and workmanship, and that CONTRACTOR shall perform all Services in accordance with all applicable engineering, construction and other codes and standards, and with the degree of high professional skill normally exercised by or expected from recognized professional firms engaged in the practice of supplying services of a nature similar to the Services in question. CONTRACTOR further warrants that, in addition to furnishing all tools, equipment and supplies customarily required for performance of work, CONTRACTOR shall furnish personnel with the training, experience and physical ability, as well as adequate supervision, required to perform the Services in accordance with the preceding standards and the other requirements of this Contract. In addition to all other rights and remedies which COMMISSION may have, COMMISSION shall have the right to require, and CONTRACTOR shall be obligated at its own expense to perform, all further services which may be required to correct any deficiencies which result from Contractor’s failure to perform any Services in accordance with the standards required by this Contract. Moreover, if, during the term of this Contract (or during the one (1) year period following the term hereof), any equipment, goods or other materials or Services used or provided by CONTRACTOR under this Contract fail due to defects in material and/or workmanship or other breach of this Contract, CONTRACTOR shall, upon any reasonable notice from COMMISSION, replace or repair the same to COMMISSION's satisfaction. Unless otherwise expressly permitted, all materials and supplies to be used by CONTRACTOR in the performance of the Services shall be new and best of kind. Contractor hereby assigns to City all additional warranties, extended warranties, or benefits like warranties, such as insurance, provided by or reasonably obtainable from suppliers of equipment and material used in the Services.

22. **INTEGRATION; INCORPORATION.** This Contract, including all the exhibits attached hereto, represents the entire and integrated agreement between COMMISSION and CONTRACTOR and supersedes all prior negotiations, representations, or agreements, either written or oral. All exhibits attached hereto are incorporated by reference herein.

23. **SEVERABILITY.** If a court of competent jurisdiction finds or rules that any provision of this Contract is invalid, void, or unenforceable, the provisions of this Contract not so adjudged shall remain in full force and effect.

24. **MISCELLANEOUS.** This written Contract, along with any attachments, is the full and complete integration of the parties’ agreement forming the basis for this Contract. The parties agree that this written Contract supersedes any previous written or oral agreements between the parties, and any modifications to this Contract must be made in a written document signed by all parties. The unenforceability, invalidity or illegality of any provision(s) of this Contract shall not render the other provisions unenforceable, invalid or illegal. Waiver by any part of any portion of this Contract shall not constitute a waiver of any other portion thereof. Any arbitration, mediation, or litigation arising out of this Contract shall occur only in the County of Santa Cruz, notwithstanding the fact that one of the contracting parties may reside outside of the County of Santa Cruz. This Contract shall be governed by, and interpreted in accordance with, California law.
25. **COUNTERPARTS.** This Agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, each of which shall be an original and all of which together shall constitute one agreement.

The Parties have executed this Contract as of the date signed by the COMMISSION.
Exhibit A Scope of Work

Project Area: Between Milepost 6.85 (Buena Vista Dr, Watsonville) and 23.02 (500’ west of road crossing 768164P, Santa Cruz), except for 1.2 specified miles in Santa Cruz. Total: 14.97 miles

Mowing

All vegetation shall be cleared at least 6 feet back from outer edge of each rail as well as between the two rails, to less than 4 inches from ground. Clearance shall extend vertically at least 8 feet above level of rails for full width. Total length is up to 14.97 miles. Invasive Pampas grass growth in approximately 0.4 mile of track will require clearing down to ground level. Mowed herbaceous clippings may be left on site. Within project area, all woody material as well as dry Pampas grass material must be hauled off site and disposed of. Contractor must follow RTC BMPs below, which are different for “North” and “South” areas.

- Task 1: “North area” (13.18 miles) performed before April 1, 2022
- Task 2: “South area” (1.79 miles) performed after April 18, 2022

Herbicide

Performed after the above mowing tasks. Contractor must be certified and is restricted to use only products approved by contract manager. Products include:

- Method 240SL
- Milestone
- Imazapyr 4 SL (only for direct application to pampas grass by hand)

Other products such as vinegar-based products will be considered for approval only if they are not hazardous under the criteria of the Federal OSHA Hazard Communication Standard 29 CFR 1910.1200. Pre-emergent and post-emergent herbicide will be applied to the track bed to a distance of 6 feet from the outer edge of each rail as well as between the two rails. Contractor must follow all of the product manufacturer best management practices and avoid areas where water is present, bridges, crossings, and areas where the ROW is too narrow, as required for the application and specified by the contract manager. Repeat applications may be necessary. Expected result will be project area almost entirely free of all vegetation and very little new growth occurring in spring. Contractor must follow RTC BMPs, which are different for “North” and “South” areas (ATTACHMENT 2).

- Task 1: “North area” (13.18 miles) performed before April 1, 2022
- Task 2: “South area” (1.79 miles) performed after April 18, 2022, applied by hand on foot
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Prior to the use of equipment along the rail lines, all equipment will be cleaned to ensure that any equipment caked with mud, soils, or debris from off-site sources or previous project sites is removed to avoid introducing or spreading invasive exotic plant species. When feasible, invasive exotic plants will be removed from along the rail line. All equipment used on the premises would be cleaned prior to leaving the site for other projects.</td>
<td>Pre-construction/Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>There must be a 20 foot vegetative buffer between all herbicide application along the rails and open water, riparian corridors, or wetlands, including saturated soils, and there will be no direct application to open water, riparian corridors, or wetlands.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>All herbicides will be mixed in areas that are not prone to runoff, such as concrete mixing/loading pads, or graveled mix pads. A suitable spill containment structure will always be in place. Following the application of herbicides, all herbicides will be properly emptied and all vessels/containers will be triple-rinsed at the time of use.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>If being sprayed, application will occur between wind speeds of 3 mph and 10 mph.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>Where vegetation clearing activities are proposed to occur adjacent to riparian and aquatic habitats (including wetlands, ponds, drainages, and waters of the US and/or state), encroachment of equipment will not occur beyond the rail line to prevent toxic substances, sediment, or debris from entering these features.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>All equipment to be used on the project that are staged or in use along the rail line will be checked daily for fuel, oil, and hydraulic fluid leaks or other problems that could result in spills of toxic materials.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>Fueling, lubrication, maintenance, storage, and staging of vehicles and equipment must not result in a discharge to any waters of the United States and/or state, and shall be located outside of waters of the United States and/or state in areas where accidental spills are not likely to enter or affect such waters.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>All refueling and equipment maintenance will be conducted at least 100 feet away from any waterbodies to avoid accidental contamination, in a location where fluids or accidental discharges cannot flow into a waterbody. Pans or absorbent pads will be utilized during maintenance activities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>If construction related materials reach surface waters, appropriate spill response procedures must be initiated as soon as the incident is discovered, and the RWQCB will be immediately notified.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>The contractor shall retain a standard construction spill plan and appropriate spill control and clean up materials (e.g., oil absorbent pads and drip pans) onsite in case spills or leaks from equipment occur.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>All equipment will remain on the rail line, and will stay outside of any water bodies or drainages.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>The contractor will visually inspect the project alignment and areas of waters adjacent to the areas where vegetation clearing occurs following the completion of project activities to ensure that the project is not causing excessive erosion, bank, or road instability, or other water quality problems. If the project does cause water quality problems, the RTC will contact the RWQCB.</td>
<td>As Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>All equipment, materials, and any management practices no longer needed shall be removed and cleared from the rail line immediately upon completion of the project.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Detail</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Mow only to 6&quot; from ground and ensure no cutting or scraping occurs below. Spray only by hand.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window</td>
<td>Activities shall take place during the dry season, between April 15 and October 15, or until the first rain of the season. All work will be avoided at night or during rain events.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Prior to the use of equipment along the rail lines, all equipment will be cleaned to ensure that any equipment caked with mud, soils, or debris from off-site sources or previous project sites is removed to avoid introducing or spreading invasive exotic plant species. When feasible, invasive exotic plants will be removed from along the rail line. All equipment used on the premises would be cleaned prior to leaving the site for other projects.</td>
<td>Pre-construction/Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention</td>
<td>At all times, fire prevention materials will be carried during vegetation removal. Employ spark arresters and carry shovels and fire extinguishers.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality, Equipment</td>
<td>There must be a 20 foot vegetative buffer between all herbicide application along the rails and open water, riparian corridors, or wetlands, including saturated soils, and there will be no direct application to open water, riparian corridors, or wetlands.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Spill Prevention</td>
<td>There will be no application of herbicides within 48 hours of forecasted rain events.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All herbicides will be mixed in areas that are not prone to runoff, such as concrete mixing/loading pads, or graveled mix pads. A suitable spill containment structure will always be in place. Following the application of herbicides, all herbicides will be properly emptied and all vessels/containers will be triple-rinsed at the time of use.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where vegetation clearing activities are proposed to occur adjacent to riparian and aquatic habitats (including wetlands, ponds, drainages, and waters of the US and/or state), encroachment of equipment will not occur beyond the rail line to prevent toxic substances, sediment, or debris from entering these features.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All equipment to be used on the project that are staged or in use along the rail line will be checked daily for fuel, oil, and hydraulic fluid leaks or other problems that could result in spills of toxic materials.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fueling, lubrication, maintenance, storage, and staging of vehicles and equipment must not result in a discharge to any waters of the United States and/or state, and shall be located outside of waters of the United States and/or state in areas where accidental spills are not likely to enter or affect such waters.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All refueling and equipment maintenance will be conducted at least 100 feet away from any waterbodies to avoid accidental contamination, in a location where fluids or accidental discharges cannot flow into a waterbody. Pans or absorbent pads will be utilized during maintenance activities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If construction related materials reach surface waters, appropriate spill response procedures must be initiated as soon as the incident is discovered, and the RWQCB will be immediately notified.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The contractor shall retain a standard construction spill plan and appropriate spill control and clean up materials (e.g., oil absorbent pads and drip pans) onsite in case spills or leaks from equipment occur.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All equipment will remain on the rail line, and will stay outside of any water bodies or drainages.</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The contractor will visually inspect the project alignment and areas of waters adjacent to the areas where vegetation clearing occurs following the completion of project activities to ensure that the project is not causing excessive erosion, bank, or road instability, or other water quality problems. If the project does cause water quality problems, the RTC will contact the RWQCB.

| All equipment, materials, and any management practices no longer needed shall be removed and cleared from the rail line immediately upon completion of the project. | Ongoing |
| As Needed |
## Exhibit B Bid Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Bid Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mow all vegetation between rails and 6' to each side to less than 4&quot; from ground and to 8' vertically (14.97 miles).</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply herbicide between rails and 6' to each side (14.97 miles).</td>
<td>$49,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul &amp; Pacific Railway (SPPR) ROE agreement</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$163,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit C St. Paul & Pacific Railway Guidelines

Current document to be attached
TO: Regional Transportation Commission/Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

FROM: Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner

RE: Call Box Maintenance and Site Improvements

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) serving as the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) approve the attached resolution:

1. Authorizing the Executive Director to amend the contract with Case Systems, Inc. to make accessibility improvements to call box sites and technology upgrades to the Santa Cruz County highway call box system for a total contract value not to exceed $605,000; and
2. Approving a fiscal year (FY) 2021-22 budget amendment as shown in Exhibit A of Attachment 1 to cover the necessary improvements and upgrades to the call box system.

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (RTC SAFE) owns and operates a system of 70 call boxes along Hwy 1, 9, 17, 129, and 152. Motorists may use call boxes to request assistance or report incidents. The call box calls are answered by a private call answering center that coordinates with the California Highway Patrol when necessary. As the SAFE, the RTC levies a $1 annual fee on all vehicles registered in Santa Cruz County. The funds raised are used to develop a motorist aid system including the roadside call boxes in Santa Cruz County.

The call boxes need to be maintained to keep them functioning properly. The maintenance of the call boxes includes preventative and corrective maintenance, site retrofits, system management and other work as defined below.

- Preventative maintenance includes visiting every call box every six months to inspect components, run comprehensive tests, and make any necessary repairs.
- Corrective maintenance involves responding to any operational problems system-wide or with individual call boxes such as failed electronic components or power supplies.
- Site Retrofits include reconfiguring or relocating call boxes to improve access.
• System management involves maintaining the callbox system specification database.

• Other work includes removals and reinstalls; repairs needed due to vandalism, knockdowns, or damage due to natural causes; and support with the designated cellular service provider to ensure that call box equipment connects to cellular service and troubleshoot potential cellular service issues.

In 2013, RTC SAFE entered into a contract with CASE Systems, Inc. to maintain the call box system for 5 years and that contract was amended in 2018 to continue services for an additional five years. The contract with CASE expires September 30, 2023. It is now necessary to amend the contract to upgrade the call boxes to current technology and make accessibility improvements.

DISCUSSION

Technology Upgrades

The call box system operates using outdated 3G GSM network technology. Wireless carriers are gradually phasing out 3G networks and expect to fully discontinue 3G service nationwide by mid-2022. The current cellular service provider provided notice to all of its customers to adopt 4G LTE service and migrate all 3G devices as soon as possible to avoid disruptions in service. The call box maintenance provider, CASE Systems, Inc., has developed and tested a 4G cell radio that is compatible with 4G LTE service on all wireless carriers and has verified that when paired with Verizon wireless service, the new 4G cell radios improved call box cellular reception along the northern portions of Highway 1 and 9.

The system of call boxes is a vital public safety service, routinely easing traffic congestion on freeways, helping stranded motorists, and, in extraordinary situations, saving lives. The number of calls from RTC SAFE call boxes has steadily decreased over the past ten years due to the increased use of cell phones. However, not every motorist owns a cell phone or carries a phone that is operational or functional in all areas. Additionally, cellular reception is weak in many areas of the county depending on the wireless carrier. Therefore, a safety net of call boxes is still required and must remain operational. Call boxes are designed to be operational at their location regardless of cellular service strength and the answering service knows exactly which call box a call originates from and where it is located to ensure rapid service, when needed by a caller. Over the past year 325 calls were made from call boxes.

ADA Accessibility Improvements

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 sets forth guidelines for accessibility to places of public accommodation and commercial facilities by individuals with disabilities. To bring the Santa Cruz County Call Box system into compliance with ADA requirements, RTC SAFE performed a site survey cataloging the physical state of all 70 call boxes in the system. This survey identified 41 sites that require site retrofits to improve wheelchair access. These site improvements primarily include site conversions, pad installations or replacements, and path installations.
FISCAL IMPACT

The cost to upgrade 70 call boxes with 4G cell radios is $80,000 for materials and installation. The estimated cost for accessibility improvements is $150,000. The estimated cost for continued maintenance is $70,000. The adopted SCCRTC FY 2021-22 Budget and Work Program does not include adequate funds to cover the complete cost of upgrading the call box system with 4G cellular radios and make the needed site improvements. Therefore, a FY 2021-22 budget amendment will be necessary to transfer funds from SAFE reserves into an appropriate budget line within the SAFE budget. There are more than sufficient funds available in the SAFE reserves for this budget amendment. **Staff recommends that the SCCRTC SAFE approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving a fiscal year (FY) 2021-22 budget amendment as shown in Exhibit A of Attachment 1 and authorizing the Executive Director to amend the contract for call box maintenance and improvement services with CASE Systems, Inc.**

SUMMARY

The RTC SAFE owns and operates a system of 70 call boxes which need to be maintained to keep them functioning properly. The call box system uses 3G cellular service to allow emergency calls, however 3G networks are being shut down nationwide. 4G LTE is the new cellular standard for call box systems. The Santa Cruz County call box system needs to be outfitted with 4G cell radios to remain operational. The attached resolution updates the adopted SCCRTC FY 2021-22 Budget and Work Program and authorizes the Executive Director to amend the current contract with CASE Systems, Inc.

**Attachment:**

1. Resolution amending the FY 2021-22 budget to authorize the Executive Director to amend the contract for call box maintenance and site improvements with CASE Systems, Inc.
RESOLUTION NO. __________

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission on the date of March 3, 2022 on the motion of Commissioner duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO AMEND THE CONTRACT RT44045-01 WITH CASE SYSTEMS, INC FOR MAINTENANCE AND ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS AND TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES OF THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY CALL BOX SYSTEM

WHEREAS the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) established a highway call box system which benefits Santa Cruz County motorists and visitors; and

WHEREAS the Santa Cruz County call box system requires preventative maintenance, corrective maintenance, and repairs on ongoing basis; and

WHEREAS the current maintenance contract includes call box site retrofits for ADA compliance and special projects.

WHEREAS the original five-year agreement with CASE was extended for an additional 5-year term on September 6, 2018, and the current contract expires September 30, 2023; and

WHEREAS the call box system uses outdated 3G cellular radios to make emergency calls and must be upgraded to 4G LTE, the new cellular standard for call boxes, to avoid disruptions in service; and

WHEREAS the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopts and periodically amends the budget and work program as necessary during the budget year.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION SERVICE AUTHORITY FOR FREEWAY EMERGENCIES:

1. The Executive Director is authorized to amend the contract
with CASE Systems, Inc. to increase the total contract value by $300,000 for maintenance of and improvements to the Santa Cruz County call box system ($150,000 for accessibility improvements, $80,000 for technology upgrades, and $70,000 for additional maintenance plus contingency) to a total maximum amount of $605,000 for the ten-year term of the contract.

2. The SCCRTC FY 2021-22 budget and work program are hereby amended as shown in Exhibit A.

3. The Executive Director is authorized to approve maintenance and site improvement expenses not covered by the contracted rates to address unforeseen maintenance and/or retrofit needs as long as the costs are within the approved SCCRTC budget.

4. The Executive Director is authorized to execute any contract amendments up to $50,000.

5. The Commission Chair is authorized to execute any contract amendments up to an additional $50,000 for a maximum total of $705,000.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

__________________________________
Sandra Brown, Chair

ATTEST:

_____________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Exhibits: A – SCCRTC FY 2021-22 Budget and Work Program as amended

Distribution: RTC Fiscal, Planner, CASE Systems, Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Measure D</th>
<th>Approved 2/3/22</th>
<th>Proposed 3/3/22</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40186</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40384</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40430</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40754</td>
<td>257,750</td>
<td>257,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>360,750</td>
<td>360,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salaries, Benefits & Overhead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Approved 2/3/22</th>
<th>Proposed 3/3/22</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51070</td>
<td>70,157</td>
<td>70,157</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62354</td>
<td>63,843</td>
<td>63,843</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Services & Supplies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Approved 2/3/22</th>
<th>Proposed 3/3/22</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61221</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61535</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62223</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62359</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62381</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62856</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>57,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62914</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63070</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75233</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75280</td>
<td>150,600</td>
<td>150,600</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>289,550</td>
<td>347,050</td>
<td>57,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Expenditures: 423,550 481,050 57,500

To/(From) reserves: (62,800) (120,300)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY20 - 21 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY21 - 22 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY21 - 22 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY21 - 22 PROJECTION DIFFERENCE AS % OF ACTUAL</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>1,016,646</td>
<td>954,838</td>
<td>1,180,089</td>
<td>225,250</td>
<td>23.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>748,355</td>
<td>702,858</td>
<td>947,834</td>
<td>244,976</td>
<td>34.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>932,896</td>
<td>876,180</td>
<td>1,008,451</td>
<td>132,271</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>1,164,146</td>
<td>1,093,371</td>
<td>1,242,981</td>
<td>149,609</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>670,297</td>
<td>629,546</td>
<td>835,454</td>
<td>205,908</td>
<td>32.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>866,405</td>
<td>813,731</td>
<td>1,015,997</td>
<td>202,266</td>
<td>24.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>898,170</td>
<td>843,565</td>
<td>990,616</td>
<td>147,051</td>
<td>17.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>1,074,000</td>
<td>1,008,706</td>
<td>1,080,393</td>
<td>71,687</td>
<td>7.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>741,758</td>
<td>696,663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>891,479</td>
<td>837,281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>821,015</td>
<td>771,101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>908,248</td>
<td>853,031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10,733,415</td>
<td>10,080,871</td>
<td>8,301,815</td>
<td>1,379,019</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

I:\FISCAL\TDA\MonthlyReceipts\FY2022\FY2022 TDA Receipts.xlsx\FY2022
# Transportation Tax Regional Transportation Fund (TTRTF) - Measure D

## Summary of Revenue Allocation by Month
### FY2022 Ending June 30, 2022

### Gross
| KEY/OBJECT | RATE | JULY       | AUGUST      | SEPTEMBER   | OCTOBER     | NOVEMBER    | DECEMBER    | JANUARY     | FEBRUARY   | TOTAL      | ADJUSTMENT | TOTAL      |
|------------|------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 729000/40186 |      | 2,649,497.47 | 2,239,834.59 | 2,210,354.12 | 2,644,849.94 | 2,146,060.56 | 2,139,182.14 | 2,060,127.88 | 3,002,943.84 | 19,092,850.56 | 0.00       | 19,092,850.56 |

### Administration & Implementation - 729100/75381

#### Administration - Salaries & Benefits
1% 26,494.97

#### O/H Admin
24,110.43 19,893.73 20,114.22 24,068.13 26,154.38 26,739.78 25,751.60 36,865.42

#### Salaries & O/H Implement/Oversight
13,056.25 6,835.75 6,835.75 13,056.25 6,835.75 6,835.75 6,835.75 6,835.75

#### Services & Supplies
6,666.67 4,944.44 4,944.44 4,944.44 4,944.44 4,944.44 4,944.44

#### Total
Net:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>70,328.32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLV SR9</td>
<td>353,971.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY 17 Wildlife</td>
<td>41,666.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### City of Watsonville - V1728
15.4078% 112,798.40 92,155.90 93,254.49 112,954.82 87,287.76 89,691.31 86,119.36 126,292.29 800,554.32

#### City of Capitola - V100207
5.0878% 37,246.67 30,430.40 30,793.16 37,298.32 28,822.91 29,616.57 28,437.10 41,702.43 264,347.55

#### City of Santa Cruz - V110467
22.5429% 165,033.15 134,831.51 136,438.83 165,262.01 127,709.03 131,225.61 125,999.56 184,775.80 1,271,275.50

#### City of Scotts Valley - V102713
4.8626% 35,598.30 29,083.69 29,430.40 35,647.67 27,547.34 28,305.87 27,178.60 39,856.87 252,648.76

#### City of Watsonville - V1728
15.4078% 112,798.40 92,155.90 93,254.49 112,954.82 87,287.76 89,691.31 86,119.36 126,292.29 800,554.32

#### County of Santa Cruz
52.0989% 381,407.55 311,608.65 315,323.31 381,936.46 295,147.89 303,275.06 291,197.16 427,034.72 2,706,930.80

#### Total
100% 732,084.08 598,110.16 605,240.18 733,099.27 566,314.93 582,114.44 558,931.79 819,662.10 5,195,756.93

#### 2. HWY Corridors - 729000/75383
25% 644,792.29 533,147.35 539,089.04 645,638.28 506,817.99 519,817.59 500,498.70 717,773.98 4,607,575.22

#### 3. Transit/Paratransit - 729900/75384
20% 515,833.83 426,517.88 431,271.23 516,610.22 405,454.40 415,854.07 400,398.96 574,219.18 3,686,060.18

#### Santa Cruz Metro (SCMTD) - 16%
80% 412,667.06 341,214.31 345,016.99 413,208.50 324,363.52 322,683.26 320,319.17 450,375.34 2,948,848.14

#### Community Bridges - V127587 - 4%
20% 103,166.77 85,303.58 86,254.25 103,302.12 81,090.88 83,170.81 80,079.79 114,843.84 737,212.04

#### 4. Active Transportation - 729000/75385
17% 438,458.76 362,540.20 366,580.55 439,034.03 344,636.24 353,475.96 340,339.12 488,086.30 3,133,151.15

#### 5. Rail Corridor - 729900/75386
8% 206,333.53 170,607.15 172,508.49 206,604.25 162,181.76 166,341.63 160,159.58 229,687.67 1,474,424.07

#### Distributed to Investment Categories
100% 2,579,169.15 2,132,589.42 2,156,356.16 2,582,553.11 2,027,271.98 2,079,270.35 2,001,994.81 2,871,095.90 18,430,300.88

#### Total Admin & Implement Investment Categories
2,649,497.47 2,186,124.59 2,210,354.12 2,644,849.94 2,092,350.56 2,139,182.14 2,060,127.88 2,949,233.86 18,931,720.56
TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
RE: Assembly Bill 361 Findings for Virtual and Hybrid Meetings

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) find that:

1. The RTC has reconsidered the circumstances of the current COVID-19 state of emergency; and
2. The state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members of the RTC, its committees, its staff and the public to meet safely in person; and
3. State or local officials continue to impose and recommend measures to promote social distancing; and
4. Therefore, meetings of the RTC will continue to be held in a hybrid or virtual format via Zoom and meetings of RTC committees will be held virtually via Zoom.

BACKGROUND

In March 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Governor Newsom declared a state of emergency which remains in effect. The Governor also issued executive orders suspending several provisions of the Brown Act to ensure that the work of government agencies could continue with virtual meetings to reduce the risk of spreading COVID-19. The executive orders suspending the Brown Act provisions expired on September 30, 2021. AB 361 was signed into law and took effect on October 1, 2021, which allows the continuation of virtual meetings as long as the declared state of emergency continues and required findings are made by local agencies.

DISCUSSION

Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic continues; therefore, the RTC has been making the necessary AB361 findings at its meetings since November 2021 to continue to hold virtual meetings. The goal of the RTC is to hold RTC meetings in a hybrid format as long as the COVID-19 situation permits, and
the facilities are available for hybrid meetings. For hybrid meetings, a limited number of Commissioners and members of the public may participate in person, as long as the County Board of Supervisors Chambers are available for the meeting. Everyone participating in person must wear a mask. All others will participate via Zoom. The RTC has not yet been able to hold any hybrid meetings. All of the meetings of RTC committees will continue to be virtual meetings via Zoom because conference rooms are not equipped for hybrid meetings.

To continue to hold virtual and/or hybrid meetings, the RTC must continue to make findings as required in Section 54953 of the Government Code, added by AB 361, which states:

“(3) If a state of emergency remains active, or state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing, in order to continue to teleconference without compliance with paragraph (3) of subdivision (b), the legislative body shall, not later than 30 days after teleconferencing for the first time pursuant to subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1), and every 30 days thereafter, make the following findings by majority vote:

(A) The legislative body has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency.
(B) Any of the following circumstances exist:
   (i) The state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person.
   (ii) State or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.”

Therefore, staff recommends that the RTC find that RTC has reconsidered the circumstances of the current COVID-19 state of emergency; the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members of the RTC, its committees, its staff and the public to meet safely in person; and state and local officials continue to impose and recommend measures to promote social distancing; and meetings of the RTC will be hybrid while meetings of committees will be virtual.

30-Day Requirement for AB 361 Findings

State law requires that findings to continue virtual and/or hybrid meetings be made every 30 days. State law also allows special virtual meetings for the sole purpose of making AB 361 findings to hold virtual and/or hybrid meetings. Therefore, it may be necessary for the RTC to hold special virtual
meetings solely for the purposes of making AB 361 findings. A number of agencies around the state are working towards legislative modifications so such special meetings will not be required but such modifications are not anticipated soon.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The costs necessary to hold meetings of the RTC either as regular Brown Act meetings, virtual meetings or hybrid meetings are included in the approved RTC budget. The costs to hold Brown Act and virtual meetings of RTC committees are also included in the RTC budget. No additional fiscal impacts are anticipated for such meetings at this time. For hybrid meetings of RTC committees, it would likely be necessary to equip conference rooms accordingly, which would have additional fiscal impacts.

**SUMMARY**

Due to the current COVID-19 pandemic, the Governor declared a state of emergency and issued executive orders to allow public agencies to hold meetings virtually. The executive orders allowing virtual meetings expired and AB 361 was signed into law to allow the continuation of virtual and/or hybrid meetings as long as the state of emergency still exists and public agencies make appropriate findings. Staff recommends that the RTC make such findings to allow virtual and/or hybrid meetings of itself and its committees.
AGENDA: March 3, 2022

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer

RE: Committee Appointments: Budget and Administration/Personnel; California Association of Councils of Government (CALCOG); Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the RTC approve appointments of Commissioners to the RTC’s Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee, the California Association of Councils of Government (CALCOG), and the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC).

BACKGROUND

Currently, the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee is the RTC’s only standing committee. The RTC rules and regulations state:

“Commissioner appointments to committees shall be made annually at the March Commission meeting by the Chair with concurrence of the Commission. When a Commissioner vacancy on a Committee is created, the Commission Chair shall make an interim appointment with concurrence of the Commission at the next meeting.”

The Regional Transportation Commission holds a membership in the California Association of Council of Governments (CalCOG). CalCOG provides public policy advocacy and intergovernmental coordination with the state legislature, state agencies, the League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties, California’s Congressional Delegation and federal officials.

The RTC also appoints a representative to the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC). The CRCC advocates for increased passenger rail service between Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area and has been successful in securing regular intercity passenger rail service between Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo.
DISCUSSION

Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee
The Budget & Administration/Personnel Committee serves to review and monitor issues relating to the budget, work program, and other administrative and personnel functions of the RTC and makes recommendations to the Commission regarding such items. The committee also functions as the Personnel Committee to review personnel matters. According to the RTC rules and regulations, the membership of the committee is to be composed of the Commission Chair and up to 5 other Commissioners. A Commissioner may be designated to serve in lieu of the Commission Chair.

The proposed 2022 membership for the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manu Koenig (Committee Chair)</td>
<td>Shane Mckeithen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Coonerty</td>
<td>Andy Schiffrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Caput</td>
<td>Felipe Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce McPherson</td>
<td>Virginia Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach Friend</td>
<td>Robert Quinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Montesino</td>
<td>Lowell Hurst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG)
CalCOG delegates are typically appointed annually. CalCOG member agencies elect delegates to serve at CalCOG’s annual Regional Issues Forum and periodic delegate meetings, where CalCOG policies and priorities are discussed and adopted. At these forums, there are presentations and discussions on transportation, legislation, local and regional planning and financing issues.

Commissioner Zach Friend is RTC’s current appointee and has expressed interest in continuing to serve in this role in 2022.

Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)
The CRCC only meets about every 3 months. The CRCC is composed of representatives from the Caltrans Rail Program, Amtrak and the counties along the coast rail corridor between Los Angeles and San Francisco. The CRCC advocates for increased passenger rail service along this route, including the initiation of a new Coast Daylight train which would connect northern and southern California.
The RTC has been a member of the CRCC since it began in 1992. Jacques Bertrand was RTC’s appointee for 2021 and has expressed interest in continuing to serve in this role in 2022.

**Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve appointments to the Budget and Administration/Personnel committee, the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC), and the California Association of Councils of Government (CALCOG).**

**SUMMARY**

The RTC has one standing Commissioner committee, the Budget and Administration /Personnel Committee (B&A/P) and is a member of the California Association of Council of Governments (CALCOG) and the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC). Staff recommends that the RTC approve appoints for 2022 to these committees.
RECOMMENDATION

The Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the re-appointment and appointment of members to fill positions on the E&D TAC.

BACKGROUND

Seats on the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) correspond to City and Supervisorial District seats on the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). Commissioners may nominate individuals for Committee and RTC consideration.

DISCUSSION

Based on the public outreach, interest was expressed by eight individuals resulting in eight applications received for the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee. Six applications are from existing members of the committee and two applications are from new applicants. In an effort to accommodate all interested applicants, staff recommends appointments as included in the attached roster (Attachment 1). The applicants are Clay Kempf, Patty Talbott, Lisa Berkowitz, Jesus Bojorquez, Daniel Zargoza, Veronica Elsea, Alicia Morales, and Nadia Noriega with their full applications in the same order in Attachment 2.

Staff is working to recruit applicants to fill vacancies and welcomes recommendations from Commissioners. The application and more information about the Committee are available on the RTC webpage.

The Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the reappointments and appointments of members to fill positions on the E&D TAC as shown in Attachment 1.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

SUMMARY
The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) functions best when all committee membership and alternate positions are filled. Eight individuals have expressed interest in joining the E&D TAC. Staff recommends that member positions be filled as shown (see Attachment 1 for current roster).

Attachment 1: February 2022 E&D TAC Roster
Attachment 2: Member Applications Form
## Membership Roster

**February 2022**

*(Membership Expiration Date)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay Kempf (Pending)</td>
<td>Social Services Provider - Seniors</td>
<td>Patty Talbott (Pending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Morales (Pending)</td>
<td>Social Services Provider - Seniors             (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Weske (2023)</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Ireland (2024)</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Persons of Limited Means</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Berkowitz (Pending)</td>
<td>CTSA (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Bojorquez (Pending)</td>
<td>CTSA (Lift Line)</td>
<td>Nadia Noriega (Pending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Wagley (2024)</td>
<td>SCMTD (Metro)</td>
<td>Daniel Zaragoza (Pending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Pisano (2023)</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (60+)</td>
<td>Patricia McVeigh (2023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Lamb (2023)</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (Disabled)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisorial District Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Edwards, Vice Chair (2023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Elerick (2023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Elsea, Chair (Pending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Rubbo (2023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Hutton (2023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff: Amanda Marino, Regional Transportation Commission
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250 in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Clay Kempf

Home address:  

Mailing address (if different):  

Phone: (home)  (business/message)  

E-mail:  

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 45 years

Position(s) I am applying for:

☐ Any appropriate position

☒ Social Service Provider for the Elderly

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

First appointed to this committee in 1989; member ever since. Also a member of the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee in San Benito County and the Aging & Long Term Care Commission there. Former member of the Santa Cruz County Long Term Care Commission until it was dissolved.
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Council/Area Agency on Aging</td>
<td>Same as current</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>2000 - present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Nutrition Services/Lift Line. (now Community Bridges)</td>
<td>519 Main State, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Director of Transportation</td>
<td>1990-98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Without access to work, services, and socialization, seniors and people with disabilities quickly become isolated and at-risk of numerous threats to their independence. Specialized transportation is an essential element of keeping people connected with their community, and living a healthy and independent life. The Area Agency on Aging supports the delivery of specialized transportation services, including contributing funding for the transportation of older adults to various destinations.
congregate meal sites in the County. The E&DTAC continues to be the most effective local forum to discuss these issues.

As the Director of the Area Agency on Aging and the Executive Director of the Seniors Council, serving on the E&D TAC provides the opportunity to continue to provide input into our local transportation delivery models. Besides discussing regularly scheduled items and plans, I remain available to assist in activities and special projects as staff and the Committee deems appropriate.

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

[Signature] [1/18/22]

How did you learn about this opportunity?

___ newspaper  ___ flyer
___ radio  ___ friend/family member
___ internet  X other

Return Application to:  SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-6178  email: amarino@sccrtc.org

Questions or Comments:  (831) 460-3200
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250 in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Patty Talbott

Home address: ____________________________

Mailing address (if different): ____________________________

Phone: [Redacted] (business/message) [Redacted]

E-mail: [Redacted]

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 39 years

Position(s) I am applying for:

☐ Any appropriate position

☐ Alternate for Clay Kempf, Social Services Provider, Seniors

☐ ____________________________

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

Alternate for E&D TAC Social Services Provider for 15 years. Staff to Area Agency on Aging on Aging Advisory Council for 20 years
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Planner/AAA Administrator</td>
<td>2005-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council/Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency on Aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Line</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Analyst</td>
<td>1995-1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

[Signature] 2/9/22

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

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

**Return Application to:** SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-6178  email: amarino@sccrtc.org
Statement of Qualifications:
I have over 30 years experience in the senior services sector as a Planner and Contracts Manager for the Area Agency on Aging. I also worked in the Lift Line program for two years. As a planner myself, I appreciate the opportunity to review transportation plans and provide feedback. As the senior population continues to grow, maintaining and expanding transportation options for seniors and the disabled is a critical issue.
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250 in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Lisa Berkowitz
Home address: [redacted]
Mailing address (if different): 

Phone: (home) [redacted] (business/message) [redacted]
E-mail: [redacted]

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 45 years

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

X CTSA Community Bridges • 

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
SCCRTC Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
Area on Aging Advisory Council
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges</td>
<td>519 Main St.</td>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>7/79-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watsonville, CA 95076</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Since 1976 I have worked in the field of aging. I have worked for organizations whose mission it has been is to address the challenges faced by adults as we age. Maintaining independence is a common component of many of those challenges. Transportation services are a key concern and frequently play a pivotal role in determining the success of many other life choices and decisions. I hope to stay involved in the committee’s efforts to ensure that transportation services for seniors and disabled adults remain an important issue in our community.

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

Signature ____________________________ Date 1-27-2022

Return Application to: SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250,
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215 email: amarino@sccrtc.org

Questions or Comments: (831) 460-3200
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COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250 in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Jesus Bojorquez
Home address: [Redacted]
Mailing address (if different):

Phone: (home) [Redacted] (business/message) [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 7 Years
Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position
□ E&D TAC Membership Renewal □ ________________

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
I have been a member of the E&D TAC since 2018 serving as an alternative for the former Community Bridges Lift Line director Kirk Ance; as the new Lift Line Director, I will like to continue to serve Santa Cruz county residents needs by being a member of this committee
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges</td>
<td>545 Ohlone Parkway Watsonville CA 95076</td>
<td>Lift Line Program Director</td>
<td>12/2020 current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges</td>
<td>545 Ohlone Parkway Watsonville CA 95076</td>
<td>Lift Line Operation Manager</td>
<td>07/2017 to 12/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges</td>
<td>545 Ohlone Parkway Watsonville CA 95076</td>
<td>Lift Line Data Analyst</td>
<td>02/2015 to 07/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Signature: [Redacted]

Date: 1/27/2022

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

- __ newspaper
- __ radio
- __ internet

- __flyer
- __friend/family member
- __other

**Return Application to:** SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-6178   email: amarino@sccrtc.org

Questions or Comments:  (831) 460-3200
Dear Member of the committee

My name is Jesus Bojorquez. In recent years, my performance on the committee has been limited to being the alternate for the former Lift Line program director Kirk Ance. Now, as the new Director of the Lift Line program, I would like to continue on the committee and be more active in decisions that affect the elderly and people with disabilities. This group has done wonderful things for the citizens of the county of Santa Cruz. My mission is to contribute my knowledge and experience to continue giving this group of people the freedom and independence they deserve and make our county a place where they can carry out their daily activities like any other citizen without dealing with obstacles that hinder their lifestyle.

Thank you
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250 in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Daniel L. Zaragoza
Home address: ________
Mailing address (if different): ________

Phone: (home) ________ (business/message) ________
E-mail: ________

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 48 Years
Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position
□ SC Metro Alternate for Eileen Wagley

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
I have served on this committee as an alternate since 2018, and I wish to continue to serve the community. I am also a member of the APTA Access Committee.
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO</td>
<td>110 Vernon St.</td>
<td>Paratransit and Bus operator</td>
<td>2004-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO</td>
<td>110 Vernon St.</td>
<td>Assistant Paratransit Superintendent</td>
<td>2013-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO</td>
<td>110 Vernon St.</td>
<td>Operations Manager: Paratransit Division</td>
<td>2018-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

**Signature**

**Date** 1/31/22

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

- [ ] newspaper
- [ ] radio
- [ ] internet
- [x] flyer
- [ ] friend/family member
- [ ] other

**Return Application to:** SCCRTC

15-17
Questions or Comments:  (831) 460-3200
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-6178  email: amarino@sccrtc.org
January 27, 2022

To: Committee Members.

I would like to continue be a member to the E&D TAC, this committee performs an important role for the elderly and disable people of Santa Cruz County, and I would like to continue to serve. I believe that my knowledge and experience in providing transportation to the Disabled and elderly community, as well as having an understanding of the challenges that they face, can be useful for the committee. We must continue to improve our transportation options and services to give people the independence to access schools, employment, shopping, entertainment, church and their medical providers, etc.

Thank you,

Daniel L. Zaragoza
Operations Manager: Paratransit Division
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250 in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Veronica Elsea

Home address: ___________________________________________

Mailing address (if different): ___________________________________________

Phone: (home) ___________________________ (business/message) business located at home

E-mail: ___________________________________________

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 41 years

Position(s) I am applying for: 3rd District Representative

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
Served for the past 14 years on E&DTAC, current chair; chaired Pedestrian Safety Work group subcommittee; now chair pedestrian ad-hoc projects subcommittee; Served as charter member of the CalTrans Accessibility Advisory Committee until disbanded by CalTrans; member of the Class IV Bikeway design subcommittee; member of Santa Cruz County voting Accessibility advisory committee; currently serving on Metro Advisory committee, served as chair of and on according to bylaws since 2015; served on Mission Street Widening Task Force 1998-its end in 2002.
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience (see separate page as I cannot write in the table.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;DTAC and Pedestrian Safety Work Group (now Pedestrian ad-hoc Projects Subcommittee)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>2008-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalTrans Accessibility Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed as a result of my work with E&amp;DTAC and PSWG.</td>
<td>2013 to disbandment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Advisory Committee, served many years as chair.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Served many years as chair. Allows me to share information among groups and be a more informed member of both committees.</td>
<td>2013 to present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Signature

Date

How did you learn about this opportunity?

___ newspaper  ___ flyer
___ radio  ___ friend/family member
___ internet, already serving on  ___ other
committee

Return Application to:  SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-6178  email: amarino@sccrtc.org

Questions or Comments:  (831) 460-3200

I:\E\DTAC\MEMBERS\Application\COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION.doc
Additional Volunteer Experience:

Voting Accessibility Advisory Committee: helped to include transportation needs of residents as part of the voting process. Helped to train poll workers in the needs of, and best ways of interacting with seniors and those with disabilities.

Soroptimist International of Capitola-by-the-Sea: held many different offices, guided many fund-raising and service projects to successful completion.

American Federation of Musicians: Held several offices, headed contract negotiation team.

Guide Dog Users, Inc: Served as chair of many different committees; organized many presentations, fund raisers and performed administrative and contract tasks.

National Federation of the Blind Accessible medical device task force (now accessible insulin pump task force): currently serve as chair; requires finding and working with several device manufacturers, helping them to understand the needs of consumers who are blind and disabled, more experience working with committees, keeping projects on track, organizing writing and seeing work to its conclusion.

Statement of Qualifications:

During my first term as a member of E&DTAC, I was able to act on one of my main concerns by helping to reinvigorate a pedestrian subcommittee, The Pedestrian Safety Work Group. During my tenure, the PSWG has been very active in securing grants and producing reports and projects related to sidewalk safety and accessibility in Santa Cruz County. We have created a brochure designed to foster better relationships and increased safety among motorists and pedestrians with additional emphasis on the needs and behaviors of those with disabilities. We have also completed a similar brochure for pedestrians and bicyclists. I have chaired this group and given many of its public presentations, as well as participated in workshops as a representative of the PSWG.

As the pedestrian projects ad-hoc subcommittee, I am helping to work with jurisdictions on intersection design, following many different projects and plans in order to help jurisdictions make any changes which benefit pedestrians with disabilities early in the design process, thus saving money and complaints from citizens. I am currently serving as chair of the E&DTAC. I am committed to fostering a welcoming and productive atmosphere during meetings and making a strong effort to balance respect for everyone's time along with thoroughly covering all important items on an often packed agenda.
I strive to work in a respectful manner with RTC staff and to be thorough, professional and true to the committee's desires when writing any correspondence on the committee's behalf. Examples exist in the committee's minutes.

My attendance record has been very good and I believe that my level of participation, in the pedestrian subcommittee, at meetings, and in the public demonstrates my commitment to the issues facing this committee, my ability to do what I say I'll do, and the contributions I've been able to bring to this committee.

I'm very proud of what I've been able to accomplish as a member of the E&DTAC and firmly believe that I could not have made this much of a difference as an individual citizen, without the wisdom, resources and staff working together. I very much look forward to continuing my efforts on behalf of the E&DTAC to improve access throughout Santa Cruz County for all residents, especially for seniors and persons with disabilities.

Thanks for considering my application renewal.
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250 in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: AUCHIA MORALES

Home address: 

Mailing address (if different): 

Phone: (home) (business/message) 

E-mail: 

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: N/A

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

□ COMMITTEE MEMBER E&D TAC

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

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
## Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Human Services DEPT</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Director, Division of Adult &amp; Long Term Care</td>
<td>11/14/00 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Social Services Agency</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Director, Division of Aging &amp; Adult Protection</td>
<td>3/1/02 - 11/15/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 2/1/2022

### How did you learn about this opportunity?

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

### Return Application to:
SCCRTC  
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee  
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
fax: 460-6178   email: amarino@sccrtc.org

### Questions or Comments:
(831) 460-3200  
I:\E\DTAC\MEMBERS\Application\COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION.doc
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Statement of Qualifications

I am interested in serving on this committee because I have a deep commitment to improving the lives of vulnerable residents in our community. I have spent more than 23 years of my professional career working with older adults and persons with disabilities in three different counties: LA County, Alameda County, and Santa Cruz County. In my current role in Santa Cruz County, I am the Director of Adult and Long Term Care for the Human Services Department. In that role, I oversee Adult Protective Services, In-Home Support Services, The Public Authority, and the County Veterans Services Office. I am also the Public Guardian for Santa Cruz County. I see through the course of my work how accessible transportation can have a tremendous impact on the community and those with access and functional needs. Accessible transportation is critical in maintaining independence and quality of life for older adults and persons with disabilities. It can help minimize isolation and elder and dependent adult abuse.

I am also working with the County, the cities, and local nonprofit leadership to develop a strategic plan for the implementation of the Master Plan on Aging throughout the county. Transportation is a pillar of that plan, and the work of this committee is essential to help further those efforts.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Alicia Morales, MA
Director, Adult and Long Term Care Division
1400 Emeline Avenue,
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Alicia.morales@santacruzcounty.us
Pronouns: she, her, hers
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250 in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Nadia Noriega

Home address: ____________________________

Mailing address (if different): ___________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Phone: (home) ______________________(business/message) ______________________

E-mail: ____________________________

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: ___21yrs__________________

Position(s) I am applying for:

☐ Any appropriate position

☐ _____E&D TAC alternate membership____________________

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

_N/A______________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

15-28
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges</td>
<td>545 Oholone PKW</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>2019 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Line</td>
<td>Watsonville Ca 95076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges</td>
<td>519 Main St ste. H</td>
<td>Administrator Assistant</td>
<td>2017 to 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Line</td>
<td>Watsonville Ca 95076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Hi my name is Nadia Noriega I have been working with Lift Line community bridges since 2017 I started as an Administrator Assistant and on 2019 I became an Executive Assistant. I’m Lift Line outreach coordinator as well I introduce the program to seniors and disable resident in the community. I attend one of your meeting back in 2018. I would like to be part of the E&D TAC committee to make a change in the community for our senior and disable residents to have a better transportation, safe sidewalks and cross walks, and accessible ramps to get into stores or restaurants. Thank You for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Nadia Noriega

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

________________ ________ Feb 08, 2022_______
Signature       Date

How did you learn about this opportunity?
___ newspaper     ___ flyer
___ radio        ___ friend/family member
___ internet      X_other

Return Application to:  SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-6178   email: amarino@sccrtc.org

Questions or Comments:  (831) 460-3200
I:\E\DTAC\MEMBERS\Application\COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION.doc
RECOMMENDATIONS

As submitted by each respective Commissioner, staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the nominations and appoint Scott Roseman, Corrina McFarlane, Sally Arnold, Peter Scott, Rick Hyman, Theresia Rogerson, and Drew Rogers to serve an additional term on the Bicycle Advisory Committee.

BACKGROUND

Seats on the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee correspond to City and Supervisorial District seats on the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). Commissioners may nominate individuals for Committee and RTC consideration. Two additional seats for Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition also exist, and nominations are made by the respective organization. Seats for the Bicycle Committee are for three-year terms and expire on a rotating basis. Each seat has a primary (voting) and an alternate representative. The Bicycle Advisory Committee’s description, role and membership are in the 2017 RTC Rules and Regulations available on the RTC website.

DISCUSSION

In January 2022, RTC staff contacted committee members whose terms end in March 2022, asking if they wish to be nominated for another term. Staff then contacted the corresponding Commissioner with that information along with any applications received recently from others interested in the seats.

- Commissioner Koenig re-nominated Scott Roseman as primary and Corrina McFarlane as alternate representing District 1. They have served since 2021.
- Commissioner Coonerty re-nominated Sally Arnold as primary and Peter Scott as alternate representing District 3. Ms. Arnold has served as alternate since 2019, and Mr. Scott has served as primary since 2007.
- Commissioner McPherson re-nominated Rick Hyman as primary and Theresia Rogerson as alternate representing District 5. Mr. Hyman has served since 1989, and Ms. Rogerson has served since 2018.
- Commissioner Montesino re-nominated Drew Rogers as the alternate representing Watsonville. He has served since 2018. Murray Fontes chose not to seek nomination for another term. He has served since 2016 including two two-year terms as Vice Chair. At the February 7th Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting, staff and the Committee expressed appreciation to Mr. Fontes for his service to the community.
Staff continues to seek applicants to fill vacancies and welcomes recommendations from Commissioners. The application and more information about the Committee are available on the RTC webpage https://sccrtc.org/meetings/bike-committee/.

A draft roster is included as Attachment 1.

As submitted by each respective Commissioner, staff recommends that the RTC approve the nominations and appoint Scott Roseman, Corrina McFarlane, Sally Arnold, Peter Scott, Rick Hyman, Theresia Rogerson, and Drew Rogers to serve an additional term on the Bicycle Advisory Committee.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

SUMMARY

The term for several positions expires in March 2022. Commissioners made several re-nominations. Staff recommends that the RTC make the above seven re-appointments.

Attachments:
  1. April 2022 Draft Bicycle Advisory Committee Roster
## Draft April 2022 Bicycle Advisory Committee Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott Roseman*</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz-District 1</td>
<td>Corrina McFarlane*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Bortolussi</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz-District 2</td>
<td>John Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Arnold*</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz-District 3</td>
<td>Peter Scott*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Kammer</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz-District 4</td>
<td>Liz Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Hyman*</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz-District 5</td>
<td>Theresia Rogerson*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Bradley</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>Mike Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Farrell</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Grace Voss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Masoner</td>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination pending</td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>Drew Rogers*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Conlen</td>
<td>Bike to Work</td>
<td>Matt Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Jed</td>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Coalition</td>
<td>Arnold Shir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recommended re-appointment
TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Shannon Munz, Communications Specialist

RE: Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee Appointments

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the appointments to the Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee of the following:

1. Jake Farrar – Second District member position
2. Trina Coffman Gomez – Fourth District member position

BACKGROUND

Measure D, the “Santa Cruz County Transportation Improvement Plan Measure,” passed by more than a 2/3 majority of Santa Cruz County voters on November 8, 2016, includes a number of safeguards, audits and accountability provisions to protect Santa Cruz County taxpayers’ investment. Per Section 32C of the voter approved measure, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), as the directors of the Measure D Authority, is responsible for forming an oversight committee tasked with the following responsibilities:

- Reviewing Expenditure Plan expenditures on an annual basis to ensure they conform to the Ordinance.
- Reviewing the annual audit and report prepared by an independent auditor, describing how funds were spent.
- Produce a publicly available Annual Report of oversight activities.

In August 2017, the RTC revised its rules and regulations to incorporate the Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee in the bylaws for RTC committees. In September 2018, the RTC appointed five members to the newly formed committee for a term of two years. The committee met for the first time in March 2019 to audit the 2018 Measure D expenditure reports, then in May 2020 to audit the 2019 Measure D expenditure reports, and again in March 2021 to audit the 2020 Measure D expenditure reports.

In 2021, two original committee members representing Districts 2 & 3 were reappointed to the committee for a two-year term. At that time, three new members representing Districts 1, 4, & 5 were appointed to two-year terms to fill vacancies.
DISCUSSION

The Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee functions best when all committee membership positions are filled. According to the committee bylaws, “Members will serve for a term of two (2) years and may be reappointed up to three (3) times. Members will not serve more than two (2) consecutive terms, if there are other eligible applicants for the position.” In 2022, one year into their two-year terms, the committee members representing Districts 2 & 4 resigned their positions creating vacancies on the committee.

RTC staff solicited applications from community members to fill the vacant positions from January 3, 2022 to February 11, 2022. During this timeframe, staff heavily promoted the application period through existing RTC channels of communication, including the RTC website, eNews, Facebook, Twitter, Nextdoor, newspaper ads, and targeted emails to community groups. To ensure a diversity of applicants, ads were placed in newspapers around the county, including the Santa Cruz Sentinel, Aptos Times, and Register Pajaronian.

In total, 8 applications were submitted. Supervisorial District 2 received 5 applications. Supervisorial District 4 received 3 applications.

Once the application period closed, RTC staff reviewed the submitted applications and worked with District 2 Commissioner/Supervisor Zach Friend and District 4 Commissioner/Supervisor Greg Caput on choosing two candidates to recommend to the Commission for approval to fill the vacant spots on the committee for Districts 2 & 4. Below is a summary of the applicants being nominated for appointment with their full applications in Attachment 1.

**Recommended Appointments**

- **District 2:** Jake Farrar – Mr. Farrar was born and raised in Santa Cruz County. He is a CPA with over 15 years of accounting experience, including extensive experience auditing mid-size to large privately held companies, and reviewing financial information. He is a former volunteer with Save our Shores and VITA, and is currently a member of Watsonville Neighbors.

- **District 4:** Trina Coffman Gomez – Ms. Coffman Gomez is a former Watsonville City Council member and RTC commissioner. She has worked in a financial profession for a large part of her career. She has participated on finance committees for a number of different boards, and she is the treasurer for Freedom Rotary and Pajaro Valley Arts.

**RTC staff recommend that the RTC appoint the two nominated applicants to fill the District 2 and District 4 vacancies on the Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee.**

RTC staff feels that these applicants represent the community, and help to provide balance and diversity to the committee. The two candidates range in age, are a mix of male and female, have a wide range of business experience and education, and come from different supervisorial districts for geographic diversity. The selected
candidates also have different needs and interests when it comes to transportation and transportation infrastructure in the county. Additionally, they both have varying degrees of an accounting or fiscal management background.

FISCAL IMPACT

The work to recruit for and appoint members to the RTC’s Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee does not add fiscal impacts.

SUMMARY

The Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee functions best when all committee membership positions are filled. In January 2022, the two committee members representing Districts 2 & 4 resigned from their positions leaving vacancies on the committee. From January 3, 2022 to February 11, 2022, the application period to fill the two vacancies was open. RTC staff promoted the application period through multiple communications channels across the entire county to ensure geographical, social, cultural, and economic diversity. In total, 8 applications were received. RTC staff reviewed the applications and selected two candidates to recommend to the Commission for appointment to the Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee.

Attachments:

1. Committee Member Applications
Application for the
Santa Cruz County Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee

Per voter-approved Measure D, the Oversight Committee shall:

A. Review Expenditure Plan expenditures on an annual basis to ensure that they conform to the Ordinance.
B. Review the annual audit and report prepared by an independent auditor, describing how funds were spent.
C. Produce a publicly available Annual Report of Oversight Activities issued to the Regional Transportation Commission with findings regarding compliance with the requirements of Measure D and its Expenditure Plan.

Meetings: Maximum of four (4) per year Term: Two (2) years with option for reappointment

Name: [Redacted]  Aptos, CA 95003
Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]  Cell phone: [Redacted]
Other Phone: [Redacted]  Supervisorial District: Two

The voter approved Measure D ordinance states that the Oversight Committee will fairly represent the “social, cultural, and economic diversity of Santa Cruz County to ensure maximum benefit for transportation users.” Describe how you represent the above (attach additional pages if necessary).

My name is Jake Fauer, I am born and raised in Santa Cruz County, and graduated from Aptos High School. After going to college in Santa Barbara, I moved home to my childhood home in Aptos. I’m happily married to a father of three great boys. I care deeply about the local community, and proud to be from Santa Cruz.
Describe your accounting or fiscal management background, if any

I'm a CPA with over 15 years of accounting, attestation & tax experience. While working at Hutchinson & Bloodgood in Watsonville, I gained valuable experience working on audits of mid-size to large privately held companies. I have extensive experience with review of financial information.

Describe your previous experience, including if you are currently a member of a commission or committee.

Aside from my experience as an auditor, I have not yet been a member of a commission or committee. I have volunteered for Save our Streets and WiTa in the past and currently a member of Watsonville Neighborhood.

Members of the Measure D Oversight Committee must be Santa Cruz County residents who are neither elected officials of any government, nor employees from any agency or organization that either oversees or implements projects funded from the proceeds of the Measure D sales tax.

I certify that the above information is true and complete to the best of my knowledge and that I am neither an elected official of any government nor an employee of any agency or organization that either oversees or implements projects funded from the proceeds of the Measure D sales tax:

Signature: [Signature] Date: 2/11/22

Return completed application to:
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250, Santa Cruz, CA 95060, info@scrtc.org

Measure D Information:
www.scrtc.org/move
Application for the
Santa Cruz County Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee

Per voter-approved Measure D, the Oversight Committee shall:

A. Review Expenditure Plan expenditures on an annual basis to ensure that they conform to the Ordinance.
B. Review the annual audit and report prepared by an independent auditor, describing how funds were spent.
C. Produce a publicly available Annual Report of Oversight Activities issued to the Regional Transportation Commission with findings regarding compliance with the requirements of Measure D and its Expenditure Plan.

Meetings: Maximum of four (4) per year Term: Two (2) years with option for reappointment

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted] Watsonville, Ca. 95076
Email: [Redacted] Cell phone: [Redacted]
Other Phone: [Redacted] Supervisory District: 4

The voter approved Measure D ordinance states that the Oversight Committee will fairly represent the “social, cultural, and economic diversity of Santa Cruz County to ensure maximum benefit for transportation users.” Describe how you represent the above (attach additional pages if necessary).

"I bring a depth of knowledge as a former City Council member at the time our Measure D was taken to the voters as a county share participation initiative."
Describe your accounting or fiscal management background, if any:

I have been in the financial profession for most of my career. Participated on financial committees on the majority of the boards I have been on. I have served as Treasurer for Freedom Rotary, as well as Cypress Valley Kids. This in addition to fiscal accountability to our City's budget and expenditures.

Describe your previous experience, including if you are currently a member of a commission or committee:

I have had the honor of an appointment onto the SCRTC for nearly 2 years as a member of my former City Council seat.

Members of the Measure D Oversight Committee must be Santa Cruz County residents who are neither elected officials of any government, nor employees from any agency or organization that either oversees or implements projects funded from the proceeds of the Measure D sales tax.

I certify that the above information is true and complete to the best of my knowledge and that I am neither an elected official of any government nor an employee of any agency or organization that either oversees or implements projects funded from the proceeds of the Measure D sales tax:

Signature: [Signature]
Date: 24 Jan 2022

Return completed application to:
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250, Santa Cruz, CA 95060, info@sccrtc.org

Measure D Information:
www.sccrtc.org/move
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE

March 2022 – May 2022
www.sccrtc.org/meetings/

See agenda for teleconference log-in information. All meetings are subject to cancellation when there are no action items to be considered.

<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>03/03/22</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/22</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/16/22</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Safe on 17 – TOS</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/17/22</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/22</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/22</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/22</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled TAC</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/22</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/22</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/22</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/19/22</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ Zoom – See agenda for log-in information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/24/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.25.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Cody</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Adverse Abandonment of Felton Branch Line - opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Moriconi</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mary Alice</td>
<td>Morency</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Draft 2022 California Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/25/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.25.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Arvanites</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>No to Adverse Abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/25/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.25.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mesiti-Miller</td>
<td>SCC Friends of the Rail and Trail</td>
<td>Felton Branch Rail Line Adverse Abandonment - RTC Meeting Agenda Feb 3, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/25/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.25.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Eric Welty</td>
<td>opposition to adverse abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/25/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.25.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>RE: Adverse Abandonment Action for Freight Service Only on the Felton Branch Line and the Relationship to the Potential for Future Railbanking on a Portion of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/22</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.26.22 (phone)</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Sweeney</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Please don’t close down the railroad where Roaring Camp operates. Roaring camp is a big part of the community and it saddens me that they may be impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/25/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.22.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Bradas</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Concern Citizen in Support of Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 1.27.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Hoda</td>
<td>Emam</td>
<td>Bay City News</td>
<td>Bay City News Interview Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/25/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>T.Travers 1.26.22</td>
<td>Tommy</td>
<td>Travers</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brigette</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>ARB, a Kleinfelder Company</td>
<td>Re: Online Railpros Tracking #9967 PG&amp;E Project ID-578G D-1386 84018347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.22.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Nestler</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>In support of keeping Roaring Camp Railroad and the beach train in operation!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.22.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Marino</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>opposition to adverse abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Marino</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>CC’d on communication to Mitchel Weiss re: opposition to adverse abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Guy Preston SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nic</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>KCBS Radio</td>
<td>Rory</td>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>KCBS Radio Interview Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.22.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Against adverse abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>NO on abandonment of the SC-Felton line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 1.27.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Questions re: Passenger Service Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/27/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Opposing Adverse Abandonment of Felton Branch Rail Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/27/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rae</td>
<td>Spencer-Hill</td>
<td>Did not state</td>
<td>Typing error in orginal email in support of light rail and trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/28/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td>RTC / Roaring Camp alternative proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/28/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>SCCRTC Consent Agenda Item #8 for February 3, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/28/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jeanette</td>
<td>Guire</td>
<td>Felton Fire Dept. via Roaring Camp</td>
<td>Re: Letter from Fire Chiefs re Adverse Abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Ellison</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>States she is &quot;...disturbed that that you people are thinking of not allowing beach access of the train....&quot; The train is a Santa Cruz treasure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Peppe</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Opposes railbanking and wants to comment that it is incredibly short-sighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/28/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jennie</td>
<td>Dusheck</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Protect, support and strengthen the Felton &amp; Santa Cruz Branch Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/28/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Lighthouse Realty</td>
<td>Please Railbank Now!!!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/28/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td>Protect publicly owned transportation corridor - authorize railbanking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/28/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Julianne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Against forced abandonment of the rail line in Felton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/28/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Wirkman</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>2/3/2022 Meeting Public Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>1/28/2021</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>Haworth</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Advisory Ballot Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22</td>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>CA Resident</td>
<td>oppose abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/25/22</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td>Watsonville Dept Public Works Support for Santa Cruz County Rail Trail Volunteer Maintenance Program, Clean California Local Grant Program Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>G.Preston 1.27.2022 (phone)</td>
<td>Shannon Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Hoda</td>
<td>Emam</td>
<td>Bay City News</td>
<td>Two additional questions re: ACL Agreement &amp; Measure D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>C.Convisser 1.28.2022</td>
<td>Cindy Convisser</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Faulkner</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>opposition to railbanking, support for Roaring Camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 2.1.2022 (phone)</td>
<td>Shannon Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>questions re: RTC project near La Selva Trestle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/20/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 1.27.2022</td>
<td>Shannon Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Bliss</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Questions about railbanking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>T.Travers 2.1.22</td>
<td>Tommy Travers</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Revel</td>
<td>USFCA Head of Financial Planning &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Raw Data Set Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Support for railbanking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/22 Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Laurence</td>
<td>Gathy</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Vote NO on abandoning the Felton Branch Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/22 Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Christoph</td>
<td>von Hahn</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Comments on Feb 3 Plenary Session-re Freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/22 Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Examples of railbanked lines that turned into passenger rail: Denton, Texas &amp; Purple Line in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22 Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Schofield</td>
<td>Ryan’s Marine</td>
<td>Support for Beach Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22 Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Interested Parties</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Brianna</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>RFP 2136 Responses to Requests for Clarification now available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22 Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Witthaus</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>opposition to adverse abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22 Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Cansler</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Support for Beach Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/22 Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Janie</td>
<td>Soito</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Destruction Attempt of the Santa Cruz Branch Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/22 Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Vote NO on abandoning the Felton Branch Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/22 Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 1.31.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td>Seacliff Park Residents Association Treasurer</td>
<td>Soquel Drive Buffered Project Meeting Wednesday 1/12/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30/22 Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Feb 3rd RTC Meeting Input for Items #22 &amp; 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30/22 Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jeanette</td>
<td>Brocklebank</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>February 3 RTC meeting - agenda items #22 and #23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30/22 Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 1.31.22</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Naranjo</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Comments re: 2045 Regional Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Seales</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Climate Action Network</td>
<td>Comments on RTC projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Yesenia</td>
<td>Parra</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Request to cure or correct action(s) taken in violation of the Brown Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>SCCRTC Agenda Item #22, February 3, 2022 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nadene</td>
<td>Thorne</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Dispelling Misinformation - Thank You!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Comments re: Passenger service plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nadene</td>
<td>Thorne</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Time to Speak Up and Stop the Misinformation Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Saso</td>
<td>Tina Saso Photography</td>
<td>Vote NO on abandoning the Felton Branch Line keep roaring camp alive &lt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Molina</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>June 2022 Ballot Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Naranjo</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Faina</td>
<td>Segal</td>
<td>SCC Friends of the Rail and Trail</td>
<td>Comments on the 2045 Draft RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Braga</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Greenway petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Berlage</td>
<td>Big Creek Lumber</td>
<td>Comments on item 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/30/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Saint</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Comments on the 2045 Draft RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Fifield</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Gaining Favor of Roaring Camp in Felton AND Big Creek Lumber in Watsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Crampton</td>
<td>Potential Applicant</td>
<td>Request for link re: Transportation Planning Technician Announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paul &amp;</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Rucker</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Longinotti</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Campaign for Sustainable Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Naranjo</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Smedberg</td>
<td>Santa Cruz for Bernie</td>
<td>Draft 2045 RTP &amp; EIR Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Opposed to adverse abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Corene</td>
<td>Marshalek</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>Please provide Quarterly Progress Report Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Montalvo</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Support for abandonment of heavy freight requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Cumming</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Rail banking NOW!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>support for railbanking; opposition to advisory measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kaki</td>
<td>Rusmore</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Opposed to adverse abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Pinoli</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Opposed to adverse abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Longinotti</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Timeline of next auxiliary lane project bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christiansen</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Garing</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>No on Forced Abandonment of Felton Rail Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>G.Preston</td>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Oetting</td>
<td>KAZU News</td>
<td>KAZU News: Adverse Abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31.2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19-6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>RTC Seeking Community Input on Aesthetic Features for Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.1.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Comments on Feb 3 Agenda, Item #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.1.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Wysocki</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Comments on adverse abandonment - opposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.1.22</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Daryl</td>
<td>Tempesta</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Buses are heavy and dangerous. Please consider adding a buffer between the bus lane and regular traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 2.1.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Heidy</td>
<td>Kellison</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Comments on aesthetics survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.1.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>I do not support abandonment of either the Felton Branch Rail Line or the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.1.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Hanson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Please Vote NO on Abandoning the Felton Branch Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.1.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Thibodeau</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Save the Beach Train</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.1.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Doug &amp; Anna</td>
<td>Huskey</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Feb 3rd meeting: Item 23: DO Not put a 2nd ballot measure on the June ballot - too confusing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 2.2.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>Birkhofer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Input on aesthetics survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 2.1.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Stallard</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Help finding the survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lou</td>
<td>Chiaramonte, Jr.</td>
<td>SCC Democratic Central Committee &amp; South Bay Indigenous Solidarity</td>
<td>ASAP: Question Re: SCBT&amp;P Change of Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Support for Roaring Camp, opposed to forced abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Caput</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Some of our strongest Greenway support came from your district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 2.14.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>Mckieithen</td>
<td>BOS</td>
<td>Correspondence Pertaining to the SCCRTC (Malcolm Park - Roaring Camp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>Sandel</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>NO on Adverse Abandonment of the Felton Branch Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Concerns about the rail trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Kambitsch</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Support for railbanking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Melani</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Roaring Camp Railroads</td>
<td>Comment Letter re: Agenda Item 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Kibrick</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Public Comment regarding SCCRTC Board Meeting - SCBRL Felton line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Novate Solutions</td>
<td>RTC Meeting Feb. 03, 2022 - Forced Abandonment Proposal (opposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>J.T.</td>
<td>Verbeck</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Vote NO on forced abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Maryjane</td>
<td>Slade</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>No Rail Banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Demetrius</td>
<td>Kastros</td>
<td>SC Visitor</td>
<td>Keep Roaring Camp Railroad to the Boardwalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>McClain</td>
<td>Friends of the Nevada State Railroad Museum</td>
<td>Opposed to adverse abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Calciano</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>RTC Meeting 2/3/22: Items 22 and 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.2.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Arjuna</td>
<td>Russel</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Do not remove rail line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ottaviano</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle hazard report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Orchid</td>
<td>Monroy-Ochoa</td>
<td>Caltrans District 5</td>
<td>request to add to email list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>opposition to abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>KirkHart</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>RAILBANKING is a necessary step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tess</td>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>opposed to abandonment actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>comments on agenda items 8, 22, &amp; 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Kenney</td>
<td>Integrated Marketing Services</td>
<td>RFP inquiry - Watsonville/Santa Cruz Multimodal Corridor &amp; On-Call Soil Investigation &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Phone</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Toni</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Please save the beach train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>&quot;Leave the railroad infrastructure in place, maintain fright rail service, and institute high capacity public transit service&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Faina</td>
<td>Segal</td>
<td>SCC Friends of the Rail and Trail</td>
<td>Comments RE item 22, Adverse Abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22 Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Support for ballot measure in item 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Andreatta</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please don’t consider abandoning either the Felton Branch Rail Line or the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mesiti-Miller</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agenda item 22 - NO NEED for Abandonment of Felton and Santa Cruz Branch Rail Lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Y.Parra 02.02.22</td>
<td>Yesenia</td>
<td>Parra</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carlaena</td>
<td>Grandey</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Request - RE: Highway 9/SLV Corridor Plan - Help requested in regards to property located at 6407 Highway 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on item 23 Ballot measure regarding the rail trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lani</td>
<td>Faulkner</td>
<td>Equity Transit Opposes Adverse Abandonment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equity Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Flower</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination of agencies to restore Santa Cruz County rail corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Bahu</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manu Koenig recusal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Troye</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: I oppose abandonment of the rail line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Auerbach</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regarding Item 22 on the February 3 agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Rosati</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abandonment of Roaring Camp Rail Line on RTC Agenda 2/3/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Wilcox-Baker</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop these rail lines into a valuable freight and passenger route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Liebenguth-Crone</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please vote NO on &quot;Forced Abandonment&quot; of Roaring Camp rail line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Walbridge</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on Railbanking to be read aloud at today’s 2/3/2022 RTC meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.4.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Abbot</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep rail access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Type</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Downing</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Art and Font Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>S. Munz 2.3.2022 (phone)</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>KCBS Radio</td>
<td>Media inquiry re: RTC meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>K. Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Chavez</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Line - Current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/22</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>K. Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Deering</td>
<td>Vicki Tackett</td>
<td>Comments re: Roaring Camp rail service &amp; abandonment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>K. Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Comments on Felton Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>K. Corwin 2.23.2022</td>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Schonbrunn</td>
<td>Train Riders Association of California</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Rail Easements &amp; Complaint-Hernandez v. SMART-March 15, 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Yesenia Parra</td>
<td>Yesenia</td>
<td>Parra</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Weller</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>CPRA Records Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>L. Mendez 2.8.2022</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Weller</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>MEMO to Luis Mendez re: determining how much of the RTC real property consists in easements, as opposed to land title in fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>S. Munz 2.11.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Flower</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Questions about the SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>K. Corwin 2.7.22</td>
<td>Brianna</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jennie</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>WMH Corporation</td>
<td>SLV Schools Complex RFP 2136 - confirm receipt of proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>K. Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>Peralta</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Maintain the Felton Branch Rail Line and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>S. Munz 2.7.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Otakan</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>re: Status of ROW acquisition Highway 1 Aux Lanes - State Park Drive to Bay Avenue/Porter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>K. Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Please read concerning RTC funding and planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ITAC Members</td>
<td>ITAC</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Moriconi</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FW: Caltrans District 5 Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Moriconi</td>
<td>SCCRTC FW: Urban Greening Grant Program Proposal Solicitation Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>E&amp;DTAC</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>E&amp;DTAC</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Marino</td>
<td>SCCRTC Caltrans District 5 Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Rail Team</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brigette</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>GTS, a Kleinfelder Company</td>
<td>Status inquiry: submitted application number 9967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Rimicci</td>
<td>Resident Comments on the rail line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI Roaring Camp Railbank Opposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 2.8.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>vanRhee</td>
<td>Resident Where do I find out what district I'm in?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Rimicci</td>
<td>Resident Comments on item 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>Resident Forced Abandonment of Santa Cruz Branchline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 2.8.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rachael</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>DNCA rep for North Coast Request for information on expected train to Davenport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Levine</td>
<td>Resident Closure of Felton Branch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>McClain</td>
<td>AC Dike Co. opposition to adverse abandonment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Van Brink</td>
<td>Resident Regarding &quot;Forced Abandonment&quot; of rail line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Cabrera</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Appointment of Shane Mckeethen as the alternate to Supervisor Koenig on the SCCRTC approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.8.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>Resident Funding availability for bridges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.9.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>Fenner-Evans</td>
<td>Resident Where is the survey?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.9.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>LeeAnn</td>
<td>Pultz</td>
<td>Resident Aesthetic Feature for Highway 1 Bay Ave-State Park drive survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.9.2022</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>DePass</td>
<td>Santa Barbara County Assn. of Govts. Re: Reimbursement to SBCAG for Central Coast Coalition Federal Advocacy Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>G.Preston 2.9.2022</td>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Weitzel</td>
<td>County CAO Meeting request for Mr. Guy Preston from CAO Carlos Palacios, County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/10/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Shivers</td>
<td>Caltrans Caltrans District 5 Announces Completion of Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SCC Democratic Central Committee &amp; South Bay Indigenous Solidarity</td>
<td>Questions re: existing exemptions from environmental laws &amp; potential reclassification of the rail line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John A</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Fundng IS available for railroad remediation projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/10/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Debbie Bulger</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Short video on Complete Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>C. Young</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Who appointed RTC Commissioners, pay, qualifications?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jake Farrar</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Taxpayer Oversight Committee Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James Weller</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Personal Communication to RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/22</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Moriconi</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Richard Rosales</td>
<td>Caltrans District 5 Update of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) for District 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/21</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Blakeslee</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Anna Eshoo</td>
<td>US House of Reps Correspondence re: North Coast Rail Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mike Weatherford</td>
<td>Resident Taxpayer Oversight Committee Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill Deering</td>
<td>Vicki Tackett Certified Folder Display Service Re: Roaring Camp's rights to the Felton Branch Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cheri Nilsson</td>
<td>Resident Bridge survey response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dinah Sapia</td>
<td>Resident Bridge survey response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paula Bradley</td>
<td>Resident RTC public meeting policy for after the COVID emergency and that the Brown Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Trink Praxel</td>
<td>Resident Nomination for Cycle 3 Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Brianna</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Erin Johnson</td>
<td>UC Santa Cruz Goat herding project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rick Longinotti</td>
<td>Resident scope of EIR aux lanes State Park to Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/15/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.15.2022</td>
<td>Grace Blakeslee</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Van Brink</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Comment: Planing for Segments 8-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/15/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.15.2022</td>
<td>Grace Blakeslee</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Re: SCCRTC TPW Agenda Item 4, MBSST Segment 12, February 17, 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.15.2022</td>
<td>Grace Blakeslee</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Erik Hansen</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>RE: Coastal Rail Trail Segments 8 through 12 (Pacific Avenue to Rio Del Mar Boulevard), Thursday, February 17, 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Grace Blakeslee</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Renee Flower</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>SCCRTC -- February 17, 2022 Meeting: Regular Agenda, Item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Krista Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karen Kaplan</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Support Rail AND Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Rachel Moriconi</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gus Alfaro</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Managing Clean CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>B.Goodman 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Brianna Goodman</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Mark Thomas Discuss SLV Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Krista Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chelsea George</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Please Support Rail AND Trail (No rail banking, no &quot;Green&quot; Way)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Krista Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark Mesiti-Miller</td>
<td>FORT</td>
<td>FORT Letter to RTC Re TPW Meeting 2_17_2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>B.Goodman 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Brianna Goodman</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>William Haday</td>
<td>WMH Corporation</td>
<td>Re: RFP 2136 - Invitation to interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Krista Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lani Faulkner</td>
<td>Equity Transit</td>
<td>Thursday RTC Agenda for February 17, 2022 email to commissioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Sarah Christensen</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Anthony Middleton</td>
<td>Kiewit</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Sarah Christensen</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael Kenney</td>
<td>Integrated Marketing Services</td>
<td>Future Consultant RFPs Inquiry Follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Shannon Munz</td>
<td>Lou Chiaramonte, Jr.</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>South Bay Indigenous Solidarity</td>
<td>Question needs more detailed answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.16.2022</td>
<td>Krista Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Colleen &amp; Jeff</td>
<td>Stobbe</td>
<td>Resident Interim Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.18.2022</td>
<td>Krista Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bob Fifield</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Getting on Path to Effective Transportation Across Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.18.22</td>
<td>Krista Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bonita Mugnani</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Re: [SCPEL] Support Rail AND Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.18.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chante</td>
<td>Boller</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>NO to Trail Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.18.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Brunner</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Support for Rail and Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.18.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Thiermann</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Re: Support Rail AND Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.18.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Waldhauer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.18.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Myles</td>
<td>Corcoran</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Comments on the Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.18.2022</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Nix</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Remove emails in docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yesenia</td>
<td>Parra</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Marco</td>
<td>Nicene Rio Gateway</td>
<td>Todd Marco - Transportation Planner application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.22.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Cauthen</td>
<td>Bay Area Transportation Working Group (BATWG)</td>
<td>Comments on Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/21/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.22.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mesiti-Miller</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>UTA reports significant increase in ridership thanks to Free Fare February, TownLift, Park City News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/21/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.22.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mesiti-Miller</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Why there are fewer cars now on Salt Lake City’s 400 South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/21/22</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.22.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>An interesting program in Portland that Santa Cruz should consider to get under represented voices heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/22/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>S.Munz 2.23.2022</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jasmin</td>
<td>Gerer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Transient Setting up on Ocean St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/20/22</td>
<td>Contact us form</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>K.Corwin 2.22.22</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Corwin</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Hodges</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Highway 1 Traffic Congestion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SCr 9 South Drainage and Erosion Control Improvements (1F920)</td>
<td>From SR 1 and 9 to slightly north of Glen Arbor Road (PM 0.0/8.5)</td>
<td>Upgrade drainage systems and stabilize slopes</td>
<td>Winter 2021/22</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>Disney Construction Inc.</td>
<td>Contract awarded and approved to Disney Construction Inc, March 4, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Highway 1/Highway 17 Ramp Safety Improvements (1H060)</td>
<td>From the Fishhook to Pasatiempo overcrossing (PM 16.7)</td>
<td>Construct ramp safety improvements</td>
<td>Contract Awarded</td>
<td>$5.8 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Heidi Borders</td>
<td>Teichert Construction</td>
<td>Project has been awarded to Teichert Construction and is in construction. CCA Target 8/1/22.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION (Cont’d.)

<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>4. TMS Detection Repair (1H990)</td>
<td>Various locations throughout District 5 along SRs 1, 17, 68, 156, 101 (PM Various)</td>
<td>Replace failed TMS Detection</td>
<td>Summer 2020/Winter 2021</td>
<td>$4.9 million</td>
<td>SHOPP SB-1</td>
<td>Nick Heisdorf</td>
<td>Traffic Loops Crackfilling, Inc.</td>
<td>Project in construction. Contract is suspended until early spring due to supply shortage and conflict with another project. Work is 95% complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Highway 9 Hairpin Tieback (1K130)</td>
<td>Near Boulder Creek about 1.1 miles south of the SR 236/9 Junction (PM 19.97)</td>
<td>Soldier Pile Tieback Retaining Wall</td>
<td>Winter 2021/22</td>
<td>$2.6 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>Gordon N. Ball, Inc.</td>
<td>The construction contract was awarded to GORDON N. BALL, INC. One-way traffic control in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Highway 1 Soquel Creek Scour Protection (1H480)</td>
<td>In Capitola at Soquel Creek Bridge (PM 13.3)</td>
<td>Bridge preventative maintenance – Place scour protection</td>
<td>Summer 2022</td>
<td>$1.4 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Heidi Borders</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>CON Allocation on January CTC Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Highway 1 Davenport Culvert Replacement (0J200)</td>
<td>Near Davenport and south of Waddell Creek Bridge (PM 31.9/35.7)</td>
<td>Replace culverts</td>
<td>Winter 2021/22</td>
<td>$7.4 million</td>
<td>SHOPP SB-1</td>
<td>Heidi Borders</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Bids opened 1/20/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Construction Timeline</td>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Extend Side Hill Viaduct&lt;br&gt;(05-1K060)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County near Brookdale 0.3 mile south of Western Avenue (PM 10.80/10.8) Construct viaduct wall extension, restore roadway and facilities, place Water Pollution Control BMPs</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$1.9 million</td>
<td>SHOPP SB-1</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>GORDON N. BALL, INC.</td>
<td>One Way Traffic Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Santa Cruz &amp; San Benito Rumble Strip &amp; Striping Safety Project&lt;br&gt;(1M330)</td>
<td>Various multi-county locations. In Sta. Cruz, the project includes Highways 1, 9, 17, 129 Update Striping and Install Edgeline and Center Rumble Strips at Various Locations</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2022</td>
<td>$4.7 million</td>
<td>SHOPP Safety Collision Reduction</td>
<td>Terry Thompson (J.W.)</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Preparing package for Advertisement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</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>Highway 9 PM 1.0 and 4.0 Viaduct (1K120)</td>
<td>Near SCr north of Vernon Street (PM 1/1)</td>
<td>Construct side-hill viaduct restore roadway and facilities, place Water Pollution Control BMPs, erosion control</td>
<td>Fall 2022</td>
<td>$9.9 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Route 9 will require long term closure during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCr 9 Upper Drainage and Erosion Control Improvements (1G950)</td>
<td>In Boulder Creek from Holiday Lane to just south of Ben Lomond to the SR 236/9 Junction (PM 8.5/25.5)</td>
<td>Upgrade drainage and erosion control</td>
<td>Spring 2023</td>
<td>$5.4 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>The project is in the Design and Right of Way phase. Design 95% plans for review April 2022.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location Post Mile (PM)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Construction Timeline</td>
<td>Estimated Construction Cost</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 9 San Lorenzo River Bridge and Kings Creek Bridge Replacement (1H470)</td>
<td>Near Boulder Creek, at San Lorenzo River Bridge and at Kings Creek Bridge (PM 13.6/15.5)</td>
<td>Replace bridges</td>
<td>2023-2025</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
<td>SHOPP SB-1</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 152 Corralitos Creek ADA (05-1F620)</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, East of Beverly Drive to Holohan / College Road (PM1.9 to R2.0)</td>
<td>Construct Accessible Pathway</td>
<td>Winter 2022/23</td>
<td>$3.4 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Nick Heisdorf</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 236 Heartwood Hill Wall (1M450)</td>
<td>Near Boulder Creek (PM 5.4)</td>
<td>Restore Embankment with a Retaining Wall</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location Post Mile (PM)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Construction Timeline</td>
<td>Estimated Construction Cost</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felton Safety Improvements</td>
<td>On Route 9 in Santa Cruz County between Kirby St. and San Lorenzo Valley High School (PM 6.3/7.2)</td>
<td>Construct Accessible Pedestrian Path</td>
<td>2024/25</td>
<td>$8 million</td>
<td>SHOPP Safety</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (P.D.)</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 129 Roadside Safety</td>
<td>Near Watsonville for SR129/1 separation to Salsipuedes Creek Bridge (PM 0/0.56)</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation, Lighting, Sign Panel Replacement and TMS Elements improvements</td>
<td>2024/25</td>
<td>$8 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Nick Heisdorf</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Roadside Safety</td>
<td>0.5 mile north of Larkin Valley Rd. U.C. (San Andreas Rd) to Laguna Rd (North) (8.20/26.00)</td>
<td>Drainage System Restoration; paving at 40 ramps; Install Lighting at Interchanges and Install Count Stations</td>
<td>2024/25</td>
<td>$15.5 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Heidi Borders</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Route 1 CAPM</td>
<td>In and near Santa Cruz from .06 miles south of Route 9 Junction to .09 miles north of the Mission St intersection. (PM 17.5/20.2)</td>
<td>Grinding/paving 2.7 miles of pavement, upgrading up to 89 curb ramps, guard rail upgrade, sign panel upgrade, loop detector replacement.</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$8.9 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Nick Heisdorf</td>
<td>PID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Nature and Scope</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Responsible Engineer</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td><strong>Highway 17 Install High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST)</strong> (1M730)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County near Santa Cruz at various locations from 0.2 miles south of Scotts Valley Overcrossing to 1.6 miles south of Summit Road Separation. Safety Construction includes HFST between the left/right edges of the travel way and cold plane removal of Open Grade Asphalt Concrete (OGAC) and replacement with Hot Mix Asphalt.</td>
<td>Winter 2022/ Spring 2023</td>
<td>$6.5 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Heidi Borders</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td><strong>Highway 9 North CAPM (1K900)</strong></td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County from 0.4 miles south of Saratoga Toll Rd to the Santa Cruz/San Mateo County line (PM 18.89/27.09) Preserve CAPM Strategies including but not limited to digouts, profile grinding, overlay, placing shoulder backing and dike. Reconstruct guardrail, rehabilitate or replace 6 culvert and replace 67 sign panels.</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$6.3 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td><strong>Highway 152 Watsonville Rehab/CAPM (05-1P110)</strong></td>
<td>Santa Cruz County on Route 152 from Jct Route 1 to 0.5 Mile East of Carlton Rd. (PM 0.31/A.14) Preserve pavement, rehabilitate or replace Salsipuedes Creek Bridge, replace culverts, rehabilitate traffic signals, upgrade curb ramps, reconstruct guardrail, replace sign panels, and complete streets.</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$25 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Heidi Borders</td>
<td>PID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project is anticipated to be programmed in the 2022 SHOPP to start PA&ED phase.
### ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIA</td>
<td>Corridor Mobility Improvement Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Environmental Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Project Approval and Environmental Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Post Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Plans, Specifications, and Estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB1</td>
<td>Senate Bill 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>State Highway Operation and Protection Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>State Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMS</td>
<td>Traffic Management System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 25, 2022

Guy Preston
Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Mr. Preston:

UPDATE OF THE STATE HIGHWAY OPERATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM (SHOPP) FOR DISTRICT 5

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 5 has included with this letter the status of SHOPP programming and project initiation documents (PID) under development in Santa Cruz County.

Caltrans is responsible for maintaining and operating approximately 50,000 lane-miles of the state highway system, the backbone of California’s transportation infrastructure. This includes monitoring the condition and operational performance of the highways through periodic inspections, traffic studies, and system analysis. The SHOPP is funded through the State Highway Account supporting the State’s priority for preserving the existing infrastructure.

The projects listed in Attachment 1 include programmed projects in progress and funded in the 2020 SHOPP program in Santa Cruz County as of December 31, 2021. These projects are comprised of SHOPP Major (greater than $1.25M), Minor (less than $1.25M), and Emergency Programs. Projects that have completed construction are not included in the list. In addition, Attachment 1 includes the 2022 SHOPP PID candidate project list that begins formal project development on July 1, 2022. The project listed in Attachment 2 include 2024 SHOPP PID project list that is currently in development. For future PID projects identified in the 10-Year Plan, please see Attachment 3.

Finally, Attachment 4 provides the list of Non-SHOPP projects that are captured in the 3-yr workplan. Please provide any updates as well as identify any new regionally or locally funded projects that Caltrans should be aware. Discussion of proposed scope, funding scenarios, delivery timeframes, potential impacts to the...
State Highway System, and coordination responsibilities can help determine partnering opportunities as well as determine if the project will require traditional Non-SHOPP PID oversight or can be processed through our Permits Office. As a reminder, for Caltrans to add projects into the Non-SHOPP PID workplan it needs to be in your Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), be in Caltrans’s 3-yr workplan, and have an executed cooperative agreement. For all Non-SHOPP questions please contact Garin Schneider at (805) 503-5025 or email Garin.Schneider@dot.ca.gov.

**District 5 SHOPP Webviewer Tool**

The District 5 SHOPP Webviewer tool is available to view current and future SHOPP projects from the approved SHOPP 10 Year Book that is within your region.

Visit [https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=97ceb019d16a4445ac4ae92cfaf8ca8](https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=97ceb019d16a4445ac4ae92cfaf8ca8)

Please share this information with your member agencies and encourage them to contact the appropriate Project Manager for specific project information. For more information on the attachments and to schedule a presentation of this material for an upcoming Technical Advisory Committee meeting, please contact Darron Hill, Office Chief of Programming and Asset Management at (805) 549-3926 or email Darron.Hill@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Richard Rosales
Deputy District Director Program/Project Management and Asset Management

Attachments
1. Programmed SHOPP Projects
2. 2024 SHOPP Project Lists
3. 2021 10 Year: Future Projects
4. 3 Year Non-SHOPP PID Workplan
“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
### PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPPP PROJECTS
in Santa Cruz County
January 2022 Semi-Annual List

[A] = Actual date RTL was achieved.
[T] = Proposed target RTL date

**Minor A Projects:**
Note: Construction Award or Vote costs are actuals; otherwise construction costs are estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Ready to List (Target/Actual)</th>
<th>Contract Acceptance (Target Date)</th>
<th>Anticipated end of construction</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>SB-1 Funds</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000) CON/RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0,7/1,4</td>
<td>OG601 05146000145</td>
<td>1968Y</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz, from 0.7 mile north of Route 1/17 Separation to Brulah Park, Undercrossing, Landscape mitigation for OG600. (201,335)</td>
<td>Hwy 17 Storm Water Mitigation Landscape Split</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>3/29/2019 (A)</td>
<td>4/13/2023</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-835-8568 <a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$427 Award/$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0,719,7, 0,3/3,3</td>
<td>1H300 0516040020</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>In and near Santa Cruz, from 0.1 mile south of Route 1/17 Separation to 0.4 mile south of Pasatempo Undercrossing; also on Route 17 (PM 0.3/3.3), Realign southbound Route 17 connector to southbound Route 1, (201,010)</td>
<td>Pasatempo ii</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>6/18/2020 (A)</td>
<td>8/1/2022</td>
<td>Heidi Borders 916-995-4633 <a href="mailto:heidi.borders@dot.ca.gov">heidi.borders@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$5,653 Award/$558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>1I990 0517000047</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>In various counties on various routes throughout District 5. Replace and upgrade existing flood detection elements for the Traffic Management Systems (TMS). (201,315) Project in MON, SBI, SCR, SLO and SB counties)</td>
<td>TMS Detection Repair</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>6/18/2020 (A)</td>
<td>2/28/2023</td>
<td>Nicholas Heisdorf 805-835-6558 <a href="mailto:nicholas.heisdorf@dot.ca.gov">nicholas.heisdorf@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,690 Award/$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0,1/7,5</td>
<td>1F620 0514000075</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>In and near the city of Santa Cruz, from Route 1 to north of Fall Creek Drive, Stormwater improvements, (201,335)</td>
<td>SCR 9 South Drainage and Erosion Control Improvements</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>6/23/2020 (A)</td>
<td>7/1/2022</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-835-8568 <a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,381 Award/$88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>1G962 0516000010</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, at Lakeview Road, Construct roundabout and improve street lighting, (201,010)</td>
<td>128/Lakeview Intersection Project</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>6/28/2020 (A)</td>
<td>9/1/2022</td>
<td>Luis Duazo 805-835-6502 <a href="mailto:luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov">luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$3,412 Award/$749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9,236</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>1M650 0520000046</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County, on Routes 1, 9 and 236 at various locations. Remove fire debris, burned trees, replace guardrail drainage systems, timber wall lagging, and signs, (201,130)</td>
<td>CZ August Lightning Complex Fire Restoration</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>8/12/2020 (A)</td>
<td>1/16/2022</td>
<td>Berkeley Lint 805-549-3315 <a href="mailto:berkeley.lint@dot.ca.gov">berkeley.lint@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$13,000/$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>2,10/15.50</td>
<td>1M780 0520000073</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County, near Boulder Creek, from Forest Drive to 2.2 miles south of Route 9, Remove hazardous trees and fire debris, (201,130)</td>
<td>SCR 236 Hazardous Tree Removal</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>9/23/2020 (A)</td>
<td>1/15/2022</td>
<td>Berkeley Lint 805-549-3315 <a href="mailto:berkeley.lint@dot.ca.gov">berkeley.lint@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$14,000/$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,15</td>
<td>1M810 0520000075</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County on Highway 17 at Sims Road. Address sinkhole in median adjacent to southbound lanes. (201,130)</td>
<td>Sims Road Sinkholes</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1/22/21 (A)</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>Berkeley Lint 805-549-3315 <a href="mailto:berkeley.lint@dot.ca.gov">berkeley.lint@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$600/$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>1N030 0520000010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>In Various Counties on Various Routes at Various Locations. Replace cameras, Replace batteries. Install census stations. This was a bid job that was advertised twice but failed to receive the minimum number of bids both times. EFA Contract (Project in MON, SBI, SCR, SLO and SB counties)</td>
<td>DS Electrical Repairs</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5/13/2021 (A)</td>
<td>8/30/2022</td>
<td>Berkeley Lint 805-549-3315 <a href="mailto:berkeley.lint@dot.ca.gov">berkeley.lint@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$333/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>1N880 0520000010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>In Various Counties on Various Routes at Various Locations. Replace cameras, Replace batteries. Install census stations. This was a bid job that was advertised twice but failed to receive the minimum number of bids both times. EFA Contract (Project in MON, SBI, SCR, SLO and SB counties)</td>
<td>CTV/MVOS/Census stations</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Berkeley Lint 805-549-3315 <a href="mailto:berkeley.lint@dot.ca.gov">berkeley.lint@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$270/$30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** For information about the SHOPPP program projects contact
Wendy Howard, SHOPPP FTIP Coordinator at (805) 788-8978
or wendy.howard@dot.ca.gov

Attachment 1
1/25/2022
# PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS

## in Santa Cruz County

### January 2022 Semi-Annual List

[A] = Actual date RTL was achieved.
[T] = Proposed target RTL date

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Ready to List (Target/Actual)</th>
<th>Contract Acceptance (Target Date)</th>
<th>Anticipated end of construction</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>SB-1 Funds</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000)</th>
<th>CON/RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1H480</td>
<td>0516000079</td>
<td>2736</td>
<td>In Capitola, at Soquel Creek Bridge No. 36-0013, Place Rock Slope Protection (RSP) to protect bridge foundation. (201,119)</td>
<td>Soquel Creek Scour Protection</td>
<td>PS&amp;R/RW</td>
<td>7/10/2021 (A)</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>8/30/2021</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$7,439 Vote/$262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3006</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties, on Routes 9, 1, 17, 25, 129 and 156 at various locations. Install both centertube and edge-line rumble strips and re-stripe with thermoplastic stripes. (201,015)</td>
<td>Santa Cruz &amp; San Benito Rumble Strip &amp; Striping Safety</td>
<td>PS&amp;R/RW</td>
<td>12/17/2021 (A)</td>
<td>1/30/2021</td>
<td>2/15/2021</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$3,291/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties, on Routes 9, 1, 17, 25, 129 and 156 at various locations. Install both centertube and edge-line rumble strips and re-stripe with thermoplastic stripes. (201,015)</td>
<td>Santa Cruz &amp; San Benito Rumble Strip &amp; Striping Safety</td>
<td>PS&amp;R/RW</td>
<td>12/17/2021 (A)</td>
<td>1/30/2021</td>
<td>2/15/2021</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$3,291/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13,615.5</td>
<td>1H470</td>
<td>2655</td>
<td>Near Boulder Creek, at San Lorenzo River Bridge No. 36-0052 (PM 13,61) and Kings Creek Bridge No. 36-0054 (PM 15,49), Replace bridges to maintain standards of safety and reliability. (201,110)</td>
<td>San Lorenzo River Bridge &amp; Kings Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>PS&amp;R/RW</td>
<td>12/17/2021 (A)</td>
<td>1/30/2021</td>
<td>2/15/2021</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$17,765/5600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>1,892.0</td>
<td>1F620</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, from 0.1 mile east of Beverly Drive to Holman Road/College Road. Construct accessible pathway, concrete barrier, retaining wall, curb, gutter and sidewalk to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. (013 Contingency) (201,361)</td>
<td>Corralitos Creek ADA</td>
<td>PS&amp;R/RW</td>
<td>4/15/2022 (T)</td>
<td>5/31/2022</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,528/3397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,071.0</td>
<td>1K120</td>
<td>2874</td>
<td>In and near the city of Santa Cruz, at north of Vernon Street also at south of Glenarity road (PM 4.0), Construct sidewalk, restore roadway and facilities, provide erosion control. (201,131)</td>
<td>PM 1.0 and 4.0 Viaduct</td>
<td>PS&amp;R/RW</td>
<td>4/4/2022 (T)</td>
<td>5/21/2022</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$11,635/599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8,282.2</td>
<td>1K070</td>
<td>2852</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County near Soledad Valley at 0.5 miles south of Sugarloaf Road. Stabilize eroded cut slope at Jarvis Slide. (201,131)</td>
<td>Jarvis Slide Rock Fence</td>
<td>PS&amp;R/RW</td>
<td>4/27/2022 (T)</td>
<td>5/15/2022</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$4,271/550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTE: For information about the SHOPP program projects contact
Wendy Howard, SHOPP FTP Coordinator at (805) 788-8978
or wendy.howard@dot.ca.gov
### PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS
#### in Santa Cruz County
#### January 2022 Semi-Annual List

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Ready to List (Target/Actual)</th>
<th>Contract Acceptance (Target Date)</th>
<th>Anticipated end of construction</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>SB-1 Funds</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000) CON/RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.20/11.27</td>
<td>1M730 0520000066</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County near Santa Cruz at various locations from 0.2 miles south of Scotts Valley Overcrossing to 1.6 miles south of Summit Road Separation, Grind pavement and place Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA), apply High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST), and constructing surface treatment, (201,010)</td>
<td>Route 17 High Friction Surface Treatment</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>7/8/2022 (T)</td>
<td>7/3/2023</td>
<td>Heid Borders 916-995-4933 <a href="mailto:heidi.borders@dot.ca.gov">heidi.borders@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$7,923/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5/25.50</td>
<td>1G905 0516000005</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>Near Ben Lomond, from Holley Lane to 4.7 miles north of the northern junction of Routes 230/9, Replace failed culverts systems and construct energy dissipators, (201,335)</td>
<td>SCR 9 Upper Drainage and Erosion Control Improvements</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>9/3/2022 (T)</td>
<td>8/4/2025</td>
<td>Nicholas Heisidor 805-835-6558 <a href="mailto:nicholas.heisidor@dot.ca.gov">nicholas.heisidor@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$7,234/276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>5.4/5.4</td>
<td>1M460 0516000103</td>
<td>3017</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County, on Route 236, near Boulder Creek, at 0.6 mile south of Lodge Road, Construct retaining wall to stabilize slope, widen shoulder, repair pavement, improve drainage systems and install erosion control, (201,131)</td>
<td>Heartwood Hill Embankment Restoration</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>8/15/2022 (T)</td>
<td>12/27/2024</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-835-8588 <a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,521/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.9/35.77</td>
<td>02D1 0522000010</td>
<td>1967X</td>
<td>Near Davenport, from 1.4 miles north of Swanton Road to 0.6 mile south of Waclows Creek, Environmental mitigation biological monitoring for project EA 02D1, (201,151)</td>
<td>Davenport Culvert Replacement Biological Monitoring</td>
<td>Will be CON only</td>
<td>11/12/2022 (T)</td>
<td>10/20/2027</td>
<td>Heid Borders 916-995-4933 <a href="mailto:heidi.borders@dot.ca.gov">heidi.borders@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$100 Con Sup/$10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Programmed in 23/24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Ready to List (Target/Actual)</th>
<th>Contract Acceptance (Target Date)</th>
<th>Anticipated end of construction</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>SB-1 Funds</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000) CON/RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.0/0.8</td>
<td>1J830 0516000078</td>
<td>2775</td>
<td>In and near Watsonville, from Route 1 to east of Blackburn Street, Rehabilitate pavement and lighting, replace sign panels, and install Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, Construct new sidewalk, curb ramps, high visibility crosswalks, flashing beacons, and Class 2 and Class 3 bike lanes as complete streets elements, (201,121) *SB1</td>
<td>129 Paving, Sign Panels, Lighting, TMS Improvement</td>
<td>PA&amp;EOD</td>
<td>5/1/2024 (T)</td>
<td>11/7/2025</td>
<td>Nicholas Heisidor 805-835-6558 <a href="mailto:nicholas.heisidor@dot.ca.gov">nicholas.heisidor@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$8,440/$726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R.0/R7.8</td>
<td>1K640 0516000239</td>
<td>2926</td>
<td>In and near Watsonville, from Monterey County line to north of Larkin Valley Road, also in Monterey County (PM R101,53), Rehabilitate drainage systems and lighting, Install Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, pave areas behind the gate and construct Maintenence Vehicle Pullouts (MVPs) to reduce maintenance and enhance highway worker safety, (201,151) *SB1</td>
<td>SCR 1 Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>PA&amp;EOD</td>
<td>4/5/2024 (T)</td>
<td>8/22/2025</td>
<td>Nicholas Heisidor 805-835-6558 <a href="mailto:nicholas.heisidor@dot.ca.gov">nicholas.heisidor@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$10,952/820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.2/20.0</td>
<td>1J460 0516000003</td>
<td>2843</td>
<td>In and near the cities of Capitola and Santa Cruz, from north of Larkin Valley Road Undercrossing to Laguna Road, also in Monterey County (PM R101,53), Rehabilitate drainage systems, enhance highway worker safety, replace lighting and Install Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, (201,151) *SB1</td>
<td>SCR 1 Roadside Safety</td>
<td>PA&amp;EOD</td>
<td>5/14/2024 (T)</td>
<td>4/9/2026</td>
<td>Heid Borders 916-995-4933 <a href="mailto:heidi.borders@dot.ca.gov">heidi.borders@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$14,389/$174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3/7.20</td>
<td>1M460 0516000196</td>
<td>3012</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County, on Route 9, near Felton, from Kirby Street to north of Fall Creek Drive, Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities to improve safety, (201,010)</td>
<td>SR8 Felton Pedestrian Safety Improvements</td>
<td>PA&amp;EOD</td>
<td>5/13/2024 (T)</td>
<td>2/3/2027</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-835-8588 <a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$4,591/$3,903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** For information about the SHOPP program projects contact Wendy Howard, SHOPP FTIP Coordinator at (805) 788-8978 or wendy.howard@dot.ca.gov
## PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPPP PROJECTS
### in Santa Cruz County
#### January 2022 Semi-Annual List

(A) = Actual date RTL was achieved.
(T) = Proposed target RTL date

**Minor A Projects:**
Note: Construction Award or Vote costs are actuals, otherwise Construction costs are estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNQ</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Ready to List (Target/Actual)</th>
<th>Contract Acceptance (Target Date)</th>
<th>Anticipated end of construction</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>SB-1 Funds</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000) CON/RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0/12.5</td>
<td>1K570 0516000233</td>
<td>2921</td>
<td>In and near the cities of Santa Cruz and Scotts Valley, from Route 1 to Santa Clara County line at various locations, Construct and install stormwater quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) and rehabilitate drainage systems, (201.335) (Long Lead Project)</td>
<td>Hwy 17 Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>PA&amp;E</td>
<td>11/16/2026 (T)</td>
<td>7/12/2029</td>
<td>Nicholas Heisendorf 805-835-6558 <a href="mailto:nicholas.heisendorf@dot.ca.gov">nicholas.heisendorf@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$4,632/$397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.897/27.994</td>
<td>1K900 0516000037</td>
<td>2890</td>
<td>Near Boulder Creek and Saratoga, from south of Saratoga Toll Road to Route 35, Rehabilitate pavement and drainage systems, and reconstruct guardrail, (201.121)</td>
<td>Upper SCR 9 CAPM</td>
<td>7/1/2022</td>
<td>1/15/2026 (T)</td>
<td>7/3/2028</td>
<td>Doug Hesling 805-835-5868 <a href="mailto:doug.hesling@dot.ca.gov">doug.hesling@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$13,145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.469/7.5</td>
<td>1K990 0516000036</td>
<td>2879</td>
<td>In and near the city of Santa Cruz, Felton and Brachpine, from Route 1 to south of El Pina Heights Drive, Rehabilitate pavement and drainage systems, Upgrade Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, reconstruct guardrail, replace sign panels, upgrade facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, and construct sidewalks and Class 2 bike lanes, (201.121)</td>
<td>South SCR 9 CAPM</td>
<td>7/1/2022</td>
<td>11/16/2026 (T)</td>
<td>7/13/2029</td>
<td>Doug Hesling 805-835-5868 <a href="mailto:doug.hesling@dot.ca.gov">doug.hesling@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$25,037 Partnering with SCDRC on Complete Streets Elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.5/20.2</td>
<td>1M110 0516000667</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>In and near the city of Santa Cruz, from south of River Street (Route 9) to north of Western Drive, Rehabilitate pavement, reconstruct guardrail, replace sign panels, upgrade facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, and update crosswalks and repair Class 2 bike lanes, (201.121)</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Route 1 CAPM</td>
<td>7/1/2022</td>
<td>9/19/2025 (T)</td>
<td>4/7/2027</td>
<td>Nicholas Heisendorf 805-835-6558 <a href="mailto:nicholas.heisendorf@dot.ca.gov">nicholas.heisendorf@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$15,806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** For information about the SHOPPP program projects contact Wendy Howard, SHOPPP FTIP Coordinator at (805) 788-8978 or wendy.howard@dot.ca.gov
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## Santa Cruz County
### 2024 SHOPP PID Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID# (EA)</th>
<th>Project Activity</th>
<th>County - Route - Postmile</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 05-1M530 | Improve inlet/outlet of Drainage System at PM 5.11 and restore wildlife connectivity for sensitive species affected by adjacent projects. | SCR-01-2.683/7.947 | In Santa Cruz County from the junction of 1/152 to the NB onramp from Larkin Valley Rd. | RIDER, BRANDY K  
(805) 503-9428  
brandy.rider@dot.ca.gov |
| 05-1P180 | Widen existing paved inside shoulder to improve vehicle drift recovery | SCR-01-85/8.2 | In Santa Cruz County on Route 1 between north of Buena Vista Dr. to Freedom Blvd. | THOMPSON, TERRY L  
(805) 503-9013  
terry.thompson@dot.ca.gov |
| 05-1N900 | Abandon/Remove Culvert, Construct Retaining Wall/Bridge | SCR-01-9.8/10 | In Santa Cruz County, on SR 1 from 0.2 mile south of Aptos Bridge UC (36-0011) to the Aptos Bridge UC | HEIDORF, NICHOLAS E  
(805) 836-6558  
nicholas.heidorf@dot.ca.gov |
| 05-1P110 | Preserve 8.252 lane miles of flexible Class 2 pavement and 9.218 miles of flexible Class 3 pavement using 3R strategy from T0.310 to R2.0 and CAPM strategy from R2.0 to 4.14, rehabilitate/replace drainage structure, replace culverts, rehabilitate traffic signals, upgrade curb ramps, reconstruct guardrail, replace sign panels, and complete streets. | SCR-152-T0.31/4.14 | In Santa Cruz County on Route 152 from Jct Route 1 to 0.5 Mile East of Carlton Rd. | BORDERS, HEIDI E  
(916) 995-4933  
heidiborders@dot.ca.gov |

Note: For project-specific questions, contact the corresponding project manager.
For general PID program questions contact Jimmy Ochoa, SHOPP PID Coordinator at (805) 549-3926

Attachment 2  
1/25/2022
## Santa Cruz County
### 2021 10 Year Plan: Future Projects as of January 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Future Proposed Project Location and Activity</th>
<th>Proposed Future PID Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20029</td>
<td>Proposed future project will address pavement needs in Santa Cruz County on Route 129 between postmiles 0.56 and 9.998</td>
<td>2026 PID Cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For project-specific question on future 10 year projects, contact Darron Hill, Office Chief of Programming and Asset Management at (805) 549-3926
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## 2020/2021
Santa Cruz County 3 Year Non-SHOPP PID Workplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Begin Postmile</th>
<th>End Postmile</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
<th>2022/2023</th>
<th>2023/2024</th>
<th>CO-OP Executed Yes/NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>Operational Improvements</td>
<td>SR 1 Mission at Bay Street Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pajero River Food control Project</td>
<td>Multiple locations- rte 1, 129, 152</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>T2.503</td>
<td>T2.503</td>
<td>Operational Improvement</td>
<td>SR 152/Main St/Freedom Blvd Roundabout</td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Locally Sponsored

### State Sponsored

No Projects at this time

---

Note: For 3 Year Workplan updates or questions contact Garin Schneider, Advance Planning Manager at (805) 503-5025 or email Garin.Schneider@dot.ca.gov 24-18
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AGENDA: March 3, 2022

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)  
FROM: Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner  
RE: Final Draft 2045 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission review and approve the final draft 2045 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (Attachment 1 – available at sccrtc.org/2045rtp).

BACKGROUND
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was released for public review on December 2, 2021, and the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was released for public review by AMBAG on November 22, 2021. Comments on the draft documents were due January 31, 2022. The RTP describes the existing transportation system, forecasts the amount of funding anticipated for transportation projects over the next 25 years, identifies transportation programs and projects to address the region’s needs, and includes a performance analysis for how well the plan advances RTP goals. Projects identified in the RTP include improvements for local roadways, highways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit service, specialized transportation for seniors and people with disabilities, park and ride lot construction and transportation demand management programs. Individual projects listed in the 2045 RTP must undergo separate design and environmental processes, and can only be implemented as local, state and federal funds become available.

DISCUSSION
Proposed revisions for the Final 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (Attachment 2) are based on comments received from members of the public, RTC Commissioners, RTC Committees, resource agencies, public interest groups and partner agencies. Recommended changes include updates to text; updates to the project list based on revised project cost estimates from project sponsors, revised project descriptions, and deletion of completed projects; and updates to financial estimates based on more recent financial information (Attachment 3). Edits to the text that staff considers administrative, including grammatical, formatting, clarification or editorial corrections, are not listed individually. Written comments received on the draft RTP are in Attachment 4. Oral comments made at the January
13th, 2022, public hearing, AMBAG EIR public workshops, and RTC advisory meetings are summarized and also included in Attachment 4.

Changes to the policy, action (project lists) or financial elements of the RTP need to be incorporated into the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), scheduled for adoption by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) on June 8th, 2022. **Staff recommends that the RTC consider and approve revisions to the final draft 2045 RTP at this meeting and inform staff of any additional changes for inclusion in the final 2045 RTP.** The RTC is scheduled to adopt the final 2045 RTP in June 2022.

**Environmental Impact Report**

AMBAG is the lead agency for the preparation of the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Environmental Impact Report (MTP/SCS EIR), which includes environmental review of the three regional transportation plans (Santa Cruz County, San Benito County, and Monterey County). The three regional transportation planning agencies, including RTC, serve as the responsible agencies under CEQA.

The comment period for the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was completed January 31st. Comments on the draft EIR were received by AMBAG, as the lead agency. The final EIR will include responses to comments received before the comment deadline and any revisions to the EIR since it was released on November 22nd. No modifications to the 2045 RTP are required based on the comments received on the draft EIR. AMBAG is scheduled to certify the environmental review of the 2045 MTP/SCS, including environmental review for the Santa Cruz County 2045 RTP, on June 8, 2022. RTC will consider adoption of the EIR findings in June 2022 after the EIR has been certified by AMBAG.

**SUMMARY**

The RTC is responsible for preparing and updating the long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Santa Cruz County. **Staff recommends that the RTC review and approve revisions for the final RTP.** The RTC is scheduled to adopt the final 2045 RTP in June 2022.

**Attachments:**

1. Final Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan – Download full document at [sccrtc.org/2045rtp](http://sccrtc.org/2045rtp)
2. Summary of revisions to draft 2045 RTP
3. Updates to the Financial Revenue Estimates
4. 2045 RTP Comments Received

\|RTCSERV2\Shared\RTP\2045 RTP (2022)\Staff Reports\RTC\03032022\0-SR-Draft 2045 RTP-030322.doc
Final Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan

Download the complete Final Draft 2045 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan at www.sccrtc.org/2045rtp.
2045 Final Draft Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan

Summary of Revisions

The following revisions were incorporated into the final draft 2045 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan based on comments received and updated financial revenue information. Edits to the text that staff considers administrative, including grammatical, formatting, or corrections, are not listed below.

Executive Summary

- Updated text where needed based on changes to chapters as discussed below.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

- Provided more details in the public outreach section

Chapter 2 – Transportation Network

- Provided additional information about unconstrained projects identified in the Highway 17 Access Management Plan
- Replaced Figure 2.7 Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Map with updated project status
- Added that the RTC’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee’s Pedestrian Safety Work Group is an ad hoc committee
- Added information about the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) serving as the RTC’s Multimodal Corridor Plan
- Added to the discussion about the TCAA/RNIS business plan
- Added additional information about the California Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, Toward an Active California developed by Caltrans
- Added to the discussion on freight rail service
- Added information about CTC Short Line Railroad Improvement program funding for Pajaro River bridge rehabilitation project

Chapters 3 – Travel Patterns

- Updated Goods Movement section to the include number of active freight rail customers

Chapter 5 – Funding Our Transportation System, and Appendix D – Funding Projections
• Updated pie chart that depicts the fund distribution based on minor revisions to the available constrained funds and the constrained project list.

• Updated references to the new federal transportation as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) of 2021

• The financial element was updated to reflect recent state, federal and local revenue estimates and actuals in FY 20/21.

• Approximately 4% increase in revenues expected compared to estimates included in the draft RTP. The majority of these funds are restricted for use by cities, county, and METRO for ongoing operations and maintenance and state-of-good repair projects.

• Revenue estimates for State Transit Assistance (STA), Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP), and SB 1 State of Good Repair (SOGR) were updated to consider the California State Controller’s Office January 2022 estimates

• Revenues that are only available for Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) projects were updated to reflect more recent trends and METRO’s latest budget estimates.

• Base year revenues for Measure D, Transit Sales Tax, and TDA updated to more closely reflect FY 20/21 actuals

• Added new SB743 VMT Fee placeholder

• Minor edits to other fund sources, including rounding base year estimates.

**Chapter 6 – Transportation Investments**

• Updated total costs for all projects included in project list

• Included updated discussion of the benefits of installing auxiliary lanes on Highway 1

• Updated pie chart that depicts the fund distribution by mode based on minor revisions to the available constrained funds and the constrained project list.

**Chapter 9 – What’s Next?**

• Updated references to Caltrans 2019 District 5 Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment and Caltrans 2021 Adaptation Priorities Report

• Added prioritization areas for detailed climate change adaptation assessments

**Appendix E – Project List and Appendix F – Escalated Project Costs**
• Updates to the project list and escalated project costs based on updated costs and revenue projections, funds programmed by the RTC in December 2021, and comments received from project sponsors.

• Projects that have been completed or will be completed by June 2022 were removed.

• The following new projects were added to the project list:
  o CAP 11b – Clares St Traffic Calming (41st to Wharf) Phase II
  o CAP 20 – 41st Ave/Capitola Road Intersection Reconstruction
  o CAP 21 – Kennedy Drive Sidewalk
  o CAP 22 - 41st Ave Rehabilitation (Cory St to Clares St)
  o CO 90 – Emergency Routes Resurfacing: Alba & Jamison Creek Roads
  o CO 91 – San Andreas Road Resurfacing
  o CO 92 – Soquel San Jose Rd/ Porter St - Road Resurfacing & Multimodal Improvements
  o CO 93 – Holohan Road Resurfacing
  o CO-P106 – Pajaro River Flood Risk Management Project
  o CO-P107 – Soquel Dr. Reversible Lane (Flex Lane) Feasibility Study
  o CO-P108 – Glen Arbor Sidewalk
  o CTSA-P07 – Lift Line EV Modernization Project
  o MTD-P61 – South County Zero-Emissions Operating and Maintenance Facility
  o RTC-P61 – Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Trestle Reconstruction and San Vincente Restoration
  o SC 52 – Chestnut Street St Storm Drain and Paving Rehab and Safety Improvements
  o SC-P135 – Advance Dilemma Zone Detection and Retroreflective Signal Back Plate Upgrades
  o SC-P136 – Hwy 1 Mission St at Fair Intersection Improvement
  o SC-P137 – Frederick St Park Accessible Ramp to Harbor
  o SV 33 (replaces SV-P73) – Granite Creek Rd Overcrossing Repaving and Bike/Ped Upgrades
  o VAR 09s – SLV Schools Complex Circulation and Access Study
  o VAR-P50 – Climate Adaptation, Resiliency, and Hazard Mitigation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCES/PROGRAMS</th>
<th>Funding Type/ Eligible Uses</th>
<th>Update from Draft RTP (n/c = no change)</th>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th>25 Year Total - Not Escalated</th>
<th>25 Year Escalated*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Sales Taxes Used on Transportation</td>
<td>Local Streets-Roads</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
<td>$48,750</td>
<td>$60,504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Developer Fees</td>
<td>Local Streets-Roads</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$43,438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County General Funds for Transportation Projects</td>
<td>Local Streets-Roads</td>
<td>$12,350</td>
<td>$308,750</td>
<td>$383,189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit, Member Fees, Sponsorships,</td>
<td>Project Specific</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>$14,375</td>
<td>$17,841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax (HUTA) or Gas Tax Replacement</td>
<td>Local Streets-Roads</td>
<td>$10,350</td>
<td>$258,750</td>
<td>$321,134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMRA Local Gas Tax</td>
<td>Local Streets-Roads</td>
<td>$7,469</td>
<td>$186,725</td>
<td>$186,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiftLine Specialized Transportation - Non-TDA revenue</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$13,750</td>
<td>$17,065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Revenues</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$86,877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC Contribution to Hwy 17 Safety Project (Santa Cruz County)</td>
<td>Project Specific</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW: SB743 VMT Fee</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$2,512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF)</td>
<td>Local Streets-Roads</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$44,622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Fares</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Reduced total</td>
<td>$241,800</td>
<td>$287,359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit non-fare revenue</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$20,478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit fuel tax credit</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$12,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Sales Tax (Measure G)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Increased total</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$744,659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Fund (LTF)/Transportation Devt Act (TDA)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Increased total</td>
<td>$267,500</td>
<td>$331,994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC Revenues &amp; Fees (Santa Cruz County)</td>
<td>Project Specific</td>
<td>$7,600</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$235,809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Sales Tax: Measure D</td>
<td>Expenditure Plan</td>
<td>Increased total</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>$775,686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2766</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>$429</td>
<td>$10,725</td>
<td>$13,311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Improvement Program match</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Aid to Airports Program</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$6,250</td>
<td>$7,757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE)</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$6,450</td>
<td>$8,005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$806,714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMRA SHOPP</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>$10,620</td>
<td>$265,500</td>
<td>$329,512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Increased total</td>
<td>$114,580</td>
<td>$138,077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB1 Competitive Programs (TCEP, SCCP, SB1 LPP Competitive)</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>$7,280</td>
<td>$182,000</td>
<td>$190,644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$12,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA SB 1 State of Good Repair (SOGR)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Reduced total</td>
<td>$19,012</td>
<td>$23,085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Interregional Share</td>
<td>Highway/Rail</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$9,308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Regional Share</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$93,082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program (ATP)</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$124,094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Reduced total</td>
<td>$13,250</td>
<td>$16,445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVENUE SOURCES/PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>Funding Type/ Eligible Uses</th>
<th>Update from Draft RTP (n/c = no change)</th>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th>25 Year Total - Not Escalated</th>
<th>25 Year Escalated*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB1 Local Partnership Program (SB1 LPP) Formula</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>$592</td>
<td>$14,800</td>
<td>$14,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing &amp; Sustainable Communities (AHSC)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Increased total $400</td>
<td>$30,100</td>
<td>$30,624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPUC Access For All Program</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,862</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$18,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (5310)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$2,875</td>
<td>$3,568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Planning (5304) (Competitive)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning (5303)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area Formula Program (5311)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$4,325</td>
<td>$5,368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$114,550</td>
<td>$142,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Transit Intensive Cities (5307c)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$62,055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Good Repair Grants (5337)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$56,250</td>
<td>$61,616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Program (5339)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td>$17,624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary Program (5339b)</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$15,514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES 5311</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAISE (formerly BUILD/TIGER)</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Name changed $400</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$12,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Bridge Program (HBP)</td>
<td>Local Streets-Roads</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$127,650</td>
<td>$158,426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>Local Streets-Roads</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$43,438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transp. Block Grant (STBG) /Regulatory Surface Transpnt Pgm (RSTP)</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>$3,712</td>
<td>$92,792</td>
<td>$115,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP)</td>
<td>Project Specific</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA/CALEMA/ER - Emergency Road Repair Funding</td>
<td>Local Streets-Roads</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$310,275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP)</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>n/c</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$8,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$218,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,235,084</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,376,897</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average escalation rate assumption: 1.75% applied to funds beyond existing programmed; except sources with set annual amount or predicted to flatline.*
**DRAFT 2045 RTP PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Advisory Committee Comments**

**Bicycle Advisory Committee (12/13/21)**
1. **Scott Roseman**: supports sustainably and climate change focus in RTP, agrees projects align with goals; says Santa Cruz is progressive but still car-centric, requests more emphasis on biking infrastructure and making cycling a more viable transportation mode in SCC.

**Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (12/16/21)**
2. **Matt Machado** (County):
   a. supports updating Goals and Policies to prioritize system preservation
3. **Steve Wiesner** (County):
   a. requests adding new project to RTP at request of Sup. Koenig (see Soquel Dr. Reversible Lane (Flex Lane) Feasibility Study)
4. **Paul Hierling** (AMBAG):
   a. Incorporate any changes to financial element based on additional funding from Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA)

**Elderly & Disabled Technical Advisory Committee (1/11/22)**
5. **Veronica Elsea**:
   a. typo in “Sustainable Transportation Analysis Ratings System), pg 4-2;
   b. update “In some areas, local jurisdictions are implementing projects to slow vehicular traffic and create more attractive pedestrian facilities” to also incorporate “functional design” with equal importance, pg. 2-20
   c. Clarify pedestrian safety work group is ad hoc committee, pg. 2-21
6. **Janet Edwards**:
   a. Update discussion on accessible transit to reflect loss of accessible taxi service availability in North County (taxi scrip), pg. 2-12
7. **Deborah Benham** (email):
   a. supports Scotts Valley Active Transportation Plan (SV ATP) incorporated in project list
   b. CT-P49 (Hwy 17): Include City of Scotts Valley for operational improvements (e.g., offramp/onramp Scotts Valley Dr/Granite Creek Rd; traffic signal and intersection design improvements (re-design of 5-way intersection).

**RTC Public Hearing Comments (1/13/22)**
1. **Rafa Sonnenfeld** stated Bus on shoulder with auxiliary lanes projects are a euphemism for highway widening and do little to improve traffic (AMBAG EIR public hearing 1/12)
2. **Brian Peoples (Trail Now)** inquired about cost estimates for Segment 7 Phase 2 project costs; stated estimates don’t line up with other less complicated projects.
3. **Mark Mesitti-Miller (FORT)** expressed support for RTP goals and policies but stated the plan document lacks clear link between approved goals/policies and project prioritization.
4. **Rebecca Downing** commented on RTP strategies and requested strategies better reflect **where** people are going and **how** they wish to get there (including survey findings or similar data)

5. **Todd Marco** (NRG) commented Aptos is central choke point between north and south county where highway, rail, and Soquel Dr. converge, presenting opportunity to prioritize projects in this area.

6. “**Equity Transit**” supports rail with trail projects and expanded transit projects; expressed opposition to any highway widening projects, including auxiliary lanes.

7. **Sally Arnold** (FORT) expressed concern with constrained funding allocated to highway projects despite more funding already identified for passenger rail; expressed concern there is a double standard and reaffirms car-centric planning

8. **Barry Scott** supports more public transit projects instead of highway projects that encourage more driving

9. **Dianne D.** supports a more energy efficient transit system and improvements that benefit all users; asked how projects reduce GHG emissions

10. **Jack Brown** supports equity component of plan that incorporates all users throughout the county; noted not all in the County can access or use rail and stated passenger rail ridership will have a minimal impact on traffic congestion (cited UCIS/TCAA studies); does not support BOS with AUX lanes, prefers “true” BOS.

11. **Ryan Sarnataro** supports prioritizing highway improvements and using rail improvement funds for better alternatives other than rail.

12. **Sean Shrum** stated State Reps can help secure additional funding for needed projects (previous rep Anna Eskew, now represented by Jimmy Panetta)

13. **Linda Wilshusen** asked about the alternative scenarios and opportunity maps included in the EIR discussion (AMBAG EIR Public Hearing 1/19)

14. **Holly Zapala** requested Caltrans move the grade separate project at Laurel Rd/ Sugarloaf Rd/ Glenwood Cutoff area (CT-P52) to the RTC constrained project list. (AMBAG EIR Public Hearing 1/24)

**Comments Received by Email**

Comments submitted to 2045rtp@sccrtc.org during the RTP public review period (December 5, 2021 – January 31, 2022) are provided beginning on the next page.
Dear Commissioners,

Equity Transit would like to thank the Commission staff for the work they have put into developing the Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). It is disappointing, however, to see minimal attention given to our Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (SCBRL) in the plan, omission of updated funding sources, a disconnect between goals and projects, and a lack of vision for the fundamental changes needed to transform our transportation system into a more equitable and sustainable system. We should absolutely not be adding any new highway widening projects from State Park Drive to Freedom Blvd. This would require current and future funds be funneled away from critical public transit projects which address both equity and environment goals and also contribute to our economic robustness. For the current commission to say there is no money to repair the tracks but in another breath allot significant funds for wasteful highway climate degrading highway widening is contradictory to our significant efforts to bring electric light rail to our community and not in line with our study recommendations or our climate mitigation goals.

We would like to suggest the following, which we extend appreciation and give credit to FORT for writing and agree to the language.

1. How Projects Meet Goals
The 2045 goals, targets and policies cited in Appendix C of the draft RTP provide an excellent overview of our hopes for a more energy-efficient and less congested future. They include state mandates to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) from transportation sources to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, and to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

Global warming is already drastically changing our local and worldwide climate in ways that will cause social turmoil and much human suffering in the coming years. Locally, we are already familiar with multi-year droughts, horrific fires, and eroding shorelines. The science is irrefutable that GHG emissions are a primary cause of global warming and climate change.

The primary approaches that are used worldwide to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation include improvements in vehicle technology and reduction in the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), primarily via public transportation investments. Yet the transportation option that was identified in the 2021 Transit Corridor Alternative Analysis & Rail Network Integration Study (TCAA/RNIS) as producing the greatest reduction in both VMT
and GHG emissions, that is, electric light rail, is not given more than a passing reference in this draft RTP.

So, while our RTP goals are laudable and the challenge of global warming formidable, the draft RTP itself does not rise to the occasion. In fact, the Plan does not anywhere make the link between its extensive project list and how these projects will achieve the Plan’s goals.

While many pages of the draft Plan include references to statewide sustainability, transit, and rail plans, our own public rail transit project on the RTC-owned coast rail line is highlighted only insomuch as it is "on the financially-unconstrained list of projects, due to the lack of identified and likelihood of available funding to the region for a passenger rail project." (p2-13)

It should be noted that most of the projects on the draft RTP’s project list do not have funding sources identified during the project development stage. Yet, the rail transit project in particular, due to extensive analysis over the past decades, has over 60% of the estimated high-end capital cost identified as likely...quite unlike any of the Highway 1 widening projects on the Constrained Project List. Also, we’re wondering how it happens, then, that NEW multi-million dollar Highway 1 projects are shown on the Constrained Project List without public discussion of total project costs or funding sources? [Hwy 1 Auxiliary Lanes and Bus on Shoulders Freedom Blvd to State Park $102M and Hwy 1: Reconstruct Bay Ave/Porter St and 41st Avenue Interchange $14M.]

FORT strongly encourages the Commission to recommit to its identified goals, targets and policies in the RTP, and to include, in the future, a constrained list of projects that can show evidence they will actually get us nearer to achieving those goals.

2. Rail Planning

In Chapter 1, the draft Plan identifies the crucial role that a planning document like the RTP serves: “planning . . . positions our community to receive funding for projects that require a well thought out plan and helps to develop collaboration on projects.” Yet the Rail section in Chapter 2 includes a simple factual description of the SCBRL and the last 20 years of its acquisition and study but makes no further reference to future planning of the branch line’s use for passenger or freight service.

The draft Plan cites multiple references made in regional and state transportation planning documents to our SCBRL and how that planning and coordination could lead to funding. These include:

Chapter 2 notes the inclusion of our SCBRL in the 2018 goals of the California State Rail Plan, including: “a new station in Pajaro/Watsonville, an analysis of connections between Santa Cruz, Monterey and the high-speed rail line at Gilroy, implementation planning for connecting Santa Cruz and Monterey to the statewide rail network at Gilroy, and establishment of hourly service by 2040, if recommended by the 2022 rail plan.” (p2-15)

It also notes that the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) is “actively pursuing rail service that includes local service as well as greater regional access...local light rail service would connect the cities of Seaside and Monterey to Castroville for connections to Pajaro station and the San Francisco Bay Area and beyond.” (p2-15)
Although not referenced in the draft Plan, our local Draft AMBAG 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan says in its passenger rail section, “rail projects are an important component of the regional transportation network that enhance mobility opportunities for the region’s diverse population and lead to economic vitality for the region. The planned rail services complement each other and result in reducing auto trips on regional highways . . . . The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) are working to bring rail service to Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties, so that residents can use rail to travel to jobs, education and entertainment.” (p2-11)

The Draft RTP’s Chapter 3 section on Goods Movement briefly mentions that our SCBRL “is also used for freight service”, and then goes on to delineate the importance of rail for freight movement, “Upward pricing pressure on the trucking industry . . . as well as safety and environmental concerns, have prompted the region’s freight and transportation stakeholders to look for alternatives for transporting goods. The rail system is one of the main options available.” (P3-15)

References in other regional and state planning documents to the use of our SCBRL for statewide freight movement are also cited:

“The 2018 California State Rail Plan and the 2020 California Freight Mobility Plan stress the importance of short line railroads, including the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. . . AMBAG(‘s). . . U.S. 101 Central Coast California Freight study in 2016 . . . recommends upgrading the rail on the Santa Cruz Branch Line to Federal Rail Administration Class 2 rail, allowing freight train speeds of up to 25 mph on sections in Santa Cruz County in order to improve freight connectivity to other regions in California and nationwide.” (p2-15)

Given the importance of planning in being successful in competing for public project funding, the Commission should include in the RTP additional discussion of the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis and Rail Network Integration Study (TCAA/RNIS) evaluation of transit investment options and its selection of electric passenger rail as the locally preferred alternative for the SCBRL.

3. Funding
The project list fails to directly connect back to goals, targets, and policies identified. This is especially true when it comes to the SCBRL.

On November 15, 2021, President Biden signed the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) that the US Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) website calls “a generational investment in America’s intermodal transportation system of which freight and intercity passenger rail are an integral part. . . will provide unprecedented federal funding for rail improvement projects in America. Over the next five years, that means greatly expanding existing FRA programs and creating new programs to enhance our nation’s rail network. The bipartisan infrastructure law includes $102 billion in total rail funding, including $66 billion from advanced appropriations, and $36 billion in authorized funding.” The IIJA also includes $27 billion just for bridge repairs.
This funding will significantly change the focus on rail throughout the country and specifically in California with its current emphasis on rail through the State Rail Plan. California alone is in line to receive $4.2 billion from the IIJA.

And yet Chapter 5 of the draft RTP on funding completely down plays this dramatic new funding source, saying “as part of negotiations for a multiyear federal infrastructure plan, congress adopted a new federal transportation act (Investing in a New Vision for the Environment and Surface Transportation in America or INVEST act) which is expected to increase funding for transportation. Details on what this means for projects in Santa Cruz County will be integrated into RTP updates once available.” (p5-2,3)

We also want to call to your attention that later in Chapter 5, there is an outdated discussion of federal funds for infrastructure, saying “while Congress and the President agree that the nation’s infrastructure is a priority, there has been no consensus around specific programs that would be funded or how to pay for transportation system projects.” (p5-6)

The Plan’s description of Unconstrained Projects is: “projects that cannot be implemented over the next 25 years unless there are significant changes in the amount of local, state, and federal funding available for transportation.” Given the magnitude of increased funding that will be available over the next 5 years from both this new federal funding and resulting impact on state funding, we feel rail projects now definitely meet this definition of “significant changes.”

We ask the Commission to revise this section to provide more current and complete description of the IIJA. We realize the final passage of this legislation may have happened after the current draft of the RTP was completed, but it is sufficiently important to make these revisions now before the RTP is adopted. It should also specifically be mentioned in the Rail section of the Plan.

Given the magnitude of increased funding that will be available over the next 5 years, we also ask the RTC to move the following rail projects from the unconstrained list to the constrained list.

- Public Transit on Watsonville-Santa Cruz Rail Corridor - RTC-P02 - $825,000 unconstrained
- Rail line: Freight Service Upgrades - RTC-P41 - $25,000 unconstrained
- Recreational Rail Infrastructure - RTC 25 - $5,340 unconstrained

Conclusion
We find it shortsighted for the Commission to adopt a twenty-year planning document that pays relatively little attention to one of the three key transit corridors identified in the RTC’s 2019 Unified Corridor Study - the Santa Cruz Rail Branch Line. In doing so, this Draft RTP
ignores the 20 years and hundreds of thousands of dollars in planning that have gone into refining successful project outcomes in the most underutilized transportation corridor in our county.

The Commission also ignores the findings of its regional and statewide planning agencies that specifically incorporate the SCRBL into their future plans, thereby increasing the possibility of significant capital funding for rail transit at a time of unprecedented new funding for passenger rail.

Finally, the Draft RTP includes excellent goals on reducing greenhouse gasses, but then does not link the project list to those goals, and does not include meaningful Constrained funding for rail projects that studies have shown would have the greatest impact on reducing greenhouse gasses and meeting the Plan’s goals.

The people of Santa Cruz County deserve a better vision for future transportation in which everyone can affordably, reliably, safely and sustainably reach their destinations — a forward-thinking vision centered squarely on the needs of working people, making our communities more connected and leaving no one behind. The immediate and catastrophic threat of global warming demands we challenge the car-centric status quo, revisit core assumptions and policies underlying our transportation system, and invest in transportation solutions that will help us achieve social justice and environmental sustainability.

We hope these oversights will be corrected in the final adopted document and all future revisions.

Sincerely,

--

Best regards,

Lani Faulkner, Director
Equity Transit - Tránsito de Equidad
www.EquityTransit.org
831-278-1007
From: Jeffrey Smedberg <santacruz4bernie@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2022 4:24 PM
To: bruce.mcpherson@santacruzcounty.us; Ryan Coonerty <ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>; 
zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; greg.caput@santacruzcounty.us; 
manu.koenig@santacruzcounty.us; Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Cc: magi amma <magiamma@magiamma.com>
Subject: Draft 2045 RTP & EIR Comments

Santa Cruz County Supervisors and Regional Transportation Commission Members,

Please see our attached comments.

--
Thanks,
Jeffrey Smedberg
Santa Cruz for Bernie
January 31, 2022

Subject: Comments on Draft 2045 RTP & its EIR

Dear Santa Cruz County Supervisors and Regional Transportation Commission Members:

The Greenway proposal is not a feasible solution. We urge you, rather, to focus on clean affordable transportation for all.

Therefore the 2,000 local members of the Santa Cruz for Bernie organization urge you to do the following:

• Do not accept the Greenway proposal. It expands the use of fossil fuel vehicles. Transportation causes 41% of Greenhouse Gas emissions in California.
  
  o Starting on page 250 of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) there is a list of planned Highway 1 expansion projects which will ultimately widen a part of the highway into eight lanes. Do not extend highway widening.

  o On page 127 the report states, "The 2045 RTP target to decrease single occupancy vehicle trip mode share by 6.5% by 2030 and increase active transportation trips to 16% of total commute trips by 2030 and to 24% of total commute trips by 2045 will likely not be met given this current trend [shown in Fig. 7.6]."

• Do not kill the Felton Branch line.
  
  o Rail is a far more efficient, far less expensive, and greener transport method than trucking.

  o The Greenway proposal will overturn the will of the voters who chose to fund the preservation of rail infrastructure through Measure D.

Autos are the main source of planet warming greenhouse emissions, and we cannot reduce emissions if we keep supporting the "auto culture." The future of our children and the planet depends on your decisions!

Jeffrey Smedberg, Membership Secretary
Magi Amma, Co-Convenor and Climate Chair for Santa Cruz for Bernie
Dear Staff,
Could you please forward this to the Commissioners?
Thank you,
Rick

Dear Commissioners,

I’ve attached my organization's comments on the Draft EIR for the AMBAG Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. This is the EIR that analyzes the Regional Transportation Plan from our county.

If you get a chance to read it, you will note that the Plan misses the opportunity for several feasible alternatives to perpetuating auto dependency, including:

- congestion pricing on roadways with revenues benefiting transit service
- increased parking pricing with revenues benefiting transit service
- bona fide bus-on-shoulder in bus-only lanes on Highway 1, instead of bus-stuck-in-auxiliary lanes
- land use patterns that reduce sprawl in rural areas

Fortunately, the opportunities are not missed forever. Please instruct staff to revise the Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan to make a substantial shift towards transit and active transportation instead of more business as usual projects that increase auto capacity.

Thank you,

Rick Longinotti, Campaign for Sustainable Transportation
January 31, 2022

Heather Adamson, AMBAG
hadamson@ambag.org

Re: Comments on the Draft 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

Dear Ms. Adamson,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. As explained below, the concern of my organization centers on the large gap between the greenhouse gas emissions reductions estimated to result from the MTP/SCS and the goals of the State of California to reduce those emissions. We are concerned that the EIR did not analyze induced travel according to state guidelines, resulting in inaccurate estimates for VMT and GHG’s. We are concerned that the EIR takes credit for state programs such as vehicle emission standards in calculating regional emission reductions, which is not allowed.

We are concerned that the EIR did not formulate and analyze an alternative that would produce substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions to better fulfill state policy. We are concerned that the EIR does not fulfill its responsibility to mandate mitigations for the significant and unavoidable impacts due to greenhouse gas emissions. We bring attention to the requirement that the EIR specify that prior EIR’s on road expansion projects that are inadequate under current CEQA standards need to be revised.

Finally, we request that the EIR evaluate how the MTP/SCS perpetuation of auto dependency impacts the health and travel behavior of residents, especially low income residents and people of color.

For the Campaign for Sustainable Transportation,

Rick Longinotti, Co-chair
Inadequate Objectives

1. The Draft EIR fails to include a target for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in its objectives that is consistent with California legislation and Governor’s Executive Orders.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that that GHG emissions with implementation of the MTP/SCS will fall far short of California legislative policy:

- GHG emissions in 2030 would decrease by approximately one percent as compared to 1990 levels, which is not sufficient to achieve the 2030 target of a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels….which would conflict with the state’s ability to achieve SB 32, EO S-3-05, and EO B-55-18 GHG reduction goals. As such, this impact is significant.

We observe that EO B-55-18 established the goal for California to become fully carbon neutral statewide no later than 2045, and to maintain net negative emissions thereafter. 2045 is exactly the timeframe of the 2045 MTP/SCS and the 2045 RTPs. The plans do not establish the transformative transportation measures required to act on this goal.

In the Project Objectives Section, the Draft EIR acknowledges that “For purposes of this EIR, the primary objective of the 2045 MTP/SCS and the county level RTPs is to comply with applicable regulatory requirements.” However, it fails to mention that those regulatory requirements include SB 32, and the Governor’s Executive Orders which mandate an alignment of transportation spending with the state’s climate goals. The MTP/SCS falls far short of the planning necessary to achieve the targets in SB 32. The remedy starts by articulating a set of objectives that is consistent with that legislation.

Inadequate Analysis of Induced Travel

2. The Draft EIR fails to analyze induced travel according to CEQA Guidelines

The policy of the State of California recognizes the empirical reality that the more roads are built and expanded, the more auto traffic will proliferate.

- A large number of peer reviewed studies have demonstrated a causal link between highway capacity increases and VMT increases. -Technical Advisory on
Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (Office of Planning and Research, 2018)

This EIR denies the relationship of roadway expansion and VMT, claiming instead that increasing roadways will reduce total VMT and greenhouse gas emissions:

VMT would be higher under Alternative 2. Although this alternative was designed to reduce VMT by providing or promoting alternative transportation modes, it did so by eliminating many roadway improvement projects, some of which would reduce congested and total VMT.

The EIR does not specify which roadway improvement projects are purported to reduce congestion and total VMT and present evidence for that claim. The MTP/SCS plans for expansion of Highway 101 near Salinas and Highway 1 in Santa Cruz County, but the EIR fails to discuss the VMT and greenhouse gas impacts of these projects.

The EIR fails to analyze the impact of induced travel. It does not utilize the tools for estimated induced travel recommended by Caltrans’ Transportation Analysis Framework (2020), which was prepared to “establish Caltrans guidance on how to analyze induced travel associated with transportation projects”.

Acknowledging that it failed to analyze major components of induced travel, the Draft EIR makes the unfounded claim that induced travel impacts may be negligible:

Although the AMBAG RTDM [the travel demand model] does not specifically evaluate induced travel from the perspective of longer trips, changes in mode choice, route changes or newly generated induced trips, at the regional level these effects may be negligible compared to the overall amount of travel.

The Transportation Analysis Framework offers a checklist for determining whether a travel demand model has “capabilities required for induced travel assessment”. It states, “In general, a model should pass all five checks before the analyst concludes that the travel demand model is appropriate for making projections of induced travel.” The EIR does not indicate that its travel demand model is capable of measuring induced travel to satisfy CEQA requirements.

The State Office of Planning and Research’s Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (2018) explains that induced travel impacts of highway expansion are not negligible:
A large number of peer reviewed studies have demonstrated a causal link between highway capacity increases and VMT increases. Many provide quantitative estimates of the magnitude of the induced VMT phenomenon. Collectively, they provide high quality evidence of the existence and magnitude of the induced travel effect...Most studies find a long run elasticity between 0.6 and just over 1.0, meaning that every increase in lanes miles of one percent leads to an increase in vehicle travel of 0.6 to 1.0 percent.”

Applying this research to a local example, the auxiliary lane projects planned for Highway 1 in Santa Cruz, adding two auxiliary lanes to the existing 4-lane highway is an increase in lane-miles of 50%. Thus, according to the studies, one would expect an increase in vehicle miles traveled of 30% to 50%. When combined with the other highway expansion projects in the MTP, this increase is not negligible compared to overall amount of travel in the region. The OPR’s Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA states, “Determine the total lane-miles over an area that fully captures travel behavior changes resulting from the project (generally the region,...” We request that the EIR state in detail how it fulfilled this requirement.

The Draft EIR relies on an outmoded, obsolete 2005 technical report:

At the regional level, induced traffic would be a smaller share of total traffic growth, because only trips diverted from other regions, plus substitutions between transportation and other goods, make up the induced share.

This notion that increases in vehicle trips on an expanded highway results in long term reduction of trips on the adjacent road network is not supported by the studies of induced travel. Nor is it consistent with current guidance on evaluating induced travel available in Caltrans’ Transportation Analysis Framework, and the OPR's Technical Advisory On Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA.

If the only induced traffic worthy of analysis at the regional level is trips diverted from other regions plus trip substitutions, that omits a major portion of the induced travel that happens on a local level. This is not consistent with CEQA guidance. The EIR’s conclusion that “the induced travel impact at the regional level would be less than significant” is inconsistent with the research and CEQA guidance.

The failure to accurately estimate the impacts of induced travel makes it highly unlikely that the MTP/SCS meets state emissions standards set by the Air Resources Board.
It also makes the analysis of air quality and health impacts, energy, and greenhouse gas impacts unreliable.

Research suggests that the travel demand model used for this EIR may be of limited accuracy. Could you please explain in detail how the following criticism applies to the model used for this EIR?

The travel time metrics are inaccurate because they rely on Static Traffic Assignment (STA), a 40-year old approach that routinely forecasts unfeasible future traffic flows that exceed capacity. Basing metrics on these impossible volumes produces invalid results. –Marshall, Forecasting the impossible: The status quo of estimating traffic flows with static traffic assignment and the future of dynamic traffic assignment (2018)

Inaccurate Measurement of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction

3. The EIR mistakenly takes credit for state programs such as fuel economy standards to demonstrate that the region will meet its GHG reduction standards. The EIR reports that VMT will increase substantially:

   THE 2045 MTP/SCS WOULD RESULT IN AN INCREASE TO DAILY VMT [vehicle miles traveled] PER CAPITA BETWEEN THE BASELINE 2020 CONDITIONS AND 2045 CONDITIONS.

One would expect greenhouse gas emissions to rise accordingly. Instead, GHG emissions from vehicular travel are projected to decline by 26% in 2045 relative to the 2020 baseline year. (Table 4.8-3) The EIR explains that it counts state programs towards the reduction:

   The estimated reduction in total mobile source emissions would be due to a combination of transportation improvements proposed in the 2045 MTP/SCS and State initiatives….At the State level, stricter fuel efficiency and vehicle emissions standards such as CAFE standards that will phase in over the planning period would decrease emissions from mobile sources, as reflected in EMFAC2017 emission factors.

It is an error to include state programs to demonstrate that the region will meet its GHG reduction standards:

   It is important to note that the current SB 375 program does not allow MPOs to take credit for State programs that improve vehicle emission standards, changes
in fuel composition, and other State measures that will reduce GHG emissions to
demonstrate achievement of their regional targets.
- California Air Resources Board:
  https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-
  06/SB375_Updated_Final_Target_Staff_Report_2018.pdf

This memo from the Air Resources Board correctly interprets the legislative purpose of
SB 375 which seeks to implement greenhouse gas emissions from land use and
transportation planning in addition to state mandated measures such as fuel standards:
Section 1 (c) Greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks can
be substantially reduced by new vehicle technology and by the increased use of
low carbon fuel. However, even taking these measures into account, it will be
necessary to achieve significant additional greenhouse gas reductions from
changed land use patterns and improved transportation. Without improved land
use and transportation policy, California will not be able to achieve the goals of
AB 32.

Counting state programs towards regional reduction targets is a major error requiring a
recalculation of regional greenhouse gas emissions from transportation.

A recalculation is likely to reveal the region’s failure to reach GHG reduction targets,
based on the projection for 2045 GHG emissions that are slightly higher for the
MTP/SCS than for the No Build Alternative. This indicates that the MTP/SCS
contributes insignificantly, if at all, to GHG reduction.

A recalculation requires that amended draft EIR be circulated, since it is likely the new
calculation will substantially alter the impact analysis of air quality and health impacts,
energy, transportation and land use.

Inadequate Alternatives Analysis

4. The Draft EIR violates CEQA Guidelines by invoking Level of Service to reject
   Alternative 3 as a feasible alternative.

   Based on the above analysis and summary in Table 7-7, Alternative 3 is the
   environmentally superior alternative…However, Alternative 3 would substantially
   increase congested VMT and would result in increased delay for freight
compared to the 2045 MTP/SCS and as such, would not meet mobility goals of the project…

It is unlawful to reject the environmentally superior alternative on the grounds of congestion impacts. ("Congested VMT" is defined in Appendix C as Level of Service E or F). Under SB 743, CEQA can no longer use roadway congestion as a measure of significance. The intent of SB 743 includes the following:

More appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. (Caltrans: Transportation Impacts Under CEQA)

This intent subordinates congestion relief to the state’s goals for public health and GHG reduction.

CEQA Guidelines state, “the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.”

5. The Draft EIR’s failure to analyze induced travel results in an unsubstantiated conclusion that Alternative 3 would increase congestion.

The EIR’s estimate that Alternative 3 would increase congestion relative to the MTP/SCS plan is unsupported because the EIR fails to analyze induced travel according to CEQA guidelines. (See #1 above)

6. The Draft EIR’s opinion on the feasibility of Alternative 3 is not substantiated

Alternative 3 may not be feasible in that AMBAG does not have land use authority and cannot require local agencies to make major changes to their general plans that would be required in order for Alternative 3 to be implemented.

While AMBAG does not have authority to require changes in the general plans of local agencies, AMBAG has considerable authority to influence local jurisdictions. Under SB 375, AMBAG is required to identify areas to house the population of the region and to
set forth a development pattern that is integrated with a transportation network which will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. A transportation project that is not listed in AMBAG’s MTP/SCS cannot be developed. This gives AMBAG considerable influence over jurisdictions in the region, as well as Caltrans. Speculation that Alternative 3 “may not be feasible” is misleading.

7. The Draft EIR fails to list Alternative 2 as a superior alternative

*Alternative 2 would result in mostly similar impacts [compared to MTP/SCS], with some reduced impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, population and housing, and tribal cultural resources.*

Since Alternative 2 would result in reduced impacts it should be clearly stated as superior to the MTP/SCS.

8. The Draft EIR fails to propose an alternative that will substantially meet state goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions

CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to set forth “those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.” This draft EIR fails to provide a reasoned choice because it does not set forth an alternative that can make a significant contribution to the reduction of VMT and greenhouse gas emissions. For example it could have combined the features of Alternatives 2 and 3, which would result in significant reduction of impacts. Instead the Draft EIR sets up straw man alternatives whose performance is not significantly different than the MTP/SCS plan. This violates CEQA Guidelines that state, “The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.”

The Draft EIR rejected for analysis the Road Pricing Alternative and the Aggressive VMT Reduction Alternative for reasons that are unfounded:

*Due to the nature of the AMBAG region, certain aggressive VMT reducing measures are infeasible…The rural areas of the AMBAG region are also experiencing higher growth in housing and employment than urban areas.*
The statement does not take into account the EIR’s statement that most growth under the MTP/SCS is planned for urban areas: “Population and job growth are allocated principally within existing urban areas near public transit.” The EIR reports that development in rural areas is increasing as if that were a phenomenon that a MTP/SCS is impotent to affect. However, the mandate to impact the location of development is a core purpose of SB 375.

*Heavy commuter travel and interregional travel to the San Francisco Bay Area for jobs create a jobs-housing imbalance and results in higher VMT for the AMBAG region. Increasing infill development and higher density in the AMBAG region may have very little impact on those long work trips.*

This statement leaves out the jobs-housing imbalance within the region, that can and should be addressed by infill development near job centers.

*tourist generated VMT would not decrease through higher density infill development or with transit improvements.*

This statement ignores the potential for tourist travel on the enhanced regional rail system, and the potential for better integrating the Highway 17 express bus with Valley Transit Authority, and thereby with the wider SF Bay Area transit network.

*Other measures such as higher parking fees as well as tolling highway travel are only feasible in highly urbanized areas where increased transit services are available as an alternative mode.*

This statement conflicts with the evidence from UCSC, where the cost of parking is a key factor resulting in a 17% transit mode share among faculty and staff, and a much higher transit mode share among students. The statement that highway tolls are only feasible where increased transit services are available makes the assumption that the region will not increase its transit service. The best examples of highway tolls reducing VMT are where the toll revenue supports transit service. The EIR makes a self-fulfilling prophecy, in which the decision not to prioritize transit service makes a viable option infeasible.

*Therefore, an aggressive VMT reduction alternative was not considered as an alternative for detailed consideration in this EIR.*
For the reasons stated above, this conclusion is unfounded.

The California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) has prepared the 2021 Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CalSTA 2021). The Climate Action Plan includes strategies to reduce VMT, including developing programs to policies to implement road pricing, also known as VMT fees. However, an alternative that aims to reduce VMT through substantially higher VMT fees would not be feasible in the AMBAG region, as these fees are only feasible in highly urbanized areas where measures like transportation demand management (TDM) strategies are highly effective. Because of the lower densities, rural areas tend to be automobile dependent.

The Draft EIR fails to mention that much of the region is urbanized, with population and job densities that support transit. In a 2018 talk sponsored by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, transit planner Jarrett Walker showed charts of population and job density and said, “For a community of your size and your density, let alone the degree of progressive values that operate in this community, you do not have very much transit.”

The EIR continues to make an unfounded claim that congestion pricing would not work in the region:

Most trips made by personal automobile on a relatively less congested roadway network which doesn’t favor tolling or congestion price strategies. There is often relatively little demand for alternative modes, such as transit, cycling and walk (such alternative travel modes are only feasible and cost effective for a shorter trip in length and time)

The statement that most trips occur on a “relatively less congested roadway network” is at odds with the reality experienced by many auto commuters. For example, Highway 1 in Santa Cruz County is just as congested as some major highways in large metropolitan areas, and would benefit from congestion pricing that supports express transit in bus-only lanes on the Highway. The Soquel Drive corridor is an exceptionally good candidate for congestion pricing due to the spill-over traffic from Highway 1. With congestion pricing, buses on Soquel Dr. would be more efficient. The same is true for the potential for congestion pricing at the two entrances to the UCSC campus, which would have the effect of stimulating demand for transit and cycling.

Because the AMBAG region does not contain areas with the same high density land uses and robust transit systems as these large metropolitan cities, and
because AMBAG does not have the legal authority to impose VMT fees, this alternative was [not] considered as an alternative for detailed consideration in the EIR.

As with the EIR’s earlier statement that AMBAG does not have the authority to channel development to urban areas instead of rural areas, the argument lacks merit. As stated above, there is significant potential for congestion pricing in the AMBAG area. AMBAG does not need the legal authority to impose VMT fees, since it has the authority to require such mitigations by jurisdictions in the region. AMBAG can work with Caltrans, which has a mandate to use road pricing to reduce VMT:

Expand toll lane use or develop other pricing-based strategy options: This option would consist of expanding the use of toll lanes or developing other pricing strategies, such as increasing parking prices in an area, to reduce VMT. - Caltrans, Transportation Analysis Under CEQA (2020)

Because the EIR did not propose an alternative that could better meet state goals for GHG emissions, the EIR’s conclusion that 2045 MTP/SCS would not result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources is not valid. A plan resulting in lower VMT would waste less energy.

9. Some performance estimates are inconsistent with empirical realities

According to Appendix C, the percentage of jobs within a half mile of quality regional transit in Alternative 2 will be 31.7% and Alternative 3 will be 30.5%,---significantly higher than the 24.8% for the MTP/SCS plan. This significant advantage of the alternatives is not reflected in projected transit ridership. Since the EIR does not explain the assumptions that result in this conclusion, it is reasonable to surmise that the methodology for estimating transit ridership is less reliable than that of estimating where the jobs will be located.

There are other anomalies that cast doubt on the credibility of the analysis. For example the number of bicycle and walking trips in Alternative 2 is equal to that of the project— in spite of $1.4 billion spent on alternative transportation in Alternative 2 compared to the project. Similarly, the number of transit trips for Alternative 3 is negligibly different from that of the project, in spite of $2.2 billion spent on transit infrastructure compared to the project. This analysis suggests that significant investment in transit, bicycle and
pedestrian infrastructure has no impact on people’s behavior. However, empirical studies have shown the opposite.\(^1\)

EIR conclusions need to be based on supported facts and evidence. The EIR Draft needs to resolve the disparity between its conclusions and the research. Caltrans’ Transportation Analysis Framework states:

> Documentation of each fact relied upon, each inference derived from established facts and the logical approach taken to reach a conclusion are necessary so others, including a court if the matter is litigated, can follow the analytical path taken by the practitioner.

10. **The MTP/SCS plans inadequately meet the project objectives**

Project objectives include:

- **Healthy Communities.** Protect the health of residents; foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing and employment choices and encourage active transportation.
- **Social Equity.** Provide an equitable level of transportation services to all segments of the population.

The EIR acknowledges that funding for the transit and active transportation infrastructure envisioned by Alternatives 2 and 3 results from “less investment in local streets, roads, and highways compared to the proposed 2045 MTP/SCS.” By prioritizing expenditures on roads and highways over active transportation and transit, the MTP/SCS negatively impacts all residents and especially low income sectors of the population that are more dependent on transit and active transportation. The result is a poverty of mobility, where those who don’t drive are second class citizens. Auto dependency requires low income households to spend a greater percentage of income on transportation.\(^2\)

The health impacts of auto dependency are well researched.\(^3\) In U.S. cities, researchers blame traffic pollution for a quarter of all new childhood asthma cases.\(^4\) According to the Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency, 54% of fatal or serious injury crashes occur on 6% of county streets. More than half of these streets are in low income

---

\(^1\) [https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/research-innovation-system-](https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/research-innovation-system-)


\(^3\) Frumkin, Frank, Jackson, *Urban Sprawl and Public Health*;

\(^4\) [https://e360.yale.edu/digest/vehicle-pollution-causes-4-million-new-child-asthma-cases-every-year](https://e360.yale.edu/digest/vehicle-pollution-causes-4-million-new-child-asthma-cases-every-year)
neighborhoods. In our region, there is considerable overlap between low income people and brown people. Is the EIR required to conduct a racial equity analysis?

The road and highway expansion projects in the MTP worsen the community’s auto dependency, which in turn has environmental impacts. The EIR is required to evaluate these impacts. CEQA Guidelines state:

*If the physical change causes adverse economic or social effects on people, those adverse effects may be used as a factor in determining whether the physical change is significant.*

**The EIR Needs to Require Mitigations**

11. The EIR needs to mandate mitigation for increased VMT, rather than suggest that agencies “can and should” implement mitigations

Transportation project sponsor agencies shall evaluate transportation projects that involve increasing roadway capacity for their potential to increase VMT. Where project level increases are found to be potentially significant, implementing agencies shall, or can and should, identify and implement measures that reduce VMT.

As stated by Caltrans’ Transportation Analysis under CEQA:

*Where changes to the project or project alternatives cannot avoid or substantially lessen the significant impact, mitigation is required.*

The Caltrans guidance also states that mitigations need to be identified early in the process:

*As a project proceeds toward final design it becomes increasingly difficult to achieve feasible, proportional project-level VMT mitigation for a capacity-increasing roadway project. Therefore, for capacity-increasing projects, early coordination and scoping of mitigation opportunities is advisable.*

12. The EIR needs to mandate VMT and greenhouse gas reduction mitigations that are proportional to their impact

---

5 Report: *The Impact of Traffic Violence on Santa Cruz County*
The mitigation measure must be “roughly proportional” to the impacts of the project. (Dolan v. City of Tigard, 512 U.S. 374 (1994)).

13. Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments.

It doesn’t appear that the Draft EIR has satisfied the enforceability requirement or the following requirements:

The discussion of mitigation measures shall distinguish between the measures which are proposed by project proponents to be included in the project and other measures proposed by the lead, responsible or trustee agency or other persons which are not included but the lead agency determines could reasonably be expected to reduce adverse impacts if required as conditions of approving the project. This discussion shall identify mitigation measures for each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR. -CEQA Guidelines

Nor does it appear that the Draft EIR has met the following requirement for monitoring mitigations.

Consistent with section 15126.4(a), lead agencies shall consider feasible means, supported by substantial evidence and subject to monitoring or reporting, of mitigating the significant effects of greenhouse gas emissions

14. Requirement of a subsequent EIR for Highway Expansion Projects

The Draft EIR should state that prior EIR’s for highway expansion projects did not adequately address significant effects of vehicle miles traveled due to induced travel, because they were prepared before current CEQA and Caltrans guidance on estimating induced travel and the requirement to mitigate increased VMT and GHG emissions. The Draft EIR should state that a revised, updated EIR is required for these projects.

A later EIR shall be required when the initial study or other analysis finds that the later project may cause significant effects on the environment that were not adequately addressed in the prior EIR...

If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration. -CEQA Guidelines

If a later EIR for these highway projects is not performed, this would allow the MTP/SCS to sidestep its responsibility under state law to require mitigations for greenhouse gas emissions for these projects, since the prior EIR’s for highway expansion do not require such mitigations.
A striking example of a need for a revised EIR is the plan to include so-called “bus on shoulder” operations as part of the auxiliary lane construction on Highway 1 in Santa Cruz County. The Tier I EIR for the HOV Lane Project included analysis of constructing auxiliary lanes in the project area. However, there was not a single mention of Bus on Shoulder in the document. Thus the alternative configurations for bus-on-shoulder were not analyzed. This includes a bus-only lane on the shoulder of the highway. Such a configuration is the very definition of bus-on-shoulder as it exists in other cities. However, the proposed “bus on shoulder” as part of the Porter Ave to State Park Drive auxiliary lanes would operate buses in the auxiliary lanes where they would share the lanes with other vehicle traffic, resulting in a substantial delay for bus operations. This failure of environmental review to analyze the alternatives could result in significant loss of ridership potential.
January 30th, 2022

Dear Commissioners

For years as an advocate for Sustainable Transportation and a sustainable environment for our tri-county area I have concluded that our SCCRTC, AMBAG and those in charge of planning and executing of transportation projects seem mostly comfortable with business as usual and limiting their efforts to follow the State of California’s Climate Action Policy.

After studying EIRs from AMBAG and Caltrans it seems most of the effort goes to finding ways to avoid following the State of California’s environmental mandates, the Governors executive orders on climate action, and getting around CEQA requirements. If the same energy could be used on ways to help mitigate the effects of Climate Change during our planning efforts we could be on our way to slowing down this existential threat to our planet and life as we know it.

Ignoring these mandates is allowing the effects of climate change to continue its increasing effect of global warming. All decisions concerning transportation projects, housing infill and sustainable planning should have at its core “are we helping to mitigate climate change?” There are no excuses not to do this.

As an example, since 2016, with the exception of our adoption of a CCE (Community Choice Energy), our transportation commissions and AMBAG have done very little to address climate change. Putting in a few green bike lanes, fixing some pedestrian intersections and not pursuing a mass transit system on the rail corridor is a poor start to a sustainable future.

Instead we have attained funding to widen Highway 1 with an addition of a bus on shoulder shared with cars. A more functional description of this hybrid system is buses stuck in traffic. The City of Santa Cruz also approved highway 1/9 Intersection/Improvement project, which includes highway and bridge widening to accommodate more cars.

The city of Santa Cruz is pursuing a major multi-use project, which includes a 310 space parking structure. Not needed according to the parking studies.

We are still too focused on car infrastructure and trying to appease a car eccentric voting base that has been uninvolved, and a leadership that is unwilling to make the tough choices.

A paradigm shift is needed to change this car dependent society. Funding must be reversed, with a majority going to public mass transit, and a robust school bus system. Living at the choke point in Aptos I have seen first hand the decrease in traffic during school holidays.

May I make a suggestion to the planners and those that make these obsolete decisions that do not reflect the realities and direction we must go in the future? Take some time and do a little more research to adopt exciting green sustainable transportation ideas from European cities.

In summary, my opinion is you may be opening yourself up to litigation. A lot of the draft EIR (MTP/SCS ) reasoning to eliminate the alternatives seems unfounded and just opinion oriented. As
an example the use of the rural excuse to not develop a robust mass transit is just conjecture. If you were to focus on where the majority of our population lives, Carmel to Salinas and up to Scotts Valley. You would find that 80% or more of our population resides in that corridor. It is also the most heavily travelled corridor in our county used by locals and visitors to our beautiful area.

As a Climate activist and very concerned citizen about the lack of concern by our governing bodies over climate change, I implore AMBAG and the SCCRTC to redo this EIR (MTP/SCS) with a combination of alternative #2 and #3 scenarios.

Sincerely,

Micheal Saint
From: Maryam Dolatshahi
To: 2045 RTP
Subject: Saving Lives By Moving The Sugarloaf Project to The Constrained List
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 12:34:28 PM

To the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission:

I live off of Sugarloaf Road and I’d like to submit comments regarding the potential Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Interchange project as part of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. This project is listed at the bottom of page 2 of 54 on the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List: https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/rptRTP2045draftCONuncon.pdf.

I have personally seen people almost die at this junction and if this isn't completed in the next 23 years, someone will finally lose their life.

This project has been talked about for many years and I am disappointed to see that it is listed as unconstrained in the next 23 years. This project is incredibly important and should be moved to the constrained list with funding secured.

As traffic has increased throughout the entire bay area, Highway 17 has become increasingly dangerous to drive. In fact, as I am sure you are aware, Highway 17 is one of the most dangerous roads in the country. According to a CBS Bay Area article from 2017, the number of collisions on Highway 17 has more than quadrupled in the last decade. - https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/05/15/stats-show-hwy-17-growing-more-dangerous-for-commuters/. And according to a 2019 Mercury News article, the number of fatal and injury collisions has increased substantially in recent years - https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/09/22/highway-17-crashes-remain-on-troubling-rise/. It is imperative that we do everything we can to reduce accidents, injuries, and deaths on Highway 17.

Accidents on Highway 17 and the traffic jams they cause have far-reaching effects including:

- Those involved who often tragically lose their lives or sustain other injuries and their families
- Strain on our first responders including CHP, Fire, Sheriff, EMS and other personnel
- Those who commute Highway 17 every day
- Others who drive Highway 17 occasionally to go to the beach or for other activities
- The thousands of people who live in communities off of Highway 17

Highway 17 is uniquely dangerous in a number of different aspects: it has heavy traffic, sharp turns, blind curves, slippery winter conditions, narrow shoulders, animals crossing, and perhaps most significantly - it functions as both a highway with fast-moving vehicles and also as a local road for thousands of people who live along it to access their neighborhoods and driveways.

These very different dual uses do not mix well and create “conflict points” where vehicle slow to exit, accelerate from a complete stop to enter, and make left turns. These actions create unexpected changes in traffic flow, especially significant when...
traffic is heavier. As a result, these conflict points are the cause of many serious accidents, the ensuing strain on first responders, and the stopped traffic and delays for anyone using the highway.

It is important that we reduce these conflict points to allow vehicles to move more efficiently and safely. There are currently 28 conflict points at Sugarloaf/Laurel/Glenwood Cutoff and this project would reduce that number to 4. This project is also in alignment with the efforts to install a wildlife habitat connectivity crossing.

For those of us that live along Highway 17, it has become increasingly dangerous to enter and exit our homes (with no commercial uses in any of these neighborhoods, we need to access Highway 17 to go anywhere). As a resident of Sugarloaf, I would gladly travel farther on frontage streets in exchange for the safety and reliability of an interchange at this location.

This project is vital to enhancing the safety, mobility, and accessibility on Hwy 17 and I hope you will consider moving it to the constrained list with funding secured.

Thank you,
Maryam
--
Maryam Dolatshahi, MD
To the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission:

I live off of Sugarloaf Road and I’d like to submit comments regarding the potential Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Interchange project as part of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. This project is listed at the bottom of page 2 of 54 on the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List: https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/rptRTP2045draftCONuncon.pdf.

I have personally seen people almost die at this junction and if this isn’t completed in the next 23 years, someone will finally lose their life.

This project has been talked about for many years and I am disappointed to see that it is listed as unconstrained in the next 23 years. This project is incredibly important and should be moved to the constrained list with funding secured.

As traffic has increased throughout the entire bay area, Highway 17 has become increasingly dangerous to drive. In fact, as I am sure you are aware, Highway 17 is one of the most dangerous roads in the country. According to a CBS Bay Area article from 2017, the number of collisions on Highway 17 has more than quadrupled in the last decade. And according to a 2019 Mercury News article, the number of fatal and injury collisions has increased substantially in recent years. It is imperative that we do everything we can to reduce accidents, injuries, and deaths on Highway 17.

Accidents on Highway 17 and the traffic jams they cause have far-reaching effects including:

- Those involved who often tragically lose their lives or sustain other injuries and their families
- Strain on our first responders including CHP, Fire, Sheriff, EMS and other personnel
- Those who commute Highway 17 every day
- Others who drive Highway 17 occasionally to go to the beach or for other activities
- The thousands of people who live in communities off of Highway 17

Highway 17 is uniquely dangerous in a number of different aspects: it has heavy traffic, sharp turns, blind curves, slippery winter conditions, narrow shoulders, animals crossing, and perhaps most significantly - it functions as both a highway with fast-moving vehicles and also as a local road for thousands of people who live along it to access their neighborhoods and driveways.

These very different dual uses do not mix well and create “conflict points” where vehicle slow to exit, accelerate from a complete stop to enter, and make left turns. These actions create unexpected changes in traffic flow, especially significant when traffic is heavier. As a result, these conflict points are the cause of many serious accidents, the ensuing strain on first responders, and the stopped traffic and delays for anyone using the highway.

It is important that we reduce these conflict points to allow vehicles to move more efficiently and safely. There are currently 28 conflict points at Sugarloaf/Laurel/Glenwood Cutoff and this project would reduce that number to 4. This project is also in alignment with the efforts to install a wildlife habitat connectivity crossing.

For those of us that live along Highway 17, it has become increasingly dangerous to enter and exit our homes (with no commercial uses in any of these neighborhoods, we need to access Highway 17 to go anywhere). As a resident of Sugarloaf, I would gladly travel farther on frontage streets in exchange for the safety and reliability of an interchange at this location.
This project is vital to enhancing the safety, mobility, and accessibility on Hwy 17 and I hope you will consider moving it to the constrained list with funding secured.

Thank you,

Hossain
Dear Regional Transportation Commission,

Attached please find a letter from the Center for Biological Diversity regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy for Santa Cruz County ("RTP/SCS"). The references for the letter are available for download here.

As noted in the letter, we also request a meeting with staff and/or appropriate Board members to discuss the recommendations in the letter.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Elizabeth

Elizabeth Reid-Wainscoat (she/her)
Urban Wildlands Campaigner
CENTER for BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
660 S. Figueroa Street #1000
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Cell: (831) 428-3312
ereidwainscoat@biologicaldiversity.org
January 31, 2022

Sent via email

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
2045rtp@sccrtc.org

Re: Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Report for Santa Cruz County’s Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy

Dear Regional Transportation Commission:

These comments are submitted on behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity (the “Center”) regarding the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) for the Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy for Santa Cruz County (“RTP/SCS”). The Center has reviewed the DEIR and RTP/SCS and provides these comments for consideration by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (“SC RTC”). As outlined in further detail below, we urge SC RTC to ensure that the DEIR fully considers and mitigates the impacts of the RTP/SCS on mountain lions, wildlife connectivity, and wildfire. As currently written, we are concerned that the DEIR does not meet these goals.

The Center is a non-profit, public interest environmental organization dedicated to the protection of native species and their habitats through science, policy, and environmental law. The Center has over 1.7 million members and online activists throughout California and the United States. The Center and its members have worked for many years to protect imperiled plants and wildlife, open space, air and water quality, and overall quality of life for people in California.

We urge SC RTC staff and the Board to consider and implement the recommendations in this letter so that the RTP/SCS complies with applicable laws. We also request a meeting with staff or appropriate Board members to discuss how these recommendations can be implemented.
I. The EIR Must Analyze and Mitigate Impacts of the RTP/SCS to Mountain Lions \((Puma concolor)\) throughout Santa Cruz County.

We are concerned that the DEIR does not adequately analyze or mitigate impacts of the RTP/SCS on mountain lions. Mountain lions in Santa Cruz County are part of the “Central Coast North” population of mountain lions, which is provisionally listed under the California Endangered Species Act (“CESA”) (Yap et al. 2019). In compliance with CESA, all projects associated with the RTP/SCS must be designed to allow safe passage of mountain lions under or over transportation projects that cross mountain lion movement corridors. (Fish & Game Code § 2054.) In addition, any structures adjacent to open space should include mitigation measures that reduce or eliminate mountain lion conflict (e.g., livestock should be kept in lion-proof enclosures at night), lighting should be turned away from open space, noise should be limited, pet cats and dogs should be kept indoors, and measures that reduce the risk of wildfire ignitions and/or spread should be required (e.g., avoiding new development in fire-prone areas and retrofitting existing communities with solar microgrids, ember-resistant vents and roofing, and 100-foot buffer immediately adjacent to structures with lightly irrigated native vegetation).

We were unable to find any such discussion in the DEIR. The omission is inconsistent with SC RTC’s obligations under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”). CEQA requires an EIR to provide decision-making bodies and the public with detailed information about the effect a proposed project is likely to have on the environment, to list ways in which the significant effects of a project might be minimized, and to indicate alternatives to the project. (Pub. Res. Code § 21061.) CEQA further requires a lead agency to mitigate to the extent feasible significant impacts. (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.4.) More specifically, CEQA requires a “mandatory finding of significance” if there is substantial evidence in the record that a proposed plan or project may cause a “wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species . . . .” (CEQA Guidelines § 15065(a)(1).) This means that a project or plan is deemed to have a significant impact on the environment as a matter of law if it reduces the habitat of a species, or reduces the number or range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species. (See Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. County of Orange (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 777, 792 fn. 12 [citing Defend the Bay v. City of Irvine (2004) 119 Cal.App.4th 1261, 1273–1274].)

Here, any further impairment of connectivity or destruction of habitat has the potential to significantly impact the Central Coast North mountain lions, as well as the broader Evolutionarily Significant Unit (“ESU”). By way of background, there is ample scientific evidence that indicates mountain lion populations in Southern California and the Central Coast are threatened and that human activities and land use planning that does not integrate adequate habitat connectivity can have adverse impacts on mountain lions. Continued habitat loss and fragmentation has led to 10 genetically isolated populations within California. Several populations in Southern California are facing an extinction vortex due to high levels of inbreeding, low genetic diversity, and high human-caused mortality rates from car strikes on roads, depredation kills, rodenticide poisoning, poaching, disease, and increased human-caused wildfires (Ernest et al. 2003; Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Benson et al. 2016; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). This is detailed in the Center’s petition to
the California Fish and Game Commission to protect Southern California and Central Coast mountain lions under CESA (Yap et al. 2019).

The primary threat to the long-term survival of mountain lions in the Southern California/Central Coast ESU is genetic isolation due to lack of connectivity caused by continuous development in mountain lion habitat with little regard of their movement needs. Thus, the persistence of the populations within Santa Cruz County relies heavily on being connected with mountain lions throughout the ESU as well as statewide. Mountain lions are wide ranging species that have home ranges of 75 to 200 mi²; clearly, anthropogenic barriers are likely limiting their movement and preventing adequate gene flow for the long-term survival of mountain lions throughout the SC RTC region (Ernest et al. 2003; Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015; Gustafson et al. 2018; Benson et al. 2019). Yet the RTP/SCS will likely result in the allocation of funding for freeway and road expansions/widenings/construction without adequate mitigation for mountain lion specific wildlife connectivity, which fragments the landscape more severely and propagates sprawl development further out into mountain lion habitat and movement corridors. Such development without addressing wildlife connectivity issues and integrating effective mountain lion specific wildlife crossings and corridors could lead to the extirpation of multiple mountain lion populations in the Santa Cruz and Central Coast region.

As the last remaining wide-ranging top predator in the region, impacts to mountain lions in the Santa Cruz Region could have severe ecological consequences; loss of the keystone species could have ripple effects on other plant and animal species, potentially leading to a decrease in biodiversity and diminished overall ecosystem function. In some ecosystems that lack mountain lions, increased deer populations can overgraze vegetation and cause stream banks to erode (Ripple and Beschta 2006; Ripple and Beschta 2008). Many scavengers, including foxes, raptors, and numerous insects, can lose a reliable food source without mountain lions (Ruth and Elbroch 2014; Barry et al. 2019). Fish, birds, amphibians, reptiles, rare native plants, and butterflies could diminish if this apex predator were lost (Ripple and Beschta 2006; Ripple and Beschta 2008; Ripple et al. 2014).

SC RTC also has an obligation to protect species that are listed or provisionally listed under CESA, including Central Coast and Southern California mountain lions. Under CESA, the SC RTC may not approve projects (including the RTP/SCS) that could jeopardize the continued existence of these populations or result in destruction of essential habitat (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2053(a) and SC RTC must require that appropriate mitigation measures be implemented for projects that could destroy mountain lion habitat or impair connectivity (Cal. Fish & Game Code § 2054).
Given that the Central Coast North mountain lion population are a candidate species under the CESA, the DEIR must be revised and recirculated to analyze and fully mitigate potential impacts on these populations in compliance with both CESA and CEQA.

II. The EIR Must Analyze and Mitigate Impacts of the RTP/SCS on Wildlife Movement and Habitat Connectivity.

The EIR must analyze the potential impacts of the RTP/SCS and its associated projects on wildlife connectivity. Roads and development create barriers that lead to habitat loss and fragmentation, which harms native wildlife, plants, and people. As barriers to wildlife movement, poorly-planned development and roads can affect an animal’s behavior, movement patterns, reproductive success, and physiological state, which can lead to significant impacts on individual wildlife, populations, communities, landscapes, and ecosystem function (Mitsch and Wilson 1996; Trombulak and Frissell 2000; van der Ree et al. 2011; Brehme et al. 2013; Haddad et al. 2015; Marsh and Jaeger 2015; Ceia-Hasse et al. 2018). For example, as noted above, habitat fragmentation from roads and development has been shown to cause mortalities and harmful genetic isolation in mountain lions in southern California (Ernest et al. 2014; Riley et al. 2014; Vickers et al. 2015), increase local extinction risk in amphibians and reptiles (Cushman 2006; Brehme et al. 2018), cause high levels of avoidance behavior and mortality in birds and insects (Benítez-López et al. 2010; Loss et al. 2014; Kantola et al. 2019), and alter pollinator behavior and degrade habitats (Trombulak and Frissell 2000; Goverde et al. 2002; Aguilar et al. 2008). Habitat fragmentation also severely impacts plant communities. An 18-year study found that reconnected landscapes had nearly 14% more plant species compared to fragmented habitats, and that number is likely to continue to rise as time passes (Damschen et al. 2019). The authors conclude that efforts to preserve and enhance connectivity will pay off over the long-term (Damschen et al. 2019). In addition, connectivity between high quality habitat areas in heterogeneous landscapes is important to allow for range shifts and species migrations as climate changes (Heller and Zavaleta 2009; Cushman et al. 2013; Krosby et al. 2018). Loss of wildlife connectivity decreases biodiversity and degrades ecosystems.

Edge effects of development in and adjacent to open space will likely impact key, wide-ranging predators, such as mountain lions and bobcats (Crooks 2002; Riley et al. 2006; Delaney et al. 2010; Lee et al. 2012; Smith et al. 2015; Vickers et al. 2015; Smith et al. 2017; Wang et al. 2017), as well as smaller species with poor dispersal abilities, such as song birds, small mammals, and herpetofauna (Cushman 2006; Slabbekoorn and Ripmeester 2008; Benítez-López et al. 2010; Kociolek et al. 2011). Limiting movement and dispersal can affect species’ ability to find food, shelter, mates, and refugia after disturbances like fires or floods. Individuals can die off, populations can become isolated, sensitive species can become locally extinct, and important ecological processes like plant pollination and nutrient cycling can be lost. Negative edge effects from human activity, such as traffic, lighting, noise, domestic pets, pollutants, invasive weeds, and increased fire frequency, have been found to be biologically significant up to 300 meters (~1000 feet) away from anthropogenic features in terrestrial systems (Environmental Law Institute 2003).
The EIR must also consider corridor redundancy (*i.e.* the availability of alternative pathways for movement) because it allows for improved functional connectivity and resilience. Compared to a single pathway, multiple connections between habitat patches increase the probability of movement across landscapes by a wider variety of species, and they provide more habitat for low-mobility species while still allowing for their dispersal (Mcrae et al., 2012; Olson & Burnett, 2008; Pinto & Keitt, 2008). In addition, corridor redundancy provides resilience to uncertainty, impacts of climate change, and extreme events, like flooding or wildfires, by providing alternate escape routes or refugia for animals seeking safety (Cushman et al., 2013; Mcrae et al., 2008; Mcrae et al., 2012; Olson & Burnett, 2008; Pinto & Keitt, 2008).

Corridor redundancy is critical when considering the impacts of climate change on wildlife movement and habitat connectivity. Climate change is increasing stress on species and ecosystems, causing changes in distribution, phenology, physiology, vital rates, genetics, ecosystem structure and processes, and increasing species extinction risk (Warren et al. 2011). A 2016 analysis found that climate-related local extinctions are already widespread and have occurred in hundreds of species, including almost half of the 976 species surveyed (Wiens 2016). A separate study estimated that nearly half of terrestrial non-flying threatened mammals and nearly one-quarter of threatened birds may have already been negatively impacted by climate change in at least part of their distribution (Pacifici et al. 2017). A 2016 meta-analysis reported that climate change is already impacting 82 percent of key ecological processes that form the foundation of healthy ecosystems and on which humans depend for basic needs (Scheffers et al. 2016). Genes are changing, species’ physiology and physical features such as body size are changing, species are moving to try to keep pace with suitable climate space, species are shifting their timing of breeding and migration, and entire ecosystems are under stress (Parmesan and Yohe 2003; Root et al. 2003; Parmesan 2006; Chen et al. 2011; Maclean and Wilson 2011; Warren et al. 2011; Cahill et al. 2012).

The DEIR must also analyze the RTP/SCS’s potential impacts to riparian corridors. Riparian ecosystems have long been recognized as biodiversity hotspots performing important ecological functions in a transition zone between freshwater systems and upland habitats. Many species that rely on these aquatic habitats also rely on the adjacent upland habitats (*e.g.*, riparian areas along streams, and grassland habitat adjacent to wetlands). In fact, 60% of amphibian species, 16% of reptiles, 34% of birds and 12% of mammals in the Pacific Coast ecoregion depend on riparian-stream systems for survival (Kelsey and West 1998). Many other species, including mountain lions and bobcats, often use riparian areas and natural ridgelines as migration corridors or foraging habitat (Dickson et al, 2005; Hilty & Merenlender, 2004; Jennings & Lewison, 2013; Jennings & Zeller, 2017). Additionally, fish rely on healthy upland areas to influence suitable spawning habitat (Lohse et al. 2008), and agricultural encroachment on these habitats and over-aggressive removal of riparian areas have been identified as a major driver of declines in freshwater and anadromous fish (*e.g.*, Stillwater Sciences 2002; Lohse et al. 2008; Moyle et al. 2011). Therefore, buffers that allow for connectivity between the aquatic resource and upland habitat is vital for many species to persist.
It is estimated that 90-95% of historic riparian habitat in the state has been lost (Bowler 1989; Riparian Habitat Joint Venture 2009). Using 2002 land cover data from CalFire, the Riparian Habitat Joint Venture estimated that riparian vegetation makes up less than 0.5% of California’s total land area at about 360,000 acres (Riparian Habitat Joint Venture 2004). This is alarming because riparian habitats perform a number of biological and physical functions that benefit wildlife, plants, and humans, and loss of what little is left will have severe, harmful impacts on special-status species, overall biodiversity, and ecosystem function. California cannot afford to lose more riparian corridors.

A literature review found that recommended buffers for wildlife often far exceeded 100 meters (~325 feet), well beyond the largest buffers implemented in practice (Robins 2002). For example, Kilgo et al. (1998) recommend more than 1,600 feet of riparian buffer to sustain bird diversity. In addition, amphibians, which are considered environmental health indicators, have been found to migrate over 1,000 feet between aquatic and terrestrial habitats through multiple life stages (Semlitsch and Bodie 2003; Trenham and Shaffer 2005; Cushman 2006; Fellers and Kleeman 2007). Accommodating the more long-range dispersers is vital for continued survival of species populations and/or recolonization following a local extinction (Semlitsch and Bodie 2003; Cushman 2006). In addition, more extensive buffers provide resiliency in the face of climate change-driven alterations to these habitats, which will cause shifts in species ranges and distributions (Cushman et al., 2013; Heller & Zavaleta, 2009; Warren et al., 2011). This emphasizes the need for sizeable riparian and upland buffers around streams and wetlands in and adjacent to any project included in the RTP/SCS, as well as connectivity corridors between heterogeneous habitats. Again, the EIR must adequately assess and mitigate impacts to local, regional, and global wildlife movement and habitat connectivity.

It is widely recognized that the continuing fragmentation of habitat by humans threatens biodiversity and diminishes our (humans, plants, and animals) ability to adapt to climate change. In a report for the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), world-renowned scientists from around the world stated that “[s]cience overwhelmingly shows that interconnected protected areas and other areas for biological diversity conservation are much more effective than disconnected areas in human-dominated systems, especially in the face of climate change” and “[i]t is imperative that the world moves toward a coherent global approach for ecological connectivity conservation, and begins to measure and monitor the effectiveness of efforts to protect connectivity and thereby achieve functional ecological networks” (Hilty et al. 2020).

Given the potential for projects authorized or streamlined by the RTP/SCS to fragment and destroy important habitat, including riparian areas, the Center urges the SC RTC to avoid further fragmentation and degradation of existing, intact, heterogeneous habitats and incorporate clear and enforceable wildlife connectivity mitigation measures that address the needs of target species into the RTP/SCS and EIR.

While DEIR does include some measures specifically for fencing, lighting and drainage systems, it does not include specific measures related to roads, nor does it provide detailed mitigation for target species (DEIR, page 4.4-46). The RTP/SCS should encourage the involvement of wildlife connectivity experts from CDFW and other agencies, organizations,
academic institutions, communities, and local groups starting at the initial planning stage of development and transportation projects so that habitat connectivity can be strategically integrated into project design and appropriately considered in the project budget. The RTP/SCS should require road and highway projects to include adequate wildlife crossing infrastructure in order to reduce impacts to mountain lions and other species.

In incorporating such measures into future drafts of the EIR and RTP/SCS, it is important to consider that different species have different behaviors and needs that affect how they move. For example, smaller species with poor dispersal abilities, like rodents and herpetofauna, would require more frequent intervals of crossings compared to larger wide-ranging species, like mountain lions or coyotes, to increase their chances of finding a crossing. Gunson et al. (2016) recommend that crossing structures generally be spaced about 300m (~0.19mi) apart for small animals when transportation infrastructure bisects large expanses of continuous habitat, though they recognize that some amphibians may need more frequent crossings no more than 50m (~0.03mi) apart. And for many amphibian and reptile species, undercrossings should have grated tops so that the light and moisture inside the crossings are similar to that of the ambient environment. Brehme and Fisher (2020) also provides additional guidance regarding amphibian crossings. Therefore, multiple crossings designed for different target species may be required. In-depth analyses that include on-the-ground movement studies of which species are moving in the area and their home range area, habitat use, and patterns of movement are needed to determine how to best implement such crossings. In addition, associated crossing infrastructure (e.g., exclusionary fencing appropriate for target species, berms to buffer crossings from sound and light) should be included to improve chances of wildlife using crossings, and such crossings and associated infrastructure should be designed and built in consultation with local and regional experts, including agency biologists. And to improve the effectiveness of any wildlife crossings, there should be protected habitat on both sides of the crossing; therefore, mitigation should also include acquiring unprotected lands on both sides of the roads where a wildlife crossing would be implemented, again, in consultation with local conservation organizations and stakeholders, and preserving and managing those lands in perpetuity to ensure that the wildlife crossings and associated infrastructure remain functional over time. Given that impacts of noise, light, and vibration can affect the use of wildlife crossings, even if crossings are designed with adequate parameters and fencing, the crossings should be built with wildlife responsive design; crossings should have sound and light berms to minimize light and sound at the entrance/exit as well as on/in/under the crossings structures, and they should be well-maintained on both sides of the crossing for animals to use them (Shilling 2020; Vickers 2020).
Here are some additional mitigation measures that should be included in the EIR that projects should be required to implement if they are to be considered “consistent” with the RTP/SCS or receive funding from SC RTP:

- Lead agency shall consult with applicable counties, cities, Tribes, and other local organizations when impacts may occur to open space areas that have been designated as important for wildlife movement related to local ordinances or conservation plans.

- Lead agency and/or project applicant shall design projects to minimize impacts to wildlife movement and habitat connectivity and preserve existing and functional wildlife corridors.

- Lead agency must conduct site-specific analyses of opportunities to preserve or improve habitat linkages with areas on- and off-site.

- For long linear projects with the possibility of impacting wildlife movement (e.g., road expansion), lead agency shall analyze habitat linkages/wildlife movement corridors on a broad scale to avoid critical narrow choke points that could reduce the function of recognized movement corridors.

- Lead agency must require review of construction drawings and habitat connectivity mapping by a qualified biologist to determine the risk of habitat fragmentation.

- For projects with impacts to habitat linkages or corridors, lead agency shall ensure adequate preservation and mitigation of habitat linkages and corridors (e.g., through mitigation banking or purchasing, maintaining or restoring offsite habitat).

- Lead agency shall design projects to promote wildlife corridor redundancy by including multiple connections between habitat patches.

- Lead agency shall install overpasses, underpasses, or culverts as appropriate to create wildlife crossings in cases where a roadway or other transportation project may interrupt the flow of species through their habitat. Retrofitting of existing infrastructure in project areas should also be considered for wildlife crossings for purposes of mitigation.

- Lead agency shall install wildlife fencing where appropriate to minimize the probability of wildlife injury due to direct interaction between wildlife and roads or construction.

- Where avoidance of impacts is determined by the lead agency to be infeasible, the lead agency shall design sufficient conservation measures through coordination with local agencies and the regulatory agency (i.e., United States Fish and Wildlife Service and/or CDFW) and in accordance with the respective county and city general plans to establish plans to mitigate for the loss of fish and wildlife movement corridors and/or wildlife nursery sites. The consideration of conservation measures may include the following measures, where applicable: Wildlife movement buffer zones, appropriately spaced...
breaks in center barriers, culverts, construction of wildlife crossings such as freeway under- or overpasses, other comparable measures.

- Lead agency shall implement berms and sound/sight barriers at all wildlife crossings to encourage wildlife to utilize crossings. Sound and lighting should also be minimized in developed areas, particularly those that are adjacent to or go through natural habitats.

- Lead agency shall reduce lighting impacts on sensitive species through implementation of mitigation measures including, but not limited to:
  
  o Use high pressure sodium and/or cut-off fixtures instead of typical mercury vapor fixtures for outdoor lighting;

  o Design exterior lighting to confine illumination to the project site;

  o Provide structural and/or vegetative screening from light-sensitive uses;

  o Use non-reflective glass or glass treated with a non-reflective coating for all exterior windows and glass used on building surfaces;

  o Architectural lighting shall be directed onto the building surfaces and have low reflectivity to minimize glare and limit light onto adjacent properties.

  o Minimize lighting at night.

- Lead agency shall reduce noise impacts to sensitive species through implementation of mitigation measures including, but not limited to:

  o Install temporary noise barriers during construction.

  o Include permanent noise barriers and sound-attenuating features as part of the project design. Barriers could be in the form of outdoor barriers, sound walls, buildings, or earth berms to attenuate noise at adjacent sensitive uses.

  o Ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained per manufacturers’ specifications and fitted with the best available noise suppression devices (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds silencers, wraps). All intake and exhaust ports on power equipment shall be muffled or shielded.

  o Use hydraulically or electrically powered tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) for project construction to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools.

  o Using rubberized asphalt or “quiet pavement” to reduce road noise for new roadway segments, roadways in which widening or other modifications require
re-pavement, or normal reconstruction of roadways where re-pavement is planned.

- Use equipment and trucks with the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible) for project construction.

- Use techniques such as grade separation, buffer zones, landscaped berms, dense plantings, sound walls, reduced-noise paving materials, and traffic calming measures.

III. The EIR Must Adequately Assess and Mitigate Impacts of New Development in High Fire-prone Areas to Wildfire Risk.

Fire is a natural and necessary ecological process for many different ecosystems within the region; however, increased human-caused ignitions and the expansion of flammable non-native grasses has led to increased fire activity in the area, which is harmful to numerous biological resources and people.

A. The EIR Must Fully Inform the Public and Decisionmakers of the Potential Impacts of More Fire Ignitions from Placing Homes and People in High Fire-Prone Areas.

According to a report from Governor Gavin Newsom’s Office, construction of more homes in the wildland-urban interface is one of the main factors that “magnify the wildfire threat and place substantially more people and property at risk than ever before” (Governor Newsom’s Strike Force 2019). Syphard et al. (2019) found that housing and human infrastructure in fire-prone wildlands are the main drivers of fire ignitions and structure loss. This is not new information; scientists have been reporting it for many years in scientific, peer-reviewed journals, and firefighters have observed it.

As outlined in the Center’s recent report, Built to Burn1, increasing housing development in high fire-risk wildlands is putting more people in harm’s way and contributing to a dramatic increase in costs associated with fire suppression and damages. Next 10 and UC Berkeley’s recent report, Rebuilding for a Resilient Recovery: Planning in California’s Wildland Urban Interface2, likewise found that state and local land use policies are increasing the economic and human cost of wildfire by encouraging rebuilding in the high risk-wildland urban interface instead of focusing development away from fire-prone areas. Sprawl developments with low/intermediate densities extending into habitats that are prone to fire have led to more frequent

wildfires caused by human ignitions, like power lines, arson, improperly disposed cigarette butts, debris burning, fireworks, campfires, or sparks from cars or equipment (Keeley et al. 1999; Keeley and Fotheringham 2003; Syphard et al. 2007; Syphard et al. 2012; Bistinas et al. 2013; Balch et al. 2017; Keeley and Syphard 2018; Radeloff et al. 2018; Syphard et al. 2019). Human-caused fires account for 95-97% of all fires in Southern California’s Mediterranean habitats (Syphard et al. 2007; Balch et al. 2017). In some Southern California counties, Keeley and Syphard (2018) found that human ignitions were responsible for 98-100% of fires between 1919-2016. Leapfrog developments in high fire-prone areas have the highest predicted fire risk (Syphard et al. 2013), and multiple studies indicate that developments with low/intermediate-density clusters surrounded by fire-dependent vegetation (i.e., grasslands, chaparral, scrub) in areas with a history of fires have the highest chances of burning (Syphard et al. 2012; Bistinas et al. 2013; Syphard et al. 2013; Syphard et al. 2019). The EIR must clearly outline and summarize the scientific evidence linking development in high fire-prone wildlands with increased fire risk; the RTP/SCS could result in the placement of more homes, infrastructure, roads, and communities in high fire-prone areas that have burned in the past and will inevitably burn again.

The EIR must acknowledge the potential wildfire hazard from increased human-caused ignitions in the Santa Cruz region. By placing people in fire-prone areas, the induced sprawl perpetuated by the RTP/SCS would increase the number of potential ignition sources, and therefore the risk of wildfires occurring. In addition, power lines and electrical equipment are a significant source of human-caused ignitions (Keeley and Syphard 2018). The 2017 Thomas Fire, 2017 Tubbs Fire, 2018 Camp Fire, and 2018 Woolsey Fire were found to have been caused by electrical transmission lines and electrical equipment, and the 2019 Kincade Fire is suspected to have been caused by power lines as well. Placing homes and people in high fire-prone areas would only increase the potential likelihood of these ignition sources, as has been documented in multiple scientific studies (Keeley et al. 1999; Keeley and Fotheringham 2003; Syphard et al. 2007; Syphard et al. 2012; Bistinas et al. 2013; Balch et al. 2017; Keeley and Syphard 2018; Radeloff et al. 2018; Syphard et al. 2019).

Although public utilities companies (i.e., PG&E and Southern California Edison) are altering operations in the form of power outages and blackouts during extreme weather conditions (Callahan et al. 2019; Krishnakumar et al. 2019; Fry et al. 2019a), wildfires can still spark and spread quickly towards homes, as evidenced by the wildfires in Moraga (Hernández et al. 2019) and Saddleridge/Sylmar (Fry et al. 2019b). And the power outages themselves disproportionately burden our most vulnerable communities, including the elderly, poor, and disabled (Chabria and Luna 2019), and can cause traffic jams and collisions (CBS San Francisco 2019). Michael Wara, Director of the Climate and Energy Policy Program and a senior research scholar at the Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment, estimated that PG&E’s power outage in Northern and Central California could have an economic impact of $2.5 billion in losses, with most of the burden on businesses (Callahan et al. 2019). It is clear that placing more homes and businesses in known fire-prone areas and wind corridors is irresponsible and can lead to deadly and costly consequences.
While the DEIR does acknowledge that some projects associated with the RTP/SCS would “result in growth in or near wildfire prone areas,” creating “substantial wildfire-related impacts” (DEIR, page 4.17-16), the DEIR fails to describe in detail the full extent of these impacts to people, ecosystems, and wildlife based upon the best available science. While the mitigation focuses on implementing fire resistant measures, there is no acknowledgement that this only reduced the wildfire risk, it does not make the new infrastructure fireproof. The DEIR must also fully consider alternatives to the proposed RTP/SCS that do not increase the risk of wildfires.

B. The EIR Must Adequately Assess and Mitigate the Impacts to Special-status Species Due to Increased Human-caused Ignitions.

As mentioned previously, sprawl developments with low/intermediate densities extending into habitats that are prone to fire, such as chaparral and scrub/shrubland habitats, have led to more frequent wildfires caused by human ignitions, and these types of developments have the highest chances of burning (Keeley et al. 1999; Keeley and Fotheringham 2003; Syphard et al. 2007; Syphard et al. 2012; Bistinas et al. 2013; Syphard et al. 2013; Balch et al. 2017; Keeley and Syphard 2018; Radeloff et al. 2018; Syphard et al. 2019). This could disrupt the natural fire regime and lead to a dangerous feedback loop of deadly fires and habitat destruction.

Significant portions of the Santa Cruz region are dominated by chaparral and scrub/shrublands, native California habitats that are adapted to infrequent (every 30 to 150 years or more), large, high-intensity crown fire regimes (Keeley and Fotheringham 2001). However, if these regimes are disrupted, the habitats become degraded (Keeley 2005; Keeley 2006; Syphard et al. 2018). When fires occur too frequently, type conversion occurs and the native shrublands are replaced by non-native grasses and forbs that burn more frequently and more easily, ultimately eliminating native habitats and biodiversity while increasing fire threat over time (Keeley 2005; Keeley 2006; Syphard et al. 2009; Safford and Van de Water 2014; Syphard et al. 2018). This could have serious consequences for special-status species in the Santa Cruz region that rely on these native habitats for survival, like California tiger salamanders and vernal pool fairy shrimp. In addition, large-scale landscape changes due to vegetation-type conversion from shifts in natural fire regimes could impact wide-ranging species like mountain lions (Jennings 2018), whose populations are already struggling in the area due to lack of connectivity and genetic isolation (Gustafson et al. 2018; Dellinger 2019).

C. The FEIR Fails to Adequately Assess and Mitigate the Potential Health and Air Quality Impacts from Increased Smoke from Human-caused Ignitions.

Human-caused wildfires at the urban wildland interface that burn through developments are becoming more common with housing extending into fire-prone habitats. This is increasing the frequency and toxicity of smoke exposure to communities in and downwind of the fires. This can lead to harmful public health impacts due to increased air pollution not only from burned vegetation, but also from burned homes, commercial buildings, cars, etc. Buildings and structures often contain plastic materials, metals, and various stored chemicals that release toxic
chemicals when burned, such as pesticides, solvents, paints, and cleaning solutions (Weinhold 2011).

Increased fire frequency due to human activity and ill-placed developments lead to increased occurrences of poor outdoor and indoor air quality from smoke (e.g., Phuleria et al. 2005), which can have public health effects. Hospital visits for respiratory symptoms (e.g., asthma, acute bronchitis, pneumonia, or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) and cardiovascular symptoms have been shown to increase during and/or after fire events (Künzli et al. 2006; Viswanathan et al. 2006; Delfino et al. 2009; Rappold et al. 2012; Liu et al. 2015; Reid et al. 2016). Children, elderly, and those with underlying chronic disease are the most vulnerable to the harmful health effects of increases in wildfire smoke. While it states that “fire related impacts may extend far beyond the fire footprint as damage to homes, infrastructure, and ecosystems, and diminished air and water quality could all occur. People residing in new residential development could be exposed to smoke and air pollution from wildfires regardless of their location within urbanized areas or the WUI” (DEIR, page 4.17-16), it does not propose an alternative that would prevent any future growth in wildfire hazard severity areas.

D. The EIR Must Adequately Assess and Mitigate the Impact of Increased Wildfires on Fire Protection Services and Utilities.

The DEIR does not adequately consider the impacts on firefighters and first responders of the growth induced by the RTP/SCS in high fire-prone natural areas subject to intermittent wildfires. Adding more development to these wild areas will necessitate significant firefighting costs from both state and local authorities. Cal Fire is primarily responsible for addressing wildfires when they occur, and its costs have continued to increase as wildfires in the wildland urban interface have grown more destructive. During the 2017-2018 and the 2018-2019 fiscal years, Cal Fire’s fire suppression costs were $773 million and an estimated $635 million, respectively (Cal Fire 2019). Note that this does not include the cost of lives lost, property damage, or clean up during these years, which is estimated to be billions of dollars. The vast majority of wildfires in southern California are caused by humans (Balch et al. 2017; Keeley and Syphard 2018), and inducing sprawl development in high fire hazard areas will increase the frequency and likelihood of such fires (Syphard et al. 2012; Syphard et al. 2013; Radeloff et al. 2018; Syphard et al. 2019). SC RTC should not be approving an RTP/SCS that will streamline or induce unsustainable sprawl in high fire-prone areas and burden future generations of California with the costs of defending and recovering even more cities from dangerous blazes.

According to Captain Michael Feyh of the Sacramento Fire Department, California no longer has a fire season (Simon 2018); wildfires in California are now year-round because of increased human ignitions in fire-prone areas. Emergency calls to fire departments have tripled since the 1980s (Gutierrez and Cassidy 2018), and firefighters (and equipment) are being spread thin throughout the state. Firefighters often work 24- to 36-hour shifts for extended periods of time (often weeks at a time), and they are being kept away from their homes and families for more and more days out of the year (Bransford et al. 2018; Del Real and Kang 2018; Gutierrez 2018; Simon 2018; Ashton et al. 2018). In addition, the firefighting force often must rely on volunteers to battle fires year-round.
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The extended fire season is taking a toll on the physical, mental, and emotional health of firefighters, as well as the emotional health of their families (Del Real and Kang 2018; Simon 2018; Ashton et al. 2018). The physical and mental fatigue of endlessly fighting fires and experiencing trauma can lead to exhaustion, which can cause mistakes in life-or-death situations while on duty, and the constant worry and aftermath that family members endure when their loved ones are away working in life-threatening conditions can be harrowing (Ashton et al. 2018). According to psychologist Dr. Nancy Bohl-Penrod, the strain of fighting fires without having sufficient breaks can impact firefighters’ interactions with their families, their emotions, and their personalities (Bransford et al. 2018). There have also been reports that suicide rates and substance abuse have been increasing among firefighters (Simon 2018; Greene 2018). This is not sustainable.

The EIR must adequately assess and mitigate the impacts to fire protection services. Placing an additional development in fire-prone areas will further burden already strained people and resources. Funding is already lacking for the increasing costs of fire suppression and property damage from wildfires in California; costs were over $30 billion from 2010 to 2017, and the destruction from 2018’s Camp Fire and Woolsey Fire will likely cost additional billions of dollars. And the draft RTP/SCS does not appear to provide a mechanism for developers to reimburse Cal Fire for the many millions (or billions) of dollars Cal Fire will likely expend when—not if—Central Coast and Southern California communities need to be defended from natural or human-caused wildfires in the vicinity. If costs are not sufficiently covered by the developers, California and federal residents end up paying in the form of fire insurance premiums and taxes that support Cal Fire and federal government subsidies and grants for homes in high risk areas. And these costs do not include other indirect/hidden costs associated with wildfires, such as the costs of doctors’ appointments, medication, sick days taken from places of work, funerals, etc. As the costs of housing in California continues to increase, these costs will also continue to rise. Given the current lack of funding and shortage of firefighting personnel, any development in high fire-prone areas should be required to provide adequate funding and resources for firefighting operations and safety measures.

E. The FEIR Fails to Provide Adequate Fire Safety Measures to Effectively Mitigate Wildfire Impacts.

While the DEIR does provide WF-1 to mitigate the RTP/SCS’s wildfire impacts (DEIR at ES-49), this measure does not constitute “all feasible mitigation measures,” as required by CEQA. First and foremost, the primary policy to minimize impacts to wildfire risk should be to avoid placing human infrastructure in high fire-prone areas, yet this does not appear to be included in the mitigation measures (or the draft RTP/SCS). Second, developers should be required to go above and beyond current state and federal standards and building codes to further minimize wildfire risk. While enforceable defensible space regulations are a laudable goal, recommending that developers follow the law and build to code is insufficient. Although defensible space immediately adjacent to structures and ember-resistant vents and roofing may help make homes fire-resistant, even the best mitigation cannot make a development fire-proof. According to an analysis conducted in the aftermath of the Camp Fire, while 51% of homes built
to code survived the blaze, the remaining 49% did not (Kasler and Reese 2019). In addition, homes can add fuel to fires, and fire safety is not guaranteed.

There are other mitigation measures that should be implemented to minimize wildfire impacts sprawl development in high fire-prone areas. For example, external sprinklers with an independent water source would reduce flammability of structures (California Chaparral Institute 2018). Although external sprinklers are not required by law, water-protected structures are much less likely to burn compared to dry structures, yet the DEIR does not provide this in the recommended project level mitigation measures. The DEIR should require external sprinkler systems for any new development in wildfire zones. In addition, local solar power paired with batteries could reduce power flow (and therefore reduce extreme temperatures) in electricity lines, which would reduce the need for power outages during extreme weather conditions and provide power for communities when outages are necessary (Lee 2019). Michael Wara argues that solar power and batteries for homes and “microgrids” linking business districts would help make communities in high fire risk areas safer because it would provide backup power for medical devices, refrigerators, and the internet to run while allowing the main power grid to get shut down (Wara 2018).

Public safety threats are often exacerbated by infrastructure unable to accommodate the consequences of more human-caused fires at the wildland urban interface. Thus, it is imperative that adequate safety plans for residents and construction/maintenance workers that reflect real-world experience associated with wildfires in California are in place prior to an emergency. Notification systems may not function as expected during an emergency, and evacuation routes can get clogged with traffic quickly, endangering the lives of those trying to evacuate. In addition, the combination of smoke obscuring roads and signage, trees collapsing or being flung into roadways by the wind, and the emotional state of those fleeing for their lives can lead to deadly collisions and roadblocks. And survivors are left to cope with the death of loved ones, physical injuries, and emotional trauma from the chaos that wildfires have inflicted on their communities. These issues are heartbreakingly depicted in an article published in the Sacramento Bee on Oct 22, 2017 (Lundstrom et al. 2017).

It is important to note that even if an adequate evacuation plan is in place, in natural areas with high fire threat where fires have historically burned, a public safety or evacuation plan may not be enough to safeguard people and homes from fires. Having warning systems and evacuation routes in place is important for fire preparedness and fire safety, but these are not guaranteed to function when a fire occurs. And wildfires may ignite with little or no notice, and, as mentioned previously, in severe weather conditions, wind-driven fires can spread quickly—they can cover 10,000 hectares in one to two days as embers are blown ahead of the fires and towards adjacent fuels (e.g., flammable vegetation, structures) (Syphard et al. 2011). This occurred in the Camp Fire in Butte County, which spread at a rate of 80 hectares a minute (about one football field per second) at its fastest, and in its first 14 hours burned over 8,000 hectares (Sabalow et al. 2018). In these types of emergencies warning systems can be slow and ineffective at reaching all residents in harm’s way, and planned evacuation routes may not be sufficient. These issues were observed during the Camp Fire, which led to at least 85 deaths and 13,000 burned homes (Sabalow et al. 2018), as well as in last year’s Tubbs Fire in Sonoma County and Thomas Fire in Santa Cruz County and Ventura County, which led to more than 40
deaths and almost $12 billion in property damage (Lundstrom et al. 2017; St. John 2017). The EIR must fully disclose the danger of fast-moving wildfires and mitigate the resulting impacts.

IV. Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the DEIR for the RTP/SCS. We look forward to working with SC RTC to foster land use policy and growth patterns that promote wildlife movement and habitat connectivity and facilitate public health and safety. We again ask to meet with SC RTP staff or appropriate Board members to advance these recommendations. Please do not hesitate to contact the Center with any questions at the email addresses listed below.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Reid-Wainscoat  
Campaigner  
Center for Biological Diversity  
660 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1000  
Los Angeles, California, 90017  
ereidwainscoat@biologicaldiversity.org

J.P. Rose  
Senior Attorney  
Center for Biological Diversity  
660 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1000  
Los Angeles, California, 90017  
jrose@biologicaldiversity.org
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RE: DRAFT 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan & the Sustainable Communities Strategy

Dear Members of the AMBAG Board of Directors:

Please accept the Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail (FORT) comments on the DRAFT Santa Cruz County 2045 Regional Transportation Plan as pertaining as well to the Goals and Policies, Performance Measures, and Project List in the DRAFT 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan & the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

In particular, FORT would like to highlight three paragraphs early in the attached letter as they embody our key comment on the Santa Cruz County Draft RTP, which applies as well to the Draft MTP:

Global warming is already drastically changing our local and worldwide climate in ways that will cause social turmoil and much human suffering in the coming years. Locally, we are already familiar with multi-year droughts, horrific fires, and eroding shorelines. The science is irrefutable that GHG emissions are a primary cause of global warming and climate change.

The primary approaches that are used worldwide to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation include improvements in vehicle technology and reduction in the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), primarily via public transportation investments. Yet the transportation option that was identified in the {Santa Cruz County} 2021 Transit Corridor Alternative Analysis & Rail Network Integration Study (TCAA/RNIS) as producing the greatest reduction in both VMT and GHG emissions, that is, electric light rail, is not given more than a passing reference in this draft RTP.

So, while our RTP goals are laudable and the challenge of global warming formidable, the draft RTP itself does not rise to the occasion. In fact, the Plan does not anywhere make the link between its extensive project list and how these projects will achieve the Plan's goals.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Faina Segal
Board Chair
Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail
P.O.Box 1652, Capitola, CA 95010-1652
www.railandtrail.org and coastconnect.org
Cell: 831-331-6432
Dear Commissioners and Staff,

Please find attached the public comments on the draft 2045 RTP from the Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail.

Best,

Faina Segal
Board Chair
Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail
P.O.Box 1652, Capitola, CA 95010-1652
www.railandtrail.org and coastconnect.org
Cell: 831-331-6432
January 31, 2021

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1101 Pacific Ave., Suite 250
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Commissioners,

The Friends of Rail and Trail first want to thank the Commission staff for all the work they have put into developing the Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). We are, however, disappointed in the minimal attention given to our Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (SCBRL) in the plan, the omission of updated funding sources, the disconnect between goals and projects, and the lack of vision for the fundamental changes needed to transform our transportation system into a more equitable and sustainable system. Accordingly, we offer the following comments for consideration in the final approved RTP:

1. How Projects Meet Goals

The 2045 goals, targets and policies cited in Appendix C of the draft RTP provide an excellent overview of our hopes for a more energy-efficient and less congested future. They include state mandates to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) from transportation sources to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, and to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

Global warming is already drastically changing our local and worldwide climate in ways that will cause social turmoil and much human suffering in the coming years. Locally, we are already familiar with multi-year droughts, horrific fires, and eroding shorelines. The science is irrefutable that GHG emissions are a primary cause of global warming and climate change.

The primary approaches that are used worldwide to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation include improvements in vehicle technology and reduction in the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), primarily via public transportation investments. Yet the transportation option that was identified in the 2021 Transit Corridor Alternative Analysis & Rail Network Integration Study (TCAA/RNIS) as producing the greatest reduction in both VMT and
GHG emissions, that is, electric light rail, is not given more than a passing reference in this draft RTP.

So, while our RTP goals are laudable and the challenge of global warming formidable, the draft RTP itself does not rise to the occasion. In fact, the Plan does not anywhere make the link between its extensive project list and how these projects will achieve the Plan's goals.

While many pages of the draft Plan include references to statewide sustainability, transit, and rail plans, our own public rail transit project on the RTC-owned coast rail line is highlighted only insomuch as it is "on the financially-unconstrained list of projects, due to the lack of identified and likelihood of available funding to the region for a passenger rail project." (p2-13)

It should be noted that most of the projects on the draft RTP’s project list do not have funding sources identified during the project development stage. Yet, the rail transit project in particular, due to extensive analysis over the past decades, has over 60% of the estimated high-end capital cost identified as likely...quite unlike any of the Highway 1 widening projects on the Constrained Project List. Also, we’re wondering how it happens, then, that NEW multi-million dollar Highway 1 projects are shown on the Constrained Project List without public discussion of total project costs or funding sources? [Hwy 1 Auxiliary Lanes and Bus on Shoulders Freedom Blvd to State Park $102M and Hwy 1: Reconstruct Bay Ave/Porter St and 41st Avenue Interchange $14M.]

FORT strongly encourages the Commission to recommit to its identified goals, targets and policies in the RTP, and to include, in the future, a constrained list of projects that can show evidence they will actually get us nearer to achieving those goals.

2. Rail Planning

In Chapter 1, the draft Plan identifies the crucial role that a planning document like the RTP serves: “planning . . . positions our community to receive funding for projects that require a well thought out plan and helps to develop collaboration on projects.” Yet the Rail section in Chapter 2 includes a simple factual description of the SCBRL and the last 20 years of its acquisition and study but makes no further reference to future planning of the branch line’s use for passenger or freight service.
The draft Plan cites multiple references made in regional and state transportation planning documents to our SCBRL and how that planning and coordination could lead to funding. These include:

Chapter 2 notes the inclusion of our SCBRL in the 2018 goals of the California State Rail Plan, including: “a new station in Pajaro/Watsonville, an analysis of connections between Santa Cruz, Monterey and the high-speed rail line at Gilroy, implementation planning for connecting Santa Cruz and Monterey to the statewide rail network at Gilroy, and establishment of hourly service by 2040, if recommended by the 2022 rail plan.” (p2-15)

It also notes that the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) is “actively pursuing rail service that includes local service as well as greater regional access…local light rail service would connect the cities of Seaside and Monterey to Castroville for connections to Pajaro station and the San Francisco Bay Area and beyond.” (p2-15)

Although not referenced in the draft Plan, our local Draft AMBAG 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan says in its passenger rail section, “rail projects are an important component of the regional transportation network that enhance mobility opportunities for the region’s diverse population and lead to economic vitality for the region. The planned rail services complement each other and result in reducing auto trips on regional highways . . . The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) are working to bring rail service to Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties, so that residents can use rail to travel to jobs, education and entertainment.” (p2-11)

The Draft RTP’s Chapter 3 section on Goods Movement briefly mentions that our SCBRL “is also used for freight service”, and then goes on to delineate the importance of rail for freight movement, “Upward pricing pressure on the trucking industry . . . as well as safety and environmental concerns, have prompted the region’s freight and transportation stakeholders to look for alternatives for transporting goods. The rail system is one of the main options available.” (P3-15)

References in other regional and state planning documents to the use of our SCBRL for statewide freight movement are also cited:
“The 2018 California State Rail Plan and the 2020 California Freight Mobility Plan stress the importance of short line railroads, including the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. ... AMBAG’s. ... U.S. 101 Central Coast California Freight study in 2016 ... recommends upgrading the rail on the Santa Cruz Branch Line to Federal Rail Administration Class 2 rail, allowing freight train speeds of up to 25 mph on sections in Santa Cruz County in order to improve freight connectivity to other regions in California and nationwide.” (p2-15)

Given the importance of planning in being successful in competing for public project funding, the Commission should include in the RTP additional discussion of the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis and Rail Network Integration Study (TCAA/RNIS) evaluation of transit investment options and its selection of electric passenger rail as the locally preferred alternative for the SCBRL.

3. Funding

The project list fails to directly connect back to goals, targets, and policies identified. This is especially true when it comes to the SCBRL.

On November 15, 2021, President Biden signed the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) that the US Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) website calls “a generational investment in America’s intermodal transportation system of which freight and intercity passenger rail are an integral part. ... will provide unprecedented federal funding for rail improvement projects in America. Over the next five years, that means greatly expanding existing FRA programs and creating new programs to enhance our nation’s rail network. The bipartisan infrastructure law includes $102 billion in total rail funding, including $66 billion from advanced appropriations, and $36 billion in authorized funding.” The IIJA also includes $27 billion just for bridge repairs.

This funding will significantly change the focus on rail throughout the country and specifically in California with its current emphasis on rail through the State Rail Plan. California alone is in line to receive $4.2 billion from the IIJA.

And yet Chapter 5 of the draft RTP on funding completely downplays this dramatic new funding source, saying “as part of negotiations for a multiyear federal infrastructure plan, congress adopted a new federal transportation act (Investing in a New Vision for the Environment and Surface Transportation in America or INVEST act) which is expected to increase funding for
transportation. Details on what this means for projects in Santa Cruz County will be integrated into RTP updates once available.“ (p5-2,3)

We also want to call to your attention that later in Chapter 5, there is an outdated discussion of federal funds for infrastructure, saying “while Congress and the President agree that the nation’s infrastructure is a priority, there has been no consensus around specific programs that would be funded or how to pay for transportation system projects.” (p5-6)

The Plan’s description of Unconstrained Projects is: “projects that cannot be implemented over the next 25 years unless there are significant changes in the amount of local, state, and federal funding available for transportation.” Given the magnitude of increased funding that will be available over the next 5 years from both this new federal funding and resulting impact on state funding, we feel rail projects now definitely meet this definition of “significant changes.”

We ask the Commission to revise this section to provide more current and complete description of the IIJA. We realize the final passage of this legislation may have happened after the current draft of the RTP was completed, but it is sufficiently important to make these revisions now before the RTP is adopted. It should also specifically be mentioned in the Rail section of the Plan.

Given the magnitude of increased funding that will be available over the next 5 years, we also ask the RTC to move the following rail projects from the unconstrained list to the constrained list.

- **Public Transit on Watsonville-Santa Cruz Rail Corridor - RTC-P02 - $825,000 unconstrained**
- **Rail line: Freight Service Upgrades - RTC-P41 - $25,000 unconstrained**
- **Recreational Rail Infrastructure - RTC 25 - $5,340 unconstrained**

**Conclusion**

We find it shortsighted for the Commission to adopt a twenty-year planning document that pays relatively little attention to one of the three key transit corridors identified in the RTC’s 2019 Unified Corridor Study - the Santa Cruz Rail Branch Line. In doing so, this Draft RTP ignores the 20 years and hundreds of thousands of dollars in planning that have gone into refining successful project outcomes in the most underutilized transportation corridor in our county.
The Commission also ignores the findings of its regional and statewide planning agencies that specifically incorporate the SCRBL into their future plans, thereby increasing the possibility of significant capital funding for rail transit at a time of unprecedented new funding for passenger rail.

Finally, the Draft RTP includes excellent goals on reducing greenhouse gasses, but then does not link the project list to those goals, and does not include meaningful Constrained funding for rail projects that studies have shown would have the greatest impact on reducing greenhouse gasses and meeting the Plan’s goals.

The people of Santa Cruz County deserve a better vision for future transportation in which everyone can affordably, reliably, safely and sustainably reach their destinations — a forward-thinking vision centered squarely on the needs of working people, making our communities more connected and leaving no one behind. The immediate and catastrophic threat of global warming demands we challenge the car-centric status quo, revisit core assumptions and policies underlying our transportation system, and invest in transportation solutions that will help us achieve social justice and environmental sustainability.

We hope these oversights will be corrected in the final adopted document and all future revisions.

Sincerely,

Faina Segal, Board Chair
Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail
Email: executive@railandtrail.org
Dear whom it may concern,

Please find attached my comments to the Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan.

Best regards,
Samaporn Tinyanont
Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

I am writing in support of the preservation of the existing, and RTC-owned, Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line and its utilization as a transit corridor with passenger rail service. Doing so will reduce Santa Cruz county’s car dependence, increase mobility without increased congestion, and connect us to the rest of the state through the upcoming rail network.

**A case for rail preservation.** Imagine Santa Cruz where you can hop on a train, weave your way through the beautiful redwoods and majestic landscape of the Santa Cruz Mountains, and arrive in San Jose ready to connect to the rest of the bay area. This was a reality in the first half of the 20th century. Since then we have abandoned this reality in pursuit of the glamor of automobiles. With Hwy 17 constructed, train ridership declined and the line was dismantled with their tunnels sealed by dynamites after a landslide in 1940 [1, 2], leaving only the southern section to Felton, which is continued to be served by the Roaring Camp Railroads.

While highways and automobiles define the American experience of the latter half of the 20th century, the continued population growth and changing travel pattern started to reveal the weaknesses of the system. Many people end up spending good parts of their days trapped behind their wheels navigating the crawling traffic. Today, there is no argument that Hwy 17 is well beyond its capacity serving both commuters on weekdays and vacationers on weekends. Should the 1900s rail infrastructure have been preserved, passenger service on that corridor would provide travelers with an efficient alternative mode of transportation, providing them with a traffic-free option to travel between Santa Cruz and the Bay Area.

With most of the rails ripped off and tunnels sealed or abandoned for almost a century, reactivating the Santa Cruz Mountain corridor will be extremely costly, with the last feasibility study putting the cost around $1 billion in 1994 ($1.8 billion today) [3]. Removing the old rail corridor with the promise of reinstallation tomorrow is anything but feasible, and those Let us not repeat the mistake of the past and remove another rail corridor that is very much functional and that is already publicly owned.

**Rail as part of the solution to our housing crisis.** Housing cost in Santa Cruz is one of the most expensive in the world. $2000 can get you a one-bedroom apartment that is readily available in virtually any market in the US, including large expensive cities like New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. The same cannot be said for Santa Cruz. Solving this crisis will involve many factors, but equitable transit including rails is a part of the solution.

First, passenger rail service will allow us to build more housing units further from places of employment, along the existing rail corridor, without adding more traffic to our already taxed highways. The foremost argument opposing new housing units is that they would make traffic worse. Rails will allow us to build more housing without adding cars to the roads. Second, passenger rail service will allow the city of Santa Cruz to reclaim land currently spent on surface parking lots in areas that would otherwise be prime housing locations. Specifically, the Broadwalk and/or 100 Beach St. surface parking lots can easily be redeveloped into
mixed-use housing-commercial units, generating tax revenue to the city. Visiting drivers can instead park further away from the city, and take the train to Broadwalk and the beach. This would also allow the visitors to support local businesses elsewhere in Santa Cruz, and not just the Broadwalk. Lastly, passenger rails will provide employment opportunities in Santa Cruz county, from operation, maintenance and beyond.

**Issues with the 2045 vision.** The current draft of the 2045 vision vastly downplays the potential contribution rails can have in Santa Cruz county. The discussions of rails’ role in the next decades in Santa Cruz is almost non-existing. This lack of details shows the RTC’s lack of commitment to this mode of transportation. Further, Appendix E lists passenger rail service as a single item, making it seem like a huge expense, while different road maintenance and construction projects get their own item. It is crucial to provide a more comprehensive cost comparison between passenger rail service and road infrastructure maintenance.

I advocate for a much more expanded discussion of roles that passenger rails can play in Santa Cruz county in 2030s and 2040s. Let’s make this document truly a vision, and not just a prediction of continued status quo. Up and down California, all cities big and small are expanding their rail network to accommodate the future. Los Angeles, a place I called home for 10 years, realized its mistake of tearing out its extensive rail networks in the 1960s, and is now relaying the tracks at a great cost, almost exactly retracing the old routes [4]. Let’s not repeat the mistake of the 20th century. Vision 2045 should advocate for the preservation and utilization of passenger rails in Santa Cruz county. Perhaps, the future will even call for an expansion of rails, serving more corridors and/or providing energy efficient, traffic-free transits to Santa Clara Valley and beyond.

Best Regards,
Samaporn Tinayanont

Dear RTC members-
I envision a Santa Cruz where people continue to value the beauty of where we live, and choose to live active lives. I support having a Greenway bike and pedestrian path along the railroad corridor as I believe that will enhance and enrich our county for all residents. We need a continuous trail that is not diverted onto busy surface streets. Communities that have turned their rails into trails have increased tourism and small business opportunities. A bicycle and pedestrian Greenway would improve safety, save vast amounts of money, including future taxes, improve the environment and get folks out of their cars.

We need to invest in our Metro bus system by increasing routes and times. Buses get people where they need to go, on an infrastructure that is already in place, at a fraction of the cost of a train. Currently there is no train infrastructure and it wouldn’t get people where they need to go (unless they then take a bus!). Tickets on a bus are much cheaper than a train ticket would be (even with tax payer subsidies), which is far more equitable.

If we add an HOV lane to Highway 1, buses could move through traffic faster and make it a reasonable and efficient commuter option.

I look forward to a future where we continue to highly value our community’s beauty, and all people are able to benefit from the incredible asset of a Greenway bringing our community together.

Thank you!
Deb Molina
District 1

Sent from my iPad
Commissioners and Staff:

After many years devoted to acquisition, study, public hearings and investment in analysis resulting in determination that electric light rail is the best use for our rail corridor, why isn't our SC Branch Rail Line given a higher level of importance and detail in the Draft RTP? It almost seems to be missing in sections focusing on future plans and projects!

Electric light passenger rail will definitely be needed as the County population grows in the coming years. Roads won't suffice, even for buses. As you know, people in cars and trucks hate sitting in traffic. They can't afford the time. And it's only going to get a lot worse.

State and Federal transportation departments are strongly encouraging passenger rail expansion.... and they are FUNDING IT! We are so fortunate to already own our rail corridor. We can be near shovel-ready as 100's of millions of dollars get allocated to regions where planning for future light rail is underway.

Electric passenger rail needs a much more thorough description in the Draft LRP, including up to date funding possibilities, like the new Federal Infrastructure Act and the State Rail Plan.

Please keep me informed about LRP revisions and RTC decisions on this matter.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.
Dianne Dryer
Thurber Lane, SC
Dear Commissioners and others,

Please find below and attached my comments relating to the Draft 2045 Regional Transportation plan:

Barry Scott  
Coastal Rail Santa Cruz  
Aptos, CA

**Comments: draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan for Santa Cruz County**

**General comment: wildfire and other natural disaster vulnerability context.** Roads and highways alone are incapable of providing adequate transportation services in preparing for, responding to, and recovering from the devasting effects of natural disasters including wildfires, earthquakes, landslides and other catastrophes. Prevention and recovery vehicles require hardened freight-capable rail infrastructure so that we are not completely dependent on roads and highways.  
**Our freight rail infrastructure, therefore, must not be compromised in any fashion.** We must maintain our railroads and bridges and trestles to the current freight-capable standard as promised to the state and to the community as part of the purchase of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line in 2012.

Please read this letter sent to Supervisor McPherson and published in the San Lorenzo Valley Post:  
January 26, 2022  
**Dear Supervisor McPherson and members of the SCCRTC:**  
We write you today to urge you not to proceed with any efforts to abandon freight service on the Felton Branch Rail Line or the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. These rail lines ensure there is a rail connection for Santa Cruz County and the rest of California, which may be critical in providing an essential route to the San Lorenzo Valley and other areas during future fire emergencies related to climate change, severe drought and catastrophic wildfires.  
New technologies and innovative solutions to climate-driven emergencies are in development in California and beyond. For example, fire trains are beginning to see use to help fight major wildfires. This was the case in Northern California during the 2021 Dixie Fire. Fire trains use water and retardant, hauled by rail in tanker cars. The trains also include firefighting professionals who battle wildfires from the train, helping to protect watersheds and critical infrastructure.  
Freight use abandonment of either rail line will lead to railbanking, which would result in
tearing out the tracks, thus eliminating a potentially critical tool in the years ahead as we learn to adapt to the new realities of climate change.

As you may be aware, there are areas of the Santa Cruz Mountains that are only accessed via the rail line, such as within Henry Cowell Redwoods State Park and the Pogonip open space area.

Coupled with new technologies, such as fire trains that are under study in California, is major new funding for wildfire prevention and protection that is being developed by both the state and federal governments. It is important for Santa Cruz County to maximize options for future resources and to not get left behind in funding and policy decisions that could potentially benefit our region.

We urge you to maintain the Felton Branch Rail Line and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line as critical infrastructure for our community.

Sincerely,
Robert Gray, Fire Chief, Felton Fire District
Dan Walters, Fire Chief, Zayante Fire District
Stacie Brownlee, Fire Chief, Ben Lomond Fire District
Mark Bingham, Fire Chief, Boulder Creek Fire District
Jim Anderson, Vice Chair, Felton Fire District
Bob Locatelli, Fire Director, Boulder Creek Fire District
Sam Robustelli, Fire Director, Boulder Creek Fire District

General comments: coastal public access context. The California Coastal Act mandates that maximum opportunities for public access to the coast shall be provided, subject to several common sense considerations.

One of the best-known public access features of the region is the partially complete Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST), part of the California Coastal Trail (CCT) network. The MBSST is envisioned to eventually provide for both a bikeway and a pedestrian route, between Pacific Grove and Davenport. The 2045 RTP represents a highly appropriate opportunity to prioritize completion of the MBSST, as well as connecting CCT segments. To the extent that it will encourage walking and bicycles as preferred commute modes, this will help communities meet their GHG goals consistent with SB 375 (and Coastal Act Sec. 30253 regarding air quality, minimizing energy consumption, and vehicle miles traveled). As a matter of public policy, completion of the MBSST/CCT will be an asset for both public recreation and public health, for our region’s tourism economy and for supporting sustainable communities.

Efforts to modify any part of the trail plans involving deactivation or other modification of the active rail line threaten the entire MBSST project and risk cost overruns and delays.

Protection of our existing Freight Rail Network:

The AMBAG region's rail corridors-including Amtrak's Coast Line, as well as the dormant Monterey Branch Line (MBL) and limited use Santa Cruz Branch Line (SCBL) are considered valuable supplements to the roadway system. This applies to rail's capacity to move freight as
well as people. It has been posited that every rail car can move the same tonnage as four highway big rigs (CSX website; SCCRTC hearing of 11/8/2018).

Therefore, to the extent that a functioning rail freight system exists, it proportionately can protect the capacity of the roadway system for all users. Thus, rail lines can represent an economical, GHG-efficient mode for certain types of freight movement-and, for getting the public to the coast (and home again).

**Rail lines: suggested additional treatment in the 2045 RTP text:** Improvement and better use of the region’s rail corridors could be amplified in the RTP. In particular, consideration should be given to the role that at least some of the region’s rail corridors might play in meeting Coastal Act policies promoting mass transit and the minimization of energy use, along with SB 375 requirements regarding minimization of GHG impacts. We also foresee a need for thoughtful advance planning for rail facilities’ adaptation to sea level rise impacts, beyond 2045. Accordingly, we recommend that the following rail-related topics receive specific treatment and priority in the RTP:

- **Santa Cruz Branch Line (SCBL).** This 32-mile line was recently acquired by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC). The RTP should expand its discussion of this corridor for maximizing its ability to enhance public access in light of the above-referenced Coastal Act objectives, including as appropriate for coastal lateral access (as a strand of the MBSST), commuting, and freight transportation.

- **Santa Cruz. Big Trees & Pacific Railway.** The AMBAG 2040 MTP/SCS appropriately includes a discussion of the existing freight and passenger excursion train operation that extends from Felton (Roaring Camp) through the scenic San Lorenzo River gorge, connecting to the SCBL at the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk. Although shown on the draft CSRP map of short line freight operations (draft CSRP Exhibit 6.2), there is no accompanying discussion. We hope that the RTP includes discussion of the Felton Line at least for regional planning purposes.

References in other regional and state planning documents to the use of our SCBRL for statewide freight movement are also cited:

“The 2018 California State Rail Plan and the 2020 California Freight Mobility Plan stress the importance of short line railroads, including the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. . . AMBAG(‘s). . . U.S. 101 Central Coast California Freight study in 2016 . . . recommends upgrading the rail on the Santa Cruz Branch Line to Federal Rail Administration Class 2 rail, allowing freight train speeds of up to 25 mph on sections in Santa Cruz County in order to improve freight connectivity to other regions in California and nationwide.” (p2-15)

Given the importance of planning in being successful in competing for public project funding, the Commission should include in the RTP additional discussion of the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis and Rail Network Integration Study (TCAA/RNIS) evaluation of transit investment options and its selection of electric passenger rail as the locally preferred
alternative for the SCBRL.

3. Funding
The project list’s failure to directly connect back to goals, targets, and policies identified. This is especially true when it comes to the SCBRL.

On November 15, 2021, President Biden signed the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) that the US Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) website calls “a generational investment in America’s intermodal transportation system of which freight and intercity passenger rail are an integral part. . . will provide unprecedented federal funding for rail improvement projects in America. Over the next five years, that means greatly expanding existing FRA programs and creating new programs to enhance our nation’s rail network. The bipartisan infrastructure law includes $102 billion in total rail funding, including $66 billion from advanced appropriations, and $36 billion in authorized funding.” The IIJA also includes $27 billion just for bridge repairs.

This funding will significantly change the focus on rail throughout the country and specifically in California with its current emphasis on rail through the State Rail Plan. California alone is in line to receive $4.2 billion from the IIJA.

The Plan’s description of Unconstrained Projects is: “projects that cannot be implemented over the next 25 years unless there are significant changes in the amount of local, state, and federal funding available for transportation.” Given the magnitude of increased funding that will be available over the next 5 years from both this new federal funding and the resulting impact on state funding, we feel rail projects now definitely meet this definition of “significant changes.”

Funding: We ask the Commission to revise this section to provide a more current and complete description of the federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. We realize the final passage of this legislation may have happened after the current draft of the RTP was completed, but it is sufficiently important to make these revisions now before the RTP is adopted. It should also specifically be mentioned in the Rail section of the Plan.

Given the magnitude of increased funding that will be available over the next 5 years, we also ask the RTC to move the following rail projects from the unconstrained list to the constrained list.

- Public Transit on Watsonville-Santa Cruz Rail Corridor - RTC-P02 - $825,000 unconstrained
- Rail line: Freight Service Upgrades - RTC-P41 - $25,000 unconstrained
- Recreational Rail Infrastructure - RTC 25 - $5,340 unconstrained

Conclusion
We find it shortsighted for the Commission to adopt a twenty-year planning document that pays relatively little attention to one of the three key transit corridors in the County - the Santa Cruz Rail Branch Line. In doing so, the Commission almost ignores the 20 years and
hundreds of thousands of dollars in planning that have gone into the study of that transit corridor.

The Commission also ignores the findings of its regional and statewide planning agencies that specifically incorporate the SCRBL into their future plans, thereby increasing the possibility of future funding for rail transit options at a time of unprecedented funding for rail.

Finally, the RTP includes excellent goals on reducing greenhouse gases, but then does not link their project list to those goals, and does not include in the identified projects, key rail projects that could have the greatest impact on reducing greenhouse gases and meeting the Plan’s goals.

Sincerely,

Barry Scott

--
Barry Scott
Office: 831.612.6574
Mobile: 209.482.5663
Hello,

I am many of our county residents DEMAND the right to vote on this rail/trail plan!!

This affects all of our lives, and our pocketbooks, our peace of mind, etc. etc.

PLEASE reconsider moving ahead with any physical actions on these plans until you have the approval of the majority of voters/payers of this plan!!

Otherwise, we will need to petition the removal of the RTC committee and replace you with elected representatives.

Janice Keith
La Selva Beach, CA
To the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission:

I live off of Laurel Road and I’d like to submit comments regarding the potential Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Interchange project as part of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. This project is listed at the bottom of page 2 of 54 on the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List: https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/rptRTP2045draftCONuncon.pdf.

This project has been talked about for many years and I am disappointed to see that it is listed as unconstrained in the next 23 years. This project is incredibly important and should be moved to the constrained list with funding secured.

As traffic has increased throughout the entire bay area, Highway 17 has become increasingly dangerous to drive. In fact, as I am sure you are aware, Highway 17 is one of the most dangerous roads in the country. According to a CBS Bay Area article from 2017, the number of collisions on Highway 17 has more than quadrupled in the last decade - https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/05/15/stats-show-hwy-17-growing-more-dangerous-for-commuters/. And according to a 2019 Mercury News article, the number of fatal and injury collisions has increased substantially in recent years - https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/09/22/highway-17-crashes-remain-on-troubling-rise/. It is imperative that we do everything we can to reduce accidents, injuries, and deaths on Highway 17.

Accidents on Highway 17 and the traffic jams they cause have far-reaching effects including:
- Those involved who often tragically lose their lives or sustain other injuries and their families
- Strain on our first responders including CHP, Fire, Sheriff, EMS and other personnel
- Those who commute Highway 17 every day
- Others who drive Highway 17 occasionally to go to the beach or for other activities
- The thousands of people who live in communities off of Highway 17

Highway 17 is uniquely dangerous in a number of different aspects: it has heavy traffic, sharp turns, blind curves, slippery winter conditions, narrow shoulders, animals crossing, and perhaps most significantly - it functions as both a highway with fast-moving vehicles and also as a local road for thousands of people who live along it to access their neighborhoods and driveways.

These very different dual uses do not mix well and create “conflict points” where vehicles slow to exit, accelerate from a complete stop to enter, and make left turns. These actions create unexpected changes in traffic flow, especially significant when traffic is heavier. As a result, these conflict points are the cause of many serious accidents, the ensuing strain on first responders, and the stopped traffic and delays for anyone using the highway.

It is important that we reduce these conflict points to allow vehicles to move more efficiently and safely. There are currently 28 conflict points at Sugarloaf/Laurel/Glenwood Cutoff and this project would reduce that number to 4. This project is also in alignment with the efforts to install a wildlife habitat connectivity crossing.

For those of us that live along Highway 17, it has become increasingly dangerous to enter and exit our homes (with no commercial uses in any of these neighborhoods, we need to access
Highway 17 to go anywhere). As a resident of Sugarloaf, I would gladly travel farther on frontage streets in exchange for the safety and reliability of an interchange at this location.

This project is vital to enhancing the safety, mobility, and accessibility on Hwy 17 and I hope you will consider moving it to the constrained list with funding secured.

Thank you,
Ali Azarchehr
To the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission:

I live off of Sugarloaf Road and I’d like to submit comments regarding the potential Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Interchange project as part of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. This project is listed at the bottom of page 2 of 54 on the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List: [https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/rptRTP2045draftCONuncon.pdf](https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/rptRTP2045draftCONuncon.pdf).

This project has been talked about for many years and I am disappointed to see that it is listed as unconstrained in the next 23 years. This project is incredibly important and should be moved to the constrained list with funding secured.

As traffic has increased throughout the entire bay area, Highway 17 had become increasingly dangerous to drive. In fact, as I am sure you are aware, Highway 17 is one of the most dangerous roads in the country. According to a CBS Bay Area article from 2017, the number of collisions on Highway 17 has more than quadrupled in the last decade. - [https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/05/15/stats-show-hwy-17-growing-more-dangerous-for-commuters/](https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/05/15/stats-show-hwy-17-growing-more-dangerous-for-commuters/). And according to a 2019 Mercury News article, the number of fatal and injury collisions has increased substantially in recent years - [https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/09/22/highway-17-crashes-remain-on-troubling-rise/](https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/09/22/highway-17-crashes-remain-on-troubling-rise/). It is imperative that we do everything we can to reduce accidents, injuries, and deaths on Highway 17.

Accidents on Highway 17 and the traffic jams they cause have far-reaching effects including:
- Those involved who often tragically lose their lives or sustain other injuries and their families
- Strain on our first responders including CHP, Fire, Sheriff, EMS and other personnel
- Those who commute Highway 17 every day
- Others who drive Highway 17 occasionally to go to the beach or for other activities
- The thousands of people who live in communities off of Highway 17

Highway 17 is uniquely dangerous in a number of different aspects: it has heavy traffic, sharp turns, blind curves, slippery winter conditions, narrow shoulders, animals crossing, and perhaps most significantly - it functions as both a highway with fast-moving vehicles and also as a local road for thousands of people who live along it to access their neighborhoods and driveways.

These very different dual uses do not mix well and create “conflict points” where vehicle slow to exit, accelerate from a complete stop to enter, and make left turns. These actions create unexpected changes in traffic flow, especially significant when traffic is heavier. As a result, these conflict points are the cause of many serious accidents, the ensuing strain on first responders, and the stopped traffic and delays for anyone using the highway.

It is important that we reduce these conflict points to allow vehicles to move more efficiently and safely. There are currently 28 conflict points at Sugarloaf/Laurel/Glenwood Cutoff and this project would reduce that number to 4. This project is also in alignment with the efforts to install a wildlife habitat connectivity crossing.

For those of us that live along Highway 17, it has become increasingly dangerous to enter and exit our homes (with no commercial uses in any of these neighborhoods, we need to access Highway 17 to go anywhere). As a resident of Sugarloaf, I would gladly travel farther on frontage streets in exchange for the safety and reliability of an interchange at this location.
This project is vital to enhancing the safety, mobility, and accessibility on Hwy 17 and I hope you will consider moving it to the constrained list with funding secured.

Thank you,

--

Thank you,

Aiyman Hadi
Head of Digital Marketing
T +1 650 784 5308
To the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission:

I live off of Sugarloaf Road and I’d like to submit comments regarding the potential Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Interchange project as part of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. This project is listed at the bottom of page 2 of 54 on the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List: https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/rptRTP2045draftCONuncon.pdf.

This project has been talked about for many years and I am disappointed to see that it is listed as unconstrained in the next 23 years. This project is incredibly important and should be moved to the constrained list with funding secured.

As traffic has increased throughout the entire bay area, Highway 17 had become increasingly dangerous to drive. In fact, as I am sure you are aware, Highway 17 is one of the most dangerous roads in the country. According to a CBS Bay Area article from 2017, the number of collisions on Highway 17 has more than quadrupled in the last decade. - https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/05/15/stats-show-hwy-17-growing-more-dangerous-for-commuters/. And according to a 2019 Mercury News article, the number of fatal and injury collisions has increased substantially in recent years - https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/09/22/highway-17-crashes-remain-on-troubling-rise/. It is imperative that we do everything we can to reduce accidents, injuries, and deaths on Highway 17.

Accidents on Highway 17 and the traffic jams they cause have far-reaching effects including:
- Those involved who often tragically lose their lives or sustain other injuries and their families
- Strain on our first responders including CHP, Fire, Sheriff, EMS and other personnel.
- Those who commute Highway 17 every day
- Others who drive Highway 17 occasionally to go to the beach or for other activities
- The thousands of people who live in communities off of Highway 17

Highway 17 is uniquely dangerous in a number of different aspects: it has heavy traffic, sharp turns, blind curves, slippery winter conditions, narrow shoulders, animals crossing, and perhaps most significantly - it functions as both a highway with fast-moving vehicles and also as a local road for thousands of people who live along it to access their neighborhoods and driveways.

These very different dual uses do not mix well and create “conflict points” where vehicle slow to exit, accelerate from a complete stop to enter, and make left turns. These actions create unexpected changes in traffic flow, especially significant when traffic is heavier. As a result, these conflict points are the cause of many serious accidents, the ensuing strain on first responders, and the stopped traffic and delays for anyone using the highway.

It is important that we reduce these conflict points to allow vehicles to move more efficiently and safely. There are currently 28 conflict points at Sugarloaf/Laurel/Glenwood Cutoff and this project would reduce that number to 4. This project is also in alignment with the efforts to
install a wildlife habitat connectivity crossing. 
For those of us that live along Highway 17, it has become increasingly dangerous to enter and exit our homes (with no commercial uses in any of these neighborhoods, we need to access Highway 17 to go anywhere). As a resident of Sugarloaf, I would gladly travel farther on frontage streets in exchange for the safety and reliability of an interchange at this location.

This project is vital to enhancing the safety, mobility, and accessibility on Hwy 17 and I hope you will consider moving it to the constrained list with funding secured.

Thank you,

Zaki Hussain
--
Zaki Hussain
408.891.6591
zakiahussain@gmail.com
To the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission:

I live off of Sugarloaf Road and I’d like to submit comments regarding the potential Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Interchange project as part of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. This project is listed at the bottom of page 2 of 54 on the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List: [https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/rptRTP2045draftCONuncon.pdf](https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/rptRTP2045draftCONuncon.pdf). This project has been talked about for many years and I am disappointed to see that it is listed as unconstrained in the next 23 years. This project is incredibly important and should be moved to the constrained list with funding secured.

As traffic has increased throughout the entire bay area, Highway 17 had become increasingly dangerous to drive. In fact, as I am sure you are aware, Highway 17 is one of the most dangerous roads in the country. According to a CBS Bay Area article from 2017, the number of collisions on Highway 17 has more than quadrupled in the last decade. - [https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/05/15/stats-show-hwy-17-growing-more-dangerous-for-commuters/](https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/05/15/stats-show-hwy-17-growing-more-dangerous-for-commuters/). And according to a 2019 Mercury News article, the number of fatal and injury collisions has increased substantially in recent years - [https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/09/22/highway-17-crashes-remain-on-troubling-rise/](https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/09/22/highway-17-crashes-remain-on-troubling-rise/). It is imperative that we do everything we can to reduce accidents, injuries, and deaths on Highway 17.

Accidents on Highway 17 and the traffic jams they cause have far-reaching effects including: Those involved who often tragically lose their lives or sustain other injuries and their families Strain on our first responders including CHP, Fire, Sheriff, EMS and other personnel Those who commute Highway 17 every day Others who drive Highway 17 occasionally to go to the beach or for other activities The thousands of people who live in communities off of Highway 17

Highway 17 is uniquely dangerous in a number of different aspects: it has heavy traffic, sharp turns, blind curves, slippery winter conditions, narrow shoulders, animals crossing, and perhaps most significantly - it functions as both a highway with fast-moving vehicles and also as a local road for thousands of people who live along it to access their neighborhoods and driveways.

These very different dual uses do not mix well and create “conflict points” where vehicle slow to exit, accelerate from a complete stop to enter, and make left turns. These actions create unexpected changes in traffic flow, especially significant when traffic is heavier. As a result, these conflict points are the cause of many serious accidents, the ensuing strain on first responders, and the stopped traffic and delays for anyone using the highway.

It is important that we reduce these conflict points to allow vehicles to move more efficiently and safely. There are currently 28 conflict points at Sugarloaf/Laurel/Glenwood Cutoff and this project would reduce that number to 4. This project is also in alignment with the efforts to install a wildlife habitat connectivity crossing.

For those of us that live along Highway 17, it has become increasingly dangerous to enter and exit our homes (with no commercial uses in any of these neighborhoods, we need to access Highway 17 to go anywhere). As a resident of Sugarloaf, I would gladly travel farther on frontage streets in exchange for the safety and reliability of an interchange at this location.
This project is vital to enhancing the safety, mobility, and accessibility on Hwy 17 and I hope you will consider moving it to the constrained list with funding secured.

Thank you,

Dr. Mohammad Reza Zarghami B.S., D.C.
To the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission:

I live off of Sugarloaf Road and I’d like to submit comments regarding the potential Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Interchange project as part of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. This project is listed at the bottom of page 2 of 54 on the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List:


This project has been talked about for many years and I am disappointed to see that it is listed as unconstrained in the next 23 years. This project is incredibly important and should be moved to the constrained list with funding secured.

As traffic has increased throughout the entire bay area, Highway 17 had become increasingly dangerous to drive. In fact, as I am sure you are aware, Highway 17 is one of the most dangerous roads in the country. According to a CBS Bay Area article from 2017, the number of collisions on Highway 17 has more than quadrupled in the last decade. -

https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/05/15/stats-show-hwy-17-growing-more-dangerous-for-commuters/.

And according to a 2019 Mercury News article, the number of fatal and injury collisions has increased substantially in recent years -


It is imperative that we do everything we can to reduce accidents, injuries, and deaths on Highway 17.

Accidents on Highway 17 and the traffic jams they cause have far-reaching effects including:

Those involved who often tragically lose their lives or sustain other injuries and their families
Strain on our first responders including CHP, Fire, Sheriff, EMS and other personnel
Those who commute Highway 17 every day
Others who drive Highway 17 occasionally to go to the beach or for other activities
The thousands of people who live in communities off of Highway 17.

Highway 17 is uniquely dangerous in a number of different aspects: it has heavy traffic, sharp turns, blind curves, slippery winter conditions, narrow shoulders, animals crossing, and perhaps most significantly - it functions as both a highway with fast-moving vehicles and also as a local road for thousands of people who live along it to access their neighborhoods and driveways.
These very different dual uses do not mix well and create “conflict points” where vehicle slow to exit, accelerate from a complete stop to enter, and make left turns. These actions create unexpected changes in traffic flow, especially significant when traffic is heavier. As a result, these conflict points are the cause of many serious accidents, the ensuing strain on first responders, and the stopped traffic and delays for anyone using the highway. It is important that we reduce these conflict points to allow vehicles to move more efficiently and safely. There are currently 28 conflict points at Sugarloaf/Laurel/Glenwood Cutoff and this project would reduce that number to 4. This project is also in alignment with the efforts to install a wildlife habitat connectivity crossing.

For those of us that live along Highway 17, it has become increasingly dangerous to enter and exit our homes (with no commercial uses in any of these neighborhoods, we need to access Highway 17 to go anywhere). As a resident of Sugarloaf, I would gladly travel farther on frontage streets in exchange for the safety and reliability of an interchange at this location.

This project is vital to enhancing the safety, mobility, and accessibility on Hwy 17 and I hope you will consider moving it to the constrained list with funding secured.

Thank you,
Asad
To the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission:

I live off of Sugarloaf Road and I’d like to submit comments regarding the potential Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Interchange project as part of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. This project is listed at the bottom of page 2 of 54 on the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List: https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/rptRTP2045draftCONuncon.pdf. This project has been talked about for many years and I am disappointed to see that it is listed as unconstrained in the next 23 years. This project is incredibly important and should be moved to the constrained list with funding secured.

As traffic has increased throughout the entire bay area, Highway 17 had become increasingly dangerous to drive. In fact, as I am sure you are aware, Highway 17 is one of the most dangerous roads in the country. According to a CBS Bay Area article from 2017, the number of collisions on Highway 17 has more than quadrupled in the last decade. - https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/05/15/stats-show-hwy-17-growing-more-dangerous-for-commuters/. And according to a 2019 Mercury News article, the number of fatal and injury collisions has increased substantially in recent years - https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/09/22/highway-17-crashes-remain-on-troubling-rise/. It is imperative that we do everything we can to reduce accidents, injuries, and deaths on Highway 17.

Accidents on Highway 17 and the traffic jams they cause have far-reaching effects including:
- Those involved who often tragically lose their lives or sustain other injuries and their families
- Strain on our first responders including CHP, Fire, Sheriff, EMS and other personnel
- Those who commute Highway 17 every day
- Others who drive Highway 17 occasionally to go to the beach or for other activities
- The thousands of people who live in communities off of Highway 17

Highway 17 is uniquely dangerous in a number of different aspects: it has heavy traffic, sharp turns, blind curves, slippery winter conditions, narrow shoulders, animals crossing, and perhaps most significantly - it functions as both a highway with fast-moving vehicles and also as a local road for thousands of people who live along it to access their neighborhoods and driveways.

These very different dual uses do not mix well and create “conflict points” where vehicle slow to exit, accelerate from a complete stop to enter, and make left turns. These actions create unexpected changes in traffic flow, especially significant when traffic is heavier. As a result, these conflict points are the cause of many serious accidents, the ensuing strain on first responders, and the stopped traffic and delays for anyone using the highway.

It is important that we reduce these conflict points to allow vehicles to move more efficiently and safely. There are currently 28 conflict points at Sugarloaf/Laurel/Glenwood Cutoff and this project would reduce that number to 4. This project is also in alignment with the efforts to install a wildlife habitat connectivity crossing.

For those of us that live along Highway 17, it has become increasingly dangerous to enter and exit our homes (with no commercial uses in any of these neighborhoods, we need to access Highway 17 to go anywhere). As a resident of Sugarloaf, I would gladly travel farther on frontage streets in exchange for the safety and reliability of an interchange at this location.
This project is vital to enhancing the safety, mobility, and accessibility on Hwy 17 and I hope you will consider moving it to the constrained list with funding secured.

Thank you,
Hi Brianna, Amy, and Sarah,

Below, please find written comments on your agenda items, below.

These were appropriately submitted by the 12pm 01/12/2022 written comment deadline. However, I was unable to send them to you ahead of the meeting due to the high volume of comments we received on the closed session item (which I am processing now) and other duties associated with the RTC meeting. For that, I apologize.

I believe these comments were also delivered orally at the meeting. They have been logged in the Correspondence log.

Best,
Krista

---

**Item #9: Pilot Project utilizing goats to control vegetation on Santa Cruz Coastal Corridor**

Based on similar experiences utilizing goats to control vegetation overgrowth along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail corridor, it is not a realistic long-term solution for management of Santa Cruz Coastal Corridor vegetation. The goats will not eat all the various vegetation, not providing a clean mitigation required to maintain the corridor. Based on our experience, the goat operator will have to bring in additional food to ensure the goats have enough to eat. The real solution is to invest in opening the Coastal Trail NOW which will require the physical removal of vegetation to allow active transportation along the corridor.

**Item #20: PUBLIC HEARING on Draft 2045 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

It does not appear that the cost projections within the draft RTP have been updated with current
market rates for construction projects. For example, item #TRL 07bSC; Segment 7-phase 2 (Bay/California St to Pacific Ave/wharf) Coastal Trail has a projected cost of $11,000,000. The recently completed Segment 7-phase 1 cost $10M per mile and was considered to be the least expensive section of the trail due to its configuration and environment. Segment 7-phase 2 is projected to be one of the most expensive due to the requirement to remove heritage trees, major earth work and construction of large retaining walls. It is not a realistic plan if the projected cost is not accurate. We recommend that there be an update to the cost estimates and, preferably, use the cost to build the Coastal Trail after railbanking, removal of rails and ties and placing trail in center of corridor.

**Item #22: Construction Contract Award – Phase 1 Coastal Erosion Repair at Manresa along the Santa Cruz Coastal Corridor**

The doubling of cost for the Coastal Erosion Repair at Manresa along the Santa Cruz Coastal Corridor is an example of how the delay in opening the Santa Cruz Coastal Trail is costing Santa Cruz taxpayers. Not shown in the detailed project cost is removal and replacement of the rails and ties. Does the scope of work include removal and replacement of rails and ties? If so, we recommend that the tracks not be replaced, rather the corridor remain as a dirt path at the completion of the erosion repair.

Brian Peoples
Trail Now
Hello Transportation Commissioners!

Thanks for all that you do for our citizens.

As a senior and increasingly less abled citizen, I’d love to see light electric rail move into focus as soon as possible for our county.

I live in Live Oak, which includes a large amount of Senior Housing, Care Facilities, and Senior Mobile Home Communities.

Many of us who must use Para Transit, Lift Line, or even Metro would definitely be able to take advantage of light electric trams on our rail corridor due to their level, easy boarding- and the proximity of the corridor to our living situations.

Metro, Para Transit, and Lift Line are helpful indeed, but due to their stairs, electric lifts, and scheduling ahead, do not all offer the same transportation freedom as level boarding electric trams.

Please consider all of our citizens when looking toward future transit needs.

We have room for light rail plus the widest adjacent trail in the County, let’s use our corridor to meet all of our citizen’s transit needs.

Thank you,
Catherine Marino
As you consider the 2045 transportation plan for the county, please include plans to have direct bus service to the San Jose airport. Currently it is necessary to take a bus to the San Jose bus station and then catch a taxi or a train or another bus to travel a few miles to the airport this is a ridiculous waste of energy and time thank you for the consideration.

From Patricia McVeigh Santa Cruz

Have a Happy Day,

Pat
The best use of transpo funds is green rail.
The worst is freeway lane additions/ widening.
Induced demand of bigger freeways will cause congestion levels to return in a short time, as well as increased pollution, noise etc.
The present and growing 8,000 commuters to UCSC from mid County and beyond could best be accommodated on the rail line with a PRT connection from the Boardwalk area with a stop at the Downtown transit center and continuing along the River levy and through the Pogonip to the U!
Lest get the most for taxpayer transpo dollars!
Fred Geiger
Santa Cruz
All of the new transit projects listed in Friday’s Sentinel are much needed improvements to our transit infrastructure. As a means to alleviate the upcoming congestion these projects will create for the Highway 1 corridor over the next several years it would be advantageous to have the rail corridor interim trail fully functional. I fully support using the trail to help reduce the car congestion these transit projects will create for much of the county. Many traveling to work, schools or shops will use the interim trail rather than add to the highway 1 corridor congestion.

If you build it (the interim trail), they will come!

Alice Schmidt
831-332-7212
101 Holiday Drive
La Selva Beach, CA
alicecs@aol.com
Please be sure to keep rail in the equation of the highway 1 corridor. To remove rail is foolish. We need to address the future of clean transportation that is available to all. Not just able bodied residents. I love walking and biking on the rail trail and will be thrilled when one day I can ride clean rail up to Capitola. Clean rail is the future.

Thanks,
Cindy Jacobs
I am writing to express my thoughts on the 2045 RTP plan.

No train
Yes on trail
No widening highway 1
Stop making decisions based on data. Make decisions based on neighborhood needs.
We need to re-do our infrastructure, we do not to create new infrastructure for more people to visit our community. Stop catering to tourists and commuters.
Start catering to local neighborhoods.

Enough said,

Sent from my iPad
Hi Draft 2045RTP,

**For the Draft 2045 RTP:**

We have many workers that work early in the morning & later in the evening, but we do not have a bus service during most of these times.

Other Counties have a “All Nighter Service” to get people home safe from work. We have several work locations that start shifts at 6am, and we have many restaurants/bar that end their workday after midnight. The GO program in Downtown Santa Cruz is awesome, but it does not have the funding to fund an earlier or later Metro service. I was in manufacturing for several decades and know that I had some workers that strongly requested to only working later shifts.

**Can there be special funding, in the “Draft 2045 RTP”, to allow a special circular “All Nighter” bus service to capture all of our counties Metro stations to help get people home safe from work?**

I envision a daily hourly one-way circular bus route that travels around the county, between Midnight & 6am, that would stop at all the counties transit centers in Watsonville, Capitola, Scotts Valley & Santa Cruz (7-days a week).

Thank You for your time and consideration
Michael Pisano - Soquel
Hi 2045RTP,

**For the Draft 2045 RTP:**

If funding could be available for more Bike Lockers in Santa Cruz County.
We are given great rebates for electric bikes, but at $3000 needed to purchase a decent ebike with
the high propensity for those ebike to be stolen.
To add bikelink controlled bike lockers at more retail locations in our County.

**EV Charging Stations:**
If funding could be added to add quick EV charging stations in Soquel Village.
If funding could be added to add quick EV charging stations at Retail locations, and at other public
parking lots (or public parking garages).

I would like to see more information on what makes a walkable city?
- What goals are we going to use to make are County more walkable...
- Some cities have robots delivering food, (like Mt. View) – do not know what this will do
to delivery employees, but with the great resignation – who knows.

I would like to see funding for a Bus Stop Committee:
The Santa Cruz Metro had a Bus Stop Committee, but disbanded after losing funding due to
budget deficit.
A bus stop committee can draw into meetings; local public works, Caltrans, etc.. to help
improve or add bus stops.
May have access to funding to complete projects.

I would like to see funding for a Pedestrian Committee:
The SCCRTC had a Pedestrian Committee, but it was disbanded.
A Pedestrian Committee can draw into meetings; local public works, Caltrans, etc.. to help
improve walkable pedestrian safety.
May have access to funding to complete projects.

Add incentives to add Flex Fuel stations in Santa Cruz County.
We have no flex fuel stations (E85) in Santa Cruz County to help lower our carbon footprint.
Here is an example of nearby locations - https://propelfuels.com/

Thank You for your time and consideration
Michael Pisano - Soquel
Dear Commissioners,

First and foremost, I would like to thank all of You for Your diligence in supporting real transit solutions. I know Your job cannot have been easy, given the contentious issues and the nature of the citizens of Our county. What I would like to interject is My support for the current locally preferred alternative, being trail with rail. I cannot tell You how much I appreciate the fine rail trail built thus far, I have ridden that trail along the rail corridor since I was 8 years old. (Dirt trail then) I wish to urge You to not be swayed by negative influences that may cause You to abandon the plan. In the future You will all be able to say You had a hand in the progress of such an important beneficial asset. I realize that rail passenger transit will not be a magic bullet to eliminate congestion and pollution, but along with metro connections, ridesharing and a trail, there can be significant reduction of single occupancy auto use. And a better opportunity for visitors to enjoy coming here. And although not all areas of the county will be served by rail transit, consider good paying local jobs that everyone will benefit from. And definitely consider the south county workers that are stressed mentally and financially just trying to get to the thousands of service jobs north of Them. As it stands at this point in time, things are kind of hanging, but please keep grounded and do what needs to be done, which is to keep moving forward.

Thanks,

Frank Rimicci Jr.
750 Amesti Rd.
Corralitos,
831-724-6710
Dear Commissioners,

What an impressive amount of work on the Draft 2045 RTP. I appreciate the opportunity to provide comment and make a request.

While I am primarily addressing the rail corridor, my feedback may apply to other elements. If it does, please extend my thinking.

The rail corridor backs up to my home in Capitola and, as I’ve mentioned in previous communication, passersby can see directly into my bedroom window. The line of sight is such that mitigation will be required no matter which proposal, rail or trail, succeeds. Living along the corridor has never been a problem due to its limited use, but I simply don’t know what the impact will be in the future. We have been residents since 2005.

It’s possible I’m missing something, but when engaging formal documents such as this draft, neighborhood safety appears to be excluded from the broader questions of transportation safety. I do not believe neighborhood safety should be extricated. That’s why I respectfully request the development of a public safety committee, comprised of emergency responders, other criminal justice officials, individuals who have experience working in human services, and neighborhood representatives to provide evaluation and advice to the RTC.

It is much easier to plan for impacts rather than respond to them. Existing residents have a right to personal safety. Cities and the county must also understand whether public safety budgets would be altered.

Best Regards,
Heidy Kellison
Fanmar Way
Capitola
I am submitting this comment in response to the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan.

I'm writing about the goals for transportation in 2045 for Santa Cruz County. Two items in particular, passenger rail on the Santa Cruz Branch Line and the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail are new developments for regional transportation.
I want passenger train service because the train offers a quiet, comfortable way to travel. It's quite a bit nicer than driving a car or taking a bus. I want train service because the tracks are fixed in place, so that once service is running, it won't be switched to another part of the city.

My hope is for 15 minute service (A train comes every 15 minutes) from end to end, from Davenport to Monterey. Once set up, the rail system has the same costs for an empty train as a full one. I want to see the fare set to 25 cents until the trains start to run full. At that point, I'd raise rates enough to have one empty seat on a peak hour train.

I want trains to reach San Jose and San Francisco, to the Amtrak station in Pajaro junction, to Monterey and to the new high-speed rail network to Sacramento, Los Angeles and San Diego. I'd like to see the operating budget come entirely from state, federal and private grants. Fare receipts would be used only to finance expansion of passenger service.

While we are waiting for local passenger service to be financed by outside sources, we should use our meager budget to put the Santa Cruz Branch Line back into serviceable condition. I have learned that a number of outside agencies have expressed interest in operating passenger trains on our line. I'd like these to commence as soon as possible. Our rails should be repaired to allow this to happen.

The rail trail on the Westside is really nice to use. I live close enough to the tracks that I use it nearly daily. Construction on the next segment begins in a few weeks, and I hope to see construction on two more segments starting next year.
TAMC has expressed interest in bringing passenger rail back to Monterey. I would like RTC to cooperate with TAMC to help make this happen. I'd also like the bicycle trail to go all the way around the bay.

I know the RTC handles more than the rail trail. However, I find this to be the topic I am concerned about. Thanks for reading.

Neil Waldhauer
Santa Cruz, California
January 11, 2022
To RTC

I strongly support the installation of usable train/rail service in Santa Cruz County. Our county is crippled by a lack of alternate routes to Hwy 1 and Soquel Ave/Drive.

People who live on the West Side of SC or in Scotts Valley perhaps don’t realize how desperate and dangerous the situation is for people who need to commute to work, school, appointments, etc.

We also need the rail service as an alternate for fuel dependent cars which pollute our air.

A trail would be nice too - for biking and walking. I like to ride my bike but am fearful of riding on roads with a lot of cars.

Now is the time to move forward with a viable rail service for our community with a trail along side where appropriate.

Thank you

Danielle Dorrian
202 Santa Clara Ave
Aptos
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the transportation goals for our community! I am very supportive of the plan's focus on sustainability, as well as the preservation and improvement of our existing infrastructure. As the plan says, "the region must find ways to operate and utilize our existing highway and transit networks more efficiently and sustainably over the long term." I am very happy that the plan is clear that it intends "to bring about safer, healthier and more efficient travel choices that provide improved multimodal access to jobs, education, healthcare, and other destinations for our residents and visitors" and is clear that "addressing many of these challenges will require a significant change in how we choose to travel".

Given this plans emphasis on sustainability and utilization of existing infrastructure, I am disappointed that the Locally Preferred Alternative of electric light rail running on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line is an unconstrained project. The SCBRL is already owned by the county, which is one of the most complicated and expensive processes in creating a project of this kind. If we intend to utilize our existing transit networks efficiently, it would be extremely shortsighted to not take advantage of such a valuable resource. The SCBRL runs straight through the most densely populated portions of our county and many of the major job centers, and it connects the largest cities in our county. This line would create a back-bone of public transportation in the community and would very likely increase the use of our other public transit services. Combined with a trail running alongside it, the rail corridor would create the potential for residents to rely on active and public transit for the majority of their travel needs. This ability to travel without a car is particularly valuable for two important groups in our community, students and service workers. What's more, an electric rail line may eventually link us to the rest of the state, according to the state rail plan, which would allow for tourists without traffic!

It is also clear that car dependent planning is unsustainable on multiple levels. Besides concerns with GHG emissions, many of our roads are already congested with further population growth expected. The draft plan states, "the population in Santa Cruz County is expected to increase 9% between 2025 and 2045". The housing crisis in California will not allow us to continue building insufficient new homes in any community, ours included. New residents will provide significant contributions to our local economy but will also add to traffic if not given alternatives to driving. Increasing capacities of highways is shown to not decrease congestion, and local roads are not able to be expanded. Even if we wanted to pursue expansion projects, the draft plan says it well that "highway projects can be relatively expensive, especially compared to the region’s share of funds. Additionally, truck and automobile traffic volumes are lower than in many areas of the state or nation, which can
make it difficult to compete for state and federal funds." Our limited funding abilities should not be focused on trying to make more car travel possible when California has made it clear it will be prioritizing sustainable transport funding: https://calsta.ca.gov/press-releases/2021-07-12-ca-finalizes-capti.

The plan is clear that reduced car dependence and increased utilization of active and public transit would provide significant benefits to our community, including lower GHG emissions, reduced air pollution, lower obesity rates, fewer traffic collisions, and keeping money within the local economy. If we truly want a sustainable and efficient transportation system in our county, and all the benefits that come with it, we must take full advantage of the SCBRL.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the 2045 draft plan.

Sean Abbey
Felton Resident
Hi,

Regarding Hwy 17 Access Management CT-P52 (Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Grade Separation Concept), clarify if eminent domain, or blight, is contemplated in the case of the adjacent residential properties.

Further, clarify contemplated treatment of the adjacent neighborhood or residential properties, and if these residences are being considered as blighted, and/or if its physical development has been contemplated as being held back by the buildings’ proximity to the highway.

If contemplated, clarify which properties are considered to represent an immediate threat to public health and safety, and provide a date by which any supporting assessment on a property-by-property basis will be made.

Thanks, Adam
Greetings,

As a resident of Sugarloaf Road for 48 years I have seen everything there is to see on Hwy 17. Literally.

The proposed Highway 17 Access Plan for the highway completely ignores the true geography of the region, identifies problem areas that just do not exist and is way, way under-budgeted for what it proposed to accomplish. $40 million won't go very far to make a dent.

The real problem with Hwy 17 IS NOT THE HIGHWAY! It is the speeding and reckless driving!

For a mere fraction of the “initial” $40 million proposed for the Access Plan, a simple ramping-up of CHP patrols stationed between the Summit and Scotts Valley on a permanent basis would accomplish the same goals — and more. This plan could be initiated and in-place in a matter of mere months. After all, nothing prevents accidents or slows crazy drivers down more than a radar-equipped CHP on a motorcycle or in a patrol car!

Why is this solution not a consideration? Is it just too obvious, simple and comparatively inexpensive? Why wait 20 or 30 years when we can accomplish the same goals when we need them most?

Don't allow more accidents, injuries and deaths to occur needlessly. Why not make this a simple solution that can be executed almost immediately, not in decades?

Thanks for considering my perspective on the matter.

FRED W. GILLASPY
465 Sugarloaf Road, Scotts Valley, CA 95066
FGillaspy@mac.com

831-438-2809 | Cell: 831-239-4292
To the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission:

I live off of Sugarloaf Road and I’d like to submit comments regarding the potential Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Interchange project as part of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. This project is listed at the bottom of page 2 of 54 on the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan Project List: https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/rptRTP2045draftCONuncon.pdf.

This project has been talked about for many years and I am disappointed to see that it is listed as unconstrained in the next 23 years. This project is incredibly important and should be moved to the constrained list with funding secured.

As traffic has increased throughout the entire bay area, Highway 17 had become increasingly dangerous to drive. In fact, as I am sure you are aware, Highway 17 is one of the most dangerous roads in the country. According to a CBS Bay Area article from 2017, the number of collisions on Highway 17 has more than quadrupled in the last decade. - https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2017/05/15/stats-show-hwy-17-growing-more-dangerous-for-commuters/. And according to a 2019 Mercury News article, the number of fatal and injury collisions has increased substantially in recent years - https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/09/22/highway-17-crashes-remain-on-troubling-rise/. It is imperative that we do everything we can to reduce accidents, injuries, and deaths on Highway 17.

Accidents on Highway 17 and the traffic jams they cause have far-reaching affects including:

- Those involved who often tragically lose their lives or sustain other injuries and their families
- Strain on our first responders including CHP, Fire, Sheriff, EMS and other personnel
- Those who commute Highway 17 every day
- Others who drive Highway 17 occasionally to go to the beach or for other activities
- The thousands of people who live in communities off of Highway 17

Highway 17 is uniquely dangerous in a number of different aspects: it has heavy traffic, sharp turns, blind curves, slippery winter conditions, narrow shoulders, animals crossing, and perhaps most significantly - it functions as both a highway with fast-moving vehicles and also as a local road for thousands of people who live along it to access their neighborhoods and driveways.

These very different dual uses do not mix well and create “conflict points” where vehicle slow to exit, accelerate from a complete stop to enter, and make left turns. These actions create unexpected changes in traffic flow, especially significant when traffic is heavier. As a result, these conflict points are the cause of many serious accidents, the ensuing strain on first responders, and the stopped traffic and delays for anyone using the highway.

It is important that we reduce these conflict points to allow vehicles to move more efficiently and safely. There are currently 28 conflict points at Sugarloaf/Laurel/Glenwood Cutoff and this project would reduce that number to 4. This project is also in alignment with the efforts to install a wildlife habitat connectivity crossing.

For those of us that live along Highway 17, it has become increasingly dangerous to enter and exit our homes (with no commercial uses in any of these neighborhoods, we need to access Highway 17 to go anywhere). As a resident of Sugarloaf, I would gladly travel farther on frontage streets in exchange for the safety and reliability of an interchange at this location.

This project is vital to enhancing the safety, mobility, and accessibility on Hwy 17 and I hope you will consider moving it to the constrained list with funding secured.
Hello,

The County of Santa Cruz is commenting and advocating for a “Fix it First” for Roads prioritization of the Goals for the 2045 RTP. Specifically, the County is advocating that the RTP prioritize Goal 3.A.1 (Maintain the existing system and improve the condition of transportation facilities - Increase the percentage of pavement in good condition to 50% by 2030 and 80% by 2045) over all the other goals in the RTP. The County’s position is that adopting a Fix it First policy for Roads will greatly benefit many of the Goals, Targets and Policies in the Plan and therefore should be the highest priority.

Please include as a comment to the 2045 RTP.

Thank you and Happy New Year!

Steve Wiesner, P.E.
Assistant Director of Public Works
Transportation Division
County of Santa Cruz

Phone: 831-454-2160
Email: steve.wiesner@santacruzcounty.us

https://www.dpw.co.santa-cruz.ca.us/
Name
Steve Wiesner

Email
steve.wiesner@santacruzcounty.us

Describe a specific project that could improve transportation in Santa Cruz County.
Project: Soquel Dr. Reversible Lane (Flex Lane) Feasibility Study

What jurisdiction is this potential project located?
- Unincorporated County

Drop a pin on the project location

Provide any other project location details
Feasibility Study limits is on Soquel Dr. from Hwy 1/Soquel Dr. intersection to Park Ave/Soquel Dr. intersection.

How will this project improve the transportation system in Santa Cruz County?
The project will reduce trip delays, congestion and air quality.

Get 2045 RTP Project Updates
- Check this box to join the RTP email distribution list

Geocoder
- Place Name: N/A
- Street Number: N/A
- Street Name: N/A
- Street (number + name): N/A
- Street (name + number): N/A
- Premise: N/A
- Subpremise: N/A
The priorities for implementing transit within Santa Cruz County:

1) Repair and maintain existing infrastructure. This includes
   - Widening and improving CA 1 between Santa Cruz and Watsonville.
   - Widening and improving CA 17 between Scotts Valley and Summit area.
   - Fixing numerous local streets. For example:
     - Glenwood Drive near Scotts Valley Drive.
     - Granite Creek Road overcrossing of CA-17.

2) The balance of funding to support commerce vs social equity should support more commerce.
   This implies more highways to anticipate autonomous vehicles traveling to employment and commerce.

Thank you,
Robert Hull
Scotts Valley
Dear Friends,

I write in support the needed traffic/bicycle/pedestrian/street and sidewalk improvements proposed in the Draft 2045 RTC Plan for the City of Scotts Valley.

In particular, as a resident of Bluebonnet Lane, Scotts Valley, I am very concerned that this residential street has become a expressway for vehicles driving to/from the library, senior center, the Skypark recreational area, library, post office, shopping center and transit center.

The city council envisions a future "town center" on the vacant property where the former airport runway is located, and this development (housing, retail, mixed housing/retail) will only increase the vehicle traffic in our area.

Scotts Valley Dr. and Mt. Hermon Rd. are the main arterials through Scotts Valley, but they are jammed with traffic day and night. Drivers use Bean Creek Rd. and Bluebonnet Lane as work arounds to avoid the congestion and traffic lights on the arterials.

Traffic calming measures along with the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians should be a high priority for our residential streets.

In particular, the round-about at Bean Creek and Bluebonnet and the implementation of the Active Transportation Plan recommendations for these two streets should be a high priority for funding and implementation.

Thank you for making these recommendations in the Draft 2045 Plan.

David Jones

831 234-6704
Hi again,

We are in the process of getting them cataloged and sending them back out to the branches. No need to go pick them up. Watsonville has a separate library system so no worries on that end as well. I'll look for an email next year and we'll make sure to get the Final copies out to where you would like them.

Best,
David

On Wed, Dec 15, 2021 at 4:54 PM 2045 RTP <2045rtp@scrte.org> wrote:

Hello David,

Thank you for your email and I apologize for just now getting back to you. I am so sorry I did not check-in with you prior to dropping off the RTP and EIRs at the library branches. I'm new to this project and was not aware the documents had to be cataloged so I hand delivered each document on Wednesday, 12/8 to the following branches: Downtown, Felton, Capitola, La Selva, and Watsonville.

Do you need me to pickup each document and return all back to the downtown branch for cataloging?

I’ll be sure to contact you in advance when we circulate the FINAL 2045 Regional Transportation Plan for public review in mid-2022.

Kind regards,

Amy
Hi Amy,

Below is a comment from a E&D TAC member who will not be able to attend the next E&D TAC meeting with a comment on the RTP.

Thanks!

Amanda

---

From: DEBORAH BENHAM <deborah05@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 16, 2021 7:37 AM
To: Amanda Marino <amarino@sccrtc.org>; Veronica Elsea <veronica@laurelcreekmusic.com>
Subject: Re: Special 1/11 E&D TAC Meeting

Hi you(s),

Just looked over the 'Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)'; and focusing on Appendix E, "Project List." I am so gratified to see the Scotts Valley Active Transportation Plan (SV ATP) sited in many of the listed projects for Scotts Valley! I also looked at Hwy 17 CalTrans corridor projects and have one comment:

Hwy 17 - Project ID CT-P49 - include City of Scotts Valley for operational improvements ie: offramp/onramp Scotts Valley Dr/Granite Creek Rd; traffic signal and intersection design improvements (re-design of 5 way intersection).

Thank you, Debbie
Dist 5 E&D TAC Rep

PS: Meeting today with the CTSC and Bluebonnet Neighborhood Group to discuss traffic calming measures along Bluebonnet Lane in Scotts Valley (once again ... will it never end??).
In a perfect world we would fund and implement all the suggested items. This world is not perfect and so all projects will not get funded. I personally would like to see the priorities as follows: Repair all currently existing roads. Create a north south transportation corridor along the rail line for transporting passengers - choose the option that can currently be implemented the soonest regardless of if it is the “best” option or not. Safe bike lane/path to ride from santa cruz to Boulder Creek Yours, Peter Thomas Cell phone # 831-515-2757
In a perfect world we would fund and implement all the suggested items. This world is not perfect and so all projects will not get funded. I personally would like to see the priorities as follows: Repair all currently existing roads. Create a north south transportation corridor along the rail line - choose the option that can currently be implemented the soonest regardless of if it is the “best” option or not.

Yours,

Peter Thomas
Cell phone # 831-515-2757
We need a trolley on the rail line similar to the one recently demonstrated, using green hydrogen and ALSO a link from the Boardwalk to the downtown and UCSC areas. Without these links the ridership will not be sufficient to justify the rail line being used. A PRT or similar system is key to making this link and ensuring success of the rail trail!

Fred J. Geiger
Santa Cruz Ca
Describe a specific project that could improve transportation in Santa Cruz County.

Re-surface Rio del Mar Blvd. It has been in very poor condition for years. Visitors get the first impression that the area is depressed, and not a good place to visit. It is also unsafe to ride bicycles on.

What jurisdiction is this potential project located?

- Unincorporated County

Provide any other project location details

Rio del Mar Blvd from the HWY 1 to Aptos Beach Drive.

How will this project improve the transportation system in Santa Cruz County?

The road is in poor condition, and is deteriorating. The worse it gets, the more expensive it will be to repair. Roads should be maintained at about 70 PCI, to make optimal use of scarce funding.