AGENDA

Thursday, May 7, 2015
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
Capitola City Council Chambers
420 Capitola Avenue
Capitola, CA

NOTE
See the last page for details about access for people with disabilities and meeting broadcasts.

En Español
Para información sobre servicios de traducción al español, diríjase a la última página.

AGENDAS ONLINE
To receive email notification when the RTC meeting agenda packet is posted on our website, please call (831) 460-3200 or email info@sccrtc.org to subscribe.

COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Caltrans (ex-officio)                Tim Gubbins
City of Capitola                    Dennis Norton
City of Santa Cruz                  Don Lane
City of Scotts Valley               Randy Johnson
City of Watsonville                 Jimmy Dutra
County of Santa Cruz                Greg Caput
County of Santa Cruz                Ryan Coonerty
County of Santa Cruz                Zach Friend
County of Santa Cruz                John Leopold
County of Santa Cruz                Bruce McPherson
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Karina Cervantez
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Cynthia Chase
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Ed Bottorff

The majority of the Commission constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business.
Article 8 Transportation Development Act Claims – only City and County representatives vote
Article 4 Transportation Development Act Claims, Policy Issues, and SAFE – all 12 members vote
1. Roll call

2. Oral communications

   Any member of the public may address the Commission for a period not to exceed three minutes on any item within the jurisdiction of the Commission that is not already on the agenda. The Commission will listen to all communication, but in compliance with State law, may not take action on items that are not on the agenda.

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

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 April 2, 2015 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Accept draft minutes of the April 13, 2015 Bicycle Committee meeting

6. Accept draft minutes of the April 14, 2015 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

POLICY ITEMS

   No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

7. Approve the FY15-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 claims for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, the Ride ‘n’ Stride program, and the Bike to work program (Resolutions)

8. Receive Monterey Bay Region 2015 Public Participation Plan

9. Approve consultant contract for federal transportation/legislative assistant (Resolution)
BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

11. Approve appointment of members to the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

12. Accept monthly meeting schedule

13. Accept correspondence log

14. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to the Honorable William Monning regarding Support for SB 344: Commercial Driver Safety Training
   b. Letter to the Honorable Jean Fuller regarding Support for SB 516 Transportation: Motorist Aid Services
   c. Letter to the Honorable Jim Frazier regarding Support for ACA 4, Local Government Transportation Projects: Special Taxes: Voter Approval
   d. Letter to CalTrans regarding City of Santa Cruz Active Transportation Program Grant Application for Branciforte Creek Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge from the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
   e. Letter to CalTrans regarding City of Scotts Valley Active Transportation Program Grant Application from the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

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

16. Accept information items
   a. Letter from the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)
   b. Local Groups MAP 21 Renewal letter
   c. Central Coast Coalition letter
   d. Grant Confirmation letter from CalTrans

REGULAR AGENDA

17. Commissioner reports – oral reports

18. Director’s Report – oral report
   (George Dondero, Executive Director)
19. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. District Director’s Report
   b. Construction projects update

20. **9:30 PUBLIC HEARING** 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs
    *(Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner)*
   a. Staff report
   b. Final Draft 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs

21. Bicycle Route Signage Program
    *(Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner)*
   a. Staff report
   b. SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program – Final Draft 2015 Implementation Plan
   c. Resolution authorizing the submittal of an application to the Active Transportation Program for implementation of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program
   d. Public comment on the Draft 2015 Implementation Plan

22. Fiscal Year 2015-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims for the Volunteer Center, Community Bridges and Santa Cruz Metro
    *(Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner)*
   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution authorizing FY 2015-16 TDA Funds for the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of Community Bridges
   c. Community Bridges TDA Claim and operations budget pages
   d. Resolution authorizing FY 2015-16 TDA Funds for the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of Volunteer Center
   e. Volunteer Center TDA Claim and operating budget pages
   f. Resolution authorizing FY 2015-16 TDA and STA Funds for Santa Cruz County Metropolitan Transit District
   g. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District TDA and STA Claim operating budget pages

23. Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project
    *(George Dondero, Executive Director)*
   a. Staff report
   b. RTC Letter of Support to CalTrans
   c. Highway 17 Project Fact Sheet
   d. Map of Project Location
   e. Letter from the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County
24. Federal Legislative Update  
*(Oral report from Chris Giglio, Capital Edge)*

  a. Memorandum from Capital Edge

25. Fiscal Year 2015-16 Overall Work Program  
*(Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director)*

  a. Staff report  
  b. Final Draft FY 2015-16 Work Program

26. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

**CLOSED SESSION**

27. Conference with legal counsel—anticipated litigation. Significant Exposure to Litigation to be considered for one case pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9 (d)(2).

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

**OPEN SESSION**

29. Report on closed session

30. Next meetings

   The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 4, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main Street, Suite 400, Watsonville, CA.

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 21, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

**HOW TO REACH US**

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

Watsonville Office  
275 Main Street, Suite 450, Watsonville. CA 95076  
(831) 768-8012  
email: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org
COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

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

HOW TO STAY INFORMED ABOUT RTC MEETINGS, AGENDAS & NEWS

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

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

- Aptos Library
- Branciforte Library
- Santa Cruz Downtown Library
- Garfield Park Library
- Live Oak Library
- Watsonville Main Library
- Boulder Creek Library
- Capitola Library
- Felton Library
- La Selva Beach Library
- Scotts Valley Library

For information regarding library locations and hours, please check online at www.santacruzpl.org or www.watsonville.lib.ca.us.

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

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

HOW TO REQUEST

❖ ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission does not discriminate on the basis of disability and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs, or activities. This meeting location is an accessible facility. If you wish to attend this meeting and require special assistance in order to participate, please contact RTC staff at 460-3200 (CRS 800/735-2929) at least three working days in advance of this meeting to make arrangements. People with disabilities may request a copy of the agenda in an alternative format. As a courtesy to those person affected, Please attend the meeting smoke and scent-free.

❖ SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/ TRANSATION SERVICES
Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del Condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de anticipo al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis.) Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance) by calling (831) 460-3200.
1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:06 am

Members present:
Tim Gubbins
Greg Caput
Ryan Coonerty
Don Lane
Bruce McPherson
Randy Johnson
Cynthia Chase

Jimmy Dutra
Patrick Mulhearn (Alt.)
John Leopold
Karina Cervantez
Ed Bottorff

Staff Present:
George Dondero
Luis Mendez
Rachel Moriconi
Karena Pushnik
Ginger Dykaar

Rachel Moriconi
Yesenia Parra
Grace Blakeslee

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson, member of the Campaign for Sensible Transportation, said common sense and transportation planning must be joined with science to better address impacts to the environment.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Additional and /or add-on pages for items 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15b, 17, 18, 23 and 24 were distributed. A brochure from Caltrans regarding the California Transportation Plan was also distributed. Item 25 was pulled from the agenda and will be rescheduled for another meeting.
CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Caput asked about the funding for the Holohan road project (Item 15a.) Tim Gubbins, Caltrans noted that the County of Santa Cruz is the lead agency for the project, and added that the funding is in place and the project is moving along.

Commissioner McPherson noted that Santa Cruz METRO fair increases have been discussed but no decisions have been made (Item 15b.)

Commissioner Lane moved and Commissioner Coonerty seconded the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Leopold, Johnson, Coonerty, Dutra, Caput, Friend, McPherson, Cervantez, Chase and Bottorff voting “aye.”

MINUTES

4. Approved draft minutes of the March 5, 2015 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Accepted draft minutes of the March 11, 2015 Safe on 17/TOS Task Force meeting

6. Approved corrected minutes of the January 15, 2015 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

7. Accepted information on the development of the 2015 Unmet Para transit needs list and public hearing scheduled for May 7, 2015.

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

9. Accepted FY14-15 SCCRTC Semi-Annual Internal Financial Statements

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

10. Approved appointment of members to the Bicycle Committee
INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

11. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

12. Accepted correspondence log

13. Accepted letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to Santa Cruz Metro from RTC Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee regarding Santa Cruz Metro Structural Deficit and ParaCruz service
   b. Letter to the California State Transportation Agency in Support for Rail Extension to Monterey County Project

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

15. Accepted information items
   a. Highway 152/Holohan Road project updates: 1) County Department of Public Work’s Highway 152/Holohan Road/College Road Intersection Improvements Status Report and 2) summary of Caltrans Projects near Highway 152 at Holohan Road
   b. Stand Up for Transportation Day flyer

REGULAR AGENDA

16. Commissioner reports – oral reports

17. Director’s Report – oral report

Executive Director George Dondero noted his participation in the historic rail walk of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line led by Sandy Lydon with a group of 40 local residents; his reappointment for a three-year term to the Committee on Sustainability of the Transportation Research Board (TRB); a public workshop scheduled for April 16 at 6:30pm at the Mid County Senior Center to discuss the Unified Corridors Plan and receive public input; RTC staff’s participation in local business fairs in an effort to keep the community informed about the RTC; a request for proposals issued for a Washington, D.C. Legislative Assistant; and a call for projects for the Active Transportation Program (ATP) for which applications are due June 1, 2015. He reported that the Pippin Apartment affordable Housing Development project made the short list for the state Strategic Growth Council-Cap & Trade Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities program grant. Funding for the project is coming from a variety of sources including the City of Watsonville and County of Santa Cruz.
Commissioner Leopold noted that LAFCO approved the application for extraterritorial water and sanitary sewer services for the project.

18. Appoint an ad-hoc committee for the performance review of the Executive Director

Chair Leopold appointed Commissioners McPherson, Lane and himself to the adhoc committee.

Commissioner Caput moved and Commissioner Coonerty seconded Chair Leopold’s appointments to the adhoc committee. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Leopold, Johnson, Coonerty, Dutra, Caput, Friend, McPherson, Cervantez, Chase and Bottorff voting “aye.”

19. Presentation of American Planning Association award to Congressman Sam Farr

Item postponed

20. Federal Legislative Update

Item postponed

21. Caltrans report and consider action items

Tim Gubbins, Caltrans District 5 Director, noted that the public comment period for the California Transportation Plan (CTP) 2040 is open until April 17, 2015. The Plan is a State Wide Long Range Transportation Plan to meet future mobility needs and reduce green house gases for the next 25 years. Mr. Gubbins said that the State Highway Operation Protection Program (SHOPP) funds are used for Highway maintenance and the information was included so that Commissioners were aware of what projects were on the list to receive SHOPP funds.

Commissioner Leopold thanked Caltrans for the outreach efforts related to the Highway 17 access plan.

22. State Legislative Update and Positions

Executive Director George Dondero presented the staff report. He noted that there has been a lot of movement in Sacramento related to transportation. Staff will continue to follow transportation related legislation and will keep the Commission informed once the two houses begin conversations.

Commissioners Lane and Leopold joined Executive Director Dondero on the Legislative day trip and noted that the visit was an excellent opportunity and it was a good example of the power of working together.
Commissioner McPherson moved and Commissioner Lane seconded to approve staff recommended positions on State bills. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Leopold, Johnson, Coonerty, Dutra, Caput, Friend, McPherson, Cervantez, Chase and Bottorff voting “aye.”

23. Rail Corridor Update
Senior Transportation Planner, Karena Pushnik presented the staff report.

Commissioners discussed funding for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network; crossing concerns on Beach st., in Watsonville; planned projects at the Pajaro train station; extended service by the Coast Daylight train; impact on local traffic by train service; the RTC commitment for a passenger rail study; over 2,000 responses to the passenger rail study survey; community safety; forming a community committee to determine the feasibility of the rail property; and information on how many train trips are done by the rail operator.

**Jack Nelson**, said that climate scientists support carbon fees and dividends. He also said that using train freight rather than trucks is a great way to reduce carbon. The community is screaming for carbon reductions.

**Piet Canin**, Ecology Action staff and board member of Friends of the Rail and Trail (FORT), thanked staff for working with them on the rail line clean up scheduled for May 3rd. He said that FORT will be at community events to promote the Rail Trail and work with private funding sources for support. He noted that the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network will be viewed as a legacy project.

**Brian Peoples**, Aptos Rail Trail, said that passenger train service does not make senses. Vehicle to Vehicle communication systems are coming and will make Hwy 1 more efficient. He also said a fixed rail system is too expensive for this community. A bike path would have more benefits to the community and would be worth having to pay back money to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The rail property has more potential than train service.

**Michael McBride**, local resident said that the rail property should be used for the greater good. He said that he is disappointed that the passenger rail study has not been released. If there was a public trail opened, the issues of graffiti and other concerns would be taken care of.

24. Rail Motorcar Excursion on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line

Deputy Director Luis Mendez presented the staff report. The excursion will take place on the weekend of April 25th and 26th.

**Michael McBride**, local resident, asked how many of the participants are Santa Cruz County residents and how this excursion benefited the community.
Eric Child, Santa Cruz Resident and former member of NARCOA, said that NARCOA does a great job on their safety training. He also said that this excursion brings in lots of people that will use hotels and restaurants.

Brian Peoples, support’s a future tax measure. It seems that this excursion is using the rail property as an amusement park ride. He also said it creates more traffic and more pollution.

Responding to questions, Deputy Director Luis Mendez said that Santa Cruz residents are part of NARCOA and people from all over the country do come to participate in the excursion and generate economic activity. The RTC does coordinate with other agencies like the Seaside Company on potential impacts. The language in the agreement for the funds to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line does allow for recreational rail service.

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner Lane seconded to approve a rail motorcar excursion on the Santa Cruz Brach Rail Line for April 25 and 26, 2015 organized by the North American Railcar Operators Association (NARCOA) with the Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay (SC&MB) Railway for a fee of $500.00. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Leopold, Johnson, Coonerty, Dutra, Caput, Friend, McPherson, Cervantez, Chase and Bottorff voting “aye.”

25. Artwork for Railroad Crossing Signal Box

Item removed from the agenda

26. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

Eric Child, member of the Golden Gate Railroad Museum (GGRM), said that GGRM has been around for over 40 years. He noted that the proposal from GGRM is to have a static museum that serves as another attraction bringing in more tourist interest and will compliment other tourist attractions in the county specifically rail attractions. He also noted that GGRM is interested in providing some sort of rail excursions.

The regular meeting adjourned to closed session at 11:06 a.m.

CLOSED SESSION

27. Conference with Real Property Negotiator pursuant to Government Code 54956.8 for lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line property within the Santa Cruz wye

Agency Negotiator: George Dondero and Luis Pavel Mendez
Negotiating Parties: SCCRTC, Golden Gate Railroad Museum
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms
OPEN SESSION

The RTC reconvened in open session at 11:35 am.

28. Report on closed session
   There was no report from closed session. The meeting adjourned at 11:36 am.

29. Next meetings

   The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 7, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the Capitola City Council Chambers, 420 Capitola Ave, Capitola, CA.

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 16, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

   Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer

Attendees

Jack Nelson Campaign for Sensible Transportation
Eric Child Golden Gate Rail Museum
Amelia Conlen People Power
Piet Canin Ecology Action
Brian Peoples Aptos Rail Trail
Michael McBride Local resident
Heather Anderson AMBAG
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s

BI CYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes - Draft

Monday, April 13, 2015
6:00 p.m. to 8:30 pm

RTC Office
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

1. Call to Order: 6 pm

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Kem Akol, District 1
David Casterson, District 2, Chair
Jim Cook, District 2 (Alt.)
Peter Scott, District 3
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
Amelia Conlen, District 4
Rick Hyman, District 5
Melissa Ott, City of Santa Cruz
Lex Rau, City of Scotts Valley
Leo Jed, CTSC, Vice-Chair
Emily Glanville, Ecology Action/Bike to Work

Unexcused Absences:

Excused Absences:
Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)
Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
Myrna Sherman, City of Watsonville
Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work (Alt.)
Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)
Andy Ward, City of Capitola
Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola (Alt.)
Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz

Vacancies:
District 4 and 5 – Alternates
City of Watsonville – Alternate

Guests:
Jo Fleming, City of Scotts Valley consultant
Scott Hamby, City of Scotts Valley Public Works
Veronica Elsea, Pedestrian Safety Work Group
Lynn Lauridsen, County Health Services Agency
Theresia Rogerson, County HSA, CTSC
Claire Fliesler, City of Santa Cruz Planner
Steve All – Citizen of the State of California

3. Announcements – Cory Caletti announced that the Cities of Santa Cruz and Capitola adopted the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Trail Network Master Plan and that the RTC received notice that a grant application is a finalist for a north coast rail trail project. The RTC will be notified by the end of June if the grant will be awarded.
4. Oral communications – Leo Jed announced that comments are due for Caltrans’ California Transportation Plan 2040 by April 20th, 2015. Kem Akol announced that much work is underway at the Santa Cruz Wharf roundabout project. Emily Glanville announced the many upcoming activities planned for this spring’s Bike to Work Week to be held between Friday, May 1st and Friday, May 8th. Karena Pushnik announced that the RTC is teaming with Ecology Action for a volunteer rail clean-up event during Bike to Work Week. Grace Blakeslee announced an upcoming Unified Corridor Plan workshop; Theresia Rogerson solicited volunteers for the spring bicycle and pedestrian observation study to take place mid-May to mid-June; and Rick Hyman announced that 2015 marks the Bicycle Advisory Committee’s 40th anniversary and suggested a celebratory get together.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion (Jed/Conlen) to approve the consent agenda passed unanimously with members Akol, Casterson, Scott, Conlen, Hyman, Ott, Rau, Jed and Glanville voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

6. Accepted draft minutes of the February 9, 2015 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting
7. Accepted summary of Bicycle Hazard reports
8. Accepted Bicycle Advisory Committee roster
9. Accepted Draft 2015 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting schedule and tentative agenda items
10. Accepted letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee to the County Public Works recommending green bike lanes at interchanges
11. Accepted letter from the Community Traffic Safety Coalition to County Public Works in support of Green Lane Treatments at Freeway Interchanges in Santa Cruz County
12. Accepted February 9, 2015 Santa Cruz Sentinel Article “Advocates proposing green lanes at freeway intersections”
13. Accepted project update on the RTC’s Unified Corridors Plan and consider participating in a survey and upcoming workshop
14. Approved recommendation that the RTC approve the FY 15/16 Transportation Development Act funding request for $50,000 from Ecology Action for the agency’s yearly Bike to Work program
15. Approved recommendation that the RTC approve the FY 15/16 Transportation Development Act funding request for $100,000 from the County Health Services Agency for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition and Ride ‘n Stride education program

REGULAR AGENDA

16. Office Elections – Cory Caletti thanked Chair Casterson and Vice-Chair Jed for their service for the past year. A motion was made (Jed/Scott) to elect David Casterson for the Chair position for another one-year term. The motion passed unanimously with members Akol, Casterson, Scott,
Conlen, Hyman, Ott, Rau, Jed and Glanville voting in favor; no votes were cast in opposition. Another motion was made (Glanville/Conlen) to elect Leo Jed for another one-year terms as Vice-Chair. The motion passed unanimously with members Akol, Casterson, Scott, Conlen, Hyman, Ott, Rau, Jed and Glanville voting in favor; no votes were cast in opposition.

17. Receive an introduction of a new member, an update on reappointments, and a comment from the public on a reappointment recommendation – Cory Caletti announced the reappointments made at the RTC’s April meeting for expired Bike Committee member and alternate terms. Melissa Ott, the newly appointed voting member representing the City of Santa Cruz, introduced herself.

18. “What Bicyclists and Pedestrians Want Each Other to Know” brochure proposal – Veronica Elsea, Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) member and Karena Pushnik, RTC Senior Transportation Planner discussed a brochure that the E&D TAC produced modeled after the RTC’s “What Bicyclists and Motorists Want to Know About Each Other” brochure geared towards pedestrian and motorist interfaces. Veronica Elsea, on behalf of the E&D TAC’s Pedestrian Safety Work Group, recommended a similar brochure geared towards bicyclists and pedestrians. After some discussion, all agreed that one tri-mode brochure geared towards all three user groups be developed. Emily Glanville volunteered to work on that with Veronica. A draft will be brought back to the Bicycle Advisory Committee for consideration once available.

19. City of Scotts Valley proposed bicycle projects – The City of Scotts Valley Public Works Director Scott Hamby and consultant Jo Fleming soliciting ideas and feedback regarding Active Transportation Plan (ATP) projects that Scotts Valley should consider for grant applications. Various gaps in the bike network identified in the City of Scotts Valley Bicycle Plan were discussed, as well as additional needs for protected bicycle lanes, improved traffic actuation, improvements to Glen Canyon and Mt. Hermon Roads. New proposed routes were also considered.

20. Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program: Draft 2015 Implementation Plan – Grace Blakeslee, RTC Senior Transportation Planner provided a presentation and summary of the draft implementation plan, solicited feedback and recommended that the Bicycle Committee recommend that the RTC adopt the draft plan at the May, 7th, RTC meeting. Members discussed the different routes proposed and suggested fine-tuning of the routing. A motion (Hyman/Scott) was made to recommend that the RTC adopt the Final 2015 Implementation Plan after incorporation of minor refinements. Member of the public Steve All provided a history of the “CycleNet” bike route numbering protocol that he designed and recommended that the numbering system be used for the signs (instead of the proposed destination based signs) and as route identification. Members and staff discussed the benefits and drawbacks of that system. The motion passed unanimously with members Akol, Casterson, Scott, Conlen, Hyman, Ott, Rau, Jed and Glanville voting in favor; no votes were cast in opposition.

21. Project check-ins and report out on Committee members’ outreach –Will Menchine and Peter Scott discussed meetings with Commissioners Coonerty and McPherson regarding improvements suggested by the Committee and will be attending a follow-up meeting with County Public Works staff. Amelia Conlen discussed the ATP application that the City of Watsonville will submit to complete the segment of the rail trail within Watsonville (identified in the MBSTT Master Plan as Segment 18). The Harbor bike improvements ad-hoc committee discussed various options for increased bike access and will present a written recommendation to the Committee after a follow-up meeting. Kem Akol also discussed the tie-in of such improvements to a grant that the County of Santa Cruz will be pursuing for the rail trail project between the Harbor and 17th Ave or 7th to 17th Avenue.
22. Member updates related to Committee Functions – Leo Jed provided legislative updates amending bicycle infraction diversion programs, the 3 foot passing law, reflectors and lighting requirements, cycletrack designs, and level of service definitions. He will provide further updates as bills move and are amended through the legislature.

23. Adjourned – 8:32 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 8, 2015, from 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

Minutes – Draft

Tuesday, April 14, 2015

Aptos Library - 7695 Soquel Drive, Aptos, CA

1. Call to order 1:30 pm

2. Introductions

   **Members Present:**
   - Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA
   - Debbi Brooks, Social Service Provider - Persons Of Limited Means
   - John Daugherty, Metro Transit
   - Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
   - Sally French, Social Services Provider - Disabled
   - Clay Kempf, Social Service Provider for Seniors
   - Donald Hagen, 4th District

   **Unexcused Absences:**
   - Grace Blakeslee
   - Patti Lou Shevlin, 1st District
   - Michael Molesky, Social Service Provider

   **Others Present:**
   - Charlie Levine, Citizen
   - Ciro Aguirre, SCMTD
   - Kari Beuerman, County Human Services
   - Ramon Cancino, Community Bridges
   - Laura Diaz, CTSA
   - Tom Hiltner, SCMTD
   - Scott Hamby, City of Scotts Valley
   - Josephine Fleming, City of Scotts Valley

   **Alternates Present:**
   - April Warnock, SCMTD

   **RTC Staff Present:**
   - Grace Blakeslee
   - Karena Pushnik

   **Excused Absences:**
   - Karena Pushnik, 1st District
   - Michael Molesky, Social Service Provider

3. Oral Communications
   - Most recent Santa Cruz Metro Headways is now available
   - Santa Cruz Metro hosted Stand Up for Transportation Day
   - Review of Santa Cruz Metro April 10, 2015 action regarding ParaCruz services
   - Unified Corridors Plan Public Workshop will be held April 16 and the online survey to collect public input is available on the SCCRTC website through April 30
   - Update on E&D TAC recruitment efforts

4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agenda
   - Item #20, Attachment 1 available as handout and emailed previously
   - Add item #23b, Santa Cruz Metro ParaCruz Service
   - Moved item #18 to item #16b
CONSENT AGENDA

Action: The motion (Elsea/Daughtery) to approve the Consent agenda, Items 5-15 carries.

Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Daughtery, Elsea, Kempf, Hagen
Nays: None
Abstain: None

5. Approved minutes from February 10, 2015 meeting
6. Recommend RTC Approve Caroline Lamb as E&D TAC Member representing potential transit user (60+)
7. Recommend RTC Approve Laura Diaz as E&D TAC Member Alternate for CTSA
8. Recommend RTC Approve Charlie Levine as E&D TAC Member Alternate for District 3
9. Received Update on the Unified Corridors Plan
10. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report
11. Received RTC Meeting Highlights
12. Received Annual Calendar of E&D TAC items
13. Received Information Items
   • Letter on February 24, 2015 from E&D TAC to Santa Cruz Metro Regarding Structural Deficit and ParaCruz Service
   • Letter on February 5, 2015 from Mission Pedestrian to E&D TAC regarding need for sidewalks
14. Receive Agency TDA Reports
   • Volunteer Center – 2nd Quarter FY 14/15
   • Community Bridges – 1st Quarter FY 14/15
   • Santa Cruz Metro
15. Received Agency Updates
   a. Volunteer Center
   b. Community Bridges
   c. Santa Cruz Metro
      i. ParaCruz Report for December 2014 & January 2015
      ii. Consideration of La Posada Transportation Alternative, January 23, 2015
      iii. Consideration to set a Public Hearing on Fare and Service Restructure of Hwy 17 Express and ParaCruz, February 27, 2015
      iv. Notice of April 10, 2015 Public Hearing to Consider Proposals for Fare Restructure and Changes to Paratransit
REGULAR AGENDA

16a. Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair

Action: The motion (Berkowitz/Hagen) - - to nominate Veronica Elsea as chair of the E&D TAC- - carries.

Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Elsea, Daugherty, Kempf, Hagen
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Action: The motion (French/Hagen) - - to nominate John Daugherty as vice- chair of the E&D TAC- - carries.

Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Elsea, Daugherty, Kempf, Hagen
Nays: None
Abstain: None

16b. Review Proposed Scotts Valley Pedestrian Projects Active Transportation Plan Grant Funding

RTC staff provided an overview of the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle II grant program. City of Scotts Valley representatives Scott Hamby and Josephine Fleming provided an overview of pedestrian and ADA improvements under consideration for ATP Cycle II grant funding. Committee members provide input of pedestrian facility and crosswalk design and bus stop improvements and commended the City of Scotts Valley for reviewing access to bus stops. Committee members recommended that the City of Scotts Valley seek input residents of Oak Tree Village.

Action: The motion (Hagen/Berkowitz) - - to send a letter of support from the E&D TAC to City of Scotts Valley for the ATP pedestrian improvements grant application.

Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Elsea, Daugherty, Kempf, Hagen
Nays: None
Abstain: None

17. Review and Recommend RTC Approval of 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs List

Grace Blakeslee provided an overview of the Draft 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs list developed with input by the Santa Cruz Metro, Volunteer Center and Community Bridges Lift Line. Ms. Blakeslee explained that the new format identifies the unmet paratransit or transit need and some of the potential ways the needs could be met.

Action: The motion (Berkowitz/Kemp) - - to modify unmet need #3 to address areas with concentrations of seniors, disabled and low income individuals and include pilot projects that provide regularly scheduled paratransit service to such areas as a proposed strategy for addressing the unmet need and increase the need to H1 priority level.

Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Elsea, Daugherty, Kempf, Hagen
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Action: The motion (Kempf/Brooks) - - add new unmet need item to provide paratransit to the individuals who lost paratransit due to changes in Santa Cruz Metro ParaCruz program in 2015 with a priority level of H1.

Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Elsea, Kempf
Nays: None
Abstain: Hagen, Daugherty

Action: The motion (Kempf/Berkowitz) - - to modify unmet need #10 to address the need for transportation services to all programs that promote senior and disabled individuals health, safety and independence including senior meal sites, stroke center and elderly programs.

Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Elsea, Kempf, Daugherty
Nays: None
Abstain: Hagen

Action: The motion (Berkowitz/Elsea) - - to increase the priority of unmet need #8 to H2.

Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Elsea, Kempf, Daugherty, Hagen
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Action: The motion (Elsea/Norm) - - to include improvements to north-south transit connections as a strategy for addressing unmet need #22.

Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Elsea, Kempf, Hagen
Nays: None
Abstain: Daugherty

Action: The motion (Elsea/Berkowitz) - - to add direct transit service to San Jose Airport as a strategy for addressing interregional transit needs identified in unmet need #21.

Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Elsea, Kempf, Hagen, Daugherty
Nays: None
Abstain: None

18. Review Proposed Scotts Valley Pedestrian Projects Active Transportation Plan Grant Funding

Moved to Item #16b

19. Approve Transportation Development Act Claim for Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
Tom Hiltner reported that the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim for $6,377,610, which is the same amount of the FY14-15 TDA claim, will be used to fund fixed route and paratransit service in urban and rural areas in FY15-16 and service hours will be similar to the prior year. Mr. Hiltner reported that in FY15-16 fixed route ridership is anticipated to be flat, the paratransit rides will be slightly decreased, and Highway 17 ridership continues to grow. Members questioned where the transfer from reserves was shown in the Santa Cruz Metro budget and why transferring funding from reserves was needed. Mr. Hiltner stated that Santa Cruz Metro operating costs have increased.

**Action:** The motion (Hagen/French) - - to recommend the Regional Transportation Commission approve the Santa Cruz Metro Transportation Development Act claim for fiscal year 15-16.

*Ayes: French, Berkowitz, Brooks, Elsea, Kempf, Hagen, Daugherty
Nays: None
Abstain: None*

20. **Approve Transportation Development Act Claim for Community Bridges**

Ramon Cancino provided an overview of the $626,561 TDA claim for Community Bridges to provide approximately 36,250 out of a total of 82,000 rides to be provided by Community Bridges one-way trips to eligible clients over FY 2015-16. Mr. Cancino reported that there are reductions in cost per trip for Taxi Scrip, Meals on Wheels, and TDA Medical Riders due to operating efficiencies realized by pooling riders, scheduling changes and reducing delays. The cost per rides provided to the Winter Shelter increase in FY15-16 due to anticipated increases in van maintenance costs. Mr. Cancino reported that there is a gap in grant funding for transportation services provided under Community Bridges Lift Line for same day medical rides between April 2015 and January 2016. Some of the savings realized from cost-savings achieved due to efficiencies in other transportation programs to provide same day medical rides during this period. In addition, some demand for transportation services previously met by the same day medical ride program is expected to shift to the TDA medical rides program and increase the number of rides provided under the TDA medical rides program in FY 15-16.

**Action:** The motion (Kempf/Hagen) - - to recommend the Regional Transportation Commission approve the Community Bridges Transportation Development Act claim for fiscal year 15-16.

*Ayes: French, Brooks, Elsea, Kempf, Hagen, Daugherty
Nays: None
Abstain: Berkowitz*

21. **Approve Transportation Development Act Claim for Volunteer Center**

Debbi Brooks provided an overview of the Volunteer Center Transportation Development Act Claim for $74,591. The Volunteer Center fills the gap for other services that do not meet geographic or physical criteria for people who need rides to medical appointments, shopping, and other needs.
**Action:** The motion (French/Berkowitz) - -   to recommend the Regional Transportation Commission approve the Volunteer Center Transportation Development Act claim for fiscal year 15-16.

**Ayes:** French, Berkowitz, Elsea, Kempf, Hagen, Daugherty  
**Nays:** None  
**Abstain:** Brooks

22. Pedestrian Safety Workgroup Update

Veronica Elsea reported that the Pedestrian Safety Workgroup visited city councils and Santa Cruz Board of Supervisors, produced a radio and television public service announcement, and plans to participate in the open street event to promote the Pedestrian and Motorist Brochure. The Pedestrian Safety Workgroup is pursing development of a Pedestrian and Bicyclists Brochure and solicited input from the Bicycle Committee at the April meeting. The Pedestrian Safety Workgroup is also involved in a statewide discussion regarding Class IV cycle track bicycle facilities. The next meeting of the Pedestrian Safety Workgroup is scheduled for May 6.

23a. Review AMBAG’s 2015 Title VI Plan

Eliza Yu presented the draft AMBAG Title VI Plan. This is AMBAG’s first Title VI Plan and covers the period from 2015-2018. The draft Title VI Plan includes discussion of demographics and limited English proficiency. Members commented that inclusion of age demographics and mobility needs could strengthen the Title VI Plan.

23b. Santa Cruz Metro ParaCruz Service

Members discussed the importance of providing input to Santa Cruz Metro regarding the ParaCruz service changes still under consideration. Members expressed the value of informing Santa Cruz Metro about the impacts of changes to ParaCruz service on affected seniors and disabled individuals. Committee members Clay Kempf, John Daugherty, Debbie Brooks, and Norm Hagen agreed to work as an ad-hoc committee for the purposes of providing comments to Santa Cruz Metro on near and limited term discussions expected to occur in May 2015, prior to the next regularly scheduled E&D TAC regularly scheduled meeting, regarding ParaCruz service changes. Kirk Ance will be requested to participate in the ad-hoc committee.

24. Adjourn 4:30 pm

Respectfully submitted, Grace Blakeslee, RTC Staff
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

RE: FY 2015-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 Claims for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, the Ride ‘n Stride Program, and the Bike to Work Program

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Bicycle Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission:

1. Review the attached proposed FY 2015-16 work plans and budgets for the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency’s Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) and Ride ‘n Stride Programs, and for Ecology Action’s Bike to Work (BTW) Program; and

2. Adopt the attached resolutions (Attachments 1 and 2) approving claims for FY 2015-16 TDA Article 8 funds for the CTSC, Ride ‘n Stride and BTW programs.

BACKGROUND

Since FY 1998-99, the RTC has provided $50,000 in Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 funding to the CTSC, a community based coalition operated by the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency (HSA) which brings together various agencies to address bicycle and pedestrian safety in Santa Cruz County. In FY 2001-02, the RTC added $50,000 to fund the HSA’s Ride ‘n Stride Program, an elementary school-based bicycle and pedestrian education program closely associated with the CTSC. The RTC approved an ongoing commitment to fund the two projects at a total of $100,000 in TDA funds annually. TDA Article 8 funds are allocated by the RTC for bicycle and pedestrian projects annually after requests are reviewed by the RTC’s advisory committees.

The RTC has played a supporting role in Bike to Work (BTW) for its entire 28-year history. Bike to Work’s goals of increasing levels of cycling in Santa Cruz County are consistent with the RTC’s Regional Transportation Plan. The project provides an unparalleled level of bicycle transportation promotion throughout the County on an ongoing basis. BTW has grown steadily in participation and organization over the years and in 2003, the RTC committed to providing on-going funding at a level of $40,000 per year. In 2012, the RTC increased the ongoing commitment to $50,000 annually.
On March 5, 2015, the Regional Transportation Commission approved its FY 2015-16 budget which included TDA Article 8 funding for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC), the Ride ‘n Stride program and the Bike to Work program at the requested amounts. Through the TDA claim process, the RTC has the opportunity to review project budgets and work plans and to provide input or set conditions or requirements on funding.

DISCUSSION

The Health Services Agency (HSA) and Ecology Action submitted TDA funding requests for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, the Ride ‘n Stride Program and the Bike to Work Program for Bicycle Advisory Committee review and RTC consideration. The Bicycle Advisory Committee reviewed all claims at the April 13th, 2015 meeting and recommended approval. Because the RTC provides a substantial portion of the operational funding for each program, the annual budgets and work programs for these projects are forwarded to the RTC for information, input and approval.

Community Traffic Safety Coalition and Ride ‘n Stride Programs

The County Health Services Agency (HSA) submitted the attached TDA funding requests, work plans and budgets for Commission review and consideration for its CTSC and Ride ‘n Stride programs (Exhibits 1 through 4 of Attachment 1). Included are a TDA claim form required from all TDA claimants, as well as a work program and budget for the ongoing work of the CTSC. The work program spans a two year period. As in previous years, the FY 2015-16 funding request for the CTSC is slightly higher than half of the 100,000 allotment at $51,500 total.

Exhibits 5 through 7 of Attachment 1 are the TDA claim form, the work plan and budget for continuation of the Ride ‘n Stride bicycle and pedestrian education program. This project includes staff costs for bicycle and pedestrian safety presentations to elementary school students. The FY 2015-16 funding request for this program is $48,500, the remaining balance of the $100,000 allotment.

The total amount requested for the CTSC and Ride ‘n Stride does not exceed the $100,000 level established in the approved RTC FY 2015-16 budget. County Health Services Agency staff will be at the meeting to address any questions.

Bike to Work

Ecology Action submitted a funding request, FY 2015-16 TDA claim, budget and work plan for its Bike to Work program (Exhibits 1 through 5 of Attachment 2) for RTC review and consideration. Ecology Action is requesting $50,000 in FY 2015/16 TDA funds to support the Bike to Work/School efforts. Exhibits 1 through 4 of Attachment 2 provide the FY 2015-16 scope of work and budget detailing the services BTW proposes to provide during the coming fiscal year. Exhibit 5 of Attachment 2 provides a 2014 Summary Report containing a description of services provided by BTW during the previous calendar year. Ecology Action staff will be at
the meeting to respond to any questions or comments regarding the Bike to Work program.

The Bicycle Advisory Committee reviewed the CTSC, Ride ‘n Stride and Bike to Work programs’ work plans and budgets at its April 13th, 2015 meeting. The Bicycle Advisory Committee and staff recommend adoption of the attached resolutions (Attachments 1 and 2) approving the TDA claims for the CTSC, the Ride ‘n Stride Program and Bike to Work programs as requested.

SUMMARY

The Bicycle Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission review and approve TDA Article 8 funding requests from the Health Services Agency’s Community Traffic Safety Coalition and Ride ‘n Stride programs, and Ecology Action’s Bike to Work program in the amount of $100,000 and $50,000, respectively. Attached are FY2015-16 claims, budgets, work programs, and allocation requests from the Health Services Agency and from Ecology Action for review and consideration.

Attachments:
1. Community Traffic Safety Coalition and Ride ‘n Stride Program resolution with exhibits
2. Bike to Work program resolution with exhibits
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of May 7, 2015
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION APPROVING TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA)
ARTICLE 8 FUNDING FOR THE COMMUNITY TRAFFIC SAFETY COALITION
AND THE RIDE ‘N STRIDE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SCHOOL EDUCATION PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency’s (HSA) Community Traffic
Safety Coalition (CTSC) and the Ride ‘n Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian School Education programs
provide bicycle and pedestrian safety education and outreach;

WHEREAS, in FY 1998/99 the RTC committed to providing on-going funding for the CTSC
program and in FY 2001/02 the RTC committed to providing on-going funding for the Ride ‘n Stride
program for a total amount of $100,000 through the yearly budget process; and

WHEREAS, the RTC allocated $100,000 in its FY 2015/16 budget for the Community
Traffic Safety Coalition and the Ride ‘n Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian School Education Program;

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

1. The Regional Transportation Commission hereby approves $51,500 in FY 2015/16
Transportation Development Act Article 8 funds for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, and

2. The Regional Transportation Commission hereby approves $48,500 in FY 2015/16
Transportation Development Act Article 8 funds for the Ride ‘n Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian
School Education Program.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

______________________________
John Leopold, Chair

ATTEST:

___________________________
George Dondero, Secretary
Exhibit 1: Request Letter from Dena Loijos, Health Services Manager
Exhibit 2: Community Traffic Safety Coalition FY 2015/16 TDA Claim Form
Exhibit 3: Community Traffic Safety Coalition FY 2014/16 Work Plan
Exhibit 4: Community Traffic Safety Coalition FY 2015/16 Budget
Exhibit 5: Ride 'n Stride TDA Claim Form
Exhibit 6: Ride 'n Stride FY 2015/16 Work Plan
Exhibit 7: Ride 'n Stride FY 2015/16 Budget

Distribution: RTC Fiscal
              RTC Planner
              Health Services Agency

S:\RESOLUT\2015\RES0515\CTSC_Ride'n_Stride_resolution_TDAfunds_2015.docx
March 24, 2015

George Dondero
Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060-3911

Regarding: FY 2015/16 TDA Request for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) and Ride n’ Stride program

Dear Mr. Dondero:

CTSC continues to serve Santa Cruz County residents through its efforts to reduce bicycle and pedestrian injuries/fatalities and increase the use of safe alternative modes of transportation. CTSC members developed a two-year work plan spanning fiscal years 2014-2016 that supports collaborative activities in the areas of education and training, advocacy and encouragement, engineering and enforcement. CTSC’s Ride n’ Stride program works in collaboration with Ecology Action’s Bike Smart program to positively impact the community through its school-based education model that teaches road safety practices to thousands of young students every year as the foundation for life-long behaviors, and works with school districts, CTSC and other community partners to conduct outreach efforts and provide bike safety helmets to low-income residents.

County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency (HSA) is requesting $51,500 to support staffing and project implementation for CTSC, and $48,500 to support the Ride n’ Stride school education program. HSA will provide $103,800 in Match through other grant funding, HSA program management, fiscal and administrative support, and community in-kind contributions, for a total CTSC/Ride n’ Stride budget of $203,800 for FY 2015/16.

Enclosed you will find the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Local Transportation Funds Claim forms, work plans and budgets for each program. I attest to the accuracy of this claim and all its accompanying documentation. Every effort has been made to ensure that the CTSC and Ride n’ Stride work plans reflect the needs and concerns of the community. Thank you for your consideration and continued support.

Sincerely,

Dena Loijos, MPH
Health Services Manager
Community Health and Prevention Programs
County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency
(831) 454-5018
Dena.Loijos@santacruzcounty.us
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Pedestrian Projects
Submit a separate form for each project.

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

Project Information

1. Project Title: **Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)**

2. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

4. TDA funding requested this claim: **$51,500**

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: **FY 2015/16**

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims (ex. Article 8 Bicycle project): Article 8 Bike/Pedestrian Project

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Lynn Lauridsen
   Telephone Number: (831) 454-5477   E-mail: lynn.lauridsen@santacruzcounty.us
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Dena Loijos
   Telephone Number: (831) 454-5018   E-mail: dena.loijos@santacruzcounty.us

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): See Attachment A - **CTSC Work Plan for FY 2014-16**

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program: The number of people served will depend on the strategies utilized for each project. Some projects, such as public campaigns, will reach many community members throughout the county and might need to be estimated. For projects involving direct education, the number of those reached will be documented. For example, in the first biannual period of FY2014/15, 17 staff/volunteers from community agencies received bicycle helmet fit training and over 300,000 motorists were reached with a bicycle safety message on Mission Street marquee over an 8-day period.

10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names): Most CTSC projects are countywide. Activities conducted with the South County Bike and Pedestrian Work Group will focus on the Watsonville/South County area. As needs and opportunities arise, specific jurisdictions within the county may be targeted for bike and/or pedestrian safety activities.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community): The CTSC continues to be the primary community-based coalition in Santa Cruz County that focuses on bicycle and pedestrian traffic safety for all age groups. The Coalition provides a forum for various agencies and individuals to share information, address community issues, collaborate on solutions, and act as a resource for its members and the community. Highlights of CTSC benefits to the community over the past year include educating 51 court-ordered attendees and members of the public through the county Bicycle
Traffic School, fitting and distributing over 500 free bicycle helmets throughout the county, and reaching 25 local driver education programs with a bilingual 3-foot passing law information packet.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy number: Programmed into the RTP under project #CO50

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program: Please see attached Work Plan for evaluation measures.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed): CTSC’s primary goal is to increase the use of alternative modes of transportation and to reduce traffic related injuries in Santa Cruz County. CTSC works to promote safe bicycling and walking by conducting community-based activities such as participating in Bike/Walk to School/Work Days and Open Streets events distributing bike helmets to low-income youth and adults, and utilizing both traditional and social media messaging to reach all age groups. CTSC supports traffic calming efforts to reduce speeding through the Trash Can Sticker and PACE Car neighborhood programs. CTSC staff also administers the County Bike Traffic School and collaborate with law enforcement to increase safer practices among all road users.

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (complete “15a” or “15b”) N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15a. Capital Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$TDA requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 4:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please describe what is included in “Other”:

15b. Non-Capital Projects – Cost/Schedule: List any tasks and amount per task for which TDA will be used. Can be substituted with alternate budget format. See attached Community Traffic Safety Coalition Budget for FY 2015-16.

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

17. Proposed schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation of prior year’s activities: Biannual progress report to be submitted by January 31, 2016 and final report to be submitted by July 31, 2016.

18. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES?/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

All Claims

- A letter of transmittal to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- Resolution from TDA eligible claimants indicating their roles and responsibilities; and, if applicable, commitment to maintain facilities as indicated in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

Bike to Work, Community Traffic Safety Coalition/Ride 'n Stride – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF

19. Improving Program Efficiency

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:

The primary goal of the CTSC is to bring together local groups to support safe cycling and walking in our communities. HSA continues to provide 100% match to TDA funding through grant sources, such as the state Active Transportation Program (ATP) and the state Office of Traffic Safety. The goal is to sustain CTSC programming that focuses on effective yet cost-saving methods, such as public media outreach and utilizing volunteers. CTSC created a two-year Work Plan schedule that includes increased coalition member involvement in projects and bimonthly meetings for the CTSC and its South County Bike and Pedestrian Work Group. CTSC/Ride n' Stride staff have been working with partner agencies to continue a train-the-trainer model Bike Helmet Fitting and Distribution program. Local schools and community-based organizations are set up as Helmet Fit Sites throughout the county. CTSC staff also maintains the CTSC website at www.sctrafficsafety.org and social media sites at www.facebook.com/sctrafficsafety and www.youtube.com/SCTrafficSafety, creates public information products, and conducts surveys, evaluations and data analysis in lieu of paying outside contractors or professional services.

20. What is different from last year’s program/claim?

HSA’s total FY 15/16 TDA request for CTSC and Ride n’ Stride programs remains at the FY 14/15 allocation of $103,800. HSA will continue to secure 100% matching funds through grants and other funding sources to maintain an adequate level of staffing for these programs to ensure continuing success and benefits to the community. The FY 14-16 CTSC Work Plan includes activities in the areas of Education and Training, Advocacy and Encouragement, Engineering, and Enforcement.
## Community Traffic Safety Coalition

**TDA/CTSC Budget, FY 2015/16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>TDA Budget</th>
<th>HSA Match</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel (Salary + 55% Benefits)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Educator, .70 FTE</td>
<td>50,142</td>
<td>28,733</td>
<td>78,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director/Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel</strong></td>
<td>50,142</td>
<td>33,733</td>
<td>83,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Costs (15% of Personnel)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel/Mileage</td>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkind</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,986</td>
<td>5,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Plan for Fiscal Years 2014-2016

Mission:
The mission of the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) is to reduce traffic-related injuries, while promoting the use of alternative modes of transportation. The primary focus is on bicycle and pedestrian safety issues. The Coalition educates all road users in safety practices to decrease the risk and severity of traffic collisions, and advocates for improved conditions to make all methods of transportation safer. The County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency (HSA) supplies staff and administration for the CTSC.

Staff Responsibilities:
Staff to the Coalition is responsible for recruitment, retention and satisfaction of coalition members, coordinating and facilitating bimonthly coalition meetings and regular project subcommittee meetings, successful implementation of the CTSC work plan, acting as a liaison between partner agencies, tracking county bicycle and pedestrian injury statistics, writing all reports and letters of advocacy/support, representing the coalition at other agency meetings, coordinating member and community volunteers on specific projects, and maintaining the coalition website and Facebook page.

Narrative:
Coalition members select and implement projects according to current issues, public requests, and direction from community agencies and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). The Coalition also has several ongoing projects, including the Ride n’ Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian Education Program, the Pace Car and Trash Can Sticker traffic calming projects, the CTSC website and Facebook page, the Bicycle Traffic School, and the South County Bike and Pedestrian Work Group (SCBPWG). The SCBPWG implements traffic safety projects that address the unique needs of South Santa Cruz County.

CTSC staff support all of these ongoing projects in addition to coordinating the work plan projects chosen by the Coalition members every two years. The work plan below outlines goals based on a two-year timeline, with chosen projects to be completed by the end of FY 15/16. Activities have been listed under several topic areas and an evaluation component accompanies each topic to determine the effectiveness of projects and provide feedback for improving future efforts. Several strategies and projects outlined can be combined to produce a countywide educational campaign on a particular traffic safety topic, such as speeding or distracted driving.

Ongoing guidance for implementing this work plan over the two years will include identifying agencies and members to work on certain projects, looking at collaborative opportunities with the SCBPWG and partner agencies, and prioritizing activities and spending based on community needs. The CTSC work plan is an umbrella of ideas and goals for collaborative traffic safety efforts related to alternative forms of transportation in Santa Cruz County. The work plan for Fiscal Years 2014-2016 includes ongoing activities, plus new projects and ideas to explore that will be chosen from those listed under the following topics:
Education and Training

Ongoing Activities:

- Support bicycle helmet distribution programs, including HSA’s train-the-trainer program with established Helmet Fit Sites
- Coordinate conducting the Bicycle Observation Survey and Pedestrian Safety Observation Survey, collaborating with RTC on bicycle and pedestrian counts
- Create annual SWITRS (Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System) bicycle and pedestrian injury/fatality summaries for Santa Cruz County and utilize them to identify local traffic safety trends, develop or promote safety projects and community outreach.
- Promote public participation in Bicycle Traffic School and work with instructors to update curriculum as necessary
- Post regularly on the CTSC Facebook page with links to resources on the CTSC website

New Projects:

- Educate public on AB1371, the 3-foot passing law, that will go into effect in September 2014
- Produce/utilize traffic safety education messages, such as a ‘Speed Kills’ campaign to reduce speeding, for road users through local media outlets using Public Service Announcements (PSA’s), bus/shuttle ads, etc.
- Find more ways to provide bike/ped safety education and helmets to adults and parents with school-aged children, especially local and migrant farm workers
- Utilize ideas from San Francisco’s ‘Light Up the Night’ project to provide and install bike lights for bicyclists while providing education
- Find opportunities to give short presentations on countywide bike/ped programs at stakeholder meetings, such as for school principals and administrators
- Assist Metro and other businesses in ensuring that bus/truck drivers are adequately trained in operating safely around bicyclists and pedestrians

Ideas to Explore:

- Community-based project to paint bike skills training practice course markings in a public space (paved surface in a park, on a paved trail, etc.)
- Supply support/outreach/training to school crossing guard programs
- Reach out to school districts about obtaining bike fleets as part of the physical education curriculum on middle and high school campuses
- Publicize collision hotspot maps online, based on SWITRS or other data source, such as by using the University of California Berkeley’s Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS)

Evaluation: Quantify audiences reached in direct education and training activities and track outreach to target populations throughout the county when feasible.
Advocacy and Encouragement

Ongoing Activities:

- Promote safe bicycling and walking for transportation and recreation through community events
- Support Bike/Walk to Work/School events and efforts
- Participate in the RTC’s Bicycle Committee as needed
- Support Safe Routes to School efforts throughout the County of Santa Cruz
- Support Open Streets Santa Cruz County projects and events throughout the county

New Projects:

- Provide outreach and support to women and communities of color on bicycling and walking for transportation
- Support establishing a local or Monterey Bay regional bicycle coalition
- Partner with RTC’s Commute Solutions program and the 511 program to encourage alternative and active forms of transportation
- Support programs and sustainability for the Bike Shack in Watsonville and the Bike Church in Santa Cruz
- Help promote Trips for Kids Santa Cruz mountain bike rides for youth throughout the county
- Develop a countywide bike/ped resources brochure and distribute widely to schools, Visitor’s Center, bike shops, etc.

Ideas to Explore:

- Outreach to and create partnerships with non-bike/ped groups (i.e. neighborhood groups, health and service organizations, businesses, transit agencies, etc.)
- Find and use existing Spanish language messaging to support healthy transportation choices and safe behaviors
- Market county bike/ped programs by producing hanging tags or information/resource packets to go on retail bikes at bike shops

Evaluation: Document outreach and support of traffic safety and alternative transportation projects and numbers of people reached at community events.
Engineering

Ongoing Activities:

- Support the RTC Elderly & Disabled Technical Advisory Committee’s (E&D TAC) Pedestrian Safety Work Group efforts
- Promote and support the RTC’s online bicycle and pedestrian hazard reporting system
- Analyze bike/ped data in order to recommend or support ‘best practices’ for bike/ped infrastructure improvements, as well as monitor the performance of projects constructed
- Promote ongoing CTSC traffic calming efforts, including the Trash Can Sticker and Pace Car projects

New Projects:

- Encourage local public works jurisdictions to adopt the American Association of Highway and Transportation Officials (ASHTO) Guides and the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Guides related to bicycle and pedestrian transportation
- Support local public works jurisdictions in accepting/endorsing RTC’s Complete Streets Guidebook
- Encourage construction of protected/separated bikeways, such as a painted bike lane or section of rail trail, through a pilot project
- Promote the use of Bikes May Use Full Lane (BMUFL) along with Shared-Lane Markings (sharrows), especially in place of Share the Road signs, and educate jurisdictions and the public on their meaning
- Connect neighborhood families to low-cost traffic calming resources, such as ‘Drive like your kids live here’ signs

Ideas to Explore:

- Create a street intersection mural project as a neighborhood traffic calming measure
- Conduct evidence-based/best practices presentations to city transportation/public works commissions on bicycle and pedestrian facility designs
- Support establishment of a bike/ped coordinator and advisory committee in each jurisdiction
- Partner with local businesses to encourage bike/ped infrastructure improvements and amenities to commercial areas, including adequate bike parking
- Support finding new sources of local transportation funding, such as through ballot measures

Evaluation: Track and report the number of coalition members and community volunteers participating in meetings and project efforts by jurisdiction, plus document letters written in regard to infrastructure projects.
Enforcement

Ongoing Activities:

- Support California Highway Patrol and local police departments in bike/ped related education and enforcement
- Share information, feedback and promotion of the County Bike Traffic School with law enforcement agencies throughout the county

New Projects:

- Encourage and assess speed reduction efforts, such as traffic enforcement, use of speed feedback signs, and traffic calming measures
- Support enforcement, warnings, or notification by mail for drivers who are endangering bicyclists and pedestrians, such as failing to use turn signals, distracted driving, driving while using a cell phone, etc.
- Support enforcement of AB1371, the 3-foot passing law, that will go into effect in September 2014

Ideas to Explore:

- Assess support for a local bike/ped anti-harassment ordinance/policy
- Create an online clearinghouse/database for bike/ped incidents

Evaluation: Document collaborative efforts with law enforcement. Administer Bike Traffic School classroom evaluation form and summarize evaluation results along with program demographics.

Overall outcome evaluation methods: Utilize available data to evaluate trends in pedestrian and bicycle traffic injuries/fatalities in Santa Cruz County. Utilize local observational survey results and other available sources of data to evaluate pedestrian, bicyclist and motorist behaviors and changes in numbers of road users who are using alternate modes of transportation.
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Pedestrian Projects
Submit a separate form for each project.

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

Project Information

1. Project Title: **Ride n’ Stride** (Bike & Pedestrian Safety school-based education program of CTSC)

2. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

4. TDA funding requested this claim: **$48,500**

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: **FY 2015-16**

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims (ex. Article 8 Bicycle project): Article 8 Bike/Pedestrian Project

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Lynn Lauridsen
   Telephone Number: (831) 454-5477
   E-mail: lynn.lauridsen@santacruzcounty.us

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Dena Loijos
   Telephone Number: (831) 454-5018
   E-mail: Dena.Loijos@santacruzcounty.us

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): See attached **Ride n’ Stride Education Work Plan for FY 2015-16**

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program: Primary work plan objective is to reach at least 2500 elementary and pre-school students to teach basic bicycle and pedestrian safety practices. In addition, it is anticipated that parent/caregiver presentations and staff participation in community events, Bike/Walk to School activities and distribution of properly fitted bike helmets will reach 100’s more children, parents/caregivers and teachers throughout the county.

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

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community): In collaboration with Ecology Action’s Bike Smart program, the Ride n’ Stride program continues to provide school-based education and encouragement towards the goal of increased bike and pedestrian safety practices among youth. These skills and knowledge increase students’ confidence as users of alternative modes of transportation in the community. Program staff is bilingual, enabling the program to be effective in reaching the county’s diverse population of students and parents with key messages promoting the benefits of riding and walking. Over the last six years, evaluation methods have consistently shown an increase in bike safety knowledge among 3rd-6th grade level students and high satisfaction levels
among teachers.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy number: Programmed into the RTP under project #CO50.

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program: Please see attached Work Plan for evaluation measures.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed): Through road safety education, biking and walking encouragement and provision of safety helmets, more students and parents will gain confidence and motivation as cyclists and pedestrians, thereby reducing the numbers of vehicle mode trips to and from school sites, as well as for other local trips.

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (complete “15a” or “15b”)

### 15a. Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other *</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDAt requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in “Other”:

### 15b. Non-Capital Projects – Cost/Schedule: List any tasks and amount per task for which TDA will be used. Can be substituted with alternate budget format. See attached Ride n’ Stride Safety Program Budget for FY 205-16

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

17. Proposed schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation of prior year’s activities: Biannual progress reports to be submitted by January 31, 2016 and final report to be submitted by July 31, 2016.

18. TDA Eligibility:

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

Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

All Claims
- A letter of transmittal to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- Resolution from TDA eligible claimants indicating their roles and responsibilities; and, if applicable, commitment to maintain facilities as indicated in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

Ride ‘n Stride education program – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF

19. Improving Program Efficiency

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:

HSA continues to provide 100% match to TDA funding through grant sources such as Active Transportation Program (ATP) and the Office of Traffic Safety to sustain CTSC/Ride n’ Stride programming that focuses on effective yet cost-saving methods. Efforts are made to utilize existing or low-cost/no-cost educational materials that reflect current best practices and are developmentally appropriate, and to secure in-kind donations of teacher and volunteer time, and to secure competitive pricing for bike helmets and other program supplies. CTSC/Ride n’ Stride staff have been working with partner agencies to implement the Train-the-Trainer Bike Helmet Fitting and Distribution program based at local schools and community service organizations. In addition, efforts have been made to promote the Ride n’ Stride program among selected elementary schools that tend to have lower numbers of teacher requests for the classroom presentations.

20. What is different from last year’s program/claim?

HSA’s total FY 15/16 TDA request for CTSC and Ride n’ Stride programs remains at the FY 14/15 allocation of $103,800. HSA will continue to secure 100% matching funds through grants and other funding sources to maintain an adequate level of staffing for these programs to ensure continuing success and benefits to the community.
CTSC
Ride n' Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian Education Program
TDA/RnS Budget, FY 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>TDA Budget</th>
<th>HSA Match</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel (Salary + 55% Benefits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Health Program Specialist, .75 FTE</td>
<td>46,968</td>
<td>30,423</td>
<td>77,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director/Support Staff</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,968</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,423</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,391</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs (15% of Personnel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,359</td>
<td>12,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel/Mileage</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Materials, Incentives, Supplies</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkind</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 7

Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)
Ride n' Stride Education Work Plan
FY 2015-2016

The goal of the Ride n' Stride program is to increase safe bicycling and walking among children and youth in Santa Cruz County. The bicycle and pedestrian safety curriculum teaches basic traffic safety to young students. The program encourages increased riding and walking as a travel mode, and inspires participants to be role models for their friends, siblings and parents. Interactive classroom education sessions on bicycle safety (and other wheeled sports, such as scooters and skateboards) and pedestrian safety are designed to be age-appropriate, bilingual and culturally competent. Pre-/post-test results consistently show more than a 25% increase in bike safety knowledge (proper helmet use, CA laws affecting cyclists, hand signals), based on results of a written quiz administered to 3rd through 6th graders. Teacher evaluations of the program have ranked very high on a scale of 1-5. In addition, staff responsibilities in the program include: participation in community events, monthly participation in the CTSC and Watsonville Bike and Pedestrian Work Group meetings, fitting and distributing helmets to low-income families, assisting CTSC with their annual observation surveys, providing safety presentations to community agencies such as preschool centers, after-school programs and neighborhood groups as requested in order to educate parents/caregivers as well.

During FY 2013/14, Ride n' Stride program staff reached over 3,385 students and 120 parents/caregivers on traffic safety education. Ride n' Stride program staff also participated in community events including National Night Out, Annual Fitness Day, Biannual Health Fair and Bike/Walk to School reaching 930 community members. Staff also helped with fitting and distribution of 500 bike helmets at numerous locations throughout the county, and assisted in the annual bike and pedestrian safety observation surveys at local schools and neighborhood locations.

FY 2014/15 Objectives and Activities Work Plan:

- Conduct bicycle and pedestrian safety education sessions for at least 2,500 elementary school and pre-school students in Santa Cruz County school districts.
- Conduct at least 4 traffic safety presentations to parents and caregivers through schools, community agencies and neighborhood groups to promote safe bicycling and walking in Santa Cruz County.
- Participate in 4 school or community events to provide traffic safety information and promote safe bicycling and walking in Santa Cruz County.
- Collaborate with CTSC and HSA staff to conduct annual bicycle and pedestrian safety observation surveys.
- Work with CTSC, HSA and community partners to coordinate distribution and proper fitting of at least 200 bike helmets to students and other community members.
- Participate in the fall and spring Bike/Walk to School/Work events, bike rodeos and other bike/pedestrian safety activities, as staff time permits.
- Participate in traffic safety meetings, such as CTSC, South County Bike/Pedestrian Work Group, Safe Routes to School subcommittee, and/or Safe Kids Chapter meetings, as staffing capacity and other program priorities allow.
- Conduct program evaluation including pre/post-testing of student sample, teacher evaluations, and reporting of bike and pedestrian observational surveys among children and youth.
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of May 7, 2015
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION APPROVING TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 8 FUNDING FOR THE BIKE TO WORK PROGRAM

WHEREAS, Bike to Work events provide important information and incentives for encouraging and rewarding bicycle commuting;

WHEREAS, in 2003 the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) committed to providing on-going Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding in the amount of $40,000 per year to Ecology Action’s Bike to Work program;

WHEREAS, in 2012, the RTC agreed to increase the annual commitment to $50,000 on an annual basis through the yearly budget process and approval; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Commission allocated $50,000 in its FY 2015/16 budget for the Bike to Work Program;

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

1. The Regional Transportation Commission hereby approves $50,000 in FY 2015/16 Transportation Development Act Article 8 funds for the Bike to Work Program.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

________________________________________
John Leopold, Chair

ATTEST:

_________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Exhibit 1: Letter from Piet Canin, Vice President, Ecology Action Transportation Group
Exhibit 2: Bike to Work TDA Claim Form
Exhibit 3: Bike to Work FY 15/16 Scope of Work
Exhibit 4: Bike to Work FY 15/16 Budget
Exhibit 5: 2014 Bike to Work Program Summary/Annual Report
Dear Mr. Dondero:

Ecology Action (EA) is requesting $50,000 in Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds for FY 2015-2016 to support the bi-annual Santa Cruz County Bike to Work and Bike to School (BTW/S) program. The Commission’s continued financial support has been vital to the continued success and expansion of our programs. EA leverages the RTC’s funding commitment by applying for additional grants to expand active transportation options for our community. EA’s programs are designed to meet growing demand and to increase bicycle commuting among residents as well as K-12 students biking to school.

To determine program effectiveness Ecology Action collects travel data from BTW/S participants and has seen the following results:

**Growth of Bike to Work and School**
- Over 13,000 participants in 2014, a 60% increase countywide over the past decade
- Over 45 schools served in 2014
- Over 10,500 school students participated in 2014

What participants say about Bike/Walk to School (solicited from parents, teachers and school staff on feedback surveys):

“Our students really have a lot of excitement around this event. It’s been really helpful to have year round support from EA staff to help continue the positive messaging throughout the school year through educational messaging. In this way we’ve started leveraging the 2 events and are seeing wider change throughout the school year with more students on bikes, walking with their friends and so on.”

“Our school site has really grown over the last couple of years. We see more parents walking or biking with their kids to the event and older kids walking or biking with younger ones. The growing popularity of the event among parents has been key in supporting this healthy behavior throughout the year. We look forward to these events every year!”

The Bike to Work program continues to leverage RTC funding with over $20,000 in cash support and some $75,000 of in-kind contributions from local businesses, and public agencies. Additionally, EA works with over two hundred volunteers who donate their time and efforts per event at schools and public sites. EA supplements RTC funding with federal and regional funds where possible to meet the growing demands especially for our bicycle transportation encouragement and safety education programs in the schools.

Ecology Action is sincerely grateful to the RTC for your continued support and for consideration of this $50,000 allocation request for FY 15/16 to support our Bike To Work/School program.

Sincerely,

Piet Canin, VP, Ecology Action Transportation Group
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Pedestrian Projects
Submit a separate form for each project.

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

Project Information

1. Project Title: Bike to Work/School program

2. Implementing Agency: Ecology Action

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

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $50,000

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 15/16

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims (ex. Article 8 Bicycle project): Article 8 Bicycle project

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Piet Canin
   Telephone Number: 515-1327   E-mail: pcanin@ecoact.org
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Jim Murphy
   Telephone Number: 515-1325   E-mail: jmurphy@ecoact.org

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

   The Bike to Work/School program consists of the following main activities: 1) Fall Bike to Work & Bike/Walk to School Day; 2) Spring Bike to Work & Bike/Walk to School Day; 3) Spring Bike Week, which includes up to 10 inclusive, fun and informative bicycle activities; 4) Ongoing support targeting novice or infrequent bike commuters via online communications; 5) Ongoing bike commuter resources, events, updates and news through Ecology Action’s 4,000+ sustainable transportation listserv through monthly electronic newsletters as well as targeted messaging via Facebook and website updates.

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program: We anticipate 10,000-14,000 people will participate directly in the program.

10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):
   The project includes the entire Santa Cruz County area including all the incorporated cities.

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

   Bike to Work/School (BTW/S) fulfills the need to directly promote, encourage and support both
residents and students to bike to work and bike/walk to school respectively. The program provides incentives and tools for local commuters to bicycle for transportation therefore reducing their single-occupancy vehicle trips. BTW/S provides a variety of resources and services to support commuters in switching to bicycle transportation and to bike commute more often. One of the primary objectives of BTW/S is to normalize bicycling as a mode of transportation and provides residents with the opportunity to experience how bicycling is possible for many different types of trips they would otherwise take by car. BTW/S includes a multi-pronged promotional and outreach approach that reaches community members throughout Santa Cruz County. The benefits associated with BTW/S including reduction of traffic congestion, reduction of air, water, and noise pollution, reduction of green house gasses, as well as the promotion of a healthy means of travel that helps combat obesity. BTW/S therefore provides a means for addressing some of the more pressing issues that Santa Cruz County is facing including worsening traffic congestion, growing childhood obesity rates and climate change. BTW/S is one approach to building a more sustainable community.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy number: Project RTC #26

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

To measure the success of the Bike To Work/School program, Ecology Action (EA) tracks the following data using participant surveys: the number of program participants, the participant’s bike commute mileage, the number of beginning and infrequent bike commuters, the number of first time participants, and the number of participants who usually drive alone to work. EA also tracks the number of school students K-12 who bike and walk to school and at a growing number of schools we survey pre-program biking and walking rates. EA also measures success by the amount of publicity generated through news articles, radio talk shows, TV newscasts, the number of newsprint ads, and the number of radio and TV PSA’s aired. Success is also measured by the number of posters and brochures distributed, direct mailings sent out, website visits, emails delivered and the growing number of people that sign-up for our electronic newsletter. The number of community, business and school events staffed with informational booths is also tracked.

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

The Bike to Work/School program helps reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips and parking demand while increasing the number of bus/bike combined trips. There also is an increase in people walking to work or school, especially those walking to school.

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (complete “15a” or “15b”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15a. Capital Projects</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other *</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$TDA requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Please describe what is included in “Other”:

### 15b. Non-Capital Projects – Cost/Schedule:
List any tasks and amount per task for which TDA will be used. Can be substituted with alternate budget format.

SEE ATTACHED BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element/Activity/Task</th>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</th>
<th>Total Cost per Element</th>
<th>$TDA requested</th>
<th>$ Source 2:</th>
<th>Source 3:</th>
<th>Source 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Quarterly reimbursement for work performed.

17. Proposed schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation of prior year’s activities:

Annual report as well as program activity narrative updates with quarterly invoices.

18. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES?/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</td>
<td>Yes, part of Ecology Action’s annual work plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: ______________________)</td>
<td>To be reviewed by the RTC Bike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documentation to Include with Your Claim:**

**All Claims**
- **A letter of transmittal** to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- **Resolution from** TDA eligible claimants indicating their roles and responsibilities; and, if applicable, commitment to maintain facilities as indicated in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

**Bike to Work, Community Traffic Safety Coalition/Ride ‘n Strike – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF**

19. Improving Program Efficiency

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.

Bike To Work/School Day participation rates over the last couple of years have been the highest in the program’s 25+ year history, with over 13,000 participants in the Spring and Fall events each year. Increases in participation are a result of a multi-pronged approach including increased outreach to local businesses and employers, increased outreach to school administrators, increased education and awareness initiatives around bike safety and safe commuting tips, compelling and relevant incentives, as well as the program’s continued comprehensive outreach campaign including our monthly electronic newsletter which goes out to over 4,000 recipients. To offset the cost of increased participants, EA both reduced the types of food served at the breakfast sites as well as increased food and prize donations, which helped contain staff expenses.

The Bike to Work/School program continues to reduce operating costs by developing and fostering our volunteer base through consistent volunteer retention and engagement events and communications as well as by recruiting new volunteers. In addition, EA continues to solicit a wide array of product donations, both financial and in-kind. Local businesses, public agencies, and individuals provide a high level of skilled volunteer labor to assure the smooth running of the Bike to Work program. As we strive to increase the scope and results of the program, we are faced with the rising cost of living, product costs, and general increases in doing business. The Bike to Work program has built on its 25+ years of success to generate non-TDA cash donations from local businesses, individuals and public agencies. Last year the program raised over $20,000 in cash donations to match the TDA funds. These cash donations are from non-transportation funding sources. EA also actively seeks other funding sources such as federal and state Safe Routes to School, local foundations, and applicable funders.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:
Ecology Action (EA) will focus on volunteer coordination strategies in order to increase volunteer retention and recruitment. Our continued collaboration with Monterey and San Benito as well as our increased focus on volunteer cultivation will allow us to pool resources and take advantage of economies of scale for our outreach and promotion materials and strategies. EA will have a specific focus on expanding this program within the schools and leveraging our existing volunteer and administrator contacts at school sites in order to increase ridership among students while keeping staff time low. EA will continue to build partnerships with employers to increase ridership by providing more incentives, resources and recognition by leveraging our existing media contacts and outreach material strategies including our electronic newsletter, which will now be sent out on a monthly basis offering a more consistent platform for messaging and recognition of participating businesses.

20. What is different from last year’s program/claim?

While EA will continue to focus on targeting novice and infrequent bike commuters from past Bike to Work events, our main focus will be on engaging and empowering more families and woman to cycle more regularly. EA has been in communication with the San Francisco Bike Coalition among other collaborators to strategize about ways to engage more families. EA’s chief approach will be targeting schools and providing raffle prizes to students and family members on BTW/S day in addition to providing the free breakfast. EA will also advertise the BTW/S program as a family-friendly activity. As there is growing concern surrounding high childhood obesity rates, particularly in South County, EA will conduct targeted outreach to families linking more regular biking to health benefits. In addition, EA will also work to leverage the BTW/S event by emphasizing ongoing campaigns and projects in Santa Cruz that need support from residents such as the Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail by incorporating advocacy messaging into outreach materials and tabling efforts.
Bike To Work Program
Scope of Work FY 15-16

Ecology Action’s Bike To Work (BTW) Program provides year-round commuter incentive, education and support services to Santa Cruz County residents and K-12 students. The BTW program consists of five main projects: 1) Fall Bike To Work & Bike/Walk to School Day; 2) Spring Bike To Work & Bike/Walk to School Day; 3) Spring Bike Week, which features inclusive, positive, fun and educational bicycle activities; 4) Ongoing support targeting novice or infrequent bike commuters via online communications including regular electronic newsletters, social media updates and website updates; 5) Targeted outreach campaign to community members and students positioning bike commuting as a growing trend within a larger Safe Routes to School and Sustainable Transportation national movement to inspire increased engagement and ridership.

Fall Bike To Work & Bike/Walk to School Day: Thursday, October 8, 2015

Work Schedule/Tasks:
Ecology Action (EA) will coordinate the 17th Annual Fall Bike To Work and Bike/Walk to School Day, which features free breakfast for all bike commuters at a minimum of 12 public sites as well as free healthy snacks and safety gear prizes at over 40 school sites. The following are tasks to be completed:

- Confirm with site managers for all public breakfast sites and all school sites
- Solicit food donations
- Increase outreach to school teachers, administrators and parents to continue to expand student participation
- Increase outreach to novice bike commuters through targeted employer and employee outreach, online social marketing and media outreach
- Create a website featuring educational resources for novice commuters to overcome obstacles to bike commuting including safety tips, suggested routes and more
- Conduct comprehensive promotional campaign including print ads, online ads, electronic newsletters, website, social media and hardcopy flyer distribution. Campaign will focus on promoting informative resources to increase ridership among infrequent riders and will focus on engaging cyclists in other campaigns such as with Friends of the Rail & Trail
- Coordinate Bike/Walk to School Day efforts with bike safety presentations conducted by EA’s Bike Smart Youth Bike Safety program and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)
- Coordinate helmet distribution with CTSC at school sites based on supply of helmets and greatest need
- Recruit, train and coordinate 200+ volunteers to assist with outreach and breakfast sites

Performance Goals for the Fall Bike to Work/School Day, 2015
- Increase participation levels by 5% from past year’s Fall BTWS Day.
- Increase the number of beginning cyclists by 5% attending BTW Day.
- Create Ecology Action Bike Programs website to promote bike commuter resources, safety tips and resources and event information
• Place over 1,000 event and informational posters at local businesses.
• Have at least two articles published in a local newspaper regarding bike commuting.
• Develop and send at least 6 targeted emails to over 4,000 past Bike to Work Day participants with bike commuting news, incentives, and resource information
• Air two weeks of PSA’s on a local radio station.

**Spring Bike Week, Second Week of May 2016**

**Work Schedule/Tasks:**
EA staff will coordinate the 29th annual Santa Cruz County Bike Week event, which will feature Bike to Work Day, Bike/Walk to School Day, and other bike incentive and educational events all week long. The main goal of Bike Week will be to continue to promote bicycle commuting as well as bicycle transportation for other trips that replace single occupancy vehicle trips. Bike commuting and safety messaging will continue to be integrated into our events and EA will strive to connect Bike Week to other ongoing transportation projects such as the Rail Trail. The following are tasks to be completed:

- Secure at least 12 public Bike To Work breakfast sites and 40 school sites
- Work with large employers to offer incentives and encourage participation in Bike To Work Day
- Solicit business donations and food donations
- Continue to build the new Ecology Action Bike Programs website into an effective resource for novice or infrequent riders
- Promote bicycle transportation and bike commuting resources and tips through a regularly scheduled electronic newsletter with a distribution of 4,000+ local contacts
- Maintain regular social media presence via the Bike2Work Facebook page with over 1200 followers
- Conduct comprehensive promotional campaign including print ads, online ads, electronic newsletters, website, social media and hardcopy flyer distribution. Campaign will focus on promoting informative resources to increase ridership among infrequent riders and will focus on engaging cyclists in other campaigns such as with Friends of the Rail & Trail
- Coordinate artwork, T-shirt and color poster production with Monterey and San Benito County Bike Week staff
- Coordinate Bike/Walk to School Day with bike safety presentations conducted by EA’s Bike Smart Youth Bike Safety program the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)
- Coordinate helmet distribution with CTSC at school sites
- Expand Bike Week partnerships with additional agencies and businesses to promote Bike Week activities and bike resources throughout the year
- Recruit, coordinate and train 200+ volunteers to assist with Bike Week events
- Continue to expand efforts in South County to improve outreach to Latino populations

**Performance Goals for the Spring Bike Week, 2016**

- Increase participation by 5% from the previous spring Bike Week.
- Increase participation by 5% from the previous spring Bike to Work & Bike/Walk to School Day.
- Increase by 5% the outreach/promotion to businesses, public agencies, & local organizations through company liaisons from the previous spring Bike Week by using email, flyers, posters, and business site presentations/booths.
- Increase by 5% the number of beginning cyclists attending BTW Day from the previous spring BTW Day.
- Develop and send at least 8 targeted emails to over 4,000+ past Bike to Work Day participants with bike commuting news, incentives, and resource information.
- Print and distribute over 1,000 Bike Week posters. Distribute posters in both English and Spanish.
Ongoing Bike Safety and Commuter Information Resources

Work Schedule/Tasks:
EA staff will promote and provide resources for safe cycling throughout the year. Information will be provided through Ecology Action’s new Bike Programs website launching in 2015, regular electronic newsletters, regular social media presence, partnerships with other local groups such as Bike Santa Cruz County to jointly promote each others events and leverage resources when appropriate, community outreach at events, engagement with business sponsors and encouragement of our bike loan program to their employees, as well as radio ads. EA will also continue to work with other public agencies to help them in their road safety and bike resource projects. EA will also continue to promote issues such as bike theft prevention, helmet use, bicycling in the rain and cold, and bike parking. These are some of the ways we conduct outreach on these issues:

- Maintain current bike resource information on our website
- Community outreach at local events where we provide informational resources and handouts
- Regular communication with our 4,000+ bike commuter list serve via electronic newsletters
- Attend RTC Bicycle Committee and CTSC meetings

Performance Goals for Bike Safety/Commuter Resources:
- Keep bike resource information current on our website, Facebook and mass emails
- Staff at least 3 information booths at community special events
- Keep BTW participants updated on important bike issues via email
**EA's Bike to Work/School 15/16 Budget**

$50,000 TDA Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>SCCRTC</th>
<th>Match*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Director (.15 FTE)</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
<td>$ 2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Specialist (.35 FTE)</td>
<td>$ 15,000.00</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Specialist (.35 FTE)</td>
<td>$ 30,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Material                                       |        |        |
| Direct Costs (program materials & supplies)    | $ 25,000.00 |        |
| Inkind services (staff & supplies)             | $ 18,000.00 |        |
| Inkind product donations (food, advertising, prizes) | $ 50,000.00 |        |

| Total                                          | $ 50,000.00 | $ 100,000.00 |
| TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET                           | $ 150,000.00 |        |

* Local business and public agencies donations, raffle and T-shirt sales contribute $25,000 in cash plus an additional $75,000 of inkind services and product annually for Bike to Work.
Ecology Action’s Bike To Work Program 2014
Program Summary/Annual Report

Program Summary

Ecology Action’s (EA) Bike To Work Program continues to be one of the largest sustainable transportation campaigns in Santa Cruz County providing significant opportunities for public education and outreach regarding bicycle transportation in our community. Now in its 28th year, the Bike To Work Program (BTW) provides vital bike education, resources and incentives to local community members, employers, employees and students throughout the county. The BTW Program has had a 19% increase in participation since 2009 and continues to garner ongoing support and publicity from community members, local businesses and media outlets.

The 2014 BTW Program had the largest turnout in the program’s 27-year history with a combined total of over 16,000 participants in the Spring and Fall events. This represents over a 65% increase countywide over the past decade. A combined total of over 10,600 students from 45+ school sites participated along with over 2,600 community members. An additionally, an estimated 3,000 people participated in our other Spring Bike Week events including First Night at the MAH, Cycle n Dine discount day, and group rides.

Contributes to the documented growth of Bike To Work Trips

For the 2014 program, over 675 beginner bike commuters participated in Bike To Work Day with an additional 550 participants who where infrequent bike commuters. The continued growth of both beginner and infrequent bike commuters in this program attests to the effectiveness of the program to engage commuters who normally drive to work.

Benefits of increased bicycle commuting

EA strives to provide activities that are positive, fun, and support community building among existing cyclists and those that are beginner or infrequent bike commuters. By taking a multi-pronged approach through the BTW Program, EA has been able to continually grow the participation numbers year after year thereby resulting in more people commuting by bike. By encouraging people to commute by bike, the BTW program is contributing to a healthier community by reducing air, noise and run-off pollution, reducing traffic congestion, promoting health and wellness among community members and contributing to safer streets.

Broad-base support

Every year, EA is able to leverage a considerable amount of private and public money to extend the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s funding for the BTW Program. In 2014, EA generated over $23,500 cash from local businesses, individuals and public agencies. In
addition, EA raised $75,000 of in-kind services and product donations. Over 75 businesses and public agencies, plus over 200 individuals volunteered their time and contributed to the success of the program.

2014 Accomplishment Highlights
*Combined figures for 2014*

- Over 16,000 participants in the Spring and Fall events including over 10,600 students for Bike to School and over 2,600 community members for Bike to Work Day (a 19% increase since 2009) and 3,000 Bike Week participants.
- Over a 65% increase of Bike To Work participation countywide over the last decade.
- Over a 200% increase of Bike To School participation countywide over the last decade.
- Over 675 beginner bicycle commuters and over 550 infrequent bicycle commuters participated in the Spring and Fall events.
- Over 65,000 miles were biked instead of driven for Bike To Work and Bike/Walk to School Day
- More financial support raised than ever before from local businesses, individuals and public agencies to leverage SCCRTC funds.
- Over 75 local businesses participated in some capacity, representing more business support than ever before.

2014 Spring Bike Week Highlights

- Over 3,500 participants during Bike Week events (excluding Bike To Work Day)
- Bike Week Frist Friday Launch Party at the Museum of Art & History: Nearly 3,000 people in attendance
- Cycle & Dine program launch: EA partnered with restaurants to provide discounts to cyclists with high participation rates reported from all participating establishments
- Launched student art contest for BTW artwork with over 90 artwork submissions from local middle and high school students. The winning piece was displayed on all event posters and other outreach materials.
- Group rides were featured as part of Bike Week through program partners including the Santa Cruz County Cycling Club, Bike Santa Cruz County and the Coastal Watershed Council with hundreds of beginner and infrequent bike commuters participating

Annual Promotion

- Electronic newsletter campaign: Over 4,000 community members received regular correspondence which included education, incentives and resource to promote bicycle commuting
- Social Media: Over 1200 followers received regular updates and communications via the Bike2Work Facebook page
- News Articles: 4 articles in the Sentinel, 3 articles in the Santa Cruz Cycling Club Newsletter, articles in the UCSC Recreation Guide, the Capitola Times and the Register Pajaronian
- Newspaper Print Ads: 2 color print ads ran in the Sentinel and 2 color print ads ran in the Good Times along with online ads in both
- Website: Over 8,000 visitors to the Bike2Work.com website
• Event Outreach: EA conducted targeted outreach at over 10 events including local farmers markets, the Mountain Bike Festival, and Earth Day events
• Poster Distribution: Over 1,000 posters were distributed throughout the County. Posters were bilingual in English and Spanish.

Bike/Walk to School Promotion
• Coordination with over 45 schools
• Over 450 posters distributed to schools throughout the County
• Educational materials distributed to program participants at school sites including helmet fit guides, traffic rules and safety tips
• Over 30 ‘Share the Road’ signs and barricades posted at school sites
• Coordinated with EA’s Bike Smart Youth Bike Safety Program to run educational programs prior to event days at 8 school sites
• Worked with law enforcement to provide additional safety support on event days

2014 Collaborations

EA benefits greatly from the many partners and collaborators that help make the BTW Program successful and effective. EA continued to forge new partnerships and build upon established partnerships. The following is a partial list of our 2014 partners:

• **Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)**: Provided major financial support along with promotional support. EA also communicated key SCCRTC initiatives to our 4,000 list-serv and on our social media platforms throughout the year
• **Regional Bike Week Partners**: EA collaborated with the Transportation Authority of Monterey County and the San Benito COG to reduce cost of program materials and promotions
• **The Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)**: EA distributed CTSC bike safety information and CTSC staff coordinated safety presentations with Bike To School events
• **Open Streets**: EA collaborated with Open Streets to cross-promote events and assist with planning efforts for events in Santa Cruz, Capitola and Watsonville
• **City of Santa Cruz**: Provided cash funding and promotional support
• **County of Santa Cruz**: Provided promotional support
• **City of Watsonville**: Provided staff and promotional support for Watsonville school and public sites
• **City of Capitola**: Provided cash and promotional support
• **University of California Santa Cruz**: Provided cash funding, staff support and promotional support
• **Cabrillo College**: Provided staff support and promotional support
• **Santa Cruz Cycling Club**: Provided promotional support and led group rides
• **Bike Santa Cruz County**: Was a program partner for the Bike Week kick-off party at the Museum of Art & History, provided bike valet at breakfast sites and assisted with promotion
• **Pedalers Express**: Hired for poster distribution and to assist with supply delivery
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of May 7, 2015,
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH CAPITAL EDGE ADVOCACY, INC.
TO SERVE AS A FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT FOR THE
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WHEREAS, monitoring transportation related legislative and administrative
activity in Washington, D.C. and securing funding to implement the Santa Cruz
County Regional Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, and
priority projects is increasingly important; and,

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has approved
funding in the RTC budget for a federal transportation legislative assistant; and,

WHEREAS, the proposal submitted by Capital Edge Advocacy, Inc. to provide
federal transportation and legislative consulting services demonstrates the skills,
experience, and understanding desired;

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

1. The Executive Director is authorized to execute a contract with CapitalEdge
Advocacy, Inc., to serve as the RTC’s Federal Transportation Legislative
Assistant for a term of up to five years, at an annual compensation rate of
$42,000 and to expend the funds for this agreement; and,

2. The Executive Director is authorized to extend the term of the contract and
negotiate and execute amendments to the agreement provided that the
amendments are within the scope of the agreement and consistent with the
RTC’s approved annual Budget and Work Program.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

________________________
John Leopold, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: RTC Fiscal, CapitalEdge

s:\resoluti\2015\res0515\capedgecontract-15-16.doc
Draft Scope of Services: Federal Transportation/Legislative Assistant

The Consultant shall provide professional services, support and assistance on a regular basis including, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Identify, monitor, report and advise the RTC on relevant legislative and administrative activities that are pertinent to the RTC. This includes information on transportation policy, introduced legislation, amendments, policy white papers, relevant hearings and testimony, regulatory guidelines and any analysis of transportation policy, legislation and regulation that have a potential impact on the RTC and its programs.

2. Assist the RTC in developing and maintaining working relationships in Washington, D.C., including with local congressional representatives and staff, as well as members and staff of transportation, appropriations, and other relevant committees. Coordinate meetings in Washington, D.C. and California for RTC board members and staff to meet with Congress members, transportation committee members, Department of Transportation (DOT) staff, and other relevant agencies, as needed.

3. Assist the RTC in securing the maximum amount of federal funding possible. Identify funding opportunities for RTC priority projects and communicate the importance of formula and discretionary funds for RTC priority projects. This includes work on the federal transportation act, participation in workshops, subsequent legislative activities that determine the method by which new or existing transportation program funds will be distributed, and providing information on and assistance with grant funding opportunities.

4. Assist the RTC with development of an annual Federal Legislative Program and advise and assist the RTC in developing strategies to effectively communicate the impacts of legislative, regulatory and funding actions on transportation in Santa Cruz County, including, but not limited to, maintenance and rehabilitation of local streets and roads, Highway 1 corridor projects, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, projects on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST), and transit facilities and operations.

5. Provide regular reports to the Executive Director and/or designated staff on pending legislative or administrative developments and make recommendations for RTC action or response. Meet with RTC Board members once per year and RTC staff at least four times per year (via teleconference) to review and discuss the progress of the RTC’s legislative and transportation programs.

6. Serve as the RTC’s liaison to federal agencies, including but not limited to the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Federal Transit Administration, the
Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Railroad Administration. Meet with congressional members, key legislative staff, policymakers and federal agencies to discuss, respond to and communicate on legislative or administrative actions of potential benefit or impact to the RTC and its transportation interests, including issues that impact the policies and programs of the RTC. Provide written responses to legislative and policy proposals (e.g. proposed rule makings) that could affect the RTC and transportation programs in Santa Cruz County.

7. Provide the necessary technical, political and logistical support for RTC Board members or staff to participate in legislative, executive or regulatory forums as appropriate.

8. Assist staff in the coordination of strategies with other interested parties, advocacy groups, the public and private entities to advance high priority projects and programs.

9. Undertake other assignments upon which the RTC and Consultant mutually agree.
AGENDA: May 7, 2015

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Monterey Bay Region 2015 Public Participation Plan

RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

Federal regulation requires the Association for Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) to prepare and maintain a public participation plan for the tri-county region (Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito). The plan describes the structure of public participation for federally-funded transportation plans, programs and projects. The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission assisted AMBAG to prepare this latest update to the plan.

DISCUSSION

A core function of the Regional Transportation Commission is to undertake public outreach and engagement activities to provide information and solicit input on the agency’s plans, programs and projects. The RTC worked with AMBAG and neighboring transportation planning agencies to update the public participation plan to include the region’s outreach program components including public meetings, hearings and workshops; use of the website, social media, press releases, print and broadcast media, and other informational materials; and coordination with standing committees, boards and public. Tri-county coordination is critical due to the shared media markets.

The 2015 Public Participation Plan was adopted by AMBAG on April 8, after a 45-day public review period. The final document is available on the AMBAG website:

http://www.ambag.org/programs-services/planning/public-participation-plan

The updated public participation plan emphasizes various outreach techniques, including innovative online and visualization methods, for transportation decision making.

SUMMARY

The RTC participated in the development of the updated 2015 tri-county Public Participation Plan. The final plan was adopted by the Association for Monterey Bay Area Governments at their April 2015 meeting and posted online. The plan provides guidance for public participation activities for the region.
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: Federal Transportation Legislative Assistant

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to execute a contract with CapitalEdge Advocacy, Inc. at an annual compensation level of $42,000 through June 30, 2020, to serve as the RTC’s Federal Transportation Legislative Assistant.

BACKGROUND

Local transportation projects, programs, and planning, including development and implementation of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and priority transportation projects, is affected by ever changing federal rules, regulations, and funding. To help monitor and participate in discussions on transportation related legislative and administrative activity in Washington, D.C., the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has had a federal legislative assistant on retainer since the mid-1990s. The FY 15/16 RTC budget includes $44,600 for a Washington Assistant. With the RTC’s current contract with CapitalEdge Advocacy, Inc. expiring in June 2015, staff issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for consultant services.

DISCUSSION

On March 17, 2015 staff posted the RFP for the Federal Transportation/Legislative Assistant on the RTC’s “Contracting Opportunities” webpage and distributed announcements about the release of the RFP to 38 individuals and legislative consulting firms. On March 25, 2015, staff held a pre-proposal meeting to provide information on the RTC, an overview of the RFP, and respond to any questions. A summary of information shared at the pre-proposal meeting and all questions and answers received about the RFP were posted on RTC’s website. Proposals were due on April 7, 2015.

Consultant Selection

While only one consultant firm submitted a proposal, staff concluded that the CapitalEdge proposal demonstrates the skills and experience needed to assist RTC in receiving federal funds and to communicate effectively regarding legislative and policy actions and initiatives that meet the goals and objectives of RTC, including
implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). CapitalEdge has many years of experience and strong relationships with the California congressional delegation, federal transportation committees and federal transportation agencies; a deep knowledge of federal transportation law and programs; as well as familiarity with the diverse transportation and other challenges facing Santa Cruz County. CapitalEdge specializes in providing an everyday presence for smaller and medium sized agencies in Washington, D.C., including the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO), the City of Santa Cruz, and the County of Santa Cruz.

The consultant team has committed to provide the services outlined in the request for proposals for a monthly retainer of $3,500. No other hourly rates or fees above this amount would be paid and CapitalEdge does not place any restrictions on the time that would be spent providing services to the RTC. **Staff recommend that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to execute a contract with CapitalEdge to serve as the RTC’s Federal Transportation Legislative Assistant for a term of up to five years, at an annual compensation rate of $42,000.**

The consultant team lead by CapitalEdge President Chris Giglio agrees to meet the requirements set forth in the RFP, as presented in their proposal and included in the attached draft scope of services (Attachment 2). The services specified are broad in nature so as not to preclude activities unforeseen at this time.

**SUMMARY**

Staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to execute a contract with CapitalEdge Advocacy, Inc. to serve as the RTC’s Federal Transportation Legislative Assistant.

Attachments:
1. Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a contract with CapitalEdge Advocacy
2. Draft scope of services for contract with CapitalEdge Advocacy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY13 - 14 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY14 - 15 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY14 - 15 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>556,100</td>
<td>583,905</td>
<td>591,100</td>
<td>7,195</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>741,500</td>
<td>778,575</td>
<td>788,200</td>
<td>9,625</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>818,354</td>
<td>859,272</td>
<td>791,871</td>
<td>-67,401</td>
<td>-7.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>596,900</td>
<td>626,745</td>
<td>616,700</td>
<td>-10,045</td>
<td>-1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>795,900</td>
<td>835,695</td>
<td>822,300</td>
<td>-13,395</td>
<td>-1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>732,985</td>
<td>769,634</td>
<td>719,449</td>
<td>-50,185</td>
<td>-6.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>557,700</td>
<td>595,461</td>
<td>601,300</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>728,800</td>
<td>793,948</td>
<td>801,800</td>
<td>7,852</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>802,890</td>
<td>704,655</td>
<td>739,331</td>
<td>34,676</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>504,100</td>
<td>530,042</td>
<td>524,400</td>
<td>-5,642</td>
<td>-1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>672,100</td>
<td>706,686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>780,261</td>
<td>845,925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,287,590</td>
<td>8,630,543</td>
<td>6,996,451</td>
<td>-81,481</td>
<td>-0.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
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TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner
RE: Appointments to the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

RECOMMENDATION

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission:

1. Approve Laura Diaz, Community Bridges Lift Line staff, (Attachment 1) for the E&D TAC Coordinated Transportation Services Agency- Lift Line alternate position;
2. Approve Charlie Levine (Attachment 2) for the E&D TAC District 3 alternate position;
3. Approve Caroline Lamb (Attachment 3) for the E&D TAC Potential Transit User (60+) member position; and,
4. Nominate members of their community for vacant positions as shown in the revised membership roster (Attachment 4).

BACKGROUND

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

DISCUSSION

At its April 2015 meeting, the E&D TAC recommended that the RTC approve Laura Diaz for the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency- Lift Line alternate position. Ms. Diaz has worked with Community Bridges Lift Line since 2013 and serves as the Lift Line Operations Manager. Ms. Diaz has daily interactions with elderly and disabled individuals seeking transportation services in Santa Cruz County. Attached is Laura Diaz’s E&D TAC membership application (Attachment 1). The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve Laura Diaz for the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency- Lift Line alternate position.

At its April 2015 meeting, the E&D TAC recommended that the RTC approve Charlie Levine for the District 3 alternate position. Mr. Levine is familiar with urban planning principles and has served on the Seniors Commission since 2010. Mr. Levine is a resident of the City of Santa Cruz and has lived in Santa Cruz County for over 20 years. Attached is Charlie Levine’s E&D TAC membership application (Attachment 2). The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve Charlie Levine for the District 3 alternate position.

At its April 2015 meeting, the E&D TAC recommended that the RTC approve Caroline Lamb for the Potential Transit User (60+) membership position. Ms. Caroline utilizes transit service and bicycling for transportation. Ms. Lamb is familiar with transportation planning and previously served on the RTC’s Bicycle Committee. Ms. Lamb lives in the
City of Santa Cruz and has been a resident Santa Cruz County for over 20 years. Attached is Caroline Lamb’s E&D TAC membership application (Attachment 3). The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve Caroline Lamb for the Potential Transit User (60+) member position.

Active recruitment is underway for vacant member positions representing:
- Social Service Provider Representing Seniors (County)
- Potential Transit User (Disabled)
- 2nd Supervisorial District
- 5th Supervisorial District

In addition, active recruitment is underway for vacant member alternate positions representing:
- Social Service Provider Representing Seniors (County)
- Social Service Provider Representing People with Disabilities (County)
- Potential Transit User (Disabled)
- Potential Transit User (60+)
- 2nd Supervisorial District
- 4th Supervisorial District
- 5th Supervisorial District

Staff would appreciate assistance from commissioners filling the vacant positions, both member and alternative positions. An E&D TAC membership application can be found at www.sccrtc.org/edtac-app.

**SUMMARY**

The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission approve Laura Diaz, Community Bridges Lift Line staff for the E&D TAC Coordinated Transportation Services Agency- Lift Line alternate position; Charlie Levine for the E&D TAC District 3 alternate member; Caroline Lamb for the E&D TAC Potential Transit User (60+) member; and assist with nominations for vacant positions.

**Attachments:**
1. Committee Appointment Applications for Laura Diaz
2. Committee Appointment Application for Charlie Levine
3. Committee Appointment Application for Caroline Lamb
4. E&D TAC Roster
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COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)

Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC)

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

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Laura Diaz

Home address: [Redacted]

Mailing address (if different): [Redacted]

Phone: (home) [Redacted]

E-mail: [Redacted]

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 30 years

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

□ [Redacted]

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

I have attended the E&D TAC Meeting in 2008/2009 for Catherine Patterson as well as the S

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
**Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges - Lift</td>
<td>2360 Santa Cruz Ave</td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>7/13 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Apts, CA 95063</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.

---

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

**Questions or Comments:** (831) 460-3200
To Whom It May Concern:

I am interested in serving as on the committee or as an alternate for Kirk Ance, Community Bridges Lift Line Division Director. I am currently the Operations Manager for the Lift Line program and face daily with issues concerning the elderly and disabled residents of Santa Cruz County. Not only their transportation concerns but also health and social service issue they are facing on a daily basis.

As the CTSA/Lift Line I want to work with other transportation programs and agencies that are looking, on a regular basis, into the planning, funding and policies for specialized transportation. After looking at the current demographic reports projecting a huge increase in seniors and people with physical and/or economic disabilities over the next 6 to 10 years, I believe this task force is key to their future transportation needs.

I have lived in this County for over 25 years and am very interested in serving on this committee. I know this committee will give me first insight to the needs of elderly residents in the county as well as the gaps in the services that are provided. Having transportation to receive a service is just as important as the service provided and I believe goes hand in hand. As a community resident I feel this committee is key to my future and the people around me.

Thank you in advance for considering my application.

Laura Diaz
CTSA/Lift Line Operations Manager
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

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

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Charles Levine

Home address: 

Mailing address (if different): 

Phone: (home) (business/message) 

E-mail: 

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: over 20 years

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

□ SCC RTC □ E&D Advisory Committee

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

County Advisory Commission - Hazardous Material

County Senior Commission (current member)

Bd Member, 1 HSS Advisory Commission (Current)

2 x, County Grand Jury

RECEIVED

MAR 13 2015

RTC
### 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>Mayor's Committee</td>
<td>Contra Costa, CA</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>1974-78, 1964-66, 1974-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton, CA</td>
<td>Clayton, CA</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Land Use Fire Commission</td>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>1984-92, 2010-16, 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd Member 1455 Broadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Opportunities Council</td>
<td>Contra Costa, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1976-78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Attached in my C.V. for when I retired in 1969

### 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.

Signed: Charles Lounsbury  
Date: 3/11/2015

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

### Questions or Comments:
(831) 460-3200  
IleDTACMEMBERSApplicationCOMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION.doc
Charles A. Levine Ph.D.

1946-1947 Iowa State University, Ames, IA BS in Chemical Technology
1940-1942 Iowa State University

Military Experience

1944-1946 U. S. Navy

Past Security Clearances

DOD (Secret)
AEC (Q)

Technical Experience

Present-1985 Consultant with Omni-Tech International and Tele-Tech
(All the following with Dow Chemical Co.)

1985-1964 Associate Scientist
- Hollow Fiber Fuel Cell development
- Sodium-Sulfur rechargeable battery development
- Lithium rechargeable battery development
- Hydrogen chloride fuel cell development
- Broad advisory role in research
- Prepared and presented R&D proposals to government agencies
- Evaluated projects
- Radiation Safety Officer of Dow's Western Division

1964-1960 Senior Research Chemist
- Worked on fundamental effects of radiation on organic and inorganic systems
- Development of hydrogen-air fuel cell
- Served on special Dow committee to forecast
1960-1954
Research Chemist
- Theoretical and experimental work on methane pyrolysis to acetylene
- Effects of high energy radiation
- Radiation grafting of polymers

1954-1951
Chemist
- Extraction of uranium from low grade ores
- Trouble shooting plant problems

Descriptive Summary

Over 34 years of progressive experience and responsibilities in planning, carrying out, and supervising experimental research.

A broad and successful record in project evaluation and market analysis.

A proven record of preparing successful grant applications to the Departments of Energy, Defense, and NASA.

Highly respected achievements as Principal Scientist and Principal Investigator on numerous governmental and industrial projects.

Substantial experience in communicating and dealing with people on technical and non-technical levels.

Served on advisory committees to the Department of Energy and to the National Academy of Sciences.

Skills and Fields of Knowledge

Able to:  
- Assemble and present Research and Development proposals for internal review and to governmental agencies
- Develop theoretical and practical evaluations of proposed or on-going projects
- Successfully communicate on both a technical and non-technical level
- Evaluate experimental approaches to a problem and suggest optimal experimental path

Expert in:  
- Corrosion of glass, metals and carbons in ambient and high temperature molten salt environments
- The fields of elevated temperature batteries and fuel cells
- The field of "advanced" batteries, e.g. lithium batteries
- The power and energy needs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy
- Radiation safety and the California state laws on radiation exposure
-Controlled atmosphere box operations

Additional Information

Dr. Levine has given seminars at a number of universities including The University of California (Berkeley), The University of Washington, Stanford, and The Brooklyn Polytechnical Institute.

He is a member of the Electrochemical Society, Sigma Xi Research Society, American Association for the Advancement of Science, and past Chairman of the California Coordinating Committee of the American Chemical Society.

Civic interests include the following:

- Mayor, City of Clayton, California; 1976-1978
- City Council, Clayton, California; 1974-1982
- Clayton Planning Commission; 1964-1976
- Planning Commission Chairman - two terms
- Economic Opportunity Council, Contra Costa County, California; 1976-1978
- Technical Member, Hazardous Waste Advisory Committee, Santa Cruz County, California, 1989-present

Publications

See Attached
PUBLICATIONS


5. "Promethium" (article in Encyclopedia Americana).


17. "Progress in the Hollow Fiber Na-S Battery" (talk given at the Electrochemical Society, Atlanta, Georgia, October 1977).


PATENTS

1. U.S. 2,947,774 - Preparation of Alkly Pyrophosphate Extractants (with E. Skeins).

2. U.S. 2,979,447 - Process for Preparation of Graft Copolymers. (Also Belgium 600,189; Italy 645,585).

3. U.S. 3,027,311 - Improved Method for Radiation Grafting Copolymerization of N-Vinyl Lactam Monomers on Acrylonitrile Polymer Substrates (with T. Traylor). (Also Belgium, 568,423; Italy 591,332; France 1,212,748; Britain 843,063; Dutch 96,100; Japan 274,257; Canada 741,550.)

4. U.S. 2,920,123 - Production of Acetylene by Pyrolysis (with C. Oldershaw). (Also Italy 577,945; Britain 816,816; France 1,184,736; Argentina 119,391; Belgium 584,957).

5. U.S. 3,331,753 - Coated Hollow Fiber.


15. U.S. 3,663,294 - Battery Employing an Alkali Metal Polysulfide Having a Low Alkali Metal Hydroxide Content (with G. Fujioka).


22. U.S. 4,224,386 - Tubesheet for Hollow Fiber Type, High Temperature Cells.

PATENT DISCLOSURES

Numerous.
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

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

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

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

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name:  Caroline Lamb

Home address:  

Mailing address (if different):  

Phone: (home)  (business/message)  

E-mail:  

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County:  since August 1992

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

☐  

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

I was an alternate on the bicycle committee  
circa 2002. Member of the bus user group under  
Gallaway in the 1990s.
## 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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** ___________________________  **Date** ___________________________

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

### Questions or Comments:
(831) 460-3200  
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Statement of Qualifications to serve on the SCCRTC Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee:

- I’m 70, soon to be 71.
- I don’t drive.
- I am single-sided deaf, with vertigo.
- I also have leukemia.
- I need buses to get where I’m going.
- My knowledge of what elders need in the way of transportation is not theoretical.
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)

Membership Roster - May 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Seniors (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Molesky (2017)</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Daugherty, vice chair</td>
<td>SCMTD (Metro)</td>
<td>April Warnock (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Lamb-pending (2018)</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (60+)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (Disabled)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Year in Parentheses) = Membership Expiration Date
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s
ELDERLY & DISABLED TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ED/TAC)
and SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (SSTAC)

Membership Roster – May 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patti Shevlin</td>
<td>1st District (Leopold)</td>
<td>Brent Gifford (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>2nd District (Friend)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Elsea, Chair</td>
<td>3rd District (Coonerty)</td>
<td>Charlie Levine-pending (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm Hagen</td>
<td>4th District (Caput)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>5th District (McPherson)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff

Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner, RTC 460-3219, gblakeslee@sccrtc.org
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Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE

May 2015 Through August 2015

All meetings are subject to cancellation when there are no action items to be considered by the board or committee. Please visit our website for meeting agendas and locations: www.sccrtc.org/meetings/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Day</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Meeting Time</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/7/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Capitola City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/15</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9/15</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Watsonville RTC Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/11/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Santa Cruz City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/6/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Scotts Valley City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10/15</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11/15</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RTC Watsonville Offices – 275 Main St Ste 450 – Watsonville, CA
Board of Supervisors Chambers/CAO/RDA Conference room – 701 Ocean St-5th floor – Santa Cruz, CA
City of Capitola-Council Chambers – 420 Capitola Ave – Capitola, CA
City of Santa Cruz-Council Chambers – 809 Center St – Santa Cruz, CA
City of Scotts Valley-Council Chamber – 1 Civic Center Dr – Scotts Valley, CA
City of Watsonville-Council Chambers – 275 Main St Ste 400 – Watsonville, CA
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/31/14</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Brandy</td>
<td>Rider</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SCCRTC - Sustainable Transportation Prioritization Plan Grant Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/14</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Luis A</td>
<td>Alejo</td>
<td>Assembly California Legislature</td>
<td>Support for Funding the Sustainable Transportation Prioritization Plan for Santa Cruz County Grant Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/14</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Maura</td>
<td>Twomey</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>Support for Funding the Sustainable Transportation Prioritization Plan for Santa Cruz County Grant Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/25/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Dene</td>
<td>Bustichi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Molesky</td>
<td>SCCRTC, Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, Chair</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Metro Structural Deficit Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/23/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz City “Grassroots” Politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/24/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John J</td>
<td>Presleigh</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Highway 152/Holohan Road/College Road Intersection Improvements - Status Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/24/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Baez</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Controller's Office Division of Audits</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Nikuna</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FY 2013/14 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) Single Audit Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</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>03/24/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>03/24/15</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>An Iranian Bridgehead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/25/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Rihui</td>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>LSR Statewide Needs Assessment Funding Concurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/25/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>03/25/15</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>California North Recycled Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Aileen K</td>
<td>Loe</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Review SCCRTTC Draft 2015/2016 Work Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/06/15</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>2015 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee - Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/27/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/06/15</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Arsenic Level in Wine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/28/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/08/15</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Heidi and Craig</td>
<td>Springbett</td>
<td>Rail to Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/28/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/06/15</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Clinton Emails Intentionally Deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/28/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Water Quality Assurance Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yemen - A Strategic Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle East Nuclear-arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global Warming Metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obama's Global Warming Executive Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elderly and Disabled Transportation Stakeholders</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Blakeslee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee Member Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/15</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Invoice #9 for STIP Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>Connell</td>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
<td>TDA Funding for 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</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>04/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MB 04/01/15</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Candice</td>
<td>Covello</td>
<td>Unified Corridors Plan - Survey and 4/16 Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 04/02/15</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Soquel Drive/Porter Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 04/02/15</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Transportation Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/03/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 04/06/15</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Preliminary Results of Nuclear Talks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Bruce Shewchuk</td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td>Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project, Contract Change Order #29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Honororable William Monning</td>
<td>California State Senate Majority Leader</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>SB 344 - Commercial Driver Safety Training - SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>SCCRTTC, Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, Chair</td>
<td>Michael Molesky</td>
<td>Proposed Fare Restructure and Changes to Paratransit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Charlene R Palmer</td>
<td>JL Patterson &amp; Associate, Inc.</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Amendments 4 to Contract for Engineering Services for Improvements to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McClendon</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Invoice #4 for the Santa Cruz County Unified Corridor Investment Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/20/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC Media Release: Survey &amp; Workshop on Unified Transportation Corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>04/08/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Juliana</td>
<td>Cheng</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC Media Release: Survey &amp; Workshop on Unified Transportation Corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>04/09/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>Poms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate Hike for ParaCruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Stuxnet Worm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>California State Water Resources Control Board’ Water Cuts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McClendon</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Invoice #4 for the Rail Passenger Study Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>Ance</td>
<td>Lift Line</td>
<td>CTSA/City of Santa Cruz Claim for 2015/2016 TDA Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</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>04/10/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>RTC: Coastal Rail Trail - Grant Finalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>RTC: Coastal Rail Trail - Grant Finalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Boudreau</td>
<td>Rail Line &amp; Trail Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>04/11/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Aptos Village sidewalk &amp; Feasibility Study Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/13/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Obama &amp; Global Warming Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>04/11/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Wilshusen</td>
<td>RTC: Coastal Rail Trail - Grant Finalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/12/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Nuclear Islam &amp; Obama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/12/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>North Charleston Shooting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</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>04/12/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Lithium Battery USA Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Alvaro Marquez</td>
<td>Stacy &amp; Whitbeck, Inc</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Pavel Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Contract #RT34039-01 Santa Cruz Branch Line Bridge Supports, Repairs and Member Replacement Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Gratz</td>
<td>Finalist Selection Grant Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Carole</td>
<td>Bridgeman</td>
<td>Rail Trail Grant Funding - Equestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Iran's S-300 Missiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Nation's Interest in Nuclear Talks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Loretta Maddux</td>
<td>California Highway Patrol - Business Services Section - Contract Services Unit</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Contract Agreement 1SR720000 between SCCRTTC SAFE and CHP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Lyndall</td>
<td>Erb</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>VP, Bay Area Barns &amp; Trails</td>
<td>Rail Trail Equestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/16/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Pavel Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Contract RT34039-01 Santa Cruz Branch Line Bridge Supports, Repairs &amp; Member Replacement Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/17/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Draft CTP 2040 Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gale</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Survey - No Reload Button</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Where in the World is Abduction Flight 370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/19/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>New Owner of the old Odwalla building, the old Davenport Producer's warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>Office of Project Implementation</td>
<td>Optional Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Federal Exchange Program FY 2014/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/21/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>US aircraft carrier sent to block arms shipments to Yemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Hefner Law</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Pavel Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Request for Equitable Adjustment from Stacy and Witbeck, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>CJ 04/22/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tehran Supply of Yemen Rebels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Maura</td>
<td>Twomey</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FY 2014/15 Third Quarter FHWA PL Invoice and the Quarterly Progress Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>GB 04/29/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bicycle Route Signage Program Draft Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>JR 04/23/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Aircraft Flight Data and Voice Recorders Are to Solve Flight 5622 Decent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>JR 04/24/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Russian Nuclear Energy Conquers the World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>JR 04/24/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Obama's Doctrine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>JR 04/24/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>The Unrecognized Islamic Ottoman Empire's Genocide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</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>04/24/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Office of Regional Planning</td>
<td>Federal Transportation Planning Grant for FY 2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/24/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Caltrans, Division of Local Assistance, MS 1</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Elsea</td>
<td>E&amp;D TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz ATP Grant Application for Branciforte Creek Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/24/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/24/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Kett</td>
<td>RTC Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/27/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Water Resource Management of Droughts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/27/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>The Carbon Energy Corruption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/27/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Toldi</td>
<td>Cruzio</td>
<td>Contact Form - Railcars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/27/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>The Out of Control US Federal Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/27/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Middle East Old Friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/15 Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC 04/27/15</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nikolas</td>
<td>Karales</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Blue Book Building &amp; Construction Network</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Segment 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/15 Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC 04/27/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recycled Water Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/15 Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC 04/27/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Energy Deals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/15 Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Sebastian E</td>
<td>Gutierrez</td>
<td>CASE Systems</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Naranjo</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Amendment #1 to Contract with CASE Systems Agreement Dated Oct 1, 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/15 Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Caltrans, Division of Local Assistance, MS 1</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Elsea</td>
<td>City of Scotts Valley Active Transportation Program Grant (ATP) Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 7, 2015

Honorable William Monning
California State Senate Majority Leader
State Capitol Building, Room 313
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 344 – Commercial Driver Safety Training – SUPPORT

Dear Senator Monning,

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is pleased to support Senate Bill 344: Commercial Driver Safety Training. This bill would require commercial drivers to have additional training prior to obtaining a license. The bill will help advance goals set forth in the RTC’s 2014 Regional Transportation Plan for Santa Cruz County (RTP) to reduce transportation fatalities and injuries and was reviewed by the Safe on 17 Taskforce, which is made up of technical experts focused on developing collision reducing strategies for the Highway 17.

The tragic truck collision that occurred on Highway 17 in July 2014 when a truck driver lost control and crashed into 10 cars, injuring 7 and killing a 25-year old man from Santa Cruz illustrates the need for improved safety training of commercial drivers. By requiring those seeking a commercial driver’s license (CDL) to complete a course of instruction from a commercial driving institution certified by the Department of Motor Vehicles before being issued a CDL will help to reduce the likelihood of these types of incidents.

Thank you for your leadership on this important issue. Please contact Rachel Moriconi of my staff if you have any questions at 831-460-3200.

Sincerely,

George Dondero
Executive Director

s:\legislat\2015\corresp\sb344trucksaftyrtc.docx
April 16, 2015

The Honorable Jean Fuller, Senator
16th District
State Capitol, Room 3063
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for SB 516 Transportation: Motorist Aid Services

Senator Fuller:

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission supports SB 516, which would broaden the list of eligible motorist aid services established under California’s Streets and Highways Code Section 2557 beyond a network of call boxes to provide for updated and more modern technologies to aid California motorists in their travels.

California’s Streets and Highways Code Section 2550-2559 calls for a network of call boxes along the state’s highways and expressways for motorist aid assistance. The code also allows for Service Authorities for Freeways and Expressways (SAFEs) to be established, region-by-region, to install and administer the call box network, using up to $2 in vehicle registration fees to fund the system. Excess funds, beyond what is needed to maintain the call box network, are allowed to be spent on other motorist aid services, such as freeway service patrols, changeable message signs and traffic operations centers.

Largely due to the proliferation of cell phones over the last 20 years, call volumes from the roadside boxes have declined substantially throughout the state, raising the cost per call and generally making the networks a less efficient service for taxpayers. In Santa Cruz County, call box call volumes have declined by more than 85% over the last 10 years. In the meantime, significant advancements in intelligent transportation systems (ITS) and mobile technology have allowed for new, less expensive motorist aid services, including phone and Web-based 511 traveler information systems, ramp meters, speed cameras and other architecture and services that benefit and ensure the safety of California’s motorists.
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission supports SB 516, which changes the Streets and Highways Code Sections 2550-2559 to allow for these additional services and infrastructure to be included along with call boxes as eligible expenses, as determined by regional SAFE's. This change allows for each region to best service its constituents. While some rural areas may prefer call boxes on remote state highways, urban regions may find additional Intelligent Transportation System architecture to be a more relevant service for congestion relief and safety purposes.

In closing, SB 516 will offer regions such as ours to transition into newer, updated technology to help serve our motorists better. Thank you for authoring this important bill.

Sincerely,

Luis Mendez  
Deputy Director  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

cc: Senate Transportation Committee  
Senator Bill Monning
April 20, 2015

The Honorable Jim Frazier  
California Assembly District 11  
P.O. Box 942849  
Sacramento, CA 94249-0030

RE: SUPPORT for ACA 4 (Frazier). Local government transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval.

Dear Assembly Member Frazier:

On behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), I am writing to express our strong support for Assembly Constitutional Amendment 4 (ACA 4), which reduces the voter threshold from two-thirds to 55 percent for passage of local sales taxes dedicated to transportation purposes.

Transportation funding levels continue to fall significantly below the levels required to implement projects that reduce congestion, improve safety, expand mobility, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and maintain the existing transportation system. Given that state and federal funding is not sufficient to meet all of California’s transportation needs, this measure would give local agencies the opportunity to address at least some of the significant backlog.

The existing two-thirds majority vote requirement to enact transportation taxes presents a significant hurdle and exacerbates the funding shortfalls that undermine efforts to restore our transportation system to a state of good repair. The RTC and local jurisdictions hear from residents and businesses daily about potholes that need to be filled, congested roadways, the need for expanded transit service, and the desire for more sidewalks and bicycle facilities. Unfortunately, the two-thirds vote requirement allows a small minority of voters to control transportation investment decisions. This amendment recognizes that our transportation systems need attention and it provides a fair and equitable option to address the ongoing revenue shortfalls.

Lowering the threshold for passage of local option transportation tax measures to 55% gives voters in all of California’s counties a realistic opportunity to generate funding to improve, repair and maintain the local and state transportation system. This is the same vote threshold required for educational bonds since 2004.

I would like to again reiterate our SUPPORT for ACA 4 and thank you for your leadership to provide additional options for voters to fund priority transportation projects. If you have any questions, please contact me or Rachel Moriconi of my staff at (831) 460-3200.

Sincerely,

George Dondero  
Executive Director

cc: Senator Monning, Assemblymember Alejo, Assemblymember Stone; RTC
April 24, 2015

Caltrans, Division of Local Assistance, MS 1
Attn: Office of Active Transportation and Spec. Prog.
P.O. Box 942874, Sacramento, CA 94274-0001

RE: City of Santa Cruz Active Transportation Program (ATP) Grant Application for Branciforte Creek Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge

Dear ATP Grant Selection Committee:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) advises transportation service providers and planning agencies on issues related to the provision of transportation for people with disabilities, seniors and persons with limited means. An essential component of transportation for people with disabilities, seniors and persons with limited means is availability of safe and continuous pedestrian facilities accessible for all members of the community.

The E&D TAC supports the City of Santa Cruz Branciforte Creek Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge. This bridge will close a critical gap in the pedestrian network. The new pedestrian access will serve an area with a high concentration of senior and low income housing. This area is also a primary destination identified in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan due to the high concentrations of employment and commercial services. Areas with high concentrations of employment and commercial services typically experience a high level of demand for walking, which will be met by the proposed improvements. Safe travel paths between senior and/or disabled living areas, medical facilities, educational facilities, employment locations, retail centers, entertainment venues and/or bus stops is one of the number one unmet transportation needs in Santa Cruz County according to the recently adopted list of 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs.

Please fund this important project to increase walking and improve pedestrian access to key destinations within the City of Santa Cruz.

Sincerely,

Veronica Elsea, Chair
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
April 28, 2015

Caltrans, Division of Local Assistance, MS 1
Attn: Office of Active Transportation and Spec. Prog.
P.O. Box 942874, Sacramento, CA 94274-0001

RE: City of Scotts Valley Active Transportation Program Grant (ATP) Application

Dear ATP Grant Selection Committee:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) advises transportation service providers and planning agencies on issues related to the provision of transportation for people with disabilities, seniors and persons with limited means. An essential component of transportation for people with disabilities, seniors and persons with limited means is the availability of safe and continuous pedestrian facilities accessible for all members of the community.

The E&D TAC supports the City of Scotts Valley Bike, and Pedestrian Accessibility Town Center ATP grant application and the City of Scotts Valley Bike and Pedestrian Improvements for Safe Routes to School and County Linkages ATP Grant application. Both projects include constructing new sidewalks to fill gaps in the sidewalk network and improving sidewalks and pedestrian crossings. These improvements will increase the number of individuals, including the many seniors who live nearby, who can safely and comfortably walk to bus stops, and to commercial services on primary transportation corridors in City of Scotts Valley. These improvements will also reduce conflict between motor vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles and reduce the potential for injury collisions.

Safe travel paths between senior and/or disabled living areas, medical facilities, educational facilities, employment locations, retail centers, entertainment venues and/or bus stops is one of the top unmet transportation needs in Santa Cruz County according to the recently developed list of 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs. There are high concentrations of seniors living along this route- making improvements to this area an important strategy for addressing unmet transportation needs. This area is also a primary destination identified in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan due to the high concentrations of employment and
commercial services. Areas with high concentrations of employment and commercial services typically experience a high level of demand for walking, which will be met by the proposed improvements.

Please fund this important project to improve pedestrian facilities and increase walking as a viable transportation option to bus stops and commercial services in City of Scotts Valley for all members of the community.

Sincerely,

Veronica Elsea, Chair
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
-----Original Message-----
From: Heidi Springbett [mailto:heidispringbett@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 28, 2015 11:24 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail to trail

We think it would be great for the community to put in a bike path on the rail. Our family supports this.
Sincerely,
Heidi and Craig springbett
Sent from my iPhone

04/08/15

Dear Heidi and Craig Springbett,

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

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

Thank you,

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
Hello.

I wasn’t sure whom I should express my thoughts to, so you are the first...
I have lived in the Capitola area 60 years. 41st was 2 lanes of chuck holes and Browns Ranch was a ranch! I went to Del Mar, Soquel, & Harbor High schools. After school bus service was discontinued, (and I remember one bus held in the order of 70 students), each of those students now have someone take an individual vehicle make a round trip to school. This is evident every school day morning and afternoon all over Santa Cruz County. I don’t know how many busses each school had, but multiply the number of schools times the busses times 70, and that number of vehicles are now making round trips to and from schools every week day. So, Santa Cruz County school districts have saved money by eliminating school busses, but the county has taken on an extremely expensive transportation issue, and at times, gridlocked traffic situation. I understand dedicated busses (safely transporting ONLY students) is very expensive, but the “corridor” improvements is only viable for a short time as the population continues to grow. We are just trying to shift the costs from the city/county, to the state, good idea, but sit in a car at 5pm almost anywhere in town.

Speaking of traffic, the Soquel Drive/Porter intersection “improvements” are a TOTAL disaster! Back a number of years ago, before the first attempt at “improvements”, one could flow through Soquel Village using both lanes of Soquel drive. Going north, the light turns green,(and only for the northbound lanes), the left lane, flow options were continue up toward 41st, or left on Porter, right lane flow options were continue up toward 41st, or turn right on Porter (Soquel High School). Southbound Soquel Drive, light turns green,(and only for the southbound lanes), left flow options were continue straight toward Capitola Avenue (and on toward Cabrillo College), or turn left on Porter (toward Soquel High school). Right lane, flow options were continue straight or turn right on Porter toward Highway 1 or Capitola village. Since the “improvements”, the creation of a dedicated left turn lane southbound (only accommodates about 5 cars) now BLOCKS all other left lane flow through the village. This has now caused traffic to back up as far as 41st avenue. In the northbound left lane of Soquel drive, the “improvement” making it a left turn only has now backed traffic up as far as beyond Capitola Avenue. This mess has forced people to use Soquel Wharf to get to highway 1 and past Nob Hill foods to get to Park avenue (in hopes to bypass the gridlock in Soquel Village). Northbound people are using Capitola Avenue to get through Capitola Village to 41st and beyond. I guess “improvements” are sometimes made on paper, instead of behind the wheel?

Stan Wilson

Capitola

Hello Stan Wilson –
First, congratulations on living in beautiful Capitola for 60 years!

Thank you for contacting the Regional Transportation Commission for Santa Cruz County. Your comments on the traffic situation, especially near schools, is noted and will be made available to the Regional Transportation Commissioners for their consideration. The intent of looking at the three parallel routes -- Highway 1, Soquel Drive/Avenue and the rail corridor -- is to identify the combination of investments that most effectively move people and provide transportation choices including projects for auto, transit, bicycle, and walking trips.

Regarding your comments about the Soquel Drive/Porter intersection in Soquel Village, I am forwarding this email to the County of Santa Cruz Department of Public Works. They are the lead agency for that project and can better address your comments.

Sincerely,

Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Gerald Weber [mailto:jerry.e.weber@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2015 1:01 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission
Subject: Re: RTC Media Release: Survey & Workshop on Unified Transportation Corridors

Sorry to have to say this...but this is perhaps the most simplistic and useless survey that I encountered in my life. It will not solve the problem. The problem is that there are simply too many people in too small an area. Too many vehicles, not enough road space. I seriously doubt that any of your proposed changes will solve the traffic woes. Add to that...the fact that there will be more and more people wanting to move into the coastal corridor...and more an more people from the Silicon Valley will try to escape to a "better place" - i.e. Santa Cruz - on weekends and holidays. It's a tough problem...and you are proposing the equivalent of putting a band aid on a severed limb.

Good luck...you will need it.

Jerry

04/20/15

Dear Mr. Weber,

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

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

Thank you,

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

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.768.8012

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
You mean one can drive his or her vehicle onto the train and goes part way without driving?

Hello Juliana Cheng –
Your email and question about the Unified Corridors Plan was received.

Indeed, the concept of three routes inter-relating as a unified corridor is confusing. The purpose of the survey and workshop is to get feedback about what transportation investments make sense in each of the three routes, understanding that funding is extremely limited and it is not possible to do it all. The survey identifies some of the transportation improvement options within each route (driving a car onto a train is not an option under consideration).

If you haven’t already, please take the survey and let me know if it helps with clarification. Thank you.

Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Julie Boudreau [mailto:julieboudreau@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2015 6:07 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: question

Thank you for your newsletter and congratulations on the grant!

We wondered if the segments being constructed now include rail line improvements or are just the trail portion. And if the latter, is that the case for the entire project, or will the rail line and trail improvements be done in tandem for the entirety of the project?

Thanks again,

Julie Boudreau

Hello Julie Boudreau –

Thank you for your interest and support of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network. Your comments will be made available for the Regional Transportation Commissioners.

Regarding your question, the north coast trail segment to be constructed as a result of this grant will not include rail line improvements. It is highly likely that the trail will be constructed independently of any improvements to the track and vice versa. However, that may change as opportunities arise. There will be many different scenarios that will be explored moving forward.

In addition, a feasibility analysis is currently underway to look at the costs and ridership potential for a number of passenger rail service scenarios. Next steps will be discussed after release of the draft plan, scheduled for later next month. If you would like updates about plans for Rail Service, please sign up for eNews.

Please let me or Cory Caletti, the project manager (copied), know if you have additional questions. The RTC website has more information about transportation projects and programs.

Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Brian Peoples [mailto:brian_peoples@rocketmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, April 11, 2015 6:51 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission
Cc: Zach Friend; Patrick Mulhearn; Karena Pushnik; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us; jimmy.dutra@cityofwatsonville.org; rhj12@comcast.net; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Dennis Norton; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; Luis Mendez
Subject: Aptos Village sidewalk & Feasibility Study date?

RTC,

It is very disappointing that the new Aptos Village sidewalk has been removed from the improvement plan due to the fact that it is not allowable next to train tracks. The train tracks have sat unused for going on 4 years that RTC has owned the property. Now, our community is losing more pedestrian walking space because of the old railroad tracks. These tracks sit unused and is not the most effective use of this property for transit.

At the last RTC meeting, RTC Staff was to provide a date when Feasibility Study would be issued to public. Can you please provide the date?

Thanks,
Brian Peoples

Brian Peoples –

Your comments regarding the Aptos Village Plan will be made available for consideration by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission.

The Aptos Village Plan project was approved in February 2010. As shown in the plan, the network of proposed sidewalks in the Aptos Village Plan is much more extensive than existed at the time of the plan’s adoption. As far as the RTC knows, no sidewalks have ever been removed from the adopted Aptos Village Plan. The County of Santa Cruz is the lead agency on the Aptos Village Plan and would be the best entity to answer detailed questions.

As I mentioned at the Unified Corridors Workshop last night, the consultant team is still evaluating the scenarios, then we will undergo peer review. If no major questions are identified during peer review, we hope to have the Draft Report for Passenger Rail Study ready to release later next month for a 45-day review period. A public workshop will be scheduled within the review period.

Thank you.

Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
-----Original Message-----
From: Joanna Miller  [mailto:millersdaughter4@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 19, 2015 9:15 AM
To: Karena Pushnik
Subject: I am the new owner of the old Odwalla building, the old Davenport Producer's warehouse

Hello,

Fred Bailey had forwarded an email about your survey and meeting Thursday. Somehow it got past me as I see now that I just missed it.... But, I would like to stay informed and I am interested in the ideas coming forth about the Rail Line. As Davenport develops, as it will when the Rail Trail becomes active , or more active as I see many people walking the train tracks now, it would be invaluable to see how the transportation can alleviate the impact of cars on the small town. If a Rail Line comes in it could be a heightened experience for travelers and hikers. To take a train, visit the proposed state park for some hiking and / or take a picnic lunch to the mountains or the beach, stop for some fried sprouts, or for a latte at the Whale City for the ride back down the coast to their car...

I depend on my car for so much, but we in the US could start to use our rail lines for travel as the europeans do it could really clear the highways of a lot of traffic and perhaps offer people a more relaxed and entertaining experience.

I realize that it may not be in the plan for the light rail train service and perhaps you are having the conversation about Bicycle and foot traffic. I am not new to the conversation as I am a Santa Cruz Land Trust supporter and I read some of what they send in their letters, but I do admit I have not informed myself very well on the topic.

Thank you for any information you could direct me to.

Joanna Miller

From: Karena Pushnik
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2015 8:01 PM
To: 'Joanna Miller'
Cc: Cory Caletti
Subject: RE: I am the new owner of the old Odwalla building, the old Davenport Producer's warehouse.

Hello Joanna Miller –
Congratulations on your ownership of the Odwalla Building in Davenport!

Regarding your request for information, the 32-mile Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line was purchased from Union Pacific by the RTC on behalf of the public using voter-approved Proposition 116 funding to increase transportation options within the county and maximize use of the 135 year old transportation corridor. Approximately half the county’s population lives within a mile of the rail corridor. In addition, over 90 parks and 30 schools, and many other attractions are within a mile of the line.

Potential uses of the rail corridor include the following:
- **Continued freight rail service** - Currently most of the freight traffic is out of Watsonville for agriculture, construction materials and biofuel. The Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway (SC&MB) is the rail operator and is federally recognized as the common carrier. The SC&MB will seek freight customers in the northern parts of the county now that the La Selva Bridge is complete and the full line is operable.
- **New Passenger Rail Service** – The RTCs us undergoing a Passenger Rail Study to analyze the feasibility of commuter and/or intercity passenger rail service on the 32-mile Branch Rail Line between Davenport and Pajaro. Public input was gathered over the summer on goals, evaluation measures, station locations and service scenarios. The draft plan with recommendations will be available for public review soon. See the [Passenger Rail Study page](#) on the RTC website for more information about the project including summaries of public input from the survey and workshop.
- **Recreational or Excursion Passenger Rail Service** - The Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway operated the seasonal Train to Christmastown 2012 -2014 and will operate it again this year out of Watsonville. The SC&MB plans other excursion services, such as dinner trains and sunset cruises.
- **Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail** – The Regional Transportation completed a Master Plan for the of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network in Santa Cruz County. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County completed a Master Plan for the portion of the trail in Monterey county to form plans for trails ringing the Monterey Bay. Trail sections in Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Capitola, Live Oak and the north coast are moving forward toward implementation. Other portions of the trail will be constructed as funds become available. The rail corridor forms the spine of the trail, sometimes called the Coastal Rail Trail, and Master Plan is a design for a shared use path adjacent to the train tracks within the rail property.

I’ve copied Cory Caletti, Project Manager for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network. Please feel free to let us know if you have additional questions.
I added you to the eNews lists for both the trail and rail projects.
Thank you for your interest in the Rail Corridor.
From: Contact Request Form [mailto:admin@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2015 11:27 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: New submission from Contact Form

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

Name
cathy toldi

Email
coldi@cruzio.com

Subject
Railcars

Your Message
Just curious: what's the purpose of the railcars that have been going back and forth all weekend? They are pretty annoying. Hoping this won't be a regular event!!
I don't mind a few trips a day, but this has been seeming nonstop.
Thanks.

Dear Ms. Toldi,

The rail motorcars were part of a weekend excursion on April 25th and 26th. A number of rail motorcars did one round trip on Saturday and another round trip on Sunday. There was a similar excursion in 2013. There are currently no plans for another such excursion. The North American Railcar Operators Association (NARCOA) may request permission again in the future to run another such excursion.

Best regards,

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

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Ellen Martinez [mailto:ellen@ellenmartinez.com]
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 4:29 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: 'joe martinez'; 'Ellen Martinez'
Subject: Motorcars on Train Tracks in Aptos

Hello,
Brian Peoples of the Aptos Rail Trail Friends suggested that I write to you.

My husband and I live in the Seascape community of Aptos. Our house is situated very close to the train tracks. We own our home and have lived here for over 15 years. We moved to this area as we love the quiet and serenity that the area provides.

When we first moved here, there was a train that moved at 5 mph down the tracks twice a day. The quiet rumble of the train going down the tracks twice daily was quite nice – it actually positively added to the ambience of the community.

We understand that the RTC has recently allowed motorcar excursions down the tracks until the RTC develops and has a plan for usage of the tracks. Over the weekend, there were about 60 motorcar excursions going down the tracks. Each of these 60 individual cars are very noisy on the tracks. The loud, clickety-clack noise that each creates is grating and offensive and eliminates the peace and quiet that exists in the community. In fact, they pollute the area with their noise.

Brian indicated to us that the RTC believes most Santa Cruz people like the motorcars. That is not the case for those of us that live close to the tracks. I would urge you to stop the use of these motorcars on the tracks.

Please consider this a formal complaint against the use of these motorcars going down the tracks.

I would appreciate a reply to this email.

Thanks,
Ellen Martinez
118 Via Trinita
Aptos CA 95003
ellen@ellenmartinez.com

Hello Ms. Martinez,

There have been two rail car excursions thus far. The first excursion occurred in May of 2013 and this past weekend's excursion was the second. The rail cars did one round trip on Saturday and another on Sunday from Davenport and Felton to Watsonville. The North American Rail Car Operators Association (NARCOA) has expressed interest in having an excursion once per year. Each time that NARCOA wants to use the rail line for excursions, they must obtain permission from the Regional Transportation Commission and from the Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway.

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

Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
Direct 831.460.3212 | Mobile 408.838.2392
Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
April 15, 2015

Brian P. Kelly, Secretary
California State Transportation Agency
915 Capitol Mall, Suite 350B
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: Support for Rail Extension to Monterey County – Pajaro/Watsonville Station Project

Dear Secretary Kelly:

I am writing on behalf of the Coast Rail Coordinating Council to express support for the Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s Rail Extension to Monterey County – Pajaro/Watsonville Multimodal Station Project.

The Coast Rail Coordinating Council is a coalition of coastal county transportation and planning agencies organized to improve passenger rail services on the coast route between San Francisco and Los Angeles by implementing the Coast Daylight, an extension of the successful Pacific Surfliner train. In addition to the Coast Daylight project, the Transportation Agency for Monterey County is also working on an extension of Capitol Corridor service from San Jose to Salinas, which will initially add two daily round trip trains, providing a new option for Monterey County residents and visitors traveling to the Silicon Valley, San Francisco Bay Area and as far north as Sacramento.

The Coast Rail Coordinating Council supports the Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s request for $23,000,000 of Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program funds for a new intercity passenger rail station in Pajaro, a disadvantaged community in northern Monterey County adjacent to Watsonville in southern Santa Cruz County. The Pajaro/Watsonville station will be a multimodal transit station that will provide Monterey County and Santa Cruz County residents and visitors access to intercity passenger rail, including the Coast Daylight, and local and regional transit service.

The Coast Rail Coordinating Council supports this important regional alternative transportation project and asks that you approve the project's grant request. Thank you for your consideration of this project.

Sincerely,

Dave Potter
Coast Rail Coordinating Council Chair

cc: Debra Hale, Executive Director, Transportation Agency for Monterey County
April 20, 2015

The Honorable James Inhofe  
Chairman  
Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works  
410 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Bill Shuster  
Chairman  
House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure  
2165 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Barbara Boxer  
Ranking Member  
Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works  
456 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Peter DeFazio  
Ranking Member  
House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure  
2163 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairmen Inhofe and Shuster, and Ranking Members Boxer and DeFazio:

On behalf of the local government community and its elected and appointed transportation officials, we are writing to thank you for your ongoing efforts to avoid any disruption in the flow of critical transportation funding for federally-assisted bridge, highway, and transit projects. As you continue your efforts to secure an adequately-funded, multi-year surface transportation bill, our organizations will stand with you to advance this critical legislation, especially as our members see renewed Congressional commitments to local and regional decision-making.

Our organizations are united in requesting modest program changes that build upon longstanding elements of current law. Specifically, we urge you to suballocate more funding to local decision-makers and local areas under the Surface Transportation Program, Transportation Alternatives Program, and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program, details of which we have shared with your staff. We also seek reaffirmation of longstanding federal commitments to the more than 177,000 federal-aid highway bridges (or “on-system bridges”) that are not a part of the designated National Highway System, which lost access to predictable funding after MAP-21 took effect. These requests can be accomplished within the program’s current structure, without the need for new programs.

Cities and counties collectively own 78 percent of the nation’s road miles, 43 percent of the nation’s federal-aid highway miles, 50 percent of the nation’s bridge inventory, and operate a majority of the nation’s transit systems. According to a 2015 Pew Charitable Trusts analysis, cities and counties collectively spend $75 billion annually on highways and transit, just four percent less than what states are investing. It is our firm belief that local elected officials, who are responsible for the vast majority of the system, are best situated to direct available transportation resources to projects that best serve their communities and regions.
Despite owning a majority share of our country’s transportation network and making a substantial investment in surface transportation infrastructure, local governments and their metropolitan and regional planning organizations receive a relatively small share of overall federal transportation funds. MAP-21 further strained local governments by decreasing – by 30 percent – the amount of highway funds available for the transportation infrastructure they own. Increasing locally available federal transportation funds would have tremendous benefits for the nation’s regional economies, without major disruptions to the underlying legislative approaches.

We are appreciative of the committees’ continued interest in the local government perspective on federal transportation funding and policy, and were pleased that Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker had the opportunity to share his views on these issues at a recent hearing before the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. We remain ready to help in any way we can and look forward to participating in future opportunities with the committees.

As representatives of the local government community, our organizations and our members are committed to working with you and your colleagues in Congress to move this critical legislation and America forward.

Sincerely,

Hon. Elaine Clegg
Vice President, AMPO
Council Member, City of Boise

Hon. Riki Hokama
President, NACo
Council Member, Maui County

Terry Bobrowski
President, NADO
Executive Director, East Tennessee Development District

Hon. Gary W. Moore
President, NARC
Judge, Boone County

Hon. Ralph Becker
President, NLC
Mayor, City of Salt Lake

Hon. Kevin Johnson
President, U.S. Conference of Mayors
Mayor, City of Sacramento
April 21, 2015

The Honorable Toni Atkins                      The Honorable Kevin de León
Speaker of the Assembly                         Senate President pro Tempore
State Capitol, Room 219                         State Capitol, Room 205
Sacramento, CA 95814                            Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: State Funding For Transportation

Dear Legislative Leaders,

On behalf of the Central Coast Coalition, we would like to express our appreciation for your willingness to construct a funding package to address the state’s transportation infrastructure. We especially appreciate that Speaker Atkins and Senator Beall have both introduced proposals that would increase revenues for transportation and restore transportation funding that has been diverted to other purposes. In your deliberations, we would respectfully request that you consider a few funding items in order to further develop a multi-modal system. Priorities for funding should be centered on maintaining our highways and local streets and roads, and alleviating congestion by making operational improvements, while enhancing the state’s passenger rail network, and bicycle and pedestrian programs.

State investment in transportation operations and infrastructure continues to be underfunded despite a rebounding economy and the stabilization of the State Budget through the passage of Proposition 30 in 2012. Transportation funding has been traditionally dependent upon the gas tax and occasional bond funding, such as Proposition 1B, which has matured for state highway purposes. While some Proposition 1B funds are still available to fund transit projects and rolling stock purchases, an additional $295 billion in new revenue will be required to meet the State’s infrastructure needs over the next six years.

The gas tax has not been increased or adjusted for inflation since 1994, reducing its buying power and depleting resources available to maintain, let alone expand or improve, highway and transit needs. The improved fuel efficiencies on vehicles have also reduced the ability of the gas tax to generate revenues for transportation. In addition, the volatility of gas prices resulted in the Board of Equalization’s recent action to adjust revenues downward by $872 million, slashing funds for the multi-modal State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) by over 50% and placing a considerable dent in funding available for local streets and roads, and the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP). All of which makes it exponentially more difficult to deliver critical projects and put the state’s labor force to work. While the legislature recently adopted funding for transportation through the Cap and Trade program, there is uncertainty over the availability of funding for highway-related programs given the emphasis on affordable housing, transit, and clean energy projects.
In short, state resources for funding transportation have dwindled and the onus has fallen squarely on the shoulders of local jurisdictions, which provide 65% of all funding, to make improvements to the state’s transportation system. Addressing our transportation infrastructure needs has become increasingly complex with state mandates to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (AB 32), placing a higher premium on funding projects that create higher housing densities (SB 375), and invest in public transportation to alleviate congestion on the state highway system (SB 862), while specifying investments required in disadvantaged communities (SB 535).

We understand that the primary focus in any package will be centered on creating new revenues to address maintenance of local streets and roads and the SHOPP. We truly appreciate this recognition and the various investments that are being considered. There are however other opportunities that bear consideration in helping to maximize our investment into creating a multi-modal transportation network. As a result, we would appreciate your consideration of a package that would provide revenue to do the following:

- **Provide additional funding to the STIP.** The STIP is a flexible program which local transportation planning agencies rely on to address highway and transit capital needs. While we appreciate the focus on rehabilitating our local streets and roads, an additional accommodation for the STIP would allow us to continue addressing the entirety of our transportation network. There are remaining critical projects on the Central Coast that need to be delivered to help improve safety, relieve congestion and improve the movement of goods to the Bay Area, Central Valley and Southern California.

- **Leverage Funding for the SHOPP.** In the event that additional funding is being considered for the SHOPP, it would be useful to allow for Caltrans to coordinate with local jurisdictions to make operational improvements to address auxiliary lanes, leverage local dollars in order to maximize the State’s investment, and assist with expediting the delivery of projects of mutual benefit.

- **Dedicate Funding for Intercity and Commuter Rail.** The Intercity Rail Program does not have a dedicated source of funding. Commuter rail operators receive allocations through the State Transit Assistance Program as a pass through from member agencies. While the Cap and Trade Program does provide funding for both commuter and intercity rail, it is within a competitive pot that is shared by bus operators, which does not leave much revenue as a result of the competition. A dedicated pot for rail is integral in helping to create a feasible statewide rail plan that services all communities and reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

- **Restore the Truck Weight Fee.** When Proposition 1B was approved by the voters in 2006, it was sold as a General Obligation Bond. Given the subsequent yawning budget deficits of the decade, we understood the need to use all available resources to pay down the deficit. The economy however has since recovered and over $1 billion annually in truck weight fees continue to be diverted. This represents nearly 12.5% of all transportation revenue that has been made unavailable. Unlike other sectors,
transportation is almost entirely dependent on special funds. Restoration of truck weight fees would provide much needed relief to addressing our transportation infrastructure.

- **Repay General Fund Loans.** As mentioned above, the repayment of funds diverted from the General Fund would reduce the State’s debt service and free up funding for transportation infrastructure. The repayment of nearly $1 billion in outstanding loans to the General Fund would also be appreciated.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and suggestions. If you have any further questions, please contact Sarkes Khachek at the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments at (805) 961-8913.

Sincerely,

Jim Kemp, Executive Director
Santa Barbara Association of Governments

Ron DeCarli, Executive Director
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Debra L. Hale, Executive Director
Transportation Agency for Monterey County

George Dondero, Executive Director
Santa Cruz Co. Regional Transportation Commission

Mary Gilbert, Interim Executive Director
San Benito Council of Governments

Maura Twomey, Executive Director
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments

cc: The Honorable Jim Frazier, Chair, Assembly Transportation Committee
The Honorable Jim Beall, Chair, Senate Transportation & Housing Committee
The Honorable Katcho Achadjian, Assembly Member, 35th District
The Honorable Luis Alejo, Assembly Member, 30th District
The Honorable Anthony Canella, Senator, 12th District
The Honorable Hannah-Beth Jackson, Senator, 19th District
The Honorable Bill Monning, Senator, 17th District
The Honorable Mark Stone, Assembly Member, 29th District
The Honorable Das Williams, Assembly Member, 37th District
Chris Woods, Budget Director, Office of the Speaker
Craig Cornett, Budget Director, Office of the President pro Tempore
Janet Dawson, Chief Consultant, Assembly Transportation Committee
Randy Chinn, Chief Consultant, Senate Transportation & Housing Committee
April 24, 2015

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

Dear Mr. Dondero:

On behalf of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Transportation Planning, I am pleased to offer my congratulations to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission for the recent award of the following Federal transportation planning grant for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015–16:

Grant Program: FTA Section 5304, Sustainable Communities  
Grant Title: Sustainable Transportation Prioritization Plan for Santa Cruz County  
Grant Award: $229,735  
Local Match: $29,765  
Total Project Amount: $259,500

Please see the list below which identifies specific conditions for a grantee to accept grant funding, to program funds, and to begin work. All conditions must be fulfilled no later than May 1, 2016. Failure to fulfill conditions of grant acceptance by the afore-mentioned date will result in forfeiture of grant funds. Also, please note that final products must be completed no later than June 30, 2018. Final requests for reimbursements must be submitted to Caltrans by August 31, 2018.

Conditions of Grant Acceptance  
These Federal grant funds cannot be encumbered until the following conditions are fulfilled:

1. The revised final Scope of Work, Project Timeline, and Grant Application Cover Sheet are submitted to the Caltrans District 5 Liaison for approval.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
2. If applicable, a Third Party In-kind Valuation Plan is submitted for the use of in-kind contributions to satisfy the federal minimum local match requirement. Third party in-kind contributions are goods and services donated from outside the grantee's agency. Examples of third party in-kind contributions include donated printing, facilities, interpreters, equipment, advertising, time and effort, staff time, and other goods and services. The Third Party In-kind Valuation Plan Checklist and Sample Third Party In-Kind Valuation Plan can be found at the following webpage:


3. The FY 2015–16 Overall Work Program (OWP) and OWP Agreement (OWPA) are amended to incorporate the grant project including the full grant amount and full local match. The OWP/OWPA amendment includes the OWPA, OWP Budget Summary, and a standalone Work Element. The Work Element name/number must remain unchanged until the project is completed. These three items must show consistent funding information for the grant project. Caltrans District staff will send a formal notice to proceed after the OWP/OWPA amendment is processed.

   Once the project is underway, quarterly status updates will be required as part of the OWP Quarterly Progress and Expenditure Report, including a transmittal memo noting the percentage of project work completed. If this reporting method is not adequately satisfied, a separate narrative quarterly progress report will be required to monitor project activities.

   Please contact Kelly McClendon, District 5 Liaison, at (805) 549-3510 or Tyler Monson, Headquarters Liaison, at (916) 653-8699, if you have any questions concerning these grant funds or program requirements.

   Sincerely,

   ERIN THOMPSON
   Acting Chief, Office of Regional Planning

   c: Karena Pushnick, Senior Transportation Planner, Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
   Brandy Rider, Senior Transportation Planner, Caltrans, District 5
   Kelly McClendon, Associate Transportation Planner, Caltrans, District 5
   Tyler Monson, Associate Transportation Planner, Caltrans, Headquarters

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
District Director’s Report

Highway 1 realignment getting under way

A construction contract is being advertised for the Highway 1 Piedras Blancas realignment project. The estimated $21 million project will realign 2.8 miles of Highway 1 near San Simeon. The project will move the highway inland to protect it from shoreline erosion in lieu of perpetuating rock slope protection along the shoreline. The new alignment will include standard 8-foot-wide paved shoulders improving conditions for bicycling along the Pacific Coast Bike Route.

Two new parking areas will also be added with 20 spaces located at the southern end of the project at the existing surfer beach access, and 30 spaces (expandable to 60 future spaces) at the northern end of the project near Arroyo de la Cruz.

Once the project is completed, the public will have access to 80 acres of land west of the new alignment. State Parks will also develop a new 2.8 mile segment of the California Coastal Trail on that land with a $1.4 million contribution from Caltrans. Construction is expected to begin in May 2015 and be completed in winter 2018. Two additional projects, totaling an estimated $11 million, will mitigate impacts and re-vegetate disturbed areas beginning in spring 2017.

Public input sought on state’s long-term transportation plan

The 2040 California Transportation Plan is now available online for public comment. The plan defines performance-based goals, policies and strategies to achieve the state’s collective vision for a statewide, integrated, multimodal and sustainable transportation system meeting future mobility needs. The updated plan will focus on meeting new trends and challenges such as economic and job growth, climate change, freight movement and public health. It will also develop performance measures and targets to assess the system and meet federal MAP-21 requirements. Comments will be accepted through April 17. More information is available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/californiatransportationplan2040/index.shtml

First cable median barrier installation in District 5

Construction is nearing completion on the US 101 cable median barrier project located near Soledad in Monterey County. The estimated $2.4 million project is installing a high-tension cable barrier, widening the inside shoulders and adding rumble strips for nearly four miles. The latter are a series of narrow indentations in the

(Continued on back)

Please Submit Maintenance Service Requests at the Following Link: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/msrsubmit
**Cable barrier continued**

Pavement, which alert inattentive or distracted drivers using vibration and noise. The project is scheduled for completion in June 2015.

Median barriers dramatically reduce both fatalities and injuries in highway cross-over collisions. At proper site locations, cable barrier offers several advantages over the more traditional concrete and thrie-beam barriers, including the following: reduced costs for installation and maintenance, less time for worker exposure to traffic during repairs, and low impacts for visual, drainage and animal crossings. This barrier type is new to District 5 with reported success in several other districts. More information is available at: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/research/deployment/cable.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/research/deployment/cable.cfm)

**Workers’ Memorial Ceremony and Safety Fair**

The public is invited to join a special event April 23 honoring all Caltrans highway workers who have died in the line of duty since 1921. San Luis Obispo County Fifth District Supervisor Debbie Arnold is the keynote speaker. Statewide, Caltrans is observing Worker Memorial Day throughout April. Headquarters’ service is April 16 in Sacramento.

On average, 1,000 Caltrans vehicles are struck each year. Highway construction is one of the most dangerous occupations in the United States. The risk of death is seven times higher for highway workers than for an average worker, according to the Occupational Safety Health Administration and U.S. Department of Labor. Speeding is a major factor in many fatal work zone crashes. Caltrans reminds everyone to *Slow for the Cone Zone* and move over for all emergency response and roadside work vehicles. After the ceremony, District 5 will host a safety fair with health screenings, giveaways and special activities for employees with more than 20 vendors and several local health departments’ participating. Contact Safety Officer Henry Garcia at 805-549-3358 or henry.garcia@dot.ca.gov.

**Third Mile Marker released**

The third edition of Caltrans *Mile Marker* is now available online. This report provides a transparent, plain-language accounting of Caltrans’ performance. The latest edition features Amtrak’s California revenue and ridership, project funding needs, technology’s role in traffic management, level of service scores, and recent data on fatal accidents and work-related illness and injuries. Other topics include the transportation system’s funding shortfall, the Caltrans Improvement Project, and an update on Proposition 1B-funded freight projects. More information is available at: [http://dot.ca.gov/ctjournal/MileMarker/index.html](http://dot.ca.gov/ctjournal/MileMarker/index.html)

**Caltrans ushers in change**

**Vision challenge: Find your role**

Change is under way at Caltrans! We are committed to achieving real and significant changes to Caltrans’ operations and culture, according to Director Malcolm Dougherty. We must *choose to lead* in order to remain a national leader in transportation policy in the future.

Going beyond our new mission, vision and goals, we plan to measure our progress as well. We are developing specific data-based performance measures, which will be featured in the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan scheduled for release in early April 2015. Improving communication both internally and externally, and telling our organization’s story better are important priorities for Caltrans. Speaking at a recent town hall meeting broadcast online statewide, Dougherty encouraged employees to familiarize themselves with Caltrans’ new mission and vision statements, and know how they apply to their daily work. He also noted their individual roles and tasks are *vital* to fulfilling the future of transportation, improving the state’s economy and contributing to Californians’ quality of life.

Some key meeting highlights include:

- Fixing-it-first, maintaining existing infrastructure, improving mobility, training staff, and streamlining the highway relinquishment process are high priorities.
- Additional investments in SHOOP and maintenance forces are needed.
- SHOOP is to preserve the system while accommodating other travel modes.
## COMPLETED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hwy. 1 Guardrail Upgrade, Concrete Barrier, and improvements (05-0R9104)</td>
<td>Highway 1 from S of South Aptos Underpass to .1 Mi N. of Rt 9 (PM 9.0-17.6)</td>
<td>Upgrade Metal Beam Guard Rail, other improvements</td>
<td>Winter 2013/Winter 2014</td>
<td>$2.3 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>RGW Construction Inc., Livermore</td>
<td>Work completed and accepted March 20, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Hwy. 9 Pollution Source Control (0Q5904)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County at and near Boulder Creek at various locations from 0.9 mile south of Glengarry Rd to 0.2 mile north of Megaffigan Mill Rd (PM 3.7-18.7)</td>
<td>Construct retaining wall &amp; viaduct structure. Replace drainage pipes. Rehab maintenance turnaround.</td>
<td>Winter 2014-Summer 2015</td>
<td>$1.8 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Rock Company, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Full closure began February 10. The highway will be fully closed for approximately 6 months (February to July) at Location 1 (PM 3.7, between Santa Cruz and Felton) for construction of the retaining wall and viaduct due to limited access for staging and equipment. A signed detour route directing traffic to Mount Hermon Road and Highway 17 will be provided for autos. A signed detour route will also be provided for bikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hwy. 17 Laurel Curve NB Shoulder Widening (1C1804)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County near Scotts Valley from 0.3 Miles North of Glenwood Cutoff to 0.5 Miles South of Glenwood Drive</td>
<td>Shoulder Widening/Soil Nail Wall</td>
<td>August 4,2014—Summer 2015</td>
<td>$3 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Steve DiGrazia (BR)</td>
<td>Graniterock Company DBA Pavex Construction Division, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Work consists of daytime alternating lane closures. No night closures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS (Cont’d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 152 Pavement Maintenance (05-1F8804)</td>
<td>Throughout Watsonville city limits</td>
<td>Sealcoating and full dig outs at spot locations</td>
<td>May 4-July 2015</td>
<td>$1 Million</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Ken Romero (KB)</td>
<td>VSS International, West Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>This maintenance project will sealcoat SR 152 within the Watsonville city limits. The project will also include full dig outs at spot locations (included in the plans). Construction is scheduled for May 4, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 1 North County Pavement Preservation and Rumble Strips (05-1C8604)</td>
<td>Near Santa Cruz from Western Drive to San Mateo C/L</td>
<td>Pavement preservation and install rumble strips</td>
<td>Spring 2015 – Winter 2016</td>
<td>$10.7 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>Granite Construction Company</td>
<td>Project was in winter suspension. Work scheduled to begin May 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CALTRANS WORKERS HIT THE HIGHWAYS TO CLEAN UP CALIFORNIA

CENTRAL COAST - District 5 Maintenance crews targeted litter and debris removal today for Caltrans Annual Anti-Litter Day from Santa Cruz to Santa Barbara counties.

"Caltrans is committed to a clean and litter-free California, but we can’t do it alone. Everyone should think about the impact when trash is discarded from their vehicles onto our highways," said Caltrans District 5 Director, Tim Gubbins. "Millions of taxpayer dollars are spent each year on this effort. Caltrans would prefer to spend that money on transportation projects."

Last year, Caltrans picked up almost 3000 cubic yards of litter which would fill more 190 garbage trucks.

One way the public can help is by participating in Caltrans' Adopt-A-Highway (AAH) Program. To become a volunteer or support the program through a paid sponsorship, call 1-866-ADOPT-A-HWY or go to: http://adopt-a-highway.dot.ca.gov. Currently, more than 12,000 volunteers participate in the AAH Program, saving taxpayers an estimated $16 million annually in litter removal costs.

Cigarette butts are the number one item littered in California - they are discarded by the millions, often causing roadside fires, clogging storm drains, and threatening water quality. Much trash also comes from illegal dumping and improperly secured and uncovered loads. Motorists face injury and even death as the result of debris (ladders, sofas, etc.) that falls from vehicles.
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner
RE: 9:30am Public Hearing – 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Hold a public hearing to receive comments on the 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs and consider public input;
2. Adopt the 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs (Attachment 1), with revisions as appropriate; and,
3. Consider unmet paratransit and transit needs as funding becomes available.

BACKGROUND

¼ percent of the 7½ percent sales tax collected by the State in Santa Cruz County is allocated to the region according to the Transportation Development Act (TDA). TDA statutes require transportation planning agencies using TDA funds for local streets and roads projects, to implement a public process, including a public hearing, to identify unmet transit needs of transit dependent or disadvantaged persons, and determine if unmet transit needs can be reasonably met. Although the RTC does not use TDA funds to local streets and roads projects, and therefore is not required to perform this analysis, the RTC endeavors to solicit regular input on unmet transit and paratransit needs to provide a useful tool to assess and prioritize needs in the region.

DISCUSSION

Serving as the social services transportation advisory council, the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) regularly hears and considers unmet paratransit and transit needs in Santa Cruz County. Unmet paratransit and transit needs are those transportation needs which are not being met by the current public transit system, have community support, and do not duplicate transit services provided publically or privately.

Attached for the Regional Transportation Commission’s consideration is the Final Draft 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs (Attachment 1). The unmet needs are prioritized using high, medium and low rankings, and within the each category there are three levels, with H1 being the top priority. The needs have been modified slightly from years past to better align with the three-county Coordinated Human
Services Plan by identifying strategies to meet the needs which can be translated into potential priority projects.

Development of the 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs considers: previously identified unmet paratransit and transit needs; input received at meetings of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC); and input from staff of Santa Cruz Metro, Community Bridges Lift Line serving as the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency, and the Volunteer Center. The list of 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs also updates priorities to reflect current conditions. The E&D TAC provided input on the draft 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs list at the February 10, 2015 and April 14, 2015 meetings. Input was also solicited from other transportation providers and elderly and disabled transportation stakeholders. To encourage public input, the Final Draft 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs was posted on the RTC website with a solicitation for comments. This public hearing on unmet paratransit and transit needs was advertised in English and Spanish in a local newspaper.

Staff recommends that the RTC consider input on the 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs and adopt the list, with amendments as appropriate, and consider unmet paratransit and transit needs as funding is available.

SUMMARY

TDA statutes require transportation planning agencies to consult with their designated social services transportation advisory councils to annually identify transit needs. Although the RTC does not use TDA funds to local streets and roads projects, and therefore is not required to perform an analysis of unmet transit needs, the RTC endeavors to solicit regular input on unmet paratransit and transit needs to provide a useful tool to prioritize needs in the region. The list of 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs was developed in coordination with E&D TAC, staff from Santa Cruz Metro, Community Bridges Lift Line serving as the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency, and the Volunteer Center. Staff recommends adoption of the list of Final Draft 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs with revisions as appropriate.

Attachments:
1. Final Draft 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs
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Final Draft
2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs

Prioritization of Need:
**H - High** priority items are those items that fill a gap or absence of ongoing service.

**M - Medium** priority items that supplement existing service.

**L - Low** priority items should become more specific and then be planned for, as funds are available.

1-3 Graduated scale indicates to what extent the need, if addressed, would:
- increase the number of individuals who are within a 30 minute transit trip to key destinations;
- improve safety;
- support economic vitality by way of decreasing transportation costs;
- or, improve cost-effectiveness of transportation services.

Strategies:
- Proposals and suggestions to address needs, including programs and projects.

General

1. **H1** - Safe travel paths between senior and/or disabled living areas, medical facilities, educational facilities, employment locations, retail centers, entertainment venues and/or bus stops (examples: Capitola Road and side streets, trailer park at Antionelli, Santa Cruz Skilled Nursing facility)
   - Improve accessibility at and to bus stops - such as, but not limited to, sidewalk and crosswalk improvements connecting destinations frequented by senior and disabled individuals and transit stops such as, but not limited to, those identified in the RTC Safe Paths of Travel Final Report.
   - Secure funding assistance to make Safe Paths of Travel improvements.
   - Expand publicity regarding sidewalk maintenance.

2. **H1** - Transportation services to areas with high concentrations of seniors, disabled and low income individuals, particularly in south county. (examples: Stonecreek Apartments in Watsonville and the San Andreas Migrant Labor Camp)
   - Support alternative transportation programs, such as vanpool programs, serving low income and senior housing areas outside of the transit service area in south county.
   - Explore pilot projects, such as regularly scheduled paratransit trips two-three times per week, to serve residents.
• Secure funding for taxi voucher programs for senior and low income individuals.
• Provide affordable and desirable housing for seniors and low income individuals within transit service area.
• Provide incentives for senior and social services to be located in transit service areas.
• Seek volunteer drivers to provide transportation services.

3. **H3** - Transportation services for low-income children and their families, including transportation for people transitioning from welfare to work
   • Support welfare to work programs and training programs.
   • Support transportation programs dedicated to serving low-income children and families.

4. **M1** – Low-cost transportation options.
   • Support programs that provide transportation services for a reduced or no fee.
   • Seek volunteer drivers to provide transportation services.

**Paratransit/Specialized Transportation Services**

5. **H1**- Coordinated and seamless-to-the-public system of specialized transportation with a Mobility Management Center (central information point, one stop shop).
   • Assess feasibility and seek funds for development/start-up of the center, and assess entities already providing information and referral services).
   • Utilize information technology solutions to provide transit information that is accessible to all users.

6. **H1** - Paratransit service for the people who lost paratransit service due to changes in Santa Cruz Metro ParaCruz program in 2015.
   • Support programs providing specialized transportation to areas outside the ADA-mandated paratransit service area for a fee or at no cost.
   • Expand taxi voucher program.
   • Support policies that expand ADA mandated paratransit service area.

7. **H2**- Specialized transportation for areas outside the ADA-mandated paratransit service area for medical, non-medical trips. Secure funding for taxi voucher programs.
   • Provide affordable and desirable housing for seniors and disabled individuals within ADA paratransit service area.
• Provide incentives for senior and social services to be located in transit service areas.
• Support programs providing specialized transportation to areas outside the ADA-mandated paratransit service area for a fee or at no cost.
• Support continuous funding for transportation to medical services.
• Seek volunteer drivers to provide transportation services from areas not served by transit or ADA paratransit service.
• Identify priority origins and destinations outside the ADA service area.

8. **H2** – Direct paratransit and accessible transit connections with neighboring counties- including Monterey (Pajaro), San Benito, Santa Clara and other points north.
   • Establish direct inter-regional fixed route accessible transit service.
   • Provide inter-regional specialized transportation.
   • Develop plan to coordinate between agencies providing specialized transportation services in neighboring counties.
   • Support programs providing inter-regional specialized transportation for a fee or at no cost.
   • Support continuous funding for specialized transportation services to out-of-county medical appointments.
   • Establish feeder services to inter-regional accessible transit services.

9. **H3** – Affordable transportation for dialysis and other medical appointments, including 'same day’ specialized transportation services for medical trips, on a continuous basis.
   • Support continuous funding for ‘same day’ transportation to medical services.
   • Support continuous funding for no or low-cost specialized transportation to medical appointments.
   • Increase capacity of existing programs providing transportation to dialysis and other medical appointments.
   • Secure funding for taxi voucher programs.

10. **M2** - Transportation for programs that promote senior and disabled individuals health, safety and independence including, but not limited to, all senior meal sites in the county, the stroke centers and senior activity centers
    • Support continuous funding for transportation services to meal sites.
    • Support continuous funding for paratransit services to medical service centers.
    • Support volunteer drivers to provide transportation services.
• Support transportation services to senior activity centers such as Elderday.

11. **M2** - Publicity about existing specialized transportation services including ADA paratransit, non-ADA paratransit, taxi services, Medi-Cal rides and mobility training for people to use regular fixed route buses.
   • Streamline communication activities by establishing a central point of contact within health providers to disseminate information about specialized transportation services.
   • Support continuous funding for communication and outreach activities.

12. **M2** - Volunteer drivers in Santa Cruz County particularly in south-county.
   • Expand outreach efforts to recruit drivers and promote services.
   • Support for the Volunteer Center Transportation Program.

13. **M3** - Ongoing provision of ADA Paratransit certification, provided by Santa Cruz Metro, at group facilities.
   • Provide on-site services to reach a greater number of individuals.

14. **L2** - Affordable special care trips and gurney vehicle for medically fragile individuals and those needing "bed to bed" transportation.
   • Provide vouchers for specialized care trips.

15. **L2** - Specialized transportation for ‘same day’ non-medical trips.
   • Expand taxi voucher program.

16. **L3** - Anticipate growing demand for services by projecting funding needs for specialized transportation (including fixed route, ADA and non-ADA Paratransit) to provide transportation services to the senior population expected to increase over the next 15 to 30 years.
   • Identify funding needs for paratransit over a 15-30 year horizon.
   • Designated funding source for paratransit service.

**Paratransit/Specialized Transportation Capital**

17. **H2** - ParaCruz operating facilities.
   • Acquire and develop permanent operation and maintenance facility for ParaCruz to accommodate increased fleet size and growth in future service.
   • Increase funding opportunities for paratransit capital projects.

18. **H2** - Consolidated Transportation Services Agency operating facilities.
• Acquire and develop permanent operation and maintenance facilities for Consolidated Transportation Services Agency.
• Increase funding opportunities for paratransit capital projects.

19. **H2** - Paratransit vehicle replacements.
• Increase funding opportunities for paratransit capital projects

**Transit Services**

20. **H1** - Increase frequency and span of transit service in densely populated areas with transit friendly land uses.
• Increase Live Oak Service- specifically Route 66.
• Reinstate the short Route 69s.

21. **H3** - Increase transit service to UCSC.
• Increase weekend and weekday UCSC service.

22. **H3** - Increase interregional and cross county transit services.
• Increase Hwy 17 weekend service frequencies.
• Extend Highway 17 service to Watsonville.
• Provide transit service from Santa Cruz County to Los Gatos.
• Provide direct transit service to San Jose Airport.

23. **M2** - Increased transit service between primary destinations in Santa Cruz County.
• Provide service between Capitola Mall and Cabrillo.
• Expand transit service to new residential and commercial areas in Watsonville.
• Expand service between UCSC and Westside University activity centers such as Long Marine Lab, Wrigley building offices, Texas Instruments building offices.
• Improve north-south transit connections (ex. Bay/Porter)

24. **M2** - Transit service to support evening, night and early morning weekend hours, work schedules.
• Extend transit service hours later in the evening between Santa Cruz/Live Oak/Cabrillo/Watsonville (Route 69, Route 91xs, Route 35/35A).
• Extend transit service hours to earlier in the morning on intercity routes between Santa Cruz/Cabrillo/Watsonville.
25. **M2**- Access to transportation services on all holidays.
   - Provide regular Santa Cruz Metro and Paracruz service on holidays.
   - Support taxi voucher programs.
   - Support volunteer transportation services.

26. **M2**- Easier and faster transit trips system wide.
   - Enhance connections through increasing the span and frequency of service.

27. **M2**- Improve run times on transit routes.
   - Route 55 adjustments and improves to serve Capitola and Aptos.
   - Consider headways based schedule for UCSC.

28. **M2** - Provide direct service to commercial centers.
   - Provide service between UCSC and Almar.
   - Route 4/8 split to create direct service to Harvey West and Emeline.

29. **M2** - Transit service to transit friendly land uses.
   - Provide service to Mission Street.

30. **M2** - Expanded transit service and frequencies.
    - Enhance service in Capitola.

31. **M2** - Circulator service in Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Capitola, Scotts Valley and Watsonville.
    - Develop Boulder Creek circular which allows the Route 35 to serve Scotts Valley Drive bidirectional.
    - Support transit friendly land uses and road design to allow for bidirectional and frequent services in Scotts Valley.

32. **L2**- Transit service to major tourists destinations.
    - Provide weekday transit service to Waddell Creek and North Coast and Highway 17 direct service to Boardwalk on weekends.

33. **L2** - Commuter transit service.
    - Provide commute option for transit riders between SLV and Santa Cruz faster.
    - Extend Highway 17 service to Watsonville.

34. **L3**- Redistribute departure times from Santa Cruz Metro Center.
    - Move 45 departures (route 4,66,71,91X)
35. **L3** - Provide service to special events.
   - Establish program to coordinate with Santa Cruz Visitor Center and partner agencies to provide special event services.

**Transit Capital**

36. **H1** - Improve bus stops to be ADA accessible.
   - Remedial ADA access at all bus stops.
   - Prioritize bus stop improvements and shelter replacement based on high usage by seniors and people with disabilities.
   - Install braille and raised numbers on bus signage at bus stops indicating which bus routes are being offered at each stop.

37. **H1** - Maintain existing transit facilities.
   - Support funding for maintenance of bus stops, parking lots, transit centers, buildings.

38. **H1** - Replace buses beyond useful life as needed including buses, including buses providing rural service.
   - Support funding for transit capital improvements.

39. **H2** - Transit station improvements.
   - Redevelop Santa Cruz Metro Center as mixed use facility incorporating local transit service, regional transit service, paratransit service, intercity bus service, commercial office functions, passenger service facilities, parking facilities, and both market rate and affordable housing and potentially for child-care facilities.
   - Complete Watsonville Transit Center Renovation.

40. **H2** - Improve transit travel times.
   - Installation of transponders on all buses for Preemptive Signal Control on major corridors improving traffic flow, reducing travel time, and improving on-time performance.
   - Automatic passenger counters on all buses.

41. **H3** - New equipment to assist with real-time operations, security and scheduling.
   - Automated Vehicle Location/Passenger (AVL) Counting System.
   - Install audio and video surveillance system for all buses.
42. **M3** - Improve multimodal connections to transit.
   - Construct park and ride lots for bus patrons on 17th ave and 41st avenue.

43. **M3** - Wifi expansion on buses.
   - Install wifi equipment on all facilities and routes beginning with UCSC and express buses.

43. **M3** - Automated phone-based trip planning providing Metro route information and or trip planning coordination via telephone and voice activated menu.
AGENDA: May 7, 2015

TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner
RE: SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program –2015 Implementation Plan

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff and the Bicycle Advisory Committee recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission:

1. Adopt the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program- 2015 Implementation Plan (Attachment 1); and,

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission:

2. Approve the attached resolution (Attachment 2) authorizing the submittal of an application to the Active Transportation Program for implementation of the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program, authorizing the Executive Director or his designees to execute and submit necessary agreements which may be necessary for implementation of the Active Transportation Program project, and authorizing up to a 20% funding match to the grant funding request to increase the competitiveness of the grant application.

BACKGROUND

In June 2009 the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) programmed $100,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program funding for the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program (SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program). In December 2013, RTC staff presented a preliminary Draft SCC Bicycle Route Signage Implementation Plan which documented extensive review of similar implementation plans and discussions with local jurisdictions. The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program - 2015 Implementation Plan builds on previous efforts.

DISCUSSION

The goals of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program are to increase safety and increase bicycling in Santa Cruz County by way of reducing conflicts between bicycles and motor vehicles; educating motorists and bicyclists about shared roadways; and increasing awareness of bicycling as a viable transportation option. To achieve program goals, signs would be placed on preferred bicycle routes that link common origins and destinations throughout Santa Cruz County as shown in the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program Implementation Plan. The signed bicycle routes direct people riding bicycles to routes better suited for bicyclists, remind motorists that the road is shared with bicyclists and increase awareness of bicycling as a mode of transportation. The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program target audience includes bicycle riders of all persuasions — commuters, families, recreational riders, and visitors.
The SCC Bicycle Route Signage- 2015 Implementation Plan (2015 Implementation Plan) sets up the methodology for selecting routes, lists Phase I bicycle routes, defines standards signs, establishes sign design guidelines, and describes scenarios for project delivery. The 2015 Implementation Plan categorizes routes by route type with designations including regional, local, and neighborhood routes. Route types are designated to address the diverse needs of the target audience and continuum of experience, attitudes, and comfort associated with bicycling, including new bicycle riders.

The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program is expected to be implemented over time as resources become available. The 2015 Implementation Plan introduces the first group of routes proposed for implementation. A phased approach introduces bicycle signage to the community at a scale that fits within available planning funds and allows for revisions to the system to adapt to the community’s level of interest. Upon completion of Phase I bicycle routes, including sufficient time for completion of field review and program evaluation, RTC, in partnership with local jurisdictions and partner agencies, may consider expanding the number of signed bicycle routes.

The standard SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program signs provide bicyclists with direction, destination, and distance information along established bicycle routes. The destination-based route signs selected for the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program are recognizable, easy to understand, provide the greatest utility in terms of destinations and distance information, and can be adapted to future bicycle route signage needs. Text on signs should be limited to destinations, points of interest and symbols for transit, multi use paths and state parks as listed in Appendix A of the 2015 Implementation Plan. Details regarding sign layout and assemblies, sign placement, frequency and coordination with other way finding sign systems are discussed in Chapter 4 of the 2015 Implementation Plan.

RTC will work with local jurisdictions to implement the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program. Chapter 5 of the 2015 Implementation Plan provides examples of RTC and local jurisdictions roles in production and installation of signs. Local jurisdictions are expected to be responsible for sign maintenance.

The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program – Draft 2015 Implementation Plan was presented to the Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Bicycle Advisory Committee at the April 2015 meeting. Public comment received on the Draft 2015 Implementation Plan is included as Attachment 3.

Staff and the Bicycle Advisory Committee recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program- 2015 Implementation Plan (Attachment 1).

RTC staff recommends pursuing Active Transportation Program funding to implement the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program. RTC staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 2) authorizing the submittal of an application for a grant from the Active Transportation Program for implementation of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program, authorizing the Executive Director or his designees to execute and submit necessary agreements which may be necessary for implementation of the Active Transportation Program project, and authorizing up to a 20% funding match to the grant funding request to increase the competitiveness of the grant application. Applications for the current cycle of Active Transportation Program grants are due June 1, 2015.
SUMMARY

The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program identifies preferred bicycle routes and is designed to increase bicycle ridership and safety. The SCC Bicycle Route Signage- 2015 Implementation Plan (2015 Implementation Plan) builds on previous planning efforts, sets up the methodology for selecting routes, lists Phase I preferred bicycle routes, defines standards signs, establishes sign design guidelines, and describes scenarios for project delivery. The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program is expected to be implemented over time as resources become available.

Staff and the Bicycle Advisory Committee recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program- 2015 Implementation Plan (Attachment 1). Staff also recommends that the RTC submit an application for Active Transportation Program grant funding to implement the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program 2015 Implementation Plan.

Attachment 1: SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program – Final Draft 2015 Implementation Plan
Attachment 2: Resolution authorizing the submittal of an application to the Active Transportation Program for implementation of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program
Attachment 3: Public comment on the Draft 2015 Implementation Plan
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Chapter 1- Project Description
In an effort to further increase bike ridership and improve safety, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) developed the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program (SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program). The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program directs bicyclists to preferred bicycle routes. Preferred bicycle routes link common origins and destinations throughout Santa Cruz County.

The Draft SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program - 2015 Implementation Plan (2015 Implementation Plan) builds on previous efforts, sets up the methodology for selecting routes, lists Phase I bicycle routes, defines standard signs, establishes sign design guidelines, and describes scenarios for project delivery. The 2015 Implementation Plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary.

The RTC is committed to promoting sustainable transportation options, including bicycle use. Commuters, recreational cyclists, families with children, and visitors, ranging from experienced to new bicycle riders, will benefit from a SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program. Because the RTC is a Regional Transportation Planning Agency, not a public works department with construction authority over streets and roads, coordinating with local jurisdictions to implement such a program is vital to its success.

Background
The need for a bicycle route sign system was identified by community members, transportation professionals and elected officials, in order to increase the number of bicyclists, as well as improve bicyclists’ safety. The project gained significant momentum after two bicyclist fatalities on Mission Street (state Highway 1). Other areas across the United States with significant bicycle ridership have implemented similar systems, including Santa Barbara, Berkeley, and Oakland in California; Portland, Oregon; Seattle, Washington; and Chicago, Illinois, among others. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County is in the early stages of developing a wayfinding plan, including bike route signing.

In June 2009, the RTC programmed $100,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program funding for the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program. In December 2013, RTC staff presented the Preliminary Draft SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program Implementation Plan. Development of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program Implementation Plan involved extensive research, review of similar implementation plans, and discussions with local jurisdictions. Earlier stages in the development of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program Implementation Plan were used to establish goals and objectives, identify the target audience, recommend standards signs, and outline potential strategies for selecting routes, sign placement, public involvement and program administration.

The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program is expected to be implemented over time as resources become available. The 2015 Implementation Plan introduces the first group of routes proposed for implementation consistent with the 2015 Implementation Plan methodology. The bicycle routes identified in the 2015 Implementation Plan are the first step in developing the community’s bicycle route signage program and are referred to as “phase 1 bicycle routes”. A phased approach introduces bicycle signage to the community at a scale that fits within available planning funds and allows for revisions to the system to adapt to the community’s level of interest. Additional signed bicycle routes could be identified consistent with available resources and funding opportunities.
**Goals and Objectives**

A bicycle route signage program in Santa Cruz County will assist in directing cyclists to preferred bicycle routes. The goals of the program are to improve safety and increase bicycling in Santa Cruz County by way of reducing conflicts between bicycles and motor vehicles; educating motorists and bicyclists about shared roadways; and increasing awareness of bicycling as a viable transportation option. Increasing the bicycling mode share, a goal of the Regional Transportation Plan, will serve to maximize use the existing transportation network, promote non-emission generating trips by converting short distance automobile trips to bicycling trips, and improve community members’ health and well-being.

To achieve program goals, the bicycle route signage program is designed to:

1) identify and guide cyclists onto streets better suited for bicycle travel to common destinations;
2) promote bicycle use by making the public more aware of the bicycle as a viable transportation mode;
3) remind motorists that they are sharing the road with cyclists who are traveling on bicycle routes;
4) attract new bicycle riders, who may be intimidated by traffic and other safety considerations or constraints, to routes with lower traffic stress; and,
5) make it easier for bicyclists to find common destinations while being informed about trip length.

The 2015 Implementation Plan will assist transportation planners, local jurisdictions and interested organizations in:

1) providing a framework for logical and useful routes for bicyclists in the county;
2) selecting bike routes that provide convenient and comfortable access to common destinations such as parks, beaches, shopping areas, schools, work, and scenic areas;
3) selecting routes well-suited to a broad range of riders such as commuters, tourists, families, fitness riders, and recreational riders;
4) eliminating and consolidating unnecessary existing bikeway signs to “declutter” area streets and bikeways; and,
5) developing a bike route signage program that can be implemented in phases as funding permits, and that provides clear directions to signing future bikeways in the same manner.

**Target Audience**

**Community**

While the main focus of the program is bicyclists and community members interested in riding a bicycle, the population to be served includes all Santa Cruz County residents and visitors. Design features to increase bicycle ridership benefits all members of the community, since it promotes human-scale environments, traffic calming, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and a healthier population.
**Bicyclists**

Bike route signs will serve bicycle riders of all persuasions — commuters, families, recreational riders, and visitors ranging from experienced to new bicycle riders. Bicycle counts taken in 2012 and 2014 show an overall increase in bicycle ridership in Santa Cruz County since 2003 with the greatest number of bicyclists in the City of Santa Cruz and mid-County including Capitola. On average, over 3,500 workers ride a bicycle to work in Santa Cruz County between 2006 and 2010 according to the American Community Survey 5-year estimate. While the sign program will clearly serve commuters, commute trips account for just 16% of all trips nationally according to the 2009 National Household Travel Survey, so a far larger number of residents traveling for other household trips such as shopping, school, and who bicycle will benefit.

**New Bicycle Riders**

Community members who want to travel by bicycle but have safety concerns may be encouraged by the designation of specific bicycle routes and add to the total number of bicyclists in Santa Cruz County. Safety concerns are the main reason why residents do not choose bicycling for short trips in Santa Cruz County according to a 2012 public input survey conducted by the RTC. Increased bicycle ridership also means higher visibility which heightens safety and provides an inviting atmosphere to timid or novice riders.

**Visitors**

Visitors to Santa Cruz County will be served from improved guidance while traveling through the county on touring trips or navigating around town by bicycle.

**Pedestrian Wayfinding**

While the bike route signs will be useful to pedestrians, the system will not be specifically designed to support pedestrian travel because. Pedestrian wayfinding signage is generally focused on a finer level of detail, supporting shorter trips, areas with higher density, and more local destinations. A bicycle signage system supports longer trips and are designed and located to accommodate users traveling at speeds in the range of ten to fifteen miles per hour.

**Funding**

The RTC initially considered an application for $300,000 for development of this program and later estimated $500,000 was needed for a robust and comprehensive countywide signage program. The requested amount was determined after researching the cost of developing such programs in other areas; identifying preliminary estimates for the number of routes and signs needed; considering maintenance requirements; and estimating the staff time needed to adequately coordinate sign and route development with all local jurisdictions. In response to the application for $300,000 in funding to develop the program, the RTC approved a reduced amount of $100,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program funding. RTC staff worked with a limited project scope to develop a SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program 2015 Implementation Plan designed to accomplish program goals and position the region to take advantage of future funding opportunities.

Other jurisdictions have financed their programs through the following funding mechanisms: Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), Transportation Development Act (TDA), Proposition 116, Transportation Enhancement Act (TEA), local maintenance funds, and various tax measures, among others. Many of these funding sources could be pursued to acquire additional funds for the county’s program and others are no longer available due to legislative changes in recent years. For example, individual jurisdictions or the RTC could apply for Active Transportation Program funds to help fund portions of the sign program within their jurisdiction.
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Chapter 2- Needs Assessment

Existing Conditions
As of December 2014, there are 216 bikeway miles in Santa Cruz County, consisting of 191 miles of Class II striped bike lanes on a street or highway and 25 miles of Class I separated paths designated exclusively for bicycle travel. Class II bike lanes can be found on most arterials and collector roads. Green bicycle lane treatments are sometimes incorporated with Class II bike lanes when bike lanes are painted green in all or some locations. Class I bike paths can be found on the San Lorenzo River Levee, Arana Gulch Multi Use Path, Branciforte Creek Trail, and some segments of the Watsonville Slough Trails. RTC staff has not conducted an analysis of the number of Class III miles existing in the county. Sharrows are sometimes found on Class III facilities and provide improved visibility for bicycles. The area has an active bicycling community which promotes the provision of dedicated bicycle facilities on a variety of road way types to accommodate the varied ability and comfort levels of bicycle riders.

While the county is currently served by a wide variety of bicycle facilities, the majority of the area lacks a clear, comprehensive, and consistent sign system that provides bicycle riders with directional information and information about mileage to destinations and points of interest. Two different sign systems already exist, namely the Pacific Coast Bike Route and the California Coastal Trail, but they do not provide destination or mileage-to-destination information. Additionally, many Pacific Coast Bike Route signs are in need of maintenance, and gaps in the sign system need closing. The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program provides an opportunity to connect routes and make improvements.

Safety
Safety concerns are the main reason why residents do not choose bicycling for short trips in Santa Cruz County according a public input survey conducted by the RTC in 2012. Santa Cruz County bicyclists’ injury/fatality rate is almost twice the State injury/fatality rate with 158 bicyclists injured or killed in 2010 according to the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, 2010 Bicycle State of the County Report. State injury/fatality rates are based on collisions per total population and not collisions per total bicycle ridership. Bicycle crashes were common at major intersections on high-speed, multi-lane arterial streets, and roads with high truck traffic volumes.

Multimodal Network Quality
The level of use of bicycle facilities is highly dependent on the quality of the facility. The quality of a bicycle facility reveals the level of comfort it provides to people riding bicycles. The Multimodal Network Quality Analysis of Santa Cruz bicycle facilities completed in 2014 concluded that the overall quality of the Santa Cruz County bicycle network rated 26 out of a maximum of 100. Although the presence of signed bicycle routes was not a variable analyzed in the bicycle network quality analysis, the location of bicycle facilities with respect to motor vehicle speed and the type of bicycle facility was a factor to determining the network score. Understanding the quality of bicycle facilities is important for increasing the number of bicycle riders by way or offering comfortable environments for bicycling.

Bicycle Plans
All local jurisdictions within the RTC planning area have developed bicycle plans to guide implementation of local policies and funding to support bikeway development, maintenance and support facilities. The purpose of bicycle plans range from developing integrated bicycle networks to implementing bicycle safety goals and designing a system that will increase bicycle
commuting. Bicycle plans have undergone public review. Routes are generally consistent with priorities dictated in bicycle plans.

**Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network**

The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network is planned to be a 50-mile bicycle and pedestrian pathway along the coast of Santa Cruz County, from the San Mateo County line in the north to the Monterey County line at Pajaro as defined in the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Master Plan adopted in 2013. The RTC is overseeing the Santa Cruz County sections of the Monterey Bay Scenic Sanctuary Trail. In Santa Cruz County, the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network merges plans for a bicycle and pedestrian trail along the rail line – including coastal alignments and neighborhood spurs – into a connected network that will overlap and converge to provide safer and convenient route choices. Segments of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network located in the urban areas of the City of Santa Cruz and City of Watsonville are under development. The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network will serve as the California Coastal Trail in Santa Cruz County.

**California Coastal Trail**

The California Coastal Trail is defined as a continuous public right-of-way along the California coastline—a trail designed to foster appreciation and stewardship of the scenic and natural resources of the coast through hiking and other complementary modes of non-motorized transportation. The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network will serve as the California Coastal Trail in Santa Cruz County.

**Pacific Coast Bicycle Route**

In Santa Cruz County, Highway 1 is recognized as the Pacific Coast Bike Route. The route generally follows Highway 1 north of the city of Santa Cruz, surface streets in the cities and county urbanized areas, and along rural surface streets south of Aptos. The Pacific Coast Bike Route is shown in Appendix C. Due to its spectacular scenery, the route draws many recreational bicycle riders, mountain bikers, charity ride participants, group riders, bike delivery operations, triathlons, and bicycle races and is promoted by the national organization Adventure Cycling Association.

**Multiuse Pathways**

There are several multi-use pathways in Santa Cruz County that serve bicycle travel including the San Lorenzo River Levee Trail, the Arana Gulch Multi Use Path, Branciforte Creek Trail and some of the Watsonville Slough Trails. The multi-use pathways and most paved trails are considered Class I bicycle facilities and are physically separated from motor vehicle traffic. Multi-use pathways can provide more comfortable facilities for less experienced bicycle riders because they do not have to share the path with motor vehicles and there are fewer opportunities for conflicts between bicycle riders and motor vehicles.

**Neighborhood Shared Streets**

Neighborhood shared streets are local roadways that emphasize slow speeds and lower volumes and optimize bicycle and pedestrian travel. Neighborhood shared streets are intended to create "low stress" routes for bicyclists connect common neighborhood destinations. Neighborhood shared streets are typically located on local roads and may have one or more of the following: pavement markings that signal drivers and bicyclists to share the road; dedicated bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and improved bicycle and pedestrian crossings; bicycle and pedestrian scale way finding signs; and traffic calming measures. Future neighborhood shared streets are identified in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan.
City of Santa Cruz Way Finding Program

The City of Santa Cruz Way Finding and Signage Program is an integrated system which markets the City of Santa Cruz and communicates that the City is unique, friendly and organized through helping visitors more easily find their way to intended and discovered destinations. The City of Santa Cruz Way Finding and Signage Program recommends developing bicycle signage for the West Cliff Drive and San Lorenzo River Levee bike loops, to include mileage and time specifications.
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Chapter 3- Route Selection

Methodology
Preferred routes are selected based on the following features: proximity to common origins and destinations; proximity to points of interest, route directness and connectivity; bicycle facilities; target audience; and traffic volumes and speeds; with safety as a major consideration. Other factors considered when choosing routes include geographic distribution, scenic attributes, and topography. The route selection process is undertaken in collaboration with all local jurisdictions in the county, as many routes crossover multiple jurisdictions.

Common Origins & Destinations
Selecting common origins and destinations is the first step in identifying preferred bicycle routes for Santa Cruz County. Common origins and destinations are considered major attractors and can generally be described as: downtowns, town centers, commercial centers, universities, state parks and beaches, and neighborhood centers. In some cases, major arterials serve as bicycle route origins (ex. Soquel Avenue and Freedom Boulevard) if their location draws individuals from more than one surrounding neighborhood or where roadways provide a connection to another bicycle route. Points of interest along routes are also important factors in determining route locations. Points of interest are described as major transit stations, colleges, coastal access points, and multi use path and trail systems. A list of common destinations and points of interest is included in Appendix A.

Target Audience
The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program is designed to serve all ages and abilities and address the needs of commuters, families, recreational riders, and visitors. Within this audience there is a continuum of experience, attitudes, and comfort associated with bicycling. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) describes this continuum using a scheme based on bicyclist skill. Advanced cyclists are those whose greater skill enables them to share roads with motor traffic and may be willing to sacrifice separation from traffic stress for greater speed. Basic adult cyclists are those who lack the “skill” to confidently integrate with fast or heavy traffic. Children cyclists are those who are less capable than the basic adult cyclists at negotiating with traffic and more prone to irrational and sudden movements. Common destinations using a bicycle may also vary across the target audience. For example, recreational riders may be most interested in reaching state parks or beaches and transit stations. Families may be most interested in reaching neighborhood centers, parks or schools. The result is diverse set of bicycle routes that expose bicyclists to varying intensities of motor vehicles and motor vehicle speeds and provide links to nearby and farther away destinations.

Traffic Volumes & Speeds
Traffic volumes and speeds can be factors in a bicycle riders safety and comfort. Increase in traffic speeds and traffic volumes create “traffic stress”. For example, multi-lane streets can promote higher traffic speeds and decrease a bicyclist’s noticeability to left-turning motor vehicles and cross traffic at driveways and intersections. Also, the severity of a crash involving a bicyclist and motorist increases exponentially with speed. Providing a low level of stress for bicyclists requires progressively more protective measures – dedicated bike lanes and, ultimately, physically segregated bikeways- commensurate with the traffic speed.
**Bicycle Facilities**

Signed bicycle routes are located on Class I, Class II and Class III bicycle facilities. Examples include bicycle routes that utilize the San Lorenzo River Levee Class I bicycle path, Class II bicycle lanes on Soquel Avenue/Drive and collectors, and local roadways, including neighborhood streets, which serve as Class III bicycle facilities. The existing bicycle route network represented in the RTC’s Santa Cruz County Bike Map should be referenced when selecting routes.

Bicycle facilities by route vary depending on the target audience and route location. Bicycle routes are typically located where there are existing bicycle facilities or low speed and low traffic roadways. Upgrades to existing bicycle facilities on identified routes may be recommended to establish the most conducive environment for the experience level and comfort of different rider types.

**Safety**

The most common motor vehicle- bicycle crashes are located at intersections and may include a motorist passing a cyclist on the left and turns right into the bike’s path or a motorist fails to see a cyclist and makes a left turn. Other common motor vehicle- bicycle crashes are a person riding a bicycle traveling next to parked cars lined up on the street strikes a car door opened by the driver; a motorist exits a driveway or parking lot into the path of a bicyclist, a motorist overtaking bicyclists from behind. In Santa Cruz County, bicycle collisions were most frequent on arterial and collector routes with speeds between 25 and 35 mph. The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program is designed to reduce potential conflicts between bicycle and motor vehicles.

**Geographic Distribution**

It is important that chosen routes are equitably distributed throughout the county. Throughout Santa Cruz County there are bicyclists with a range of needs. Providing a variety of bicycle route options at locations throughout the county is the most equitable approach to distributing the benefits of bicycling. Furthermore, the overall success of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program is depending on the routes ability to link common origins and destinations across Santa Cruz County.

**Route Type**

Preferred bicycle routes are categorized by route type. Regional, local and neighborhood routes have been designated to address the diverse needs of the target audience. Identifying three classes of preferred bicycle routes promotes routes that are designed to maximize utility and appeal to the broadest range of bicycle riders consistent with the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program target audience. While the preferred bicycle routes are designed for all, bicyclists should always use their judgment in selecting routes that suit their experience and comfort level.

*Regional Bicycle Routes:* Connect common origins and destinations that support several communities and a mixture of community needs. Routes are designed to prioritize route directness over low traffic stress. Routes are typically cross-county routes between six and twenty-miles and link to local and neighborhood routes. Routes may appeal to more experienced bicycle riders categorized as advanced riders by FHWA. Routes are typically composed of Class II bicycle facilities.
Local Bicycle Routes: Connect between three or four common origins and destinations that support a local community’s needs and provide connections to adjacent jurisdictions and neighborhoods. Routes are designed to balance route directness with traffic stress. Routes are between five and eight miles in length and link with other local route and neighborhood routes. Routes may appeal to bicycle riders with less experience integrating with traffic and fall into the category of basic adult riders according to FHWA. Routes are typically composed of Class II and Class I bicycle facilities, and shared local roadways.

Neighborhood Bicycle Routes: Connect two or more common neighborhood origins and destinations. Routes prioritize low traffic stress over route directness. Routes are intended for new bicycle riders with little or no experience negotiating traffic and bicycle riders who fall into the category of children riders according to FHWA. Routes are between two and three miles in length and link with other local and regional routes. Routes are typically Class I bicycle facilities and shared local roadways such as neighborhood shared streets. Class II bicycle facilities may provide connections along the route. Neighborhood routes may be further evaluated in conjunction with other neighborhood transportation planning projects.

Phased Approach
The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program is expected to be implemented over time as resources become available. The 2015 Implementation Plan introduces the first group of routes proposed for implementation consistent with the 2015 Implementation Plan methodology. A phased approach introduces bicycle signage to the community at a scale that fits within available planning funds and allows for revisions to the system to adapt to the community’s level of interest. Additional signed bicycle routes could be identified in phases consistent with available resources and funding opportunities. Once successful routes have been signed, there will likely be public requests for additional routes. Such support could help facilitate securing of funds for future routes.

Phase I Bicycle Routes
The bicycle routes identified in the 2015 Implementation Plan are the first step in developing the community’s bicycle route signage program and establish the foundation for future routes and are referred to as phase 1 bicycle routes. Phase I bicycle routes build on the information provided in 2013 by local jurisdictions’ representatives as well as by bicycle advocacy/advisory organizations’ representatives during development of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program 2015 Implementation Plan. Phase I bicycle routes focus on identifying preferred routes between common origins and destinations connecting locations generally within the urbanized areas of Santa Cruz County. Phase I bicycle routes are designed to link with an expanded network of routes as future phases of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program are implemented. Appendix B includes a description of Phase 1 bicycle routes, maps of routes, and street network details.

Public Involvement
The RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee and representatives from local jurisdictions provided input on the 2015 Implementation Program. The RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee is comprised of members of the public representing a variety of bicycling interests and representatives of local bicycle organizations. Updates to the program goals, phase I bicycle routes, and program promotion were made in response to comments received. Neighborhood routes may be revised as a result of additional input received during future neighborhood transportation planning activities. Development of local bicycle plans and the Regional Transportation Plan include extensive public involvement and were considered in the development of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program 2015 Implementation Plan.
**Program Expansion**

Upon completion of phase I bicycle routes, including sufficient time for completion of field review and program evaluation, the RTC, in partnership with local jurisdictions and partner agencies, may consider expanding the number of signed bicycle routes. Future signed bicycle routes should be selected consistent with the methodology described in the 2015 Implementation Plan. Adjustments to the methodology should only be made if the outcomes do not conflict with previously implemented signed bicycle routes.
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Chapter 4- Sign Design Guidelines

Standard Signs
The standard SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program signs provide bicyclists three general kinds of guidance: direction, destination, and distance information along designated SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program routes.

1) Directional information instructs bicyclists about which way to go to reach common destinations near approaching decision points and intersections.

2) Destination information confirms the bicyclist’s route choice for reaching common destinations after selection of a direction at decision points and intersections.

3) Distance information indicates mileages and allows bicyclists to plan for energy needs and to better account for the time that the bicycle trip may require.

The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program purposes to use the Federal Highway Administration’s and California Manual on Traffic Safety Control Devices (MUTCD) sign standards to support a destination-based route signing system. The MUTCD destination-based route signs selected for the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program are recognizable, easy to understand and provide the greatest utility in terms of destination and distance information. The destination-based sign system follow the look and feel of standard highway guide signs, with the addition of a bicycle graphic to identify that the signs are designed for bicyclists, and encourage consistency with existing “Bike Route” signs. Several areas within California with signed bicycle routes are installing or moving towards destination-based route signs.

A modified version of sign D11-1 combined with D1-1a to D1-3a, shown in Figure 1, are the primary signs utilized for the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program to direct bicycle riders and assure bicyclists they are on the correct route. A modified version of the D11-1 sign is proposed to remove the words “BIKE ROUTE”. The words “BIKE ROUTE” officially reference a Class III facility. While this distinction may not be of concern to users, the use of “route” on a Class I or II facility is incorrect. In addition, minimizing the number of words presented on a sign is typically preferred. Sign D11-1c shown in Figure 1 may occasionally be utilized for the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program when only the final destination is identified, typically in more rural areas where there are few decision points. The D1-1a/D1-3a signs provide directional and mileage aspects when combined with the D11-1 sign.

In order to give jurisdictions as much flexibility as possible while maintaining a uniform look across the county, the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program should deploy the signs identified in Figure 1 below in a modular fashion, with consideration for the 2015 Implementation Plan sign design guidelines, and professional judgment of location and route specific circumstances.
Figure 1: Standard SCC Bicycle Route Sign

Option 1: To be used before decision points to direct bicycle riders to the correct destination and identify the direction and distance to destinations and points of interest.

D11-1, modified (“Bike Route” removed)
Size: 24” x 18”

D1-1a: Single Destination
D1-2a: Two Destinations
D1-3a: Three Destinations (shown here)
Size: Height varies based on number of destinations; width varies, but could limit to 24” to match width of D11-1
Note: The two signs for Option 1 can be mounted on single plate

Option 2: To be used after decision points or along routes to confirm that bicycle riders are headed towards the correct destination. Only the final destination is identified on confirmation signs.

D11-1c
Size: 24” x 18”
The sign layout specification for the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program deviates from the MUTCD as described in Table 1.

**Table 1: Standard Sign Deviation from MUTCD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference from MUTCD</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removes “BIKE ROUTE”</td>
<td>Remove reference to Class III facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates symbols with destination names</td>
<td>Improved communication while minimizing text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sign Text & Mileage**

Text on signs should be limited to destinations, points of interest and symbols for transit, multiuse paths and state parks as listed in Appendix A. Reference to commercial destination should be minimized. Final destinations should be included on all respective route signs. Route destinations should be signed at a distance of less than six miles. Points of interest should be signed at a distance of less than two miles. Signs shall use mixed case letters (e.g. upper case and lower case).

Distances on bicycle routes should be measured from the center of intersections to the geographical or business center of urban nodes. Mileage on signs should be listed in one mile increments. When the distance is less than one mile, the mileage number is expressed as a decimal, with a zero placed before the decimal (e.g., “0.5”).

**Symbols on Standards Signs**

Symbols will be used to convey destination and point of interest information in a space efficient manner. Symbols will be incorporated to identify the location of multiuse paths or trails, state parks, and transit stations. Symbols that may be incorporated with the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program are shown in Figure 2. Figure 3 provides examples of SCC bicycle route sign with symbols.

**Figure 2: Symbols for Use with SCC Bicycle Route Signs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi Use Path</th>
<th>Transit Station</th>
<th>California State Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Multi Use Path Symbol" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Transit Station Symbol" /></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3: SCC Bicycle Route Sign with Transit or Multi Use Path Symbol

Symbols will be used to convey destination and point of interest information in a space efficient manner on SCC Bicycle Route Signs. The modified D1-1a signs here are combined with D11-1 modified sign to identify the location of a transit station and multi use path.

Sign Layout

The following should be considered when determining sign layout:

1) include no more than three locations made up of a combination of destinations and points of interest;
2) locate the nearest destinations or point of interests at the top two places. If destinations or points of interests are equal in distance, the sign with an up arrow should be placed on top;
3) the final destination should be located in the bottom place. If a point of interest is beyond the final destination, then the point of interest beyond the final destination may be located in the bottom place and the final destination should be located in the middle place;
4) if a combination of destinations and points of interest are greater than three, than the two nearest destinations or points of interest should be listed in the top two places and the final destination should be listed in the bottom place. If a point of interest is beyond the final destination, then the nearest destination or point of interest should be placed in the top place, the final destination placed in the middle and the point of interest beyond the destination should be placed in the bottom place;
5) the straight arrow should be placed to the left of a destination and be left-justified, the left arrow to the left of a destination and be left-justified, and the right arrow to the right of a destination and be right-justified; and,
6) symbols should be located between arrows and destination text and included only for destinations within two miles of the bicycle route.
Sign Assemblies
A sign assembly is the group of signs that are placed at one location. SCC Bike Route Signage Program sign assembly would include the modified D11-1 “Bike Route” sign shown in Figure 1 plus a second set of D1-1a to D1-3a signs mounted below that contain destination and distance information. In unison, they contain the necessary SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program information at that location.

The RTC recommends that each sign be produced separately, rather than putting all the signs for a given sign assembly on a single plate. Separate signs will ease replacement of individual units. Using a single plate for each sign assembly is possible, though, and has been done by various jurisdictions.

Sign Frequency
Signs per directional mile will vary based on the number of decision points. Some routes might be more rural, and have less decision points, meaning fewer signs are needed. More urban routes will need more signs, since decision points are abundant. Other bicycle route signage program sign frequency range from 14 to 2 signs per bi-directional mile. The Pacific Coast Bike Route signs originally installed in Santa Cruz County contain 8 signs per bi-directional mile (4 in each direction). The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program is expected to average 2 to 4 signs per bi-directional mile with signs per mile increasing in areas where there are multiple decision points and signs per mile decreasing in areas where there are fewer decision points.

Sign Placement
Effective placement of signs along the routes is crucial to the functioning of the system. Each route should be evaluated individually to determine the most effective location for signs. Signs should generally be located before and after major intersections or decision points, before a bike route turns. Location for sign installations should be determined by the responsible local jurisdiction.

Sign placement located near intersections should consider intersection geometrics, number of lanes, sign distance and professional judgment. For example, left turns may require a sign to be placed a greater distance before the intersection based on the number of lanes the bicyclist must merge across in order to make the left turn. Other bicycle route signage programs place decision signs 30 feet for a zero lane merge, 100 feet for one or more lane merges.

Sign locations should be mapped prior to installation. A database of final sign locations should be documented and shared between local jurisdictions and RTC. Doing so will ease maintenance efforts when signs need to be replaced, which will help maintain the integrity of the sign system. Evaluation of sign locations conducted during field reviews should utilize maps of planned sign locations.

A database of final sign locations should include a detailed description of:
- sign placement including closest cross streets and distance in feet from intersections, where possible;
- sign assembly including MUTCD signs utilized, signed destination and mileage, other signage located on the sign post, and a image of posted sign where possible; and,
- sign dimensions including sign height and clearance.
Other Sign Systems
SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program signs should integrate with other signs systems to avoid proliferation of signs, where appropriate. Existing signs for the California Coastal Trail, the Pacific Coast Bike Route, San Lorenzo River Levee Trail as well as standard bike path, bike lane, and bike route signs are installed throughout the county. SCC bicycle route signs should also plan to integrate with future sign systems.

Bike Facility Signs
Figure 4 provides examples of existing bicycle sign systems in Santa Cruz County. Class III signs are similar to and can integrate well with the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program. Class II signs are different in color scheme and Class I signs are different in color scheme and layout than the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program. To encourage an easily recognizable sign system, where bike facility signs are located on SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program routes:

1) existing Class III facility signs should generally be removed or combined with SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program signs; and,
2) existing Class I and Class II facility signs should be removed.

Two bike facility signs initiatives – one state and one national – could result in new bike signs in the county as shown in Figure 5. The U.S. Bike Route initiative, a program sponsored by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and the American Cycling Association, is requesting that local jurisdictions designate and sign bike routes of national significance. A California initiative resulting from the passage of AB 1464 is requesting the same thing. Both programs have unique signs. At this time, RTC staff is recommending that the Pacific Coast Bike Route network be used for both programs and that no new signs are installed in order to avoid confusion and sign proliferation.

Figure 4: Existing Bicycle Facility Signs in Santa Cruz County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pacific Coast Bike Route</th>
<th>Class I Bike Path</th>
<th>Class II Bike Lane</th>
<th>Class III Bike Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Pacific Coast Bike Route" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Class I Bike Path" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Class II Bike Lane" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Class III Bike Route" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pacific Coast Bike Route

The Pacific Coast Bike Route signs are similar to the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program signs and can integrate well with the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program. To encourage an easily recognizable sign system, existing Pacific Coast Bike Route signs may be combined with SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program signs. Combining Pacific Coast Bike Route sign with the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program sign can be accomplished by replacing the existing D11-1 “Bike Route” sign with the adopted SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program standard signs (modified D11-1 sign), adding directional sign elements, and relocating signs consistent with the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program sign placement principles. An example of a Pacific Coast Bike Route sign combined with the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program sign is shown in Figure 6.
Multi Use Path & Trail System Signs

Bicycle route signs identifying the location of multi use paths or trail systems may include the multi use path or trail system symbol in addition to the text description, such as shown on Figure 3. Where SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program routes overlap with multi use path or trail systems, such as the San Lorenzo River Levee Trail, Watsonville Slough Trails, and future Monterey Bay Area Scenic Sanctuary Trail, signing for the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program could be incorporated into the unique multi use path or trail use signs. When SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program signs are incorporated with unique multi use path or trail system signs, the bicycle route sign should maintain the look and feel of the standard SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program signs and remain consistent with the 2015 Implementation Plan placement principles. The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program signs may be modified in size to fit within the adopted multi use path or trail post sign. Figure 7 provides an example of how a SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program sign may be incorporated into a unique multi use path or trail use sign.
Chapter 5- Project Delivery
As a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), the RTC is in a unique position to implement a countywide bike route signage program. The RTC will work closely with all local jurisdictions through which routes will traverse (the Cities of Watsonville, Scotts Valley, Capitola, and Santa Cruz, the County of Santa Cruz, and Caltrans for state highway facilities) to deliver the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program.

In 2010, the RTC provided the initial funding for development of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program. The RTC developed the 2015 Implementation Plan in coordination with the RTC’s Bicycle Advisory Committee and local jurisdictions. RTC will work with local jurisdictions to implement the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program. Sign design standards and placement will be consistent with the adopted 2015 Implementation Plan.

Sign Production and Installation
Available resources for project delivery, related planning efforts, and institutional capacity will influence the role of RTC and local jurisdictions in production and installation of signs. The RTC will pursue funding for implementing the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program as opportunities arise. Local jurisdictions may also provide funding for sign production and installation. Distribution of funds from RTC for implementation of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program will consider equitable geographic distribution, time of requests by local jurisdiction, and route connectivity.

Some examples of RTC and local jurisdictions roles in production and installation of signs may include:

1) Local jurisdictions produce and install signs consistent with the 2015 Implementation Plan.
2) RTC coordinates production of signs and local jurisdictions install signs consistent with the 2015 Implementation Plan. Production of signs may be completed by an outside vendor or one local jurisdiction on behalf of other local jurisdictions within Santa Cruz County.
3) RTC coordinates production and installation of signs consistent with the 2015 Implementation Plan. Production and installation of signs may be completed by an outside vendor or one local jurisdiction on behalf of other local jurisdictions within Santa Cruz County. Because the RTC does not have a licensed traffic engineer on staff, and sign placement will be dependent on engineering evaluations after consideration of line of sight, traffic volume, lane numbers, and other factors. RTC recommends this approach only if all other options have been exhausted.

Agreements, contracts or memorandums of understanding desired or required to carry-out sign production and installation will be handled on a case by case basis. Coordination with Caltrans may require more administration, however, as local bicycle route signs may require greater level of consideration to be located on state facilities.

The RTC will provide as much assistance, direction, and guidance as possible. Local agencies’ participation is paramount and creative streamlining, such as waiving encroachment permits, will provide for time and cost savings.

Sign Maintenance
Sign maintenance is crucial to the success of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program.
Missing, damaged, or vandalized signs in any link in a route could render that route incomplete.

Local jurisdictions will be responsible for sign maintenance, including manufacture of replacement signs, installation, and all associated costs. In preliminary discussions with local jurisdictions in Santa Cruz County, sign maintenance costs are estimated between $2,000 and $4,000 annually per local jurisdiction, depending on the number of signs installed. If funding is identified, the RTC will strive to cover on-going sign replacement as possible.

**Sign Costs**

A major expense in the sign program is the cost to manufacture the bike route signs and install them, including hardware and labor. In preliminary discussions with local jurisdictions and a review of other Bay Area bike route sign programs, sign production/installation costs are estimated to be between $300 and $400 per sign for the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program. This estimate includes the cost of encroachments permits where they may be needed. One way of determining the total costs for implementing signage on bike routes is to determine the average number of signs used per bi-directional mile. Once the number of miles on a given route is known the number of signs and cost per route can be calculated.

**Field Survey**

It is recommended that a pre-installation field survey occur for each route prior to sign installation to ensure that directional guides are logical, comprehensive, and streamlined. Field survey should reveal route deficiencies that may impact sign placement and solutions or enhancements such as bicycle route pavement markings. A post-installation field review would also be advisable to confirm network connectivity and functionality. Members of the public and/or advocacy organizations could be invited to assist in this effort.

**Liability**

Liability questions have been raised locally by the members of the RTC. Other jurisdictions determined that improvements associated with the bike route system (i.e. improved road conditions, increased motorist awareness) could themselves reduce liability concerns. Additionally, the recent “Complete Streets” approach to transportation projects, which aims to address the safety and mobility needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users in all projects, is a goal of this improvement project as well.
Chapter 6- Promotion & Evaluation

Promotion
The SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program will be promoted using a variety of public information strategies including public officials' endorsement at a ribbon cutting, media coverage in local publications, route maps. Additionally, the resources of partnering organizations such as Ecology Action and its Bike to Work program, the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, Bike Santa Cruz County (formerly People Power) will be utilized to promote routes. At the current time, funding is not available for any specific promotional campaign so no-cost avenues will be employed.

Route Maps
Maps of bicycle routes may be developed in hard copy and electronic version when additional resources are available. Maps of the complete bicycle route system may be posted at key junctures along the bicycle route system. In addition, the inclusion of quick response, “QR” codes on hard copies and electronic versions of the maps may assist bicycle riders in identifying their exact location and could be further investigated for inclusion in route map materials. Route numbering can provide a reference for bicycle riders utilizing reference maps and may be included in hard copy and electronic versions of SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program maps. Consistent with other bicycle route numbering systems, routes that are generally east-west are referenced with even numbers and routes that are generally north-south are referenced with odd numbers. Route numbers will not be included on signs and will serve as reference for planning purposes and mapping resources only.

Evaluation
Bicycle ridership counts should be completed before and after sign installation. Bicycle ridership counts on bicycle routes may be incorporated into existing bicycle count programs held annually and overseen by the Community Traffic Safety Coalition and the RTC. Surveys to capture the public’s awareness of bicycle route signage and routes can also evaluate the program effectiveness.
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## Appendix A: Common Origins-Destinations & Points of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Signed Locations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sign Text</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>Symbol</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origins-Destinations, Commercial Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptos Village</td>
<td>Aptos Vlg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola Mall</td>
<td>Capitola Mall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola Village</td>
<td>Capitola Vlg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Dwn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Watsonville</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felton</td>
<td>Felton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Valley Commercial Center</td>
<td>Green Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Point</td>
<td>Pleasure Pt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley Town Center</td>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacliff Village</td>
<td>Seacliff Vlg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel Village</td>
<td>Soquel Vlg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origins-Destinations, Neighborhoods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak Neighborhood</td>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Heights Neighborhood</td>
<td>Prospect Hts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabright Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>Seabright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacliff Neighborhood</td>
<td>Seacliff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>Westside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points of Interest, State Beaches</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manresa State Beach</td>
<td>Manresa</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Cowell State Park</td>
<td>Henry Cowell</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse State Beach</td>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Bridges State Beach</td>
<td>Natural Bridges</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brighton State Beach</td>
<td>New Brighton</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisene Marks State Park</td>
<td>Nisene Marks</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabright State Beach</td>
<td>Seabright</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacliff State Beach</td>
<td>Seacliff</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset State Beach</td>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Lakes State Beach</td>
<td>Twin Lakes</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder Ranch State Park</td>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>Park/Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points of Interest, Multi Use Paths and Trail Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arana Gulch Multi Use Path</td>
<td>Arana Gulch</td>
<td>Multi Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branciforte Creek Path</td>
<td>Branciforte Cr.</td>
<td>Multi Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Scenic Sanctuary Trail</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td>Multi Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo River Levee</td>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>Multi Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Harbor</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>Multi Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville Slough Trails</td>
<td>Slough Trails</td>
<td>Multi Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points of Interest, Transit Stations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Transit Station</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Dwn.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola Mall Transit Station</td>
<td>Capitola Mall</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Village Transit Station</td>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville Transit Station</td>
<td>Watsonville Dwn.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Points of Interest, Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points of Interest</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Creek</td>
<td>Boulder Cr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo College</td>
<td>Cabrillo Colg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo College Watsonville Center</td>
<td>Cabrillo Colg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey West Park</td>
<td>Harvey West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Marine Lab</td>
<td>Long Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinto Lake</td>
<td>Pinto Lk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Point</td>
<td>Pleasure Pt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Wharf</td>
<td>Wharf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannery Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>Tannery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Locations Not Signed

### Origins-Destinations, Roadways**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origins-Destinations, Roadways</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitola Avenue</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clares Street</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cliff Drive</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Boulevard</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Valley Road</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Street</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel Avenue</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel Drive</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Origins-Destinations, Schools***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origins-Destinations, Schools</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley High School</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Valley High School</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville High School</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sign text may be modified to fit within sign spacing requirements.

**Roadways serve as a bicycle route origins if they link to more than one neighborhood or place, where the roadways provides a connection to another bicycle routes or where alternative routes to major roadways are recommended.

***Schools are identified as bicycle route origins if the school location also serves as origin for a neighborhood or is located on the outer limit of a bicycle route that also links commercial services.
Appendix B- Phase I Bicycle Routes, General Description

The bicycle routes identified in the 2015 Implementation Plan are the first step in developing the community’s bicycle route signage program and establish the foundation for future routes and are referred to as Phase I bicycle routes. The Phase I bicycle routes build on the information provided in 2013 by local jurisdictions’ representatives and bicycle advocacy/advisory organizations’ representatives during development of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program - 2015 Implementation Plan. Phase I bicycle routes focus on identifying preferred routes that connect common origins and destinations. Phase I bicycle routes are designed to link with an expanded network of routes as future phases of the SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program are implemented. Consistent with other bicycle route numbering systems, routes that are generally east-west are referenced with even numbers and routes that are generally north-south are referenced with odd numbers. Route numbers will not be included on signs and will serve as reference for bicycle riders using mapping resources only.

Regional Bicycle Routes (RR):
- RR01- Felton to and from City of Scotts Valley and Downtown Santa Cruz
- RR02- Downtown Santa Cruz to and from Soquel Village, Aptos Village, Downtown Watsonville
- RR04- Capitola Mall to and from Downtown Santa Cruz
- RR05- Soquel Village to and from Capitola Village
- RR06- Seacliff Village to and from Capitola Village and Downtown Santa Cruz

Local Bicycle Routes (LR):
- LR 07- Scotts Valley High School to and from Scotts Valley Town Center
- LR08- Natural Bridges State Beach to and from Downtown Santa Cruz
- LR09- UCSC to and from Downtown Santa Cruz via Bay
- LR10- Capitola Village to and from Natural Bridges State Beach
- LR11- UCSC to and from Downtown Santa Cruz via High
- LR12- Capitola Village to and from UCSC
- LR13- Soquel Avenue to and from Seabright Neighborhood Center
- LR14- Pajaro Valley High School to and from Downtown Watsonville
- LR15- Pinto Lake to and from Downtown Watsonville
- LR17- Soquel Drive to and from Capitola Village

Neighborhood Bicycle Routes:
- NR18- Scotts Valley Drive to and from Scotts Valley Town Center
- NR19- Mission Street to and from Laurel Street
- NR20- Westside Neighborhood Center to and from West Cliff Drive
- NR21- Soquel Avenue to and from East Cliff Drive
- NR22- New Brighton State Beach to and from Capitola Village
- NR23- Soquel Avenue to and from Seabright Neighborhood Center
- NR25- Prospect Heights to and from Seabright Neighborhood Center
- NR27- Live Oak Neighborhood to and from Seabright Neighborhood Center
- NR29- Capitola Road to and from Pleasure Point
- NR31- Clares Street to and from Capitola Village
- NR33- Seacliff Neighborhood to and from Seacliff Village
- NR35- Hall Middle School to and from Downtown Watsonville
- NR36- Downtown Watsonville to and from Green Valley Commercial Center and Green Valley Road
- NR37- Watsonville High School to and from Downtown Watsonville
- NR39- Freedom Boulevard to and from Main Street
- NR40- Freedom Boulevard to and from East Lake Avenue
- NR41- Freedom Boulevard to and from Highway 129
Appendix B: Phase I Bicycle Routes, Map - Scotts Valley and Felton

SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program

- **Red**: Regional Bike Routes
- **Blue**: Local Bike Routes
- **Green**: Neighborhood Bike Routes
- **绿**: Schools
- **School**: Transit Center

[Map of Scotts Valley and Felton with bicycle routes marked.]
Appendix B: Phase I Bicycle Routes, Map - North & Mid County

SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program

- **Regional Bike Routes**
- **Local Bike Routes**
- **Neighborhood Bike Routes**
- **Schools**
- **Transit Center**

Miles
Appendix B: Phase I Bicycle Routes, Map - Capitola & Aptos

SCC Bicycle Route Signage Program

- **Regional Bike Routes**
- **Local Bike Routes**
- **Neighborhood Bike Routes**

- **Schools**
- **Transit Center**

Miles
## Appendix B: Phase I Bicycle Routes, Street Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Reference</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Street Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR01</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Felton and Scotts Valley to Downtown Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Graham Hill Road, Mt. Hermon Road, Glen Canyon Road, Market Street, Water Street, Front Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Hermon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glen Canyon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR02</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Downtown Santa Cruz to Soquel Village, Aptos Village, Downtown Watsonville</td>
<td>Front Street, Soquel Avenue, Soquel Drive, Bonita Drive, San Andreas Road, Beach Road, West Beach Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soquel Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soquel Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonita Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Andreas Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beach Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Beach Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR04</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Capitola Mall to Downtown Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Capitola Road, Soquel Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitola Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soquel Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR05</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Soquel Village to Capitola Village</td>
<td>Porter Street, Bay Avenue, Monterey Avenue, Capitola Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Porter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bay Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitola Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR06</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Seacliff Village to Capitola Village and Downtown Santa Cruz</td>
<td>State Park Drive, McGregor Drive, Park Avenue, Monterey Avenue, Cliff Drive, Portola Drive, East Cliff Drive, 7th/Lake Avenue, Murray Street, San Lorenzo River Levee, Front Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Park Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McGregor Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cliff Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portola Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Cliff Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7th Avenue/Lake Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Murray Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Lorenzo River Levee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Phase I Bicycle Routes, Street Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Reference</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Street Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LR07            | Local      | Scotts Valley High School to Scotts Valley Town Center | Glenwood Drive, Scotts Valley Drive, Mt. Hermon Road  
|                 |            |                   | Glenwood Drive  
|                 |            |                   | Scotts Valley Drive  
|                 |            |                   | Mt. Hermon Road  
|                 |            |                   | Kings Village Road  |
| LR08            | Local      | Natural Bridges State Beach to Downtown Santa Cruz | Delaware Avenue, Bay Street, West Cliff Drive, West Cliff Drive (trestle), Pacific Avenue, Front Street  
|                 |            |                   | Delaware Avenue  
|                 |            |                   | Bay Street  
|                 |            |                   | West Cliff Drive  
|                 |            |                   | West Cliff Drive (trestle)  
|                 |            |                   | Pacific Avenue  
|                 |            |                   | Front Street  |
| LR09            | Local      | UCSC to Santa Cruz Wharf and Downtown Santa Cruz | Bay Drive, Bay Street, West Cliff Drive, West Cliff Drive (trestle), Pacific Avenue, Front Street  
|                 |            |                   | Bay Drive  
|                 |            |                   | Bay Street  
|                 |            |                   | West Cliff Drive  
|                 |            |                   | West Cliff Drive (trestle)  
|                 |            |                   | Pacific Avenue  
|                 |            |                   | Front Street  |
| LR10            | Local      | Capitola Village to Natural Bridges State Beach | Capitola Avenue, Stockton Avenue, Cliff Drive, Opal Cliff Drive, 41st Avenue, East Cliff Drive, 7th/Lake Avenue, Murray Street, Beach Street, West Cliff Drive  
|                 |            |                   | Capitola Avenue  
|                 |            |                   | Stockton Avenue  
|                 |            |                   | Cliff Drive  
|                 |            |                   | Opal Cliff Drive  
|                 |            |                   | 41st Avenue  
|                 |            |                   | East Cliff Drive  
|                 |            |                   | 7th Avenue/Lake Avenue  
|                 |            |                   | Murray Street  
|                 |            |                   | Beach Street  
|                 |            |                   | West Cliff Drive  |
| LR11            | Local      | UCSC to Downtown Santa Cruz | High Street, High Street (pedestrian bridge), Sylvan Street, Mission Street, Pacific Avenue  
|                 |            |                   | High Street  
|                 |            |                   | High Street (pedestrian bridge)  
|                 |            |                   | Sylvan Street  
|                 |            |                   | Mission Street  
|                 |            |                   | Pacific Avenue  |
### Appendix B: Phase I Bicycle Routes, Street Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Reference</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Street Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR12</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Capitola Village to UCSC</td>
<td>Capitola Avenue/Esplanade, Stockton Avenue, Cliff Drive, 47th Avenue, Topaz Street, Jade Street, Brommer Street, Arana Gulch Multi Use Path, Broadway, Laurel Street, King Street, Bay Street, Bay Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitola Avenue/Esplanade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockton Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cliff Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topaz Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jade Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brommer Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arana Gulch Multi Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laurel Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bay Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bay Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR13</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Soquel Avenue to Seabright Neighborhood</td>
<td>7th Avenue, Murray Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Murray Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR14</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Pajaro Valley High School to Downtown Watsonville</td>
<td>Harkins Slough Road, Ford Street, Rodríguez Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harkins Slough Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ford Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rodríguez Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR15</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Pinto Lake to Downtown Watsonville</td>
<td>Green Valley Road, Pennsylvania Drive, Main Street Path, Rodríguez Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Valley Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rodríguez Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR17</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Soquel Drive to Capitola Village</td>
<td>Capitola Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Phase I Bicycle Routes, Street Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Reference</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Street Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR18</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Scotts Valley Drive to Scotts Valley Town Center</td>
<td>Bean Creek Road, Blue Bonnet Lane, Kings Village Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bean Creek Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Bonnet Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kings Village Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR19</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Mission Street to Laurel Street</td>
<td>Almar Avenue, Seaside Avenue, Acadia Avenue, California Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almar Avenue at Mission Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seaside Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acadia Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR20</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Westside Neighborhood Center to West Cliff Drive</td>
<td>Fair Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR21</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Soquel Avenue to East Cliff Drive</td>
<td>Cayuga Street, Buena Vista Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cayuga Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buena Vista Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR22</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>New Brighton State Beach to Capitola Village</td>
<td>Kennedy Drive, Monterey Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennedy Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR23</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Soquel Avenue to Seabright Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>Cayuga Street, Logan Street, Seabright Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cayuga Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seabright Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR25</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Prospect Heights to Neighbourhood Center</td>
<td>Prospect Heights, Park Way, to Arana Gulch Multi Use Path, Santa Cruz Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospect Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>La Fonda Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>La Fonda Avenue/Park Way multi use pathway connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arana Gulch Multi Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Cliff Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR27</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Live Oak Neighborhood to Seabright Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>Rodriguez Street, Jose Avenue, El Dorado Avenue, Brommer Street, Arana Gulch Multi Use Path, Santa Cruz Harbor, Atlantic Avenue, East Cliff Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rodriguez Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jose Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Dorado Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brommer Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arana Gulch Multi Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Cliff Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Phase I Bicycle Routes, Street Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Reference</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Street Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR29</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Capitola Road to Pleasure Point</td>
<td>30th Avenue, Roland Drive, 35th Avenue, Portola Drive, 37th Avenue, East Cliff Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roland Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portola Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Cliff Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR31</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Clares Street to Capitola Village</td>
<td>46th Avenue, Capitola Road, 47th Avenue, Cliff Drive, Stockton Avenue, Capitola Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitola Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47th Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cliff Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockton Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capitola Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR33</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Seacliff Neighborhood to Seacliff Village</td>
<td>Mar Vista Drive, Seacliff Drive, State Park Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar Vista Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seacliff Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Park Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR35</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Hall Middle School to Downtown Watsonville</td>
<td>Palm Avenue, Madison Street, 5th Street, Brennan, West 5th Street, Rodriguez Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brennan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West 5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rodriguez Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR36</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Downtown Watsonville to Green Valley Commercial Center and Green Valley Road</td>
<td>Kearney Street, Lower Slough Trails, Oholone Parkway, Upper Slough Trails, Pennsylvania Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kearney Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Slough Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oholone Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Slough Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR37</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Watsonville High School to Downtown Watsonville</td>
<td>East Beach Street, Lincoln Street, Maple Ave, 2nd, Rodriguez Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Beach Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maple Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rodriguez Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR39</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Freedom Boulevard to Main Street</td>
<td>Arthur Road, Hammer Drive, Pennsylvania Drive, Main Street Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hammer Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street Path</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Phase I Bicycle Routes, Street Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Reference</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Street Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR40</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Freedom Boulevard to East Lake Avenue</td>
<td>Crestview Drive, Brewington Avenue, Martinelli Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crestview Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brewington Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martinelli Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR41</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Freedom Boulevard to Highway 129</td>
<td>Crestview Drive, Brewington Avenue, East Lake Avenue, Blackburn Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crestview Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brewington Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Lake Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackburn Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of May 7, 2015
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO APPLY FOR FUNDS AND
EXECUTE AGREEMENTS WITH CALTRANS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SANTA CRUZ
COUNTY BICYCLE ROUTE SIGNAGE PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the 2015 Implementation Plan for the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route
Signage Program was approved on May 7, 2015;

WHEREAS, the Active Transportation Program was created by Senate Bill 99 and
Assembly Bill 101 of 2013 to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such
as bicycling and walking;

WHEREAS, RTC is eligible to receive federal and state funding for certain transportation
projects through the California Transportation Commission and California Department of
Transportation (Caltrans); and,

WHEREAS, the Active Transportation Program grant will be most competitive if up to
20% in matching funds is provided;

WHEREAS, the RTC will request up to $450,000 in Active Transportation Program funds
for the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program;

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
(RTC):

1. The Executive Director, or his or her designee, is hereby authorized to execute and file
an application with Caltrans for a grant from the Active Transportation Program, to
accept such funding and execute the necessary agreements with Caltrans and local
jurisdictions if awarded, and to appropriate such funding to implement the Santa Cruz
County Bicycle Route Signage Program; and

2. A contribution of up to $90,000 is hereby authorized to be used as matching funds for
the Active Transportation Program, if awarded.

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

____________________________
John Leopold, Chair

George Dondero, Secretary

S:\RTC\TC2015\TC0515\BicycleRouteSignage\Attach2_RES-CTPlanningGrant--SCCBikeRouteSignage.docx
Dear Bicycle Committee:
SCCRTC used over 100 pages to describe its Bicycle Route Signage Program (BRSP) Draft Plan, published a mere four days prior to it being unanimously approved at last Monday’s meeting. And while I have written much to describe a complementary protocol, brevity is my intention here to denote significant errors and omissions in this BRSP Draft. To be succinct, I use the CycleNet bicycle numbering protocol as a language of route numbers to describe physical bicycle infrastructure, as it is ideally suited to do so (and actually is described on a single page). I attempt to make equivalences between BRSP and the elegance of CycleNet. However, I repeatedly encounter factual errors, omissions and a continuing lack of access to the public process the BRSP and the RTC claim to provide. I continue to improve bicycle routing in this County, and because this Plan conflates and thus forces the issue, bicycle signage as well. Hence, this forum is an appropriate time and place to do so. Furthermore, my study of and contributions to this endeavor are many years long, not to mention well reasoned and widely vetted. There is no opposition to CycleNet except apparently by Members of the Bicycle Committee or this Commission, even as some simultaneously publicly express interest in and call for further study of numbered routing protocols, including CycleNet itself. Why is that? How can that be true while the vote was unanimous to approve this Draft?

The following lists BRSP Draft Route Proposals (RR01-NR24) and how CycleNet already describes this infrastructure, more succinctly and correctly, using only bicycle infrastructure designated in the County Bicycle Map (CBM). It conveys how significantly the BRSP Draft route proposals are rife with errors and omissions, while CycleNet simplifies and extends this exact process (of identifying bicycle routes via infrastructure) in a superior manner:

Regional Routes
RR01 = 8, 95, 98. BRSP uses 6 named infrastructures vs. 3 CycleNet #s
RR02 = 10, 37, 50. BRSP uses 4 named infrastructures vs. 3 CycleNet #s
RR03 = 95, 70, 73, back to 95. Broadway Bridge crossing @Front/Levee and 41st Avenue section @East Cliff/Portola are both omitted from the Street Network in Appendix B. BRSP uses 14 named infrastructures (counting the two omissions) vs. 3 CycleNet #s.

Clearly, for regional routes, CycleNet is superior in its brevity: only 9 CycleNet routes encompass the RTC’s wish to identify specific regional routes, vs. 24 named infrastructures in the BRSP Draft Plan. While a more detailed analysis is required, using CycleNet may very well simplify routing via signage as well, since specific destinations and turn locations can be still further refined. Plus, these 9 CycleNet routes actually span more bicycle infrastructure in the regional network -- in the case of CycleNet 95, the extent of the entire County, noted in the Plan as numbered United States Bicycle Route 95 -- increasing destination flexibility. USBR 95, to be introduced along the entire length of California including in Santa Cruz County, is yet another example (in addition to Santa Clara and San Francisco Counties) that numbered bicycle routes are already here, and will eventually exist in Santa Cruz. I spoke on this topic at a national mapping conference in Washington, DC last year, as I have extensive knowledge of our national bicycle networking numbering protocols, their history and even experience in their deployment (including recognition by Adventure Cycling Association and AASHTO). USBRs are fully consistent and harmonious with regional and local numbered bicycle networks in a three-tiered (national, regional, local) hierarchy. CycleNet fully accommodates these by both remaining at
the local level, and anticipating state and national routes, while harmonizing consistency across these multiple numbering spaces.

**Local Routes**

LR05 = 15, 5. "North Pacific" is not connected to "Trestle," only Pacific to Front, then either Cathcart, Soquel or Water must be used to connect, but these are omitted from the Street Network. If "North on Pacific" (instead of North Pacific) was meant, significant portions are one-way, not bicycle infrastructure identified on the CBM, and do not allow through traffic in either direction. BRSP uses 4 named infrastructures (once you count the omission) vs. 2 CycleNet #s. LR06 = 10, 18, High, Sylvar, 10, 5. "Spear" is not a named street in Santa Cruz: Map C-1 displays the East side of High Street and Sylvar Street, both of which are not identified as bicycle infrastructure on the CBM. Furthermore, Front Street is not mentioned but is clearly shown. BRSP uses 4 named infrastructures vs. 3 or even 2 CycleNet #s if it were known that "High Street, Spear Street" (East High, Sylvar) are legal bicycle infrastructure: Mission between Sylvar and Highland changes from 10 to 12 (to reflect this addition) and Highland/High East changes to 13. Then, simply, LR06 = 10, 5: just 2 CycleNet #s. LR07 = 20, 15, 5. The origin/destination of this route says "Natural Bridges State Beach," yet Delaware does not connect to Natural Bridges State Beach, so something -- Swanton Boulevard? Crespi Court? -- has been omitted from the Street Network. "North Pacific" does not connect to "Bay" by a significant distance and "West Cliff" is vague, at best. The map appears to connect LR07 to LR09, so a connection is implied, but it is not clear where. BRSP uses 4 named infrastructures vs. 3 CycleNet #s.

LR08 = 89, 91, 92, 94. BRSP uses 4 named infrastructures vs. 4 CycleNet #s.

LR09 = 95, 764, 62, 4, 14, 15. Topaz Street and Opal Cliff Drive are not identified on the CBM as a bicycle infrastructure. This route is much more "regional" than local, as it is ~6 miles in length. But with only a handful of turns, this is a well-developed (regional, not local) route. Thumbs up for five or even six signs! BRSP uses 4 named infrastructures vs. 6 CycleNet #s, but see below how this might be simplified to just 5 or even 4 CycleNet #s. It may simply be that better current bicycle infrastructure data are needed. It is certainly true we need good communication between the public and the planners, something lacking now, but which CycleNet aims to address, and can as both communication and CycleNet itself improve.

LR22 = 21, 15, 14, 4, 62, 95 (between 62 and 95 is vague). BRSP uses perhaps 12 or 15 named infrastructures (the omissions make it unclear) vs. 6 CycleNet #s. "Broadway" is misspelled. LR22 significantly overlaps (double-routes) LR05 on Bay. "Bay Avenue" is nonexistent in Santa Cruz, there are Bay Drive north of Escalona and Bay Street south of it; the Draft Plan leaves the boundary unclear. Map C-1 shows much more significant infrastructure (Coolidge Drive and the UCSC Bike Path) than what is omitted from the Street Network to bike the whole distance to UCSC, instead of simply "Bay."

**Neighborhood Routes**

NR10 = 70.

NR11 = 93, but neither Maple, Kearney nor 2nd are identified as bicycle infrastructure on the CBM. This route is invented largely from non-existent bicycle infrastructure, so no accurate comparison between BRSP and CycleNet can be made. If CycleNet could coin routes, 293 might be assigned to parts of this, using perhaps as few as 2 CycleNet #s to describe the same route.

NR12 = 93, 91. But, from Hall Middle School, East 5th is not contiguous to connect to Walker, as it must use Brennan Street (omitted from the Street Network) to connect to West 5th. None of these are identified as bicycle infrastructure on the CBM. "Slough Trails" are vaguely identified twice, lacking the specificity of "Southern Watsonville Slough Trail" and "Upper Struve Slough Trail" where these are necessary. Furthermore, Upper Struve Slough Trail (northbound)
stops near Winding Way, necessitating continuation to Green Valley Road using Pennsylvania Drive (which does have a parallel cycleway track), but only after crossing Pennsylvania Drive to its eastern side. No accurate comparison between BRSP and CycleNet can be made.

NR13 = 380. Hammer Drive is not bicycle infrastructure on the CBM. 91, 92, 93. Ohlone Parkway(s) does not connect to Kearney street without the addition of Southern Watsonville Slough Trail, and then to get to "2nd or 5th" it is necessary to include Walker, Rodriguez or Main (96, 94, 92) all of which are omitted from the Street Network. The endpoints (origins/destinations) of this route are said to be "Freedom Boulevard to Downtown Watsonville" but this convoluted route of nearly 4 miles is one that anybody wishing to simply route from these two points might seldom if ever take. Instead, continue southbound on Freedom Boulevard (80) to Main (92), both of which are already identified as county bicycle infrastructure and total less than 1 mile, one fourth the length of NR13! Just look at Map D-2 and find NR13 (twice, and apparently disconnected from itself): is this a good route from Freedom Blvd. to Downtown Watsonville? No, it is not! What is the black segment of NR13 identified on Map D-2? Is it Lincoln Street (180)? This is not identified in the Street Network! This route contains too much non-existent bicycle infrastructure to make an accurate comparison between BRSP and CycleNet.

NR14 = 62, 4. But, "Jose Avenue" and the footpaths through Jose Avenue Park are not identified as bicycle infrastructure on the CBM. Also, Jose contradicts "Jade Avenue" (which is actually Jade Street) in the Street Network, so both of these are errors. "El Dorado Avenue" is not identified as bicycle infrastructure on the CBM. Naming "Santa Cruz Harbor Trail" coins a new name for the entire northwest and southwest segments of westside Harbor paved infrastructure, when these in fact already have names: Mariner Park Way and East Cliff Drive (not to mention CycleNet 47). Finally, the entire segments of Atlantic Avenue and East Cliff Drive (32) to connect to Seabright (43) -- the destination -- are omitted from the Street Network description, where the map clearly shows them! This route contains too much non-existent bicycle infrastructure to make an accurate comparison between BRSP and CycleNet.

NR15 = The segment of 30th (360) between Capitola Road (the intended origin/destination) and Brommer (to get to Roland Drive) is not identified on the CBM as bicycle infrastructure, nor are Roland Drive itself, 35th Avenue and 37th Avenue. Portola Drive (60) is not identified as connecting 35th and 37th to East Cliff Drive (95). This route is invented largely from non-existent bicycle infrastructure, so no accurate comparison between BRSP and CycleNet can be made.

NR16 = 39, but Cayuga and Buena Vista Avenue are not identified on the CBM as bicycle infrastructure. This route is invented largely from non-existent bicycle infrastructure, so no accurate comparison between BRSP and CycleNet can be made. However, CycleNet 39 perfectly completes these origin/destination pairs using existing bicycle infrastructure, so it can be said to be superior.

NR17 = 49, 47, if CycleNet knew to collapse 249 and Park Way into a 47 extension. However, Park Way is not identified on the CBM as bicycle infrastructure. BRSP uses 7 named infrastructures vs. what might be 2 CycleNet #s.

NR18 = 520, but Fair Avenue south of Delaware is not identified on the CBM as bicycle infrastructure, so half of this route is invented from non-existent infrastructure, hence no accurate comparison between BRSP and CycleNet can be made.

NR19 = This looks like a seed to grow a Mar Vista bicycle bridge over Highway 1. This route is invented completely from non-existent bicycle infrastructure, so no accurate comparison between BRSP and CycleNet can be made. CycleNet has no routes like this, because it is not designated bicycle infrastructure. However, if CycleNet could coin a route number, it might be 170. If the RTC has designated this as bicycle infrastructure, the RTC must publish this somewhere and it appears it does not, or must produce these data.
NR20 = 711, 11. This looks like a "route around Mission" route. However, Almar is not identified on the CBM as bicycle infrastructure. Younglove (411) is, and connects to Seaside and Acadia (711). These connect at California and Woodrow, so only one CycleNet parent route (11) is needed, which is also shorter in distance between the destinations specified!

NR21 = 64, 764/67 or 964 (roughly). However, 46th Avenue is not identified on the CBM as bicycle infrastructure, nor is the turn along Capitola Road included in the Street Network description of this route, nor is the existing bicycle infrastructure, 49th Avenue (964) used in this route. CycleNet might rather simply renumber this area to include 46th Avenue as legal infrastructure, blend 64 and 67 with Wharf Road at Cliff (with two smart signs) and make a single route (67) out of this. That is a distinct improvement to routing through here and should be done.

NR23 = 396. This route is invented completely from non-existent bicycle infrastructure, so no accurate comparison between BRSP and CycleNet can be made. CycleNet has no routes like this, because it is not designated bicycle infrastructure. If CycleNet could coin a route number, it might be 396. If the RTC or City of Watsonville has designated this as bicycle infrastructure, the RTC must publish this somewhere and it appears it does not, or must produce these data.

NR24 = 280. This route is invented completely from non-existent bicycle infrastructure, so no accurate comparison between BRSP and CycleNet can be made. CycleNet has no routes like this, because it is not designated bicycle infrastructure. If CycleNet could coin a route number, it might be 280. If the RTC or City of Watsonville has designated this as bicycle infrastructure, the RTC must publish this somewhere and it appears it does not, or must produce these data.

In short, the BRSP Draft Plan uses significant amounts of undeclared bicycle infrastructure (CycleNet has or endeavors to achieve a perfect 100% 1:1 correspondence), tedious Street Network descriptions (CycleNet always wins with regard to brevity) and contradicts itself with numerous errors between maps, Street Network descriptions and destinations (which CycleNet was designed to avoid, so it does).

I propose RTC and/or its Bicycle Committee quickly adopt CycleNet 8, 80 and 95 as distinctly identified bicycle infrastructure. This is separate from adopting the BRSP Draft Plan. In addition to those initial three regional routes, largely speaking, CycleNet 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 32, 37, 39, 47, 49, 50, 60, 62, 70, 73, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94 and 98 are the infrastructure needed to implement this Draft Plan. These can be adopted as needed, especially as the slightly larger number of routes (CycleNet proposes 29, BRSP proposes 24) yields a vastly larger legal bicycle infrastructure as an Introduction (Phased Approach), offering further and more flexibility for destinations than does the BRSP plan. The upshot is for SCC BRSP's very roughly-described 24 routes being proposed to use CycleNet identifiers as infrastructure, on an as-needed basis. CycleNet simplifies things as it collapses three layers of Planning/Internal numbering (RR01-RR24) to one well-designed layer (1-99). At the same time, this does not diminish the importance of considering a three-tiered construction of routes [Regional, Local, Neighborhood] for planning, development and/or internal purposes. For example, Class III being closer to what is meant by Neighborhood Routes means to be included in this conversation: such a thing as the "edge case" of a Neighborhood Route as a "soft introduction of a Class III facility" actually does happen, so this is acknowledged as a real occurrence in route planning (and perhaps signage deployment).

Transportation planning and deployment often contain two distinct systems for denoting physical infrastructure and logical routes. For example, railway networks at an infrastructure layer are known as Subdivisions, Branches and Lines, then logical routes as passenger train services (e.g. Caltrain Baby Bullet or Amtrak California Capitol Corridor) are made up of multiple elements of the physical infrastructure components. It may very well be that using CycleNet to
identify physical bicycle infrastructure in Santa Cruz County is a preferred solution to express the intents of the BRSP. The RTC can continue to internally use (e.g. in the BRSP Plan) numbers such as RR01, LR05 and NR10, while at the same time use CycleNet to describe the infrastructure upon which these logical routes depend. If planning and communication improves to a state of perfecting full transparency, it is conceivable that CycleNet numbering could actually become equivalent to both infrastructure identification AND logical route numbers. Some willingness by RTC is required to achieve this, but beyond that, not much additional effort would be. I urge you to consider this, then adopt CycleNet 8, 80 and 95 as distinctly identified bicycle infrastructure. If the RTC is going to name logical routes with numbers (and it just did by adopting this Draft Plan), it can and should do the same by similarly identifying underlying physical infrastructure, as CycleNet proposes to do. And it "keeps honest" botched routing attempts like BRSP to stick to legal bicycle infrastructure -- to the extent that CycleNet remains current with that set of facilities: as the RTC transparently provides this information, CycleNet can continue to do so, too. But as RTC allows its CBM to become five years old without a reprint, or by not providing transparent access to GIS layers of bicycle infrastructure and route planning data, this harmonization is impossible and frustrates public input to planning our transportation networks.

CycleNet acts as a buffer of route harmonization by ideally becoming the method of identifying infrastructure components and identified destinations (as well as additional logical routes). These must be discussed, as must the process of how these are determined and deployed. CycleNet clearly acts as a more senior and well established protocol compared to the rough and frequently self-contradictory BRSP now introduced. CycleNet is a serious proposal to precisely facilitate correspondence mapping from physical infrastructure to numbered logical routes, and it is well suited to do so. The public who are aware of bicycle route planning must also enjoy better disclosure of this topic: its exact data and its exact processes. Otherwise RTC can distinctly be said to remain opaque and obfuscatory in its planning process, frustrating attempts for its public to properly interface with Staff and Committee Members on this issue.

The number of locations where turn indication on a sign is required to fully route a user of BRSP is significant: hundreds of signs or more could be required depending on route introduction phasing. It is complex to consider early and full destination routing on a signed network and cover all cases (without a map, whether routes are numbered or not numbered). The point is that routes have been identified. Now, how smart, accurate and well-placed do you want the signs to be, especially where needed at turns? There is no need to rush this analysis, but it should be carefully done. The Draft Plan does not address this issue, but CycleNet does, with its "Destination Signage Control Points" and "Other Route Intersections" columns: one more method by which the BRSP Draft falls far short of what CycleNet already offers.

Finally, the BRSP Draft makes no mention of the need to distinguish between "Local" and "Neighborhood" routes. There are many valid reasons for a distinction between Regional routes and those which are "more local" or "less improved." But if the only distinction between "Local" and "Neighborhood" is that the infrastructure is "less improved," then that should be clearly stated, and it is not. This Plan could easily conflate "Local" and "Neighborhood" Routes with no apparent loss in significance between the two groupings. Not to mention that LR09 acts much more as a Regional rather than Local route, and that the route numbers chosen in the BRSP Draft seem to be chosen completely at random. In CycleNet, route numbers are carefully chosen: east-west routes are even, north-south routes are odd, significant routes end in either 0 or 5, and there is a geographic significance to each route number, so much so that each route "tells you" about where it is. For example, CycleNet 20 (Delaware Avenue) already "tells you" that you are on a major east-west route on the westside of Santa Cruz. There is no similar help
whatsoever from the haphazard nature of the BRSP route numbers.

The BRSP Draft is rife with errors and omissions. It is recognized as an early Draft of a Plan, though harmonizing its intentions (e.g. a thee tier hierarchy, a de facto or de jure RTC-internal route reference numbering system -- by the way, future phases of which remain undisclosed with this Plan) with other systems having significant overlap like CycleNet is fundamentally required. CycleNet remains harmonious with this the BRSP Plan, even as CycleNet is used here to identify significant errors and omissions within it. Iterative processes must continue to improve this planning via multiple conversations, versions and Drafts: that is the only way a proper process that includes significant and important public input will work. Yet the RTC appears to do everything it can to disengage itself from CycleNet.

If the RTC has special power to declare streets, footpaths and unmapped trail as "newly declared bicycle routes" while simultaneously planning signage and routing (and it appears that is exactly what has happened), then our community and planning are significantly disadvantaged. If CycleNet expands slightly to do the same (which would be only fair) then CycleNet can further simplify what is already complex -- just give it a chance as the useful tool that it is. Fair isn't everyone getting the same thing, fair is everybody getting what is needed to be successful. Fair for CycleNet is transparent access to GIS layers and route planning data. CycleNet remains true to its fidelity to identify existing, designated bicycle infrastructure, succinctly with well chosen numbers. If CycleNet is allowed to expand its scope to declare other streets and paths as legal infrastructure, or better, even ideally, as CycleNet stays tuned with developments of what is or becomes legal bicycle infrastructure, then RTC can perfect this process. However, as this BRSP Draft exists now, it is far from perfect. The RTC must correct its many errors and document or otherwise justify its omissions. For example, publish (whether printed on paper or not) a CBM newer than 2010 and direct public access requests for bicycle infrastructure data and bicycle route planning data to SCC GIS or the GIS of other jurisdictions. This process must be made more open, not remain as opaque as it is today. Comprehensive would be a full disclosure of physical bicycle infrastructure data (and how they get "included") interfacing with the process of planning logical bicycle routes (and how they get "included"). While that is ambitious, it appears to be required for the longer term. And CycleNet even goes a good distance towards being a suitable methodology to discuss and facilitate this process, having largely achieved the goal of well-identifying 100% of County bicycle infrastructure.

Perhaps it is as simple as making more transparent our GIS data, as well as better including public input during our planning process (exactly what this is). But at least much that is required for the harmony that bicycle route planning must include in Santa Cruz County, if not more so. Not the behind-the-scenes, rife with errors, published mere days before being presented to the public and this Committee for rubber-stamped unanimous passage and sloppy results that this BRSP Draft represents. We must do better, and that starts with corrections to this Plan's errors and full public access to GIS data of accurate bicycle infrastructure and routes (whether actual or proposed). Also required is much more sunshine into the process of determination and selection of these routes. What this plan represents does not represent what the People of Santa Cruz County and our Planning Documents have repeatedly said we want to see as specific Goals for many years: among them, a sensible bicycle route network. CycleNet is much closer to meeting our County's Goals of identifying, planning for, discussing and developing our bicycle infrastructure (whether for routing purposes, planning purposes or both) than is the very rough sketch we see with the BRSP Plan. Yet the conversation seems one-way, "our way or the highway," even as CycleNet appears to be tossed into the dustbin of "not invented here" (within RTC). Yet, CycleNet WAS invented here: right here in Santa Cruz! Now, better represent your Electorate which has already rolled up its sleeves and done this
work and improve public input and interaction with regard to planning bicycle routes. Especially compared to this (generously considered) "Draft" of a BRSP.

Even as CycleNet improves (via revision 1.5 later in 2015) to better accommodate this Draft Plan's gleaned intentions, don't let such efforts stop yours on a required next BRSP Draft. I look forward to corrections and distinct improvements in results and process. This might include a direct invitation (by you, with me) to harmonize CycleNet with this Plan, perhaps with a Working Group or subcommittee. I await your reply to these important issues.

Respectfully,

Stephen All
Citizen of the state of California and Member of the Electorate
Author, CycleNet (Santa Cruz County's de facto bicycle infrastructure numbering protocol)
Speaker, OpenStreetMap Project (State Of The Map-US, Washington, DC, April 2014) on numbered bicycle routing
Honorary Member, Adventure Cycling Association (after publicly mapping the entire United States Bicycle Route System, both actual and proposed)
Alumnus, UC Santa Cruz (Stevenson College, Class of '87, Computer & Information Sciences, Linguistics)
Principal, Softworker (local software contracting services company, since 1983)
Santa Cruz (1981-2015)
AGENDA: May 7, 2015

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner

RE: Fiscal Year 2015-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims for Volunteer Center, Community Bridges and Santa Cruz Metro

RECOMMENDATION

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission:

1. Adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the fiscal year (FY) 2015-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 funds claim (Attachment 2) in the amount of $626,561 from Community Bridges to provide transportation for seniors and people with disabilities, contingent on approval from the City of Santa Cruz to act as the claimant; and,

2. Adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 3) approving the FY 2015-16 TDA Article 8 funds claim (Attachment 4) in the amount of $74,591 from the Volunteer Center to administer the volunteer driver transportation program primarily serving seniors, contingent on approval from the City of Santa Cruz to acts as the claimant.

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission:

3. Adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 5) approving the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4 and State Transit Assistance (STA) claims (Attachment 6) from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District in the amounts of $6,377,491 and $2,832,152 respectively.

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) allocates Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds from the region’s ¼ cent share of the state’s 7.5 cent sales tax according to state law and established formulas in the Commission’s Rules and Regulations. At the RTC’s March meeting, the FY 2015-16 budget was approved including Transportation Development Act (TDA) apportionments for Community Bridges, the Volunteer Center and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District. The City of Santa Cruz, as a local jurisdiction, has agreed to act as the claimant for both Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center, as it has historically. The City of Santa Cruz is scheduled to take action approving a resolution to act as claimant at the May 21, 2015 City of Santa Cruz City Council meeting.
DISCUSSION

At its April 14, 2015 meeting, the RTC’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) reviewed the Community Bridges, Volunteer Center and Santa Cruz Metro FY 2015-16 TDA claims, budgets, and operating plans.

Community Bridges
Community Bridges serves low income and disabled individuals, many of whom are unable to use traditional public transit or complementary paratransit. In FY 2015-2016, TDA funds are projected to provide 36,250 out of a total of 82,000 rides to be provided by Community Bridges in the form of TDA Medical Rides (5,779), Taxi Scrip (2,400 rides), Meals on Wheels (8,625 rides), Elderday (12,000 rides), and the Winter Shelter Program (7,446) (Attachment 2). Community Bridges grant funded same day medical ride and out-of-county/veteran medical rides program expires April 2015. New grant funds for the same day medical ride and out-of-county/veteran medical rides program are expected to be available beginning in January 2016. Community Bridges expects an increase in TDA Medical Rides while the same day medical ride and out-of-county/veteran medical rides program is temporarily suspended, July to December 2015. Continuous funding for same day medical ride and out-of-county/veteran medical rides is identified by the E&D TAC as an unmet paratransit need.

The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the FY 2015-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 funds claim (Attachment 2) in the amount of $626,561 from Community Bridges to provide transportation for seniors and people with disabilities, contingent on approval from the City of Santa Cruz to act as the claimant. Community Bridges staff will be available at the meeting to answer questions about their TDA claim.

Volunteer Center
The Volunteer Center Transportation Program provides transportation for seniors and disabled individuals free of charge to medical appointments, grocery shopping and other necessary activities. In FY15-16, the Volunteer Center’s Transportation Program will use TDA funds to provide 4,600 one-way trips to eligible clients (Attachment 4). The Volunteer Center prioritizes trips based on type and income. Because this program uses volunteer drivers, it is a highly cost effective method of providing rides to many in the county who are ineligible for ParaCruz services.

The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 3) approving the FY 2015-16 TDA Article 8 funds claim (Attachment 4) in the amount of $74,591 from Volunteer Center to administer the volunteer driver transportation program primarily serving seniors, contingent on approval from the City of Santa Cruz to act as the claimant. Volunteer Center staff will be available at the meeting to answer questions about their TDA claim.
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
The Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District operates and maintains the countywide bus system. Fixed-route public transit operations serve 34 routes throughout Santa Cruz County and the Highway 17 Express. ParaCruz, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District’s complementary paratransit service, operates 42 accessible vans in demand response service for persons who, due to disability, cannot access the fixed-route system. In FY 15-16, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District will use the TDA funds to assist with operating the fixed route bus services and the American’s with Disabilities Act-mandated paratransit service, ParaCruz, to provide transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities. Metro projects to provide 90,000 ParaCruz rides and 5,411,083 bus rides in FY 2015-16 (Attachment 6). The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee considered the TDA claim and recommends approval.

Staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 5) approving the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4 and State Transit Assistance (STA) claims (Attachment 6) from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District in the amounts of $6,377,491 and $2,832,152 respectively.

SUMMARY

Annually Community Bridges, the Volunteer Center and Santa Cruz Metro submit claims for the expenditure of Transportation Development Act funds. TDA funds are allocated to the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of Community Bridges and Volunteer Center to provide specialized transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities per state mandates. Santa Cruz Metro also submits a claim for the expenditure of State Transit Assistance funds. The annual FY 2015-16 TDA claims and STA allocation are consistent with state requirements and the RTC’s rules and regulations, and were reviewed by the RTC’s E&D TAC.

Attachments:
1. Resolution authorizing FY 2015-16 TDA Funds for the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of Community Bridges
2. Community Bridges TDA Claim and operations budget pages
3. Resolution authorizing FY 2015-16 TDA Funds for the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of Volunteer Center
4. Volunteer Center TDA Claim and operating budget pages
5. Resolution authorizing FY 2015-16 TDA and STA funds for Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
6. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District TDA and STA Claim and operating budget pages
RESOLUTION NO.
Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of May 7, 2015
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PROPOSED FY 2015-16 ARTICLE 8 CLAIM FROM
THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ ON BEHALF OF COMMUNITY BRIDGES

WHEREAS the Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 provides that the applicant may
file an Article 8 claim for monies from the Local Transportation Fund; and

WHEREAS the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has identified a process for TDA
claims in their Rules and Regulations; and

WHEREAS the Regional Transportation Commission, in adopting its FY 2015-16 TDA budget,
has apportioned $626,561 to be used by Community Bridges for providing specialized transportation; and

WHEREAS the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, reviewed claim details at
its April 14, 2015 meeting, and recommended that the Regional Transportation Commission approve
this claim; and

WHEREAS the City of Santa Cruz is eligible to claim Article 8 funds and is scheduled to approve
their role as claimant for Community Bridges on May 21, 2015;

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

1. The claim submitted in the amount of $626,561 fulfills the requirements as specified in the
Transportation Development Act and the Rules and Regulation of the RTC and is consistent
with the Regional Transportation Plan, as follows:

   a. The claim includes a proposed budget for the 2015-16 fiscal year;

   b. The claim includes a statement of projected or estimated revenues and expenditures for the
      prior fiscal year;

   c. The claim will fund specialized transportation services and respond to transportation needs
      not otherwise being met within the community; and

   d. The proposed expenditure of the funds is consistent with the most current Regional
      Transportation Plan.
2. The City of Santa Cruz will act as a claimant on behalf of the Community Bridges, for Article 8 claims for specialized transportation programs and the FY 2015-16 claim is hereby approved in the amount of $626,561 consisting of quarterly payments as follows:
   - July 15, 2015  $219,296
   - October 15, 2015 $135,755
   - January 15, 2016 $135,755
   - April 15, 2016 $135,755

3. The Executive Director is authorized to modify the payment amounts should the RTC amend the FY 2015-16 Transportation Development Act apportionments in the RTC’s FY 2015-16 budget.

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

-------------
John Leopold, Chair

ATTEST:

-------------
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution:  City of Santa Cruz
               Community Bridges
               Transportation-Fiscal
               Staff TDA File
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Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds

CLAIM FORM

Submit a separate form for each project.

This form has been developed in an effort to standardize information required from TDA recipients, based on TDA Statute, RTC Rules and Regulations, and/or RTC board requests.

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

Project Information

1. Project Title: Lift Line / CTSA Specialized Paratransit Service for Santa Cruz County

2. Implementing Agency: Community Bridges

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant:
   The City of Santa Cruz acts as the eligible TDA claimant for Lift Line. Lift Line receives the TDA funds through a contract with the City of Santa Cruz.

4. Funding requested this claim: TDA $ 626,561
   STA (transit only) $_______________

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 15 / 16

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims:
   - [ ] Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility
   - [ ] Article 4 Public Transportation
   - [x] Article 8 Specialized Transportation
   - [ ] Article 3 & 8 TDA Admin or Planning

7. Contact Person/Project Manager
   Name: Kirk Ance
   Telephone Number: 831-688-8840 ext. 238 E-mail: kirka@cbridges.org

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Raymon Cancino
   Telephone Number: 831-688-8840 ext. 201 E-mail: raymonc@cbridges.org

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks. Please see Exhibit C-1 and C-2 attached.

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

   The TDA funding for CTSA is to coordinate and provide social service transportation services with existing fixed-route service of public and private transportation providers for low-income elderly and disabled Santa Cruz County residents according to the requirements of the Social Services Transportation Improvement Act.

10. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community)
Community Bridges has been the designated Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) since 1982. CTSAs are authorized under California Government Code Sections 15975 and 15950-15952 which were enacted pursuant to the Social Service Transportation Improvement Act. The purpose of the CTSA is to improve transportation required by social service recipients by promoting the consolidation and coordinating of social service transportation.

As the Consolidated Transportation Service Agency, Lift Line coordinates transportation services with other transportation providers and human service agencies in order to provide the most efficient transportation possible. Some of them are the Human Services Department of the County of Santa Cruz, County Office of Education, Veterans Service Offices in Santa Cruz and Palo Alto, and other hospitals and medical facilities.

Lift Line also works closely with several other non-profit organizations and other counties to continue to identify unmet needs and define effective responses to meet those needs to help mobilize Santa Cruz County residents with various disabilities, low income and senior populations to travel easily throughout our county. Lift Line also maintains a vital lifeline for eligible participants to access healthcare providers throughout the region, including destinations in Monterey County and the San Francisco Bay Area. This is consistent with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) Coordinated Public Transit Plan.

The benefits to having CTSA coordination is to improve and identify the need for specialized transportation equipment, if the equipment is funded through Caltrans 5310 and isn’t reaching its proposed requirements, as the CTSA, the equipment can be coordinated for use through other identified paratransit services.

Pursuant to the CTSA designation for Santa Cruz County, Community Bridges operates the Lift Line transportation program, which works in identifying unmet transportation needs, coordinates and provides social service transportation services to low-income seniors, disabled residents, underserved populations and other persons in Santa Cruz County. Lift Line directly addresses the issues identified through the unmet needs process by providing rides to medical appointments (including dialysis), alternative care, mental health and various therapy appointments.

11. Project Productivity Goals for this fiscal year:
   a. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program (ex. increase use of facility/service, decrease collisions, etc.):

   The majority of our dispatching/scheduling is automated with Mobile Data Computers (MDC) and Automatic Vehicle Locaters (AVL) that integrate with Trapeze, making it easy to make changes if needed and track rides as they occur. As rides are completed, the MDCs tag completed rides with real pickup and drop-off times and highlights these times in blue, making it easier for our dispatchers to monitor all rides. Likewise, uncompleted or unassigned rides (such as will-call returns) are highlighted in red to inform the dispatcher of the priority of pending trips. The addition of the AVLs in the fleet allows Lift Line to monitor and track vehicles at any moment. These systems allow Lift Line to provide accurate monthly encounter data to satisfy data requirements. We will continue to provide our quarterly TDA reports, with the RTC reporting requirements, which are generated directly from the actual rides performed and documented through these systems. Lift Line Dispatch System still has some components that are manual, for back up in case of power loss or technical problems that occasionally occur, when connections through the system can not be made. Since we can not determine in advance when a power or technical problem should arise, we give all drivers a paper manifest to work from daily so as to not lose any information. Daily drivers fill out paper work to let us know if they have any incidents, accidents or mechanical failures. In order to track turndowns and referrals anyone answering the phones keep track daily on a specified phone log.
Performance Measures to be included in Quarterly Reports

1. Unduplicated passengers per month
2. Total passenger trips (units of service) per month
3. Incidents per month
4. Accidents per month
5. Mechanical failures* (including lift failure) per month
6. No-shows per month
7. Turndowns or referrals per month
8. Cancels per month
9. Donations per month
10. Total operating cost per passenger
11. Total operating cost per vehicle service hour
12. Total passengers per vehicle service hour
13. Total passengers per vehicle service mile
14. Fare box recovery level
15. Van mileage per program
16. % of Rides performed by subcontractors
17. % of shared trips/ Average vehicle occupancy
18. % of cancellations of total rides

*Mechanical failure means any problem which results in a delay of one hour or longer, or cancellation of service.

b. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program (ex. number of new or maintained bike miles; number of people served/rides provided):

Lift Line’s is projecting to provide service to over 700 Santa Cruz County residents who will need specialized wheel-chair accessible vans. We are projecting to provide and coordinate over 82,000 rides in the 2015/2016 fiscal year. Please see Exhibit C-1 and C-2 Operating Plan for details. Lift Line will continue to provide responsive, non-emergency health and medical paratransportation for seniors and disabled residents of Santa Cruz County, all of which are low-income. Trips are provided to health and medical destinations such as hospitals, medical centers and clinics, doctors’ offices, pharmacies, dialysis centers, human services, and various mental health and physical therapy appointments. In partnership with Central Coast Alliance for Health, rides to medical destinations will be provided for qualified members. Lift Line continues to work closely with Watsonville Dialysis and Santa Cruz Satellite Dialysis to provide flexible services for its clients who are unable to use transit or METRO ParaCruz services.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Is program/project listed in the RTP and/or consistent with a specific RTP Goal/Policy?

The Lift Line programs are consistent with 2014 RTP goals 1 and 3 and advance:
- Target #3c of the 2014 RTP: Reduce travel times and increase travel options for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to income, age, race, disability or limited English proficiency by increasing the percentage that are within a 30-minute walk, bike or transit trip to key destinations (Lift Line included as transit in this instance) and Target #3d: Ensure transportation services (and impacts) are equitably distributed to all segments of the population.

The Lift Line program also support the following RTP policies:
- Improve multimodal access to and within key destinations.
- Ensure network connectivity by closing gaps in the bicycle, pedestrian and transit networks.
- Support projects that provide access to emergency services.
13. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):

Lift Line is a complementary service to the ADA-mandated METRO ParaCruz service. In addition, Lift Line provides a flexible specialized transportation service for ongoing identified unmet immediate service needs. Due to the diverse nature of our services, Lift Line is able to group riders in various service categories, which ultimately reduces the number of vehicles needed to perform rides and in turn cuts down on traffic and emissions. Lift Line continues to optimize our service by scheduling rides in the most efficient manner and ultimately reducing the duplication of rides by grouping ride types for long distance, cross county rides.

Furthermore, Lift Line provides residents with specialized transportation needs who do not qualify for ParaCruz rides because they live outside the service area (more than ¾ mile from fixed transit route), don’t have family or friends to assist them, their mobility device is too large, and/or they may need same day service. For people who are low-income or who face health/physical challenges, these services are paramount.

Lift Line anticipates providing more rides this year with fewer funds as a result of two contributing factors, reductions in fuel cost and increased efficiencies.

- We project doing more units of service with fewer funds for Meals on Wheels mostly due to efficient consolidation of rides.
- We project doing more units of service with fewer funds for Elderday. This is a result of eliminating our subcontractor Medical Appointments Made Easy (MAME) and doing a double run with one of our Elderday busses making it more efficient and reduces the cost.

Lift Line was also awarded Section 5317 grant for funds in 2014-2015 to support same day medical transportation service, as identified in the AMBAG unmet needs plan. This new service was implemented in 2013 and we have been awarded 5317 funds to continue the project through April 30, 2015.

14. Estimated Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (attach project budget).

Specialized Transportation Claims require 10% local match. Local match can take the form of fares, donations, agency charges, grants, revenue sharing and other non-restricted sources. In kind services many NOT apply toward the local match.

What is the total project cost? Total CTSA Transportation Budget = $1,469,645 (TDA only = $626,561)

Is project fully funded? YES

What will TDA (and STA) funds be used on (ex. administration, brochures, engineering, construction)? These funds will be used for administration, all cost related to provision of paratransit rides.

This is clearly identified in our Operating Plan Exhibit C-2. Please see TDA Operating Plan, Exhibit C-2.

15. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution (see RTC Rules and Regulations for details):

CTSA: ☑ Quarterly disbursement, with up to 35% in first quarter, and the remaining quarterly payments being one-third of the remaining claim amount;
  OR ☐ Quarterly disbursement
16. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Form of approval</th>
<th>YES/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges Board Resolution. (eg resolution, work program, budget, other document)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "NO," provide the approximate date approval is anticipated. _________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: ________________________________ | N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Bike, Ped, and Specialized Transportation Claims: Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval). April 2015 E&amp;D TAC meeting</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| E. For "bikeways," does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: http://www.dot.ca.gov). | N/A |

SCMTD, CTSA, Bike to Work, CTSC Only – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF

17. Improving Program Efficiency/Productivity

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.

Lift Line routes are continually assessed and re-structured to increase productivity, and we have succeeded in lowering some costs by grouping rides so that vehicles and staff time are serving at capacity as much as possible. Our overall cost per service unit has remained steady the past two years, even as individual costs and demands for service have fluctuated. In the case of taxi subcontractors, we have paid special attention to maximizing the benefit of working with these outside partners only when we have reached our internal existing capacity and there is a cost benefit to calling in a taxi ride. We also continue to work with physicians and participants to group rides for maximum efficiency. Our experienced drivers and dispatch staff, and the use of computerized scheduling equipment, continue to serve as valuable assets toward achieving these goals.

This year, we are paying special attention to Elderday transportation costs, and we have initiated quarterly collaboration meetings between these two programs to improve the quality and efficiency of this service area.

Community Bridges Lift Line continues to seek to open UTU negotiations to address ways to lower the economical issues impacting the operations of the budget. We also continue to work on reducing our workers compensation costs and exposures in order to reduce our premiums. Lift Line also maintained optimum fleet size for the services provided, and we continually seek to update our vehicles and equipment through grants.

The County Heath Services Department’s programs such as In Home Health Services, as well as local medical facilities and the Senior Network Services, are assisting their clients to help fill out the TDA Medical Transportation Application and fax them with the required supporting documents to our office daily. We also work closely with the Central Coast Alliance to coordinate Medi-Cal eligible participants with medical rides.

Lift Line has participated in several outreach forums in the community that are addressing the transportation needs of the local senior and disabled population, including veterans, as well as conducted presentations to local service organizations and senior living facilities. Lift Line annually participates in local business and health fairs to increase community awareness about local transportation service.

Lift Line staff has also participated in numerous planning meetings and networking events to identify and expand services for area veterans. These efforts include attendance at county VetNet meetings and events, as well as participation in the Veterans Advisory Council. In recent years, Lift Line not only succeeded in
securing new funding to sustain and expand our previously volunteer-supported Out-of-County transportation services, connecting Santa Cruz County veterans with VA facilities in Monterey and Santa Clara Counties, but we also continued to provide and promote our in-county veterans transportation services at three weekly pickup and drop off locations, including the veterans’ centers in Capitola and Santa Cruz, as well as the Homeless Service Center, with the final destination being the County Veterans Services office.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale, planned productivity improvements). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:

  Lift Line will continue to assess the costs and demands for our services on an ongoing regular basis, and structure our routes and staffing to be as responsive and efficient as possible. Lift Line staff will continue to participate in outreach efforts to identify emerging needs in the community, and we will coordinate with service providers to meet the transportation needs of low-income elderly and disabled residents, including our area veterans. This year, we expect to make diligent progress toward working with Elderday efficiencies to ensure optimum programming and use of our limited funds.

18. What is different from last year’s program/claim?

Community Bridges Lift Line/CTSA is requesting TDA funds to assist with the same types of rides as last year, with the exception of funding for same-day medical rides. We are requesting funding for: Medical TDA Rides, Meals on Wheels, Elderday, Taxi Scrip, and the Winter Shelter programs.

This year we are expecting to maintain transportation service for Elderday, and work on further program efficiencies to allow us to keep the program available to hundreds of dementia patients and their caregivers. Community Bridges is in the process of leading a major outreach effort to help raise awareness for the costs, challenges and risks associated with dementia in the community, while highlighting the effectiveness of the social, medical and therapeutic interventions Elderday has to offer.

Lift Line is also expecting to meet our prior year projections for service to the Homeless Service Center’s Winter Emergency Shelter Program, where currently 30% of the clients transported are disabled, and 7% are seniors 60 or over. Many participants are also veterans, and at least one or two wheelchair-using participants are being transported both ways every day. Lift Line requests funds to offset the expenses incurred during winter months when additional shelter is provided at the National Guard Armory to provide adequate funding for this need.

19. Schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation at the end of the year:

  ✓ CTSA: Specialized Transportation: Quarterly to E/D TAC, RTC: Nov 2015, Jan 2016, Apr 2016, Jul 2016 and year end report 15/16

CTSA and Volunteer Center (Article 8) Only

20. Are these transportation services responding to transportation needs not otherwise being met within the community or jurisdiction of the claimant? Describe.

Yes. For our target population we provide transportation that is otherwise not available. Lift Line paratransit services are provided to seniors and people with disabilities who can’t drive, are not able or eligible to use METRO or METRO ParaCruz services (do not have the financial resources, have origins/destinations out side the service area, need same-day service, or have wheelchairs that do not meet the size criteria). We anticipate an increase in demand for Lift Line services proportionate to proposed increases in ParaCruz fees. Also, the out of county Medical ride services are used for residents who have no other resources, particularly due to financial restraints, to get to critical care treatment. The veterans we are currently providing paratransit
services for are funded through the FTA Section 5317 New Freedom (NF) Grants Program. This grant has been awarded through April 2015, and we very proud to be able to maintain this service for as long as possible, as demand for service for this specific population has continued to grow. Even though the 5317 funds for this service potentially could come to an end, Lift Line/CTSA will continue to seek other funding sources to support this service, which will now become an unmet need in the coordinated plan.

21. Where appropriate, are these specialized transportation services coordinated with other transportation services? Describe.

Lift Line, as the CTSA, acts as the safety net transportation service for low-income seniors and disabled individuals unable to secure mobility through other programs. In addition, Lift Line coordinates and refers people daily to other services more suited to their specialized transportation requirements such as: METRO bus or METRO ParaCruz; local taxi services through the taxi scrip program; the Volunteer Center; Veterans Services and our in house “Out of County” Medical ride service. Lift Line continues coordinates with the Central Coast Alliance for Health in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties to get Medi-Cal patients to essential medical appointments who cannot transfer from their mobility device to a bus seat or are too large to use local METRO ParaCruz ADA guidelines services. We work closely with Watsonville Dialysis and Santa Cruz Satellite Dialysis to provide flexible service for the clients. We help identify an individual’s specific need for specialized transportation service and coordinate not only services in our County, but also for rides to neighboring counties of San Benito, Monterey and Santa Clara. In addition, Lift Line assists those who call from other parts of California, as well as from out of the state, looking for other public and specialized transportation. Lift Line’s staff will continue to participate with local and statewide transportation groups to develop coordinated processes and keep current on transportation systems for seniors and disabled residents.

22. Provide performance information, as pertinent, such as: verification of the operating cost per passenger, operating cost per vehicle service hour, passengers per vehicle service hour, passengers per vehicle service mile, and vehicle service hours per employee for last fiscal year (definitions available in Section 99247 of TDA Guidelines). *(99246) (99246d, per 2010 Performance Audit)*

All TDA reports, quarterly and annual are sent directly to the RTPA within the scheduled time schedules. These reports are included in the above listed performance measures.

23. Discuss the needs and types of the passengers being served and the employment of part-time drivers and the contracting with common carriers of persons operating under a franchise or license to provide services during peak hours, as defined in subdivision (a) of Section 99260.2. *(99246d, per 2010 Performance Audit)*

There are times during the day when it is more cost effective or necessary to use taxi to provide some of the TDA Medical rides, especially when they are short rides and more on an individual need basis, while Lift Line buses provided more of the grouped rides. Lift Line has five on call drivers to assist with paratransit services as needed.

24. **SCMTD, CTSC, Volunteer Center & RTC Only** List the recommendations provided in the last TDA Triennial Performance Audit and your progress toward meeting them.

- Describe the work your agency has undertaken to implement each performance audit recommendation and the steps it will take to fully implement the recommendation.
- For any recommendations that have not been implemented, explain why the recommendation has not been implemented and describe the work your agency will undertake to implement each performance audit recommendation.
- Describe any problems encountered in implementing individual recommendations.
TDA Triennial Performance Audit Recommendations:

1) Community Bridges should work with its annual fiscal and compliance auditor to evaluate the transportation related measures required under the TDA, including annual operating costs and revenues.

Community Bridges' auditor has noted the amount of TDA revenues and expenses in our Audited Financials beginning with the audit of Fiscal Year 2013-14.

2) Develop expanded performance standards for CTSA service efficiency and effectiveness including:
   - On-time Performance;
   - Complaints per 1,000 Passenger Trips;
   - Safety Incidents per 100,000 Vehicle Miles;
   - Return on investment as a measure of effectiveness of meeting community transportation needs.

Lift Line has begun implementing methods to collect, track and report the suggested additional performance measures to include in the 4th quarter TDA Report for FY 2014-15.

Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

All Claims

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

☒ Statement from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims

☐ Evidence of environmental review for capital projects

All Transit and Specialized Transportation Claims (SCMTD, CTSA, and Volunteer Center)

☒ A copy of the operating and capital budgets for the coming fiscal year

☐ Description of capital projects, including time frame over which project will be funded and implemented

☒ Operating Plan for current and upcoming activities – can be within project description

Article 4 Transit Claims

☒ A certification from the California Highway Patrol (completed within the last 13 months) indicating that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code.

☐ Other Certifications

☒ Written report of current and upcoming activities. (per RTC Rules and Regulations)

Local Agency Certification:

This TDA Claim has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC’s Budget, SCCRTC’s Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html). I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature: [Signature]
Title: CEO
Date: 4/10/15
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Community Bridges Lift Line is designated as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) of Santa Cruz County. Community Bridges has operated transportation under this designation since 1982.

Lift Line provides and coordinates the most accessible, reliable and safe transportation possible. Lift Line provided over 80,000 rides in the past year to frail, elderly, and disabled county residents at no cost to the passengers “client”. Lift Line operates daily Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. 250 days a year; we extend our hours for Santa Cruz County emergencies, special occasion and/or special requests. Lift Line also coordinates and schedules taxi rides that are provided outside of business hours.

With a current fleet of 18 vehicles, Lift Line provides a variety of services to assist seniors and people with disabilities in getting to where they need to go.

Current Services Offered Include:

Medi-Cal: In partnership with the Central Coast Alliance for Health, rides to medical destinations are fully covered for qualified members who have been determined to need above ADA METRO Para Cruz services.

TDA Medical Transportation: Transportation Development Act funds are used to provide medical rides (two round-trips per week) to those persons qualified as low-income who are disabled or elderly.

Senior Dining Centers: Lift Line provides transportation to four senior dining centers throughout the County five days per week.

Taxi Scrip: Taxi Scrip is available for persons who are disabled and/or age 60 and over. Depending on income $30 of Scrip can be purchased for $16 or $30 worth of Scrip for $8 (limited amounts of Scrip available).

Elderday Adult Day Health Care Transportation: Transportation is provided to the Elderday program that provides outpatient day health care to seniors and community residents who need constant care, and/or are diagnosed with dementia or Alzheimer’s type of dementia.

Outside Contracts: Lift Line is available for community events for groups needing specialized transportation accessible for the elderly and disabled.

Non-Emergency Medical Transportation: Is available within Santa Cruz County for private pay.
Services to be discontinued as of April 15, 2015:

If continued funding cannot be secured, the following services are being discontinued in FY 2015-16. Note that Community Bridges has applied for Section 5310 funding to continue these services in January 2016. If awarded, Lift Line will reinstate these services at reduced levels of about 25% of previous service levels given the available funding.

**Out of County Medical rides:** Lift Line provides door-to-door specialized transportation to low income residents who have no other way to get to medical facilities for appointments that are in Santa Clara, San Mateo, and San Francisco Counties.

**Veterans' Transportation:** Lift Line coordinates and provides transportation for local veterans to out of county VA outpatient medical facilities in Monterey and Palo Alto.

**Same Day Medical Transportation:** First come, first serve same day rides for eligible riders to medical appointments including dentist, prescription drugs, and other medical related needs.

**Upcoming Challenges**

Community Bridges lease for the Lift Line Maintenance Facility and Fleet parking located at 240 Ford St. in Watsonville will expire October 15, 2015. While we plan to secure a new lease at this same location, finding a permanent location and funding to build or purchase a Lift Line Maintenance/Operations Facility has been identified as an unmet paratransit need by the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and is part of the overall Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs List.
## TDA 2015-16 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES &amp; WAGES</td>
<td>227,986</td>
<td>323,785</td>
<td>551,770</td>
<td>228,385</td>
<td>410,841</td>
<td>639,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE BENEFITS: UNEMPLOYMENT</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>3,238</td>
<td>5,518</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>5,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS COMP</td>
<td>29,205</td>
<td>41,498</td>
<td>70,703</td>
<td>28,662</td>
<td>46,647</td>
<td>75,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH INSUR.</td>
<td>54,648</td>
<td>77,602</td>
<td>132,250</td>
<td>59,951</td>
<td>78,786</td>
<td>138,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA</td>
<td>17,441</td>
<td>24,769</td>
<td>42,210</td>
<td>17,471</td>
<td>26,293</td>
<td>43,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401K PLAN</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>3,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS:</td>
<td>332,699</td>
<td>472,506</td>
<td>805,205</td>
<td>338,124</td>
<td>567,329</td>
<td>905,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES &amp; SUPPLIES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE OPERATIONS-GAS</td>
<td>53,059</td>
<td>51,449</td>
<td>104,508</td>
<td>51,765</td>
<td>53,305</td>
<td>105,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE LICENSES</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>2,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>10,784</td>
<td>10,996</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>10,521</td>
<td>12,228</td>
<td>22,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE INSURANCE</td>
<td>31,176</td>
<td>55,177</td>
<td>86,353</td>
<td>30,416</td>
<td>50,583</td>
<td>80,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS-RADIO</td>
<td>9,160</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>11,492</td>
<td>8,936</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>11,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL VEH. OPERATING COSTS:</td>
<td>105,225</td>
<td>121,274</td>
<td>226,499</td>
<td>102,658</td>
<td>119,680</td>
<td>222,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER OPERATING &amp; ADMINISTRATION COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>5,009</td>
<td>5,951</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>5,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANITORIAL SERVICES/SUPPLIES</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>2,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDRAISING COMM RELATIONS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICITY/MEDIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EVENTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF TRAVEL</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT MAINT &amp; REPAIR-TRAPEZE</td>
<td>26,827</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,827</td>
<td>25,908</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>26,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM SUPPLIES</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE MAINT SUPPLIES</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SUPPLIES/RELATED</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE RENTAL</td>
<td>15,865</td>
<td>34,129</td>
<td>49,994</td>
<td>15,478</td>
<td>33,201</td>
<td>48,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>5,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2,729</td>
<td>2,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>4,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS FEES</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF TRAINING</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE-GEN'L LIABILITY &amp; FIDELITY</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>2,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERSHIPS/SUBSCRIPTIONS</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING &amp; COPYING</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>1,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDIZED TAXI - ELDERRDAY RIDES</td>
<td>8,777</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,777</td>
<td>7,523</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDIZED TAXI - MOW RIDES</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDIZED TAXI - LL RIDES</td>
<td>7,532</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,532</td>
<td>4,618</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDIZED TAXI - SCRIP</td>
<td>24,876</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,876</td>
<td>26,353</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSP SERVICE EXPENSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,846</td>
<td>13,846</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,871</td>
<td>16,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSF TO EQUIP RESERVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSF FROM EQUIP RESERVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR EQUIPMENT 5310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131,973</td>
<td>131,973</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR EQUIPMENT-NON 5310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY OVERHEAD</td>
<td>90,851</td>
<td>50,694</td>
<td>141,545</td>
<td>90,853</td>
<td>36,743</td>
<td>127,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ADMINISTRATION COSTS:</td>
<td>188,637</td>
<td>249,304</td>
<td>437,941</td>
<td>185,790</td>
<td>122,310</td>
<td>308,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>626,561</td>
<td>843,084</td>
<td>1,469,645</td>
<td>626,572</td>
<td>809,319</td>
<td>1,435,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>626,561</td>
<td>843,084</td>
<td>1,469,645</td>
<td>626,572</td>
<td>809,319</td>
<td>1,435,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET GAIN (LOSS)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>626,561</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>626,561</td>
<td>626,572</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>626,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>15,559</td>
<td>15,559</td>
<td>15,150</td>
<td>15,150</td>
<td>15,150</td>
<td>15,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CAPITOLA</td>
<td>46,948</td>
<td>46,948</td>
<td>45,714</td>
<td>45,714</td>
<td>45,714</td>
<td>45,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>2,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF WATSONVILLE</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>9,264</td>
<td>9,264</td>
<td>9,020</td>
<td>9,020</td>
<td>9,020</td>
<td>9,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA AGENCY ON AGING-TITLE IIIB</td>
<td>39,281</td>
<td>39,281</td>
<td>39,281</td>
<td>39,281</td>
<td>39,281</td>
<td>39,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA SECTION 5310-TRADITIONAL</td>
<td>131,978</td>
<td>131,978</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA SECTION 5310-EXPANDED</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA SECTION 5317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138,241</td>
<td>138,241</td>
<td>138,241</td>
<td>138,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEREY PENIN FDN</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI-CAL (CCAH)</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>2,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACTS</td>
<td>34,005</td>
<td>34,005</td>
<td>19,005</td>
<td>19,005</td>
<td>19,005</td>
<td>19,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIP - CLIENT TAXI PMTS</td>
<td>7,878</td>
<td>7,878</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>7,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIP - MSSP</td>
<td>22,638</td>
<td>22,638</td>
<td>24,269</td>
<td>24,269</td>
<td>24,269</td>
<td>24,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOW INTER-PROGRAM CHARGES</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDERDAY INTER-PROGRAM CHARGES</td>
<td>313,146</td>
<td>313,146</td>
<td>335,880</td>
<td>335,880</td>
<td>335,880</td>
<td>335,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDRAISING</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATIONS</td>
<td>18,110</td>
<td>18,110</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM INCOME - OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE INTER-PROGRAM</td>
<td>4,823</td>
<td>4,823</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>5,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE SALES</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>626,561</td>
<td>843,084</td>
<td>1,469,645</td>
<td>626,572</td>
<td>809,319</td>
<td>1,435,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Operating Fund Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY 13-14</th>
<th>FY 14-15</th>
<th>FY 15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>599,743</td>
<td>626,572</td>
<td>626,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,150</td>
<td>15,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CAPITOLA</td>
<td>44,730</td>
<td>45,714</td>
<td>46,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>3,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF WATSONVILLE</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>8,826</td>
<td>9,020</td>
<td>9,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA AGENCY ON AGING-TITLE IIB</td>
<td>39,313</td>
<td>39,281</td>
<td>39,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA SECTION 5310-EXPANDED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA SECTION 5317</td>
<td>334,397</td>
<td>138,241</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEREY PENIN FDN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI-CAL (CCAH)</td>
<td>6,373</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>2,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACTS</td>
<td>12,399</td>
<td>19,005</td>
<td>34,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACT - ISSP</td>
<td>46,954</td>
<td>50,237</td>
<td>50,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXI SCRIP SALES</td>
<td>7,095</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>7,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSP SCRIP</td>
<td>21,667</td>
<td>24,269</td>
<td>22,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOW INTERPROGRAM CHGS.</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDERDAY INTERPROGRAM CHGS.</td>
<td>273,569</td>
<td>335,880</td>
<td>313,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDRAISING</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATIONS</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>18,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE INTERPROGRAM</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>4,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE SALES</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC INCOME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Revenues</strong></td>
<td>1,466,504</td>
<td>1,428,291</td>
<td>1,337,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 5310 - PASS THRU</strong></td>
<td>481,000</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>131,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>1,947,504</td>
<td>1,435,891</td>
<td>1,469,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXHIBIT B

CTSA FIVE YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 14/15
FISCAL YEARS: 14/15 THROUGH 18/19

### CAPITAL REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>$167</td>
<td>$168</td>
<td>$169</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition to Fund</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Interest</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$168</td>
<td>$132,169</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$425,171</td>
<td>$290,172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year-End Balance | $168 | $169 | $170 | $171 | $172 |

Notes:

1. As capital grants are indefinite, and as capital equipment arrival dates vary, projected figures may require adjustment.
2. "Equipment Purchase" in 15/16 is for 2 Vans and MDC's.
3. "Equipment Purchase" in 17/18 is for 3 Vans, 4 Buses, and MDC's.
4. "Equipment Purchase" in 18/19 is for 4 Buses and computer equipment.
1. **Operating Plan**

The Lift Line program provides demand responsive, specialized non-emergency health and medical transportation for low-income seniors and disabled residents of Santa Cruz County. Riders are not charged a fare for the service, although donations are accepted. Service is generally provided from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM, five days a week (with the exception of published holidays), while Lift Line also coordinates additional services on behalf of its clients outside these hours.

Service is focused on individuals that live outside the METRO ParaCruz service area, those who are unable to afford the METRO ParaCruz fare, those that do not meet the ADA complementary paratransit eligibility requirements, those needing same day service, and those that need a higher level of service than can be provided by METRO ParaCruz. Lift Line operates a fleet of 18 wheelchair accessible vans. Transportation is provided to destinations such as doctors’ offices, pharmacies, Elderday Adult Day Health Care, Senior Dining Centers, Dialysis Sites and various medical therapy appointments.

Due to the current demand for service during our peak hours, we have been asking our TDA medical clients to increase the potential for grouping rides by booking their medical rides between 10:30am and 1:30 pm. Lift Line has been working closely with local medical facilities to optimize this preferred window of service for this select group of Santa Cruz residents.

Community Bridges maintains comprehensive auto and general liability coverage, including the City of Santa Cruz and SCCRTC as additional insured parties. A copy of each insurance certificate shall be filed with the City and with SCCRTC.

**Lift Line is seeking to continue the TDA Medical Rides service and ensure that this service reaches those with the most need.** Lift Line projected 4,300 TDA Medical Rides in FY 14/15, including direct service and coordinated taxi rides. At 67% of the 14/15 fiscal year, we have met our goal at 100%. We continue to maintain these basic, vital services.

**Lift Line also coordinates with the local taxi companies to offer the very popular Taxi Scrip (TS) program.** Lift Line projected 1,748 Taxi Scrip rides in FY 14/15. At 67% of the 14/15 fiscal year for which data is available, we have reached 73% of our goal.

This program serves as a safety net service for non-medical rides and rides needed outside the ADA-mandated METRO paratransit service areas. Individuals may purchase subsidized taxi scrip so that they can directly schedule taxi rides, and the majority of taxi vehicles are fully accessible for mobility devices. Currently all of residents that receive the Taxi Scrip at a discount are low income and below the federal 200% poverty level. Lift Line staff continue to update the TDA applications to reflect the new Federal Government poverty level guidelines. Area taxi service providers include: Deluxe Taxi, Courtesy Cab, and Santa Cruz Yellow Cab. Lift Line provides ongoing monitoring and assessment of the program to ensure that eligibility criteria are met, safety criteria are met by subcontractors, and to ensure there is no abuse of this vital program. The average cost per ride is now $18, thereby decreasing the amount of rides that can be taken with the scrip. Currently clients can purchase three $10.00 books, for a total of $30.00 worth of scrip, for $8.00 which would give them approximately one (1) or two (2) rides per book. There is currently a limit to purchase three books per person per quarter.
**Exhibit C – 1**

**Lift Line / CTSA 15/16 Operating Plan**

Lift Line projected 15,982 Meals on Wheels rides in FY 14/15, 8,625 of which were to be funded by TDA funds. At 67% of the year, we have reached 76% of our total goal.

While we are on track to meet our projected goal for the current fiscal year, last year we also saw demand for Meals on Wheels rides increase in the second half of the fiscal year by up to 8% over the first half. Taking this variable into account, we expect to exceed our 14/15 projection by 13%. Lift Line will continue to coordinate with the Meals on Wheels program to increase attendance at all of the senior dining centers, as Lift Line continues to meet with the Meals on Wheels Program Director and site managers to review unmet transportation service needs.

Lift Line projected to provide 28,781 Elderday rides in FY 14/15, 11,444 of which were to be funded by TDA. At 67% of the fiscal year, we have reached 77% of our goal.

The Elderday program provides outpatient day health care to seniors and community residents who need constant care, and/or are diagnosed with dementia or Alzheimer’s type of dementia. Almost all of these participants use wheelchairs or walkers, and require vans with lifts. Generally, these clients are very frail, and need personal, door-to-door assistance. Elderday rides are reflective of the level of client service that Lift Line drivers provide to patients with critical needs.

Lift Line projected to provide 30,768 Winter Shelter ISSP program rides in FY 14/15, with 7,444 to be funded by TDA. At 67% of the fiscal year, Lift Line has reached 56% of our total goal, by providing 12,378 rides to date. We expect to reach our goal this year.

Lift Line/CTSA is requesting TDA funds to match Lift Line costs for providing transportation for the Homeless Service Center’s Winter Shelter Program, which operates November through April of each year. Lift Line provides more than 20,000 rides to the additional shelter provided at the National Guard Armory. Through shelter staff input, we know that 30% of participants are disabled, 7% are seniors, and there are one to three wheelchair-using participants being transported both ways every day. We are asking for TDA funds to cover the rides for these senior and disabled participants, while we know that 100% of participants have unmet health care needs.

Lift Line staff will continue to work with the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) in identifying and addressing unmet needs. Lift Line continues to work with the E&D TAC in meeting the Unmet Transit and Paratransit Needs as well as the recommendations of the Paratransit Coordination Task Force. For those who don’t qualify for METRO ParaCruz or Medi-Cal assistance, we will continue to help them complete the required paperwork to make it easier for them to use the current TDA programs that meet their specific needs. In our role as the Coordinated Transportation Service Agency, Lift Line will continue working with other transportation providers to ensure maximum efficiency and coordination of rides for all residents.

Lift Line will continue to focus its resources on transportation needs that are not being met by other paratransportation services, such as ADA-mandated METRO ParaCruz. Through TDA funding, Lift Line will continue to serve those not eligible for METRO ParaCruz service, specifically low-income individuals who cannot afford the $8.00 round-trip METRO ParaCruz co-pay, those who don’t meet the ADA parameters, and those with origins/destinations outside of the METRO ParaCruz service area. Lift Line is anticipating an increase in demand for its services resulting from proposed fare increases for METRO ParaCruz. Also, because Lift Line provides safety net services to those ineligible or unable to use other services, its goal is to provide flexible programs, scheduling, and dispatching that can respond to the changing needs of all participants.
### TABLE 1 - TDA PROPOSED SERVICE UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TAXI SCRIP</th>
<th>MEDICAL TDA</th>
<th>MEALS ON WHEELS</th>
<th>ELDERDAY</th>
<th>WINTER SHELTER PROGRAM</th>
<th>TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUNDS ALLOCATED</td>
<td>$34,110</td>
<td>$291,233</td>
<td>$82,327</td>
<td>$196,215</td>
<td>$22,676</td>
<td></td>
<td>$626,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING COST</td>
<td>$8.69</td>
<td>$32.84</td>
<td>$6.02</td>
<td>$10.58</td>
<td>$1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>$3.47</td>
<td>$10.25</td>
<td>$1.93</td>
<td>$3.40</td>
<td>$0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e., Mgmt Personnel: Director/Fleet Mgr, Admin Asst, Info Mgr, Rent, Liability Insur., Phone, Supplies, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>$2.06</td>
<td>$7.31</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
<td>$2.37</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5% of total cost per unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COST PER SERVICE UNIT</td>
<td>$14.21</td>
<td>$50.39</td>
<td>$9.55</td>
<td>$16.35</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16 PROJECTED TDA UNITS OF SERVICE</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>8,625</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>7,446</td>
<td>36,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT PURCHASE MATCH</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TDA CLAIM REQUEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$626,561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Taxi Scrip allocations went down while the projected units of service remain the same. The general cause of this is that shorter trips are being utilized. There continues to be a strong demand for this program. For the current FY 14-15, we are 43 units over our projected goal for the first six months.

Note 2: Medical TDA allocations were increased this year by approximately $70,000 and the units of service increased by 1,479. It's expected that the demand for this ride type will increase as the funding for Same-Day Medical transportation is either eliminated or greatly reduced.

Note 3: Meals on Wheels allocations went down while the projected units of service remains the same. This is mostly due to efficient consolidation of rides.

Note 4: Elderday allocations decreased the second year in a row while we projected doing more units of service this FY. This was done by eliminating our subcontractor, Medical Appointments Made Easy (MAME), and doing a double run with one of our Elderday busses making it more efficient.

Note 5: Winter Shelter Program allocations went up $7,690 as direct reflection of the cost per service unit going up by $1.04 and our projected units of service remaining the same. The main cause for this increase is the limited availability of our one and only 25 passenger bus due to mechanical issues and the fact that it is getting old and less reliable. This means extra trips or an additional driver needed to compensate.

Note 6: It's believed that lower fuel cost has been a contributing factor in lowering the overall cost of service unit this cycle.
### TABLE 2 - OTHER CTSA SERVICE UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Units</th>
<th>Meals on Wheels</th>
<th>Elderday Services</th>
<th>Winter Shelter</th>
<th>MSSP</th>
<th>Medical Section 5310</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds Allocated</td>
<td>$77,644</td>
<td>$326,131</td>
<td>$50,237</td>
<td>$22,638</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$518,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per Service Unit</td>
<td>$9.55</td>
<td>$16.35</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
<td>$9.55</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16 Projection Units of Service</td>
<td>8,134</td>
<td>19,945</td>
<td>16,496</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$192,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$711,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5310-Capital Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Claim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>626,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,469,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3 - ALL SERVICE UNITS TOTALED (Total tables 1 and 2, units of service, to equal table 3 totals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Units</th>
<th>Taxi Scrip</th>
<th>Medical TDA</th>
<th>Meals on Wheels</th>
<th>Elderday</th>
<th>Winter Shelter</th>
<th>MSSP Taxi Scrip</th>
<th>Medical Section 5310</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Exhibit D

Schedule of Payments
FY: 2015-2016 TDA Claim
Life Line CTSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 2015</td>
<td>$219,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2015</td>
<td>135,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15, 2016</td>
<td>135,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2016</td>
<td>135,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$626,561</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution: Quarterly disbursement, with up to 35% in first quarter, and the remaining quarterly payments being one-third of the remaining claim amount.
Community Bridges has been the designated Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) since 1982. CTSA s are authorized under California Government Code Sections 15975 and 15950-15952 which were enacted pursuant to the Social Service Transportation Improvement Act. The purpose of the CTSA is to improve transportation required by social service recipients by promoting the consolidation and coordinating of social service transportation. As the Consolidated Transportation Service Agency, Community Bridges Lift Line will continue to coordinate and consolidate transportation services with other transportation and human service agencies in order to provide the most efficient transportation possible. Lift Line will continue to work with Santa Cruz County School Districts, Human Services Department of the County of Santa Cruz, County Office of Education, Veterans Service Offices in Santa Cruz and Palo Alto, Hospice of Santa Cruz County, as well as hospitals and other medical facilities. Community Bridges Lift Line will also continue working closely with the RTPA and to help with the unmet needs identified in the Tri-County AMBAG Coordinated Plan. Community Bridges Lift Line will also continue working with local non-profit organizations and other human service and medical facilities in neighboring counties to continue to define and create an effective mobility management center to help mobilize residents with various disabilities, low income and senior populations to travel easily throughout our County as well as to travel seamlessly throughout our tri-county Monterey Bay region and the San Francisco Bay Area.

As the CTSA, Community Bridges Lift Line will continue coordination to improve and identify the need for specialized transportation equipment. If the equipment is funded through Caltrans 5310 and isn’t reaching its proposed requirements through their contract, the equipment can be recaptured and its use coordinated through other identified paratransit service needs. We will continue to offer training to ensure that not only Lift Line staff operates in a safe and sensitive manner but will continue to offer expertise and training for other transportation providers in the County.

Pursuant to the CTSA designation for Santa Cruz County, Community Bridges operates the Lift Line transportation program, which will continue to take a lead, and work closely with the RTPA, to continue to help identify unmet transportation needs, coordinate and provide social service transportation services to low-income seniors, disabled residents, underserved populations and other identified individuals in Santa Cruz County. Lift Line will continue to directly address the issues identified through the unmet needs process by providing rides to medical appointments (including dialysis), alternative care, mental health and various medical transportation needs.
At the duly noticed regular meeting of the Community Bridges Board of Directors/Governance Committee held on April 2, 2015 the following resolution was made:

Be it resolved that the Governance Committee of the Board of Directors of Community Bridges (CB) hereby authorizes Community Bridges/Lift Line to make a claim for the 15/16 TDA funds from the Regional Transportation Commission through the City of Santa Cruz.

It is further resolved that the officers and the President/CEO and/or designees are authorized to sign any documents and take any steps necessary to fulfill the intent of this Resolution.

Linda Fawcett, Board Chair
Jordan Ciliberto, Secretary

Each of the undersigned declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the statements in the foregoing certificate are true and correct of his or her own knowledge, and that this declaration was executed on April 2, 2015, at Aptos, California.

Linda Fawcett, Board Chair
Jordan Ciliberto, Secretary
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of May 7, 2015
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PROPOSED FY 2015-16 ARTICLE 8 CLAIM FROM
THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ ON BEHALF OF THE VOLUNTEER CENTER

WHEREAS the Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 provides that an applicant may
file an Article 8 claim for monies from the Local Transportation Fund; and

WHEREAS the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has identified a process for TDA
claims in their Rules and Regulations; and

WHEREAS the Regional Transportation Commission, in adopting its FY 2015-16 TDA budget,
has apportioned $74,591 to be used by the Volunteer Center for administering the volunteer
transportation program; and

WHEREAS the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, at its April 14, 2015
meeting, recommended that the Regional Transportation Commission approve this claim; and

WHEREAS the City of Santa Cruz is eligible to claim Article 8 funds and is scheduled to approve
their role as claimant for Community Bridges on May 21, 2015;

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

1. The claim submitted in the amount of $74,591 fulfills the requirements as specified in the
Transportation Development Act and the Rules and Regulation of the RTC and is consistent
with the Regional Transportation Plan, as follows:

   a. The claim includes a proposed budget for the 2015-16 fiscal year;

   b. The claim includes a statement of projected or estimated revenues and expenditures for the
      prior fiscal year;

   c. The claim will fund specialized transportation services and respond to transportation needs
      not otherwise being met within the community; and

   d. The proposed expenditure of the funds is consistent with the most current Regional
      Transportation Plan.
2. The submitted FY 2015-16 claim in the amount of $74,591 is hereby approved consisting of one payment in July of 2015 and the City of Santa Cruz will act as a claimant on behalf of the Volunteer Center, for Article 8 claims for specialized transportation programs.

3. The Executive Director is authorized to modify the payment amounts should the RTC amend the FY 2015-16 Transportation Development Act apportionments in the RTC’s FY 2015-16 budget.

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

______________________________
John Leopold, Chair

ATTEST:
______________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: City of Santa Cruz Volunteer Center Transportation-Fiscal Staff TDA File

S:\RESOLUTI\2015\RES0515\VC-TDA_15-16.DOC
Transportation Development Act (TDA)-Local Transportation Funds

CLAIM FORM
Submit a separate form for each project.

This form has been developed in an effort to standardize information required from TDA recipients, based on TDA Statute, RTC Rules and Regulations, and/or RTC board requests. If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: Transportation Program

2. Implementing Agency: Volunteer Center of Santa Cruz

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant: The City of Santa Cruz acts as the eligible TDA claimant for Volunteer Center. Volunteer Center receives the TDA funds through a contract with the City of Santa Cruz.

4. Funding requested this claim: TDA $_74,591

   STA (transit only) $____

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY_2015/2016

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims:
   □ Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility
   □ Article 4 Public Transportation
   X Article 8 Specialized Transportation
   □ Article 3 & 8 TDA Admin or Planning

7. Contact Person/Project Manager
   Name: Debra Brooks
   Telephone Number: 831-427-5070
   E-mail: rsypvol@scvolunteercenter.org
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available) : Lois Connell
   Telephone Number: 831-427-5070
   E-mail: Lois@scvolunteercenter.org

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks. See attached scope of work

9. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names): All of Santa Cruz County

10. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community)
    We know from needs assessments that low or free transportation to elderly and disabled persons outside of the fixed route are in desperate need. The Volunteer Centers Transportation Program is a vital link in providing this service. Volunteer drivers provide the service free of charge to clients throughout the county.

11. Project Productivity Goals for this fiscal year:
    a. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program (ex. increase use of facility/service, decrease collisions, etc. The number of rides provided and the number of clients served will measure performance. This will be evaluated through ride reports compiled on each ride that details client, date and time of ride, destination of ride and driver providing ride. These records are entered into a computerized data file.

    b. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program (ex. number of
new or maintained bike miles; number of people served/rides provided): Our goal is to provide 4,600 one-way trips to eligible clients. Clients will be limited to a maximum of two rides per week. Our priority for filling requests is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Eligible Destinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Medical trips for low-income persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Medical trips for other persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Shopping for low-income persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Shopping for other persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Other eligible destinations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These trips will be targeted for geographic distribution as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rides</th>
<th>% of Rides</th>
<th>#Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz/Mid-County/Aptos/Capitola</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo/Scotts Valley</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville/Freedom</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on population data derived from the latest census and available transit services for each area of operations. In considering geographic distribution of services, our goal is to provide extra support in those areas which are outside the boundaries of Liftline services, or which receive limited Liftline service and have limited public transit services.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Is program/project listed in the RTP and/or consistent with a specific RTP Goal Policy?

The Volunteer Center Program is consistent with RTP goals and advances Target #3C of the 2014 RTP by offering increased travel options for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to income, age, race, disability or limited English proficiency by increasing the percentage that are within a 30-minute walk, bike or transit trip to key destinations. It is important to note that the very frail people on fixed incomes cannot use other modes of transportation. The Volunteer Center Transportation Program is listed in the 2014 RTP (VC-P1).

13. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed): This project will have little or no impact on other modes of travel.

14. Estimated Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (attach project budget). Specialized Transportation Claims require 10% local match. Local match can take the form of fares, donations, agency charges, grants, revenue sharing and other non-restricted sources. In-kind services may NOT apply toward the local match.

What is the total project cost? $74,591
Is project fully funded? Yes

What will TDA (and STA) funds be used on (ex. administration, brochures, engineering, construction)? Funds are used for personnel costs, Audit fees, Supplies, Telephone, Occupancy, Printing, Postage, Volunteer mileage, Administration.

15. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution (see RTC Rules and Regulations for details):
Bike/Ped: Up to 90% upon initiation of work OR D 100% upon project completion

CTSA:
- Quarterly disbursement, with up to 35% in first quarter, and the remaining quarterly payments being one-third of the remaining claim amount;
- OR Quarterly dispersment

Volunteer Center:
- X Full approved claim amount in the first quarter

SCMTD: Quarterly disbursement

16. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES/NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Form of approval work plans and budget (eg resolution, work program, budget, other document)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Bike, Ped, and Specialized Transportation Claims: Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCMTD, CTSA, Bike to Work, CTSC Only - PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF

17. Improving Program Efficiency/Productivity
- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.
- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale, planned productivity improvements). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:

18. What is different from last year’s program/claim?

19. Schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation at the end of the year:
- SCMD - April each year
- Specialized Transportation: Quarterly to E&D TAC, RTC __________ (Months/Year)
- CTSA: Bicycle Committee (Month, year); RTC (Month, year)
- B2W: Bicycle Committee (Month, year); RTC (Month, year)

CTSA and Volunteer Center (Article 8) Only

20. Are these transportation services responding to transportation needs not otherwise being met within the community or jurisdiction of the claimant? Describe.

The Volunteer Center's Transportation Program is a volunteer program providing rides, at no cost to the clients, to low and fixed income seniors. Approximately ⅕ of our clients live in congregate areas such as mobile homes and low income housing. We specialize in meeting the needs of those clients outside the ADA-mandated paratransit service area.
Volunteer Center does not provide access to services on holidays or outside the service hours of paratransit. We have a recruitment process in place, specializing on recruitment in South County. Volunteer transportation services is identified in the draft 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs List

21. Where appropriate, are these specialized transportation services coordinated with other transportation services? Describe.

When possible, the Volunteer Center will refer those callers whose requests cannot be accommodated through our program to other transportation programs.

22. Provide performance information, as pertinent, such as: verification of the operating cost per passenger, operating cost per vehicle service hour, passengers per vehicle service hour, passengers per vehicle service mile, and vehicle service hours per employee for last fiscal year (definitions available in Section 99247 of TDA Guidelines.

The program has no owned service vehicles or employee drivers. Volunteer driver use private vehicles. It is estimated that each one-way trip is 9.5 miles, with approximately 4600 one-way rides provided in the last fiscal year. This is about 43,700 projected service miles per year. Each one-way ride is an average of 1-hour average or a total of 4600 service hours. Volunteers have the option of being paid mileage at a cost of $0.31/mile, although not all accept payment. Based on the FY 2013-14 TDA allocation of $71,389 and the service estimates provided by volunteer drivers, the cost per one-way passenger ride and a cost per vehicle service hour of about $15.49, and a cost per service mile of $1.63.

23. Discuss the needs and types of the passengers being served and the employment of part-time drivers and the contracting with common carriers of persons operating under a franchise or license to provide services during peak hours, as defined in subdivision (a) of Section 99260.2 (99246d, per 2010 Performance Audit)

The Transportation Program works in conjunction with the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee/Social Service Transportation Advisory Council to help assure that transportation needs for the elderly and disabled are represented. We know from needs assessments that low or free transportation to elderly and disabled are represented. We know from needs assessments that low or free transportation to elderly and disabled persons outside of the fixed routes or those unable to use fixed routes are in desperate need. Many of our clients live in rural areas, have little or no family to assist and are living on fixed incomes. The Volunteer Centers Transportation Program providing transportation to doctor's appointment, grocery shopping and other necessary appointment. Volunteer drivers provide the service free of charge to clients throughout the county

SCMTD, CTSC, Volunteer Center & RTC Only.

24. List the recommendations provided in the last TDA Triennial Performance Audit and your progress toward meeting them.

- Describe the work your agency has undertaken to implement each performance audit recommendation and the steps it will take to fully implement the recommendation.
- For any recommendations that have not been implemented, explain why the recommendation has not been implemented and describe the work your agency will undertake to implement each performance audit recommendation.
- Describe any problems encountered in implementing individual recommendations.

Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center should work with their respective annual fiscal and compliance auditors to evaluate the transportation related measures required under the TDA, including annual operating costs and revenues.

The Volunteer Center’s independent Auditors review costs and revenues that are not aggregated in our accounts. TDA finances are audited as one of over 60 separate fund accounts. It would be too cumbersome to include all 60+accounts that are audited in the published financials. However, since this is an issue, we will have our auditors include a TDA finance page in the audit, which will be for 2014-2015.
Volunteer Center Should Regularly Review the Mileage Reimbursement Rate.

For the last 2 years and currently we have been putting our extra resources towards driver recruitment as our top priority. Increasing mileage reimbursement is something we will review for next year’s submission.

SCMTD Only

25. Farebox Recovery Ratio: (split out=urbanized service vs. non-urban service farebox ratios for prior year and year-to-date)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Urbanized Service</th>
<th>Rural/Non-Urban Service (Could use FTA 5311 allocation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenue:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Support Revenues:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation costs:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio Fare Rev Op Cost:</td>
<td>__%</td>
<td>____%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(minimum required= 15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per ride being subsidized for different services/funds</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Exemptions for calculating operating costs — spell out in your operating budget summary.
- Service extensions are exempt until two years after the end of the fiscal year during which they were established (PUC Sec. 99268.8). This exemption applies only if the new service was not provided nor was funded by LTFISTA during any of the prior three fiscal years.
- The additional operating costs to a transit operator of providing comparable complementary paratransit services, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, that exceed operator’s prior year costs as adjusted by the CPI are exclude from operating cost.

26. Current fare & local support revenue to operating cost ratio versus FY J978-79 ratio (for services to the general public).
   - Current ratio ((sum of fare revenues + local support) / operating cost): 56.9%
   - FY 1978-79 Ratio:________________

27. Did the SCMTD operating budget increase over 15% from the prior fiscal year?
   If the answer is yes, please provide a statement identifying and substantiating the reason, or need for the increase in the transit operating budget in excess of 15% above the preceding year, and identify substantial increases or decreases in the scope of operations or capital provisions for major new service - (transit claimants only, if applicable).

28. Operating statistics (compare current fiscal year to date to last three full fiscal years; *TDA required performance indicators), submit items from the following list.
   - Annual passengers
     - Rides/passenger trips provided by type (student, senior, adult, pass holders, etc, or however slat’s kept) and amount of TDA $ used for each type of ride
   - Annual service hours
   - Passengers per vehicle service hour*
   - Annual service miles
   - # of fixed-route miles
   - Service Area - square miles
   - Service Area Population
   - Passengers per vehicle service mile*
   - Average passengers per weekday
   - Total operating costs in budget
   - Operating cost per vehicle service hour*
TDA Claim

- Total operating cost per passenger*
- Average Farebox Revenue per passenger (describe what is included)
- # of FTE employees (all employees, not just drivers)
- Vehicle Service hours/Employee*
- # of routes
- Average route length
- Average travel times/rider
- # of bus stops
- # of vehicles in operation
- # of monthly bus passes in circulation
- Max vehicles in service at any time:
- Hours of service:
- Approximate # of unduplicated passengers
- Cost per unit of service plus text about long range plans to make/keep this low
- Funds and percentage spent on administration/overhead/grantee allocation/etc
- Actual financials compared with budget
- Actual number of rides provided compared with goal and text about whether goal was met and why/why not

Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

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

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

All Transit and Specialized Transportation Claims (SCMTD, CTSA, and Volunteer Center)
- A copy of the operating and capital budgets for the coming fiscal year
- Description of capital projects, including time frame over which project will be funded and implemented
- Operating Plan for current and upcoming activities – can be within project description

Article 4 Transit Claims
- A certification from the California Highway Patrol (completed within the last 13 months) indicating that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code.
- Other Certifications
Local Agency Certification:

This TDA Claim has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC's Budget, SCCRTC's Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hg/MassTrans/State-TDA.html). I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of May 7, 2015
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FISCAL YEAR 2015-16 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT
ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 4 and STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA) CLAIM FROM THE SANTA CRUZ
METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act of 1971, Article 4, Section 99260(a) of
the Public Utilities Code provides that transit operators may file a claim for monies from a
county's local transportation fund with the transportation planning agency for that county; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) is a transit operator in
accordance with Article 1, Section 99210 of the Public Utilities Code, and the Santa Cruz County
Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is the regional transportation planning agency for
Santa Cruz County, in accordance with Article 1, Section 99214 of the Public Utilities Code; and

WHEREAS, the RTC apportioned $6,377,491 in Transportation Development Act (TDA)
funds and $2,832,152 in State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to METRO in its fiscal year 2015-
16 budget; and

WHEREAS, METRO submitted a claim for Transportation Development Act and State
Transit Assistance funds in accordance with TDA statutes and the RTC Rules and Regulations;

WHEREAS, the RTC’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee reviewed
the TDA claim and recommend approval of the those funds;

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

1. The FY 2015-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA)
claim by Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) fulfills the requirements specified
in the Transportation Development Act and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation
Commission’s (RTC) Rules and Regulations and the RTC finds that:

a. The proposed expenditures are in conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan.

b. The level of passenger fares and charges is sufficient to enable the METRO to meet the
fare revenue requirements of Public Utilities Code sections 99268.1 or 99268.2b as an
older operator.

c. METRO is making full use of federal funds available under the Urban Mass
Transportation Act of 1964.

d. The sum of METRO’s allocations from the State Transit Assistance (STA) and the TDA
funds does not exceed the amount that METRO is eligible to receive during the fiscal
year.
e. The claim funds may be used to offset reductions in federal operating assistance and the unanticipated increase in the cost of fuel, to enhance existing public transportation services, and to meet high priority regional, countywide, or area wide public transportation needs.

f. METRO made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvements recommended pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 99244 as specified in sections 17 and 22 of the TDA claim form.

g. METRO obtained certification by the Department of the California Highway Patrol verifying that METRO is in compliance with section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code, as required in Public Utilities Code section 99251. The certification shall have been completed within the last 13 months.

2. The claim submitted by the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District for Transportation Development Act Article 4 funds in the amount of $6,377,491 and State Transit Assistance funds in the amount of $2,832,152 for fiscal year 2015-16 is hereby approved, to be paid in quarterly payments, as specified below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>TDA</th>
<th>STA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>$1,594,372.75</td>
<td>$677,686.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>$1,594,372.75</td>
<td>$677,686.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>$1,594,372.75</td>
<td>$677,686.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>$1,594,372.75</td>
<td>$677,686.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,377,491.00</td>
<td>$2,832,152.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Should the RTC amend its FY 2015-16 budget to modify TDA or STA revenue apportionments to METRO, the Executive Director is authorized to modify the payment amounts consistent with the RTC’s approved FY 2015-16 budget.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________
Eduardo Montesino, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: METRO
RTC Fiscal
RTC Planner
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Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance (STA)

CLAIM FORM

Submit a separate form for each project.

This form has been developed in an effort to standardize information required from TDA recipients, based on TDA Statute, RTC Rules and Regulations, and/or RTC board requests. If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: FY16 Public Transit Operations in Santa Cruz County

2. Implementing Agency: Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)

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

4. Funding requested this claim:  TDA    $6,377,491
   STA (transit only)  $2,832,152

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY16

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims:
   - Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility
   - Article 4 Public Transportation
   - Article 8 Specialized Transportation
   - Article 3 & 8 TDA Admin or Planning

7. Contact Person/Project Manager
   Name: Alex Clifford, CEO/General Manager
   Telephone Number: (831) 426-6080
   E-mail aclifford@scmtd.com

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Thomas Hiltner, Acting Planning & Development Manager
   Telephone Number: (831) 426-2580
   E-mail: thiltner@scmtd.com

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

This project provides operating assistance for fixed-route public transit and ADA complementary paratransit operations in Santa Cruz County. Fixed-route public transit operations require a maximum fleet of 82 vehicles serving 34 routes throughout Santa Cruz County and the Highway 17 Express, a commuter express and AMTRAK feeder service between Santa Cruz and San Jose (Diridon Station). ParaCruz, METRO’s complementary paratransit service, operates 42 accessible vans in demand-response service for persons who, due to disability, cannot access the fixed-route system.
9. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):

METRO Service Area

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

This project supports public fixed-route transit and paratransit service in Santa Cruz County. Public transit serves as an alternative transportation mode of choice and as essential lifeline transportation for residents who do not have access to a privately owned vehicle.

11. Project Productivity Goals for this fiscal year:
   a. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program (ex. increase use of facility/service, decrease collisions, etc.):
      Total Annual passenger trips
      Operating Cost/Hour
      Farebox Recovery Ratio
   
   b. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program (ex. number of new or maintained bike miles; number of people served/rides provided):
      For FY16, METRO projects 5,411,083 trips on its fixed-route (including commuter) and 90,000 trips on ParaCruz.
12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Is program/project listed in the RTP and/or consistent with a specific RTP Goal/Policy?
Yes, METRO’s FY16 TDA/STA project conforms to these goals from the 2014 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan:

**Goal 1:** Improve people’s ability to meet most of their daily needs without having to drive.
Improve access and proximity to employment centers (p. 4-7; p. 7-1).
- Improve people’s ability to meet most of their daily needs without having to drive.
- Improve access and proximity to employment centers (p. 7-1).
- Re-invest in the local economy by reducing transportation expenses from vehicle ership, operation and fuel consumption. Reduce smog-forming pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions (p. 7-2).
- Improve the convenience and quality of trips, especially for walk, bicycle, transit, freight and carpool/vanpool trips (p. 7-3).
- Improve health by increasing the percentage of trips made using active transportation, including bicycling, walking and transit (p. 7-4).

13. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):
- Reduce congestion on local streets and roads by providing alternatives to the private automobile.
- Increase range of travel for bicycles by accommodating bikes on buses.
- Provide feeder service to intercity bus, rail and airline network at San Jose.

14. Estimated Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (attach project budget). Specialized Transportation Claims require 10% local match. Local match can take the form of fares, donations, agency charges, grants, revenue sharing and other non-restricted sources. In kind services may NOT apply toward the local match.

What is the total project cost? **$49,994,995** for FY16 as published in the Metropolitan Transit District Preliminary FY16 & FY17 Operating Budget, 3/27/15, Attachment A.

Is project fully funded? The Metropolitan Transit District Preliminary FY16 & FY17 Operating Budget indicates that the FY16 Operating Budget is fully funded: however, the budget is balanced with a transfer of over $5.7 million from operating and capital reserves.

What will TDA (and STA) funds be used on (ex. administration, brochures, engineering, construction)?
Public transit operations; administration.

15. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution (see RTC Rules and Regulations for details):
   a. Bike/Ped: [ ] Up to 90% upon initiation of work OR [ ] 100% upon project completion
   b. CTSA: [ ] Quarterly disbursement, with up to 35% in first quarter, and the remaining quarterly payments being one-third of the remaining claim amount;
   OR [ ] Quarterly disbursement
   c. Volunteer Center: [ ] Full approved claim amount in the first quarter
   d. SCMTD: [x] Quarterly disbursement
16. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Form of approval (eg, resolution, work program, budget, other document) On 3/27/15 The Board adopted the Preliminary FY16 &amp; FY17 Operating Budget for the purpose of submitting the TDA and STA claim in the amounts requested with this claim. If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.</th>
<th>YES?/ NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding? (This Project is defined as FY16 operations.)</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: __________________________)</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. For &quot;bikeways,&quot; does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov">http://www.dot.ca.gov</a>.)</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SCMTD, CTSA, Bike to Work, CTSC Only – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF**

17. Improving Program Efficiency/Productivity

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.
  - METRO added a new Route 6 as a demonstration to increase program usage by residents of the La Posada senior housing complex.
  - METRO added trips on the Highway 17 to reduce overloads. Arrival and departure times on some routes were modified to improve connections with Caltrain and AMTRAK at the San Jose Diridon Station.
  - METRO continued to monitor trip departure times to better coordinate timed transfer points and improve travel time throughout the service area.
  - METRO continued construction of the new Judy K. Souza Operations Building which will improve the daily fleet operations and save an estimated $1,000,000 in operating expenses when it opens in January, 2016.
  - METRO’s new CEO/General Manager conducted a thorough evaluation of the organizational structure and initiated changes to improve METRO’s effectiveness. Reducing operating expenses and/or increasing revenue will ensure the long-term sustainability of transit operations in the county.
  - METRO conducted a comprehensive evaluation of its operating expenses and revenue stream to solve its ongoing budget structural deficit.
  - METRO continued conceptual design services for Pacific Station and Watsonville Transit Center renovations. Transit center improvements can increase accessibility to the transit network by providing greater safety enhanced amenities and improved customer service.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale, planned productivity improvements). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:
  - Complete Pacific Station renovation environmental assessment and advance into the engineering phase.
  - Complete the Watsonville Transit Center conceptual design and locate funding for
environmental review and engineering.
  o Complete the Judy K. Souza Operations Facility and move Santa Cruz METRO operations into the new facility.
  o Maintain current service levels on Highway 17 and intercity routes.
  o Improve on-time performance.
  o Consider re-alignment of the ParaCruz service to match the fixed-route operating hours.
  o Participate in sustainable development and corridor transportation studies in Santa Cruz.

18. What is different from last year’s program/claim?
   a. The TDA claim amount this year is greater than last year’s.
   b. The FY16 operating expenses will increase due to increased rates in labor contracts, increased costs of medical premiums and liability.
   c. This year’s program projects a fully-funded budget with an enormous transfer to the operating budget from reserves.

19. Schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation at the end of the year:
   ☑ SCMD – April each year
   ☐ Specialized Transportation: Quarterly to E/D TAC, RTC _____________ (Months/Year)
   ☐ CTSA: Bicycle Committee ____________ (Month, year); RTC _____________ (Month, year)
   ☐ B2W: Bicycle Committee ____________ (Month, year); RTC _____________ (Month, year)

   CTSA and Volunteer Center (Article 8) Only
20. Are these transportation services responding to transportation needs not otherwise being met within the community or jurisdiction of the claimant? Describe.

21. Where appropriate, are these specialized transportation services coordinated with other transportation services? Describe.

SCMTD & RTC Only
22. List the recommendations provided in your last Triennial Performance Audit and your progress toward meeting them.
   - Describe the work your agency has undertaken to implement each performance audit recommendation and the steps it will take to fully implement the recommendation.
   - For any recommendations that have not been implemented, explain why the recommendation has not been implemented and describe the work your agency will undertake to implement each performance audit recommendation.
   - Describe any problems encountered in implementing individual recommendations.

1. Santa Cruz METRO should submit Annual State Controller Reports to SCCRTC
   From this point forward, METRO Finance Department will submit the Annual State Controller reports to the SCCRTC.

2. Santa Cruz METRO should further promote security aspects of the transit system.
   METRO is building a comprehensive video surveillance system, installing back-up generators and upgrading its land mobile radio system with investments from the California Transit Security Grant Program. In addition, METRO has increased its private security foot patrols and improved coordination with local police to improve security at the Watsonville and Santa Cruz transit centers. METRO has programmed its future California Transit Security Grant Program funding to install an o-board video surveillance system.

3. Santa Cruz METRO should develop a method to continuously track on-time performance.
   Installing an Automatic Vehicle Locator system is one of METRO’s highest-priority unfunded
capital projects. Until that is installed, however, METRO will rely upon spot surveys and comprehensive on-time performance surveys to evaluate performance and revise scheduled running time as indicated. METRO staff is currently completing a grant-funded on-time performance survey and entering data from surveys conducted in April and October of 2014. Results and service change recommendations will be presented to the METRO Board in June 2015.

**SCMTD Only**

23. Farebox Recovery Ratio: (split out=urbanized service vs. non-urban service farebox ratios for prior year and year-to-date)

The following table shows Urban vs. Rural Farebox recovery ratio for FY14. FY16 Ridership is projected from FY14 ridership. The allocation of ridership and revenue between rural and urban service is calculated by using the actual FY14 revenue/cost ratio for rural and urban operations and the FY16 budgeted revenue/costs. Differences between the recovery ratios shown here and reported for the system-wide performance result from assumptions used to make the urban/rural split and the hypothetical apportionment of ridership on a single route into urban and rural fares. Ridership and revenue also include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Urbanized</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenue</td>
<td>$7,486,367</td>
<td>$263,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local support Revenues</td>
<td>$38,135,597</td>
<td>1,263,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Costs</td>
<td>39,168,784</td>
<td>1,739,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Ratio</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers/Year (2)</td>
<td>5,294,939</td>
<td>116,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Ride</td>
<td>$7.40</td>
<td>$14.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) FY14 Revised Final Budget and FY14 FTA 5311 rural cost and farebox revenue
(2) Excludes Highway 17 performance

Note: Exemptions for calculating operating costs – spell out in your operating budget summary.

- Service extensions are exempt until two years after the end of the fiscal year during which they were established (PUC Sec. 99268.8). This exemption applies only if the new service was not provided nor was funded by LTF/STA during any of the prior three fiscal years.
- The additional operating costs to a transit operator of providing comparable complementary paratransit services, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, that exceed operator’s prior year costs as adjusted by the CPI are excluded from operating cost.

The FY14 cost/ride in the respective urban and rural areas has been calculated differently than in previous years. For FY14, METRO’s cost per ride in the urbanized area is $7.40 and $14.95 in the rural area. These differences reflect the much lower ridership per hour in the rural areas vs. the urban areas. Ridership, costs and revenue for the Highway 17 Express are excluded.

24. FY16 budgeted fare & local support revenue to operating cost ratio versus FY1978-79 ratio (for services to the general public):

- Current ratio ((sum of fare revenues + local support) ÷ operating cost): 58.4%
- FY1978-79 Ratio: 56.9%
25. Did the SCMTD operating budget increase over 15% from the prior fiscal year? NO, the FY16 preliminary operating budget shows an increase of 3.2% over the revised FY15 budget (March 2015).

If the answer is yes, please provide a statement identifying and substantiating the reason or need for the increase in the transit operating budget in excess of 15% above the preceding year, and identify substantial increases or decreases in the scope of operations or capital provisions for major new service - (transit claimants only, if applicable).

26. Operating statistics (compare current fiscal year to date to last three full fiscal years; *TDA required performance indicators), submit items from the following list.

Please see METRO Performance Indicators FY10–FY14 YTD Following

- Annual passengers
  - Rides/passenger trips provided by type (student, senior, adult, pass holders, etc, or however stat’s kept) and amount of TDA $ used for each type of ride.

For FY16, TDA funds will contribute an estimated $1.01 per fixed-route passenger trip and $7.64 per ParaCruz passenger trip.
- **Annual service hours**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Passengers per vehicle service hour**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Annual service miles**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **# of fixed-route miles**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Passengers per vehicle service mile**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Average passengers per weekday**
- **Total operating costs in budget**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Operating cost per vehicle service hour**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Total operating cost per passenger**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Average Farebox Revenue per passenger (describe what is included)**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **# of FTE employees (all employees, not just drivers)**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Vehicle Service hours/Employee**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **# of routes**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Average route length**
- **Average travel times/ rider**
- **# of bus stops**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **# of vehicles in operation**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **# of monthly bus passes in circulation**
- **Max vehicles in service at any time**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Hours of service**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached
- **Approximate # of unduplicated passengers**
- **Cost per unit of service plus text about long range plans to make/keep this low**: Please see Transit Fact Sheet, attached.

*METRO will continue to provide transit service that balance the needs of the community in a cost efficient manner, including high ridership corridors, geographic coverage, and equitability.*

- **Funds and percentage spent on administration/overhead/grantee allocation/etc**
- **Actual financials compared with budget**
- **Actual number of rides provided compared with goal and text about whether goal was met and why/why not**
## Santa Cruz METRO Operating Financials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Fixed-Route Expenses</td>
<td>$28,142,306</td>
<td>$29,325,606</td>
<td>$31,924,402</td>
<td>$35,519,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17</td>
<td>$3,442,774</td>
<td>$3,587,532</td>
<td>$3,905,454</td>
<td>$4,345,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>$4,434,489</td>
<td>$4,639,062</td>
<td>$4,971,209</td>
<td>$4,921,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,019,569</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,552,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,801,065</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,786,254</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Revenue</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-Route Fares</td>
<td>$3,382,948</td>
<td>$3,729,509</td>
<td>$3,849,089</td>
<td>$3,850,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>$3,436,133</td>
<td>$3,014,081</td>
<td>$3,249,049</td>
<td>$3,336,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17 Fares</td>
<td>$1,182,951</td>
<td>$1,482,786</td>
<td>$1,711,122</td>
<td>$1,700,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17 Payments</td>
<td>$371,049</td>
<td>$250,228</td>
<td>$330,265</td>
<td>$327,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParaCruz Fares</td>
<td>$4,434,489</td>
<td>$4,639,062</td>
<td>$4,971,209</td>
<td>$4,921,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$15,209,774</td>
<td>$16,064,503</td>
<td>$17,250,072</td>
<td>$15,685,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (FTA)</td>
<td>$5,324,932</td>
<td>$4,883,799</td>
<td>$4,909,385</td>
<td>$5,719,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Development Act (TDA)</td>
<td>$5,001,737</td>
<td>$5,244,964</td>
<td>$5,507,038</td>
<td>$6,244,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td>$2,801,550 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,565,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Revenue</td>
<td>$1,419,708</td>
<td>$959,933</td>
<td>$1,521,788</td>
<td>$982,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Revenue</td>
<td>($2,354,772)</td>
<td>($1,626,052)</td>
<td>($2,408,721)</td>
<td>($1,076,842)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,019,569</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,552,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,801,065</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,786,254</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Santa Cruz METRO Operating Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Information</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directional Route Miles</td>
<td>479.3</td>
<td>479.3</td>
<td>479.3</td>
<td>479.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bus Stops</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Routes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Active Fleet</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Bus In-Svc</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total METRO Employees</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hour Per Employee</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Fixed-Route Performance</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>5,446,104</td>
<td>5,034,169</td>
<td>5,179,457</td>
<td>5,145,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>193,754</td>
<td>180,797</td>
<td>194,512</td>
<td>199,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>2,577,615</td>
<td>2,376,833</td>
<td>2,561,028</td>
<td>2,639,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>28.11</td>
<td>27.84</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>25.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$5.17</td>
<td>$5.83</td>
<td>$6.16</td>
<td>$6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$1.37</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>24.23%</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>20.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway 17 Performance</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>330,340</td>
<td>339,048</td>
<td>352,824</td>
<td>368,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>21,524</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>21,101</td>
<td>23,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>579,144</td>
<td>614,837</td>
<td>610,983</td>
<td>685,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>15.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$10.42</td>
<td>$10.58</td>
<td>$11.07</td>
<td>$11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$4.70</td>
<td>$5.11</td>
<td>$5.11</td>
<td>$5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>45.14%</td>
<td>48.31%</td>
<td>46.12%</td>
<td>45.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed-Route Total Performance</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>5,776,444</td>
<td>5,373,217</td>
<td>5,532,281</td>
<td>5,514,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>215,278</td>
<td>203,997</td>
<td>215,613</td>
<td>223,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>3,156,759</td>
<td>2,991,670</td>
<td>3,172,011</td>
<td>3,325,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>24.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$5.47</td>
<td>$6.13</td>
<td>$6.48</td>
<td>$7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
<td>$1.61</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>26.51%</td>
<td>25.75%</td>
<td>24.84%</td>
<td>23.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy Per Passenger</td>
<td>$4.02</td>
<td>$4.55</td>
<td>$4.87</td>
<td>$5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>$146.72</td>
<td>$161.34</td>
<td>$166.18</td>
<td>$178.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ParaCruz Performance</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>94,510</td>
<td>92,325</td>
<td>90,492</td>
<td>96,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>43,963</td>
<td>46,163</td>
<td>45,678</td>
<td>48,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>639,424</td>
<td>628,247</td>
<td>418,781</td>
<td>481,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$46.92</td>
<td>$50.25</td>
<td>$54.94</td>
<td>$50.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$2.58</td>
<td>$3.21</td>
<td>$3.37</td>
<td>$3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
<td>6.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include Depreciation, GASP Liability, or other adjustments
Documentation to Include with your Claim:

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

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

All Transit and Specialized Transportation Claims (SCMTD, CTSA, and Volunteer Center)
☐ A copy of the operating and capital budgets for the coming fiscal year
☐ Description of capital projects, including time frame over which project will be funded and implemented
☐ Operating Plan for current and upcoming activities – can be within project description

Article 4 Transit Claims
☐ A certification from the California Highway Patrol (completed within the last 13 months) indicating that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code.
☐ Other Certifications

Local Agency Certification:

This TDA Claim has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC’s Budget, SCCRTC’s Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html). I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature __________________________

Title: CEO/General Manager __________________________
Date: April 6, 2015
FY 16 TDA/STA Claim
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District

FY 16 & FY17 Operating Budget
## SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT
### FY16 & FY17 PRELIMINARY OPERATING BUDGET

#### REVENUE SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCE</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY15</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY16</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET FY16</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>FINAL BUDG FY16 REVISED BUDG FY16</th>
<th>BUDGET FY17</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Passenger Fares</td>
<td>4,250,459</td>
<td>4,377,973</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
<td>3,850,000</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Special Transit Fares</td>
<td>3,407,643</td>
<td>3,509,872</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>3,550,000</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Paratransit Fares</td>
<td>323,795</td>
<td>333,509</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Highway 17 Fares</td>
<td>1,640,203</td>
<td>1,689,409</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>1,550,000</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Highway 17 Payments</td>
<td>455,260</td>
<td>468,918</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Commissions</td>
<td>5,768</td>
<td>5,941</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>-41.1%</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Advertising Income</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rent Income</td>
<td>165,763</td>
<td>170,736</td>
<td>144,344</td>
<td>-15.5%</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Interest Income</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>-30.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other Non-Transp Revenue</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-27.8%</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Sales Tax (1/2 cent)</td>
<td>19,675,758</td>
<td>21,053,061</td>
<td>19,095,116</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
<td>19,477,018</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 SLPP Backfill for Metro Base</td>
<td>(3,012,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,000,000)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Transp Dev Act (TDA) Funds</td>
<td>6,377,610</td>
<td>6,568,938</td>
<td>6,377,491</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>6,377,491</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 FTA Sec 5307 - Op Assistance</td>
<td>4,133,984</td>
<td>4,401,049</td>
<td>4,163,523</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>4,246,793</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 FTA Sec 5311 - Rural Op Asst</td>
<td>212,267</td>
<td>229,157</td>
<td>177,787</td>
<td>-22.4%</td>
<td>181,343</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 AMBAG/CTC/Misc. Grant Funding</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>84,749</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>-24.5%</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 STIC</td>
<td>1,344,113</td>
<td>1,430,946</td>
<td>1,323,588</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>2,118,060</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 STA - SLPP Backfill for Metro Base</td>
<td>3,012,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 STA - Operating (Current Year)</td>
<td>2,689,917</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>2,832,152</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2,832,152</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96,411</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>104,804</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Fuel Tax Credit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>638,208</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>638,208</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Fuel Tax Credit (Transfer to Reserves)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(638,208)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>(638,208)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Carryover from Previous Years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Medicare Subsidy</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>141,743</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>167,256</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Transfer (to)/from Operating Reserves</td>
<td>3,408,933</td>
<td>3,194,673</td>
<td>5,737,340</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>6,149,248</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUE**

| FINAL BUDGET FY16 | 48,464,472 | 50,671,930 | 49,994,995 | -1.3% | 51,991,665 | 4.0% |

* FTA funding is used solely to fund labor expense
### SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT
#### FY16 & FY17 PRELIMINARY OPERATING BUDGET

**Consolidated Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY15</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY16</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET FY16</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>FINAL BUDG FY16</th>
<th>BUDGET FY17</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LABOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501011 Bus Operator Pay</td>
<td>9,378,428</td>
<td>9,761,937</td>
<td>9,681,997</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>10,097,438</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501013 Bus Operator OT</td>
<td>2,105,529</td>
<td>2,191,418</td>
<td>1,888,681</td>
<td>-13.8%</td>
<td>1,710,442</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501021 Other Salaries</td>
<td>7,748,334</td>
<td>7,939,699</td>
<td>8,066,888</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>8,422,105</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501023 Other OT</td>
<td>473,197</td>
<td>488,470</td>
<td>513,938</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>526,834</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>19,705,489</td>
<td>20,381,523</td>
<td>20,151,504</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>20,756,820</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRINGE BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502011 Medicare/Soc. Sec.</td>
<td>342,772</td>
<td>353,385</td>
<td>349,699</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>360,974</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502021 Retirement</td>
<td>4,333,972</td>
<td>4,750,432</td>
<td>4,560,052</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>5,120,595</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502031 Medical Ins</td>
<td>8,475,197</td>
<td>9,180,889</td>
<td>9,718,724</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>10,512,299</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502041 Dental Ins</td>
<td>537,457</td>
<td>554,288</td>
<td>557,969</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>578,961</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502045 Vision Ins</td>
<td>129,498</td>
<td>133,383</td>
<td>133,585</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>138,272</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502051 Life Ins/AD&amp;D</td>
<td>50,443</td>
<td>51,833</td>
<td>52,709</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>54,462</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502060 State Disability Ins (SDI)</td>
<td>238,577</td>
<td>293,289</td>
<td>220,016</td>
<td>-25.0%</td>
<td>233,521</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502061 Long Term Disability Ins</td>
<td>148,562</td>
<td>150,345</td>
<td>143,199</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>160,175</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502071 State Unemployment Ins (SUI)</td>
<td>84,712</td>
<td>112,712</td>
<td>75,748</td>
<td>-32.8%</td>
<td>80,834</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502081 Worker's Comp Ins</td>
<td>1,364,750</td>
<td>1,405,693</td>
<td>1,405,693</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,447,864</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502101 Holiday Pay</td>
<td>643,075</td>
<td>664,771</td>
<td>663,656</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>692,693</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502103 Floating Holiday</td>
<td>94,595</td>
<td>89,277</td>
<td>96,038</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>101,226</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502109 Sick Leave</td>
<td>1,031,292</td>
<td>1,020,199</td>
<td>1,018,333</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>1,062,845</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502111 Annual Leave</td>
<td>2,014,456</td>
<td>2,059,947</td>
<td>1,991,434</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>2,076,492</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502121 Other Paid Absence</td>
<td>150,561</td>
<td>155,643</td>
<td>196,185</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>204,700</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502251 Phys. Exams</td>
<td>14,110</td>
<td>14,110</td>
<td>14,110</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14,110</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502253 Driver Lic Renewal</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502999 Other Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>66,648</td>
<td>61,680</td>
<td>63,535</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>61,334</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>19,725,332</td>
<td>21,056,533</td>
<td>21,265,342</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>22,906,013</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**FY16 & FY17 PRELIMINARY OPERATING BUDGET**

**Consolidated Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY15</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY16</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET FY16</th>
<th>% CHANGE FY16</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY17</th>
<th>BUDGET FY17</th>
<th>% CHANGE FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503011 Accting/Audit Fees</td>
<td>82,250</td>
<td>83,250</td>
<td>83,250</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>83,250</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503012 Admin/Bank Fees</td>
<td>347,200</td>
<td>353,050</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>353,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503031 Prof/Technical Fees</td>
<td>229,950</td>
<td>249,291</td>
<td>405,558</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>169,042</td>
<td>-58.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503032 Legislative Services</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503033 Legal Services</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>106,396</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>106,396</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503034 Pre-Employment Exams</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>8,720</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>-41.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503041 Temp Help</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503161 Custodial Services</td>
<td>79,510</td>
<td>81,580</td>
<td>34,642</td>
<td>-57.5%</td>
<td>34,642</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503162 Uniforms/Laundry</td>
<td>23,450</td>
<td>23,850</td>
<td>28,368</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>28,368</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503171 Security Services</td>
<td>534,550</td>
<td>594,837</td>
<td>458,500</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
<td>458,500</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503221 Classified/Legal Ads</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>13,048</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>10,248</td>
<td>-21.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503222 Legal Ads</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503225 Graphic Services</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503351 Repair - Bldg &amp; Impr</td>
<td>59,740</td>
<td>61,532</td>
<td>55,342</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
<td>55,342</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503352 Repair - Equipment</td>
<td>562,095</td>
<td>577,367</td>
<td>581,233</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>564,449</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503353 Repair - Rev Vehicle</td>
<td>364,500</td>
<td>375,315</td>
<td>327,233</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
<td>327,233</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503354 Repair - Non Rev Vehicle</td>
<td>18,020</td>
<td>19,101</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503363 Haz Mat Disposal</td>
<td>42,230</td>
<td>43,497</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,567,395</td>
<td>2,589,971</td>
<td>2,627,290</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2,367,745</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOBILE MATERIALS & SUPPLIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY15</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY16</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET FY16</th>
<th>% CHANGE FY16</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY17</th>
<th>BUDGET FY17</th>
<th>% CHANGE FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>504011 Fuels &amp; Lubricants - Non Rev Veh</td>
<td>90,743</td>
<td>93,465</td>
<td>84,952</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>84,952</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504012 Fuels &amp; Lubricants - Rev Veh</td>
<td>2,521,518</td>
<td>2,597,163</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504021 Tires &amp; Tubes</td>
<td>279,000</td>
<td>287,370</td>
<td>272,023</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td>272,023</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504161 Other Mobile Supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504191 Rev Vehicle Parts</td>
<td>949,000</td>
<td>968,000</td>
<td>988,109</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>988,109</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3,840,261</td>
<td>3,945,999</td>
<td>3,745,084</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
<td>3,745,084</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT
## FY16 & FY17 PRELIMINARY OPERATING BUDGET
### Consolidated Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY15</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET FY16</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET FY16</th>
<th>% CHANGE FINAL BUDG FY16</th>
<th>BUDGET FY17</th>
<th>% CHANGE BUDG FY16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER MATERIALS &amp; SUPPLIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504205 Freight Out</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>136</td>
<td><strong>-68.0%</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504211 Postage &amp; Mailing</td>
<td>14,430</td>
<td>14,615</td>
<td>12,575</td>
<td><strong>-14.0%</strong></td>
<td>12,575</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504214 Promotional Items</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>800</td>
<td><strong>-33.3%</strong></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504215 Printing</td>
<td>83,380</td>
<td>87,338</td>
<td>36,184</td>
<td><strong>-58.6%</strong></td>
<td>40,184</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504217 Photo Supp/Process</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td><strong>-41.6%</strong></td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504311 Office Supplies</td>
<td>93,669</td>
<td>88,628</td>
<td>71,537</td>
<td><strong>-19.3%</strong></td>
<td>71,537</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504315 Safety Supplies</td>
<td>24,936</td>
<td>26,785</td>
<td>22,039</td>
<td><strong>-17.7%</strong></td>
<td>22,039</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504317 Cleaning Supplies</td>
<td>61,900</td>
<td>64,200</td>
<td>54,480</td>
<td><strong>-15.1%</strong></td>
<td>54,480</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504409 Repair/Maint Supplies</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td><strong>-10.0%</strong></td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504417 Tenant Repairs</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td><strong>-50.0%</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504421 Non-Inventory Parts</td>
<td>26,103</td>
<td>27,106</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td><strong>-26.2%</strong></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504511 Small Tools</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>4,269</td>
<td><strong>-56.4%</strong></td>
<td>4,269</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504515 Employee Tool Replacement</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>783</td>
<td><strong>-73.9%</strong></td>
<td>783</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>469,231</strong></td>
<td><strong>477,698</strong></td>
<td><strong>352,489</strong></td>
<td><strong>-26.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>356,489</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505011 Gas &amp; Electric</td>
<td>275,420</td>
<td>282,853</td>
<td>269,200</td>
<td><strong>-4.8%</strong></td>
<td>269,200</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505021 Water &amp; Garbage</td>
<td>146,386</td>
<td>150,578</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td><strong>-26.3%</strong></td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505031 Telecommunications</td>
<td>240,240</td>
<td>244,650</td>
<td>144,989</td>
<td><strong>-40.7%</strong></td>
<td>144,989</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>662,046</strong></td>
<td><strong>678,080</strong></td>
<td><strong>525,189</strong></td>
<td><strong>-22.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>525,189</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASUALTY &amp; LIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506011 Insurance - Property</td>
<td>63,167</td>
<td>75,172</td>
<td>61,615</td>
<td><strong>-18.0%</strong></td>
<td>61,615</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506015 Insurance - PL/PD</td>
<td>445,484</td>
<td>477,626</td>
<td>452,695</td>
<td><strong>-5.2%</strong></td>
<td>452,695</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506021 Insurance - Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506123 Settlement Costs</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506127 Repairs - District Prop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>658,651</strong></td>
<td><strong>702,798</strong></td>
<td><strong>664,310</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>664,310</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNT</td>
<td>FINAL BUDGET FY16</td>
<td>FINAL BUDGET FY17</td>
<td>REVISED BUDGET FY16</td>
<td>% CHANGE</td>
<td>BUDGET FY16</td>
<td>% CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507051</td>
<td>14,420</td>
<td>14,853</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507201</td>
<td>18,050</td>
<td>18,514</td>
<td>14,701</td>
<td>-20.6%</td>
<td>14,901</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507999</td>
<td>18,540</td>
<td>19,096</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-31.9%</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>51,010</td>
<td>52,462</td>
<td>42,701</td>
<td>-18.6%</td>
<td>42,901</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURCHASED TRAN.</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Expense</td>
<td>319,818</td>
<td>316,443</td>
<td>202,225</td>
<td>-36.1%</td>
<td>202,225</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASES &amp; RENTALS</td>
<td>215,240</td>
<td>220,422</td>
<td>218,861</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>224,889</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL TOTAL</td>
<td>39,430,820</td>
<td>41,438,056</td>
<td>41,416,846</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>43,662,833</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel Total</td>
<td>9,033,652</td>
<td>9,233,874</td>
<td>8,578,149</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>8,328,832</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>48,464,472</td>
<td>50,671,930</td>
<td>49,994,995</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>51,991,665</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 16 TDA/STA Claim
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District

FY16 Capital Budget
## SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT
### PRELIMINARY FY16 CAPITAL BUDGET
#### AS OF MARCH 27, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT/ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RESTRICTED FEDERAL FUNDS</th>
<th>RESTRICTED SAKATA/LAW SUIT PROCEEDS</th>
<th>RESTRICTED FY11 PTMISEA (1B)</th>
<th>RESTRICTED SLPP</th>
<th>RESTRICTED CAL-EMA PROP 1B - TRANSIT SECURITY</th>
<th>RESTRICTED STIP</th>
<th>RESTRICTED CAPITAL STAND TRANSPORTATION TRADE</th>
<th>RESTRICTED LC TOP (CAP &amp; TRADE)</th>
<th>SALES TAX MATCH - SLPP (BACKFILL W/B)</th>
<th>OPERATING / CAPITAL RESERVES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Related Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Metrobase Project - Judy K. Souza - Operations Bldg.</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 635,000</td>
<td>$ 9,225,000</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 14,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transit Security Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pacific Station/Metro Center - Conceptual Design / MOU w/ City of SC</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Watsonville Transit Center - Conceptual Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sales/Incentives - Vernon Bus Stop (FTA 5339)*</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fire Egress - 138 Golf Club (FTA 5339)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WTC Customer Service Booth/Kiosk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vernon Office Reconfiguration (FTA 5339)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>$ 635,000</td>
<td>$ 9,225,000</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ 538,000</td>
<td>$ 7,000</td>
<td>$ 82,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 17,021,243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Finance Software Replacement (Partial Funding ~ 1/2)</td>
<td>$ 35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. HR Software Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fiber optic Switches (FTA 5339)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Repair &amp; Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. L/CNG Station Upgrades-Parts (FTA 5339)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ADA Bus Stop Improvements (FTA 5339)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. WTC Renovations &amp; Repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 71,790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Vehicle Replacement &amp; Campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Paratransit Van Replacements (4)</td>
<td>$ 345,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. State of Good Repair #2 - 6 Buses, 42 MDC’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Mid-Life Bus Engine Overhaul Campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Bus Repair Campaign (~ 12 per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 345,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Revenue Vehicle Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Replacement Non-Revenue Vehicles (FTA 5339)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet &amp; Maint Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Facility Tooling (FTA 5339)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Replace two (2) Photocopier / Scanners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Key Pads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Ticket Vending Machine-SLV (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. WM Audible Improvements - Firmware, Braille Placards, and Key Pads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CAPITAL PROJECTS</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>$ 635,000</td>
<td>$ 9,225,000</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ 538,000</td>
<td>$ 345,000</td>
<td>$ 199,822</td>
<td>$ 82,000</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 17,021,243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FTA 5339 - Staff is currently developing the comprehensive list of projects to be funded with FTA Section 5339 grant funds; the revised Preliminary FY16 Capital Budget to be presented to the Board in May may include additional projects along with amounts for those projects listed as $0 above, along with any new projects identified between now and then.

FTA 5339 - FTA Share = $454,116; Local share = $113,529; Total $567,645
## SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT
### PRELIMINARY FY16 CAPITAL BUDGET
### AS OF MARCH 27, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT/ACTIVITY</th>
<th>RESTRICTED FEDERAL FUNDS</th>
<th>RESTRICTED - SAKATA/LAW SUIT PROCEEDS</th>
<th>RESTRICTED - FY11 PTMISEA (1B)</th>
<th>RESTRICTED - SLPP</th>
<th>RESTRICTED - CAL-EMA PROP 1B - TRANSIT SECURITY</th>
<th>RESTRICTED - STIP</th>
<th>RESTRICTED - CAPITAL STA</th>
<th>RESTRICTED - LCTOP (CAP &amp; TRADE)</th>
<th>SALES TAX MATCH - SLPP (BACKFILL W/STA)</th>
<th>OPERATING / CAPITAL RESERVES</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL PROGRAM FUNDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Sources of Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants (FTA)</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakata / Lawsuit Proceeds</td>
<td>$ 635,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Sources of Funds:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTMSEA (1B)</td>
<td>$ 9,225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalEMA Prop 1B Transit Security Grant Funds (CTSGP)</td>
<td>$ 538,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</td>
<td>$ 345,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Restricted - State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td>$ 199,822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) - Cap &amp; Trade</td>
<td>$ 82,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Match for SLPP - (Backfilled w/STA)</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Sources of Funds:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating / Capital Cash Reserves</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAPITAL FUNDING BY FUNDING SOURCE</strong></td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>$ 635,000</td>
<td>$ 9,225,000</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ 538,000</td>
<td>$ 345,000</td>
<td>$ 199,822</td>
<td>$ 82,000</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 17,021,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Funds</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>$ 635,000</td>
<td>$ 9,225,000</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ 538,000</td>
<td>$ 345,000</td>
<td>$ 199,822</td>
<td>$ 82,000</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 16,084,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Restricted Funds</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAPITAL FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>$ 635,000</td>
<td>$ 9,225,000</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ 538,000</td>
<td>$ 345,000</td>
<td>$ 199,822</td>
<td>$ 82,000</td>
<td>$ 2,380,000</td>
<td>$ 936,421</td>
<td>$ 17,021,243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

RTC staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) send a letter of support (Attachment 1) to Caltrans to include the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing project on the 2016 State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) project list.

BACKGROUND

The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County is collaborating with Caltrans to create a safe passage for wildlife across Highway 17. The dense traffic, concrete median barriers, and lack of culvert or bridge undercrossings make Highway 17 the biggest barrier for wildlife moving through the Santa Cruz Mountains. As a result, Highway 17 has high rates of wildlife fatalities which also affect driver safety.

Biologists at Pathways for Wildlife and the UCSC Puma Project have identified Laurel Curve as the most feasible location for such a Wildlife undercrossing. Caltrans District 5, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the California Wildlife Conservation Board, the UCSC Puma Project and numerous bay area conservation organizations have identified the project as an important priority. The project under consideration is a tunnel undercrossing of Highway 17 in the vicinity of Laurel Curve. Tunnel undercrossings have been shown to be very successful in reducing wildlife fatalities and improving motorist safety. A variety of wildlife have been documented using tunnels or bridges to cross highways 1, 68, 101, 152 and 280. Tunnels can be built under highways without affecting traffic flow.

DISCUSSION

Due to the Conservation Blueprint work by the Land Trust and the Caltrans District 5 Wildlife Corridor and Habitat Connectivity Project, numerous local and state agencies have recognized the tremendous importance of the Highway 17 wildlife crossing at Laurel Curve. District 5 staff has been actively collaborating with the Land Trust on this project and is now working on the Project Initiation Document (PID). Completion of the PID by June 2015 creates the opportunity for the wildlife undercrossing to be funded through the 2016 SHOPP.

The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County and community supporters of this project have taken some big steps to see that this project is realized. They have been actively engaged in protecting three properties on either side of Highway 17 near Laurel Curve to
provide undeveloped wildlife habitat, ensuring the viability of the wildlife corridor (Attachments 2 and 3). The Land Trust has spent $3.5 million to complete two land acquisitions, protecting 290 acres at the site. This includes $1 million from community donors showing their enthusiastic support for this project. The Land Trust is expected to complete the acquisition of a conservation easement on the third property in early 2016 for an additional $1.6 million. In addition to this investment, the Land Trust’s Board of Trustees has pledged to raise $1 million in private donations to complete the wildlife undercrossing.

A letter from the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County to the RTC provides the history and need for this project and the desire for RTC to express their support to Caltrans for this project (Attachment 4). This project has overwhelming support from the community to address the high number of wildlife fatalities and associated driver safety issues. **RTC staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission send a letter of support to Caltrans (Attachment 1) to include the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing project on the 2016 SHOPP project list.**

**SUMMARY**

The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County has been collaborating with Caltrans to create a safe passageway for wildlife across Highway 17 near Laurel Curve. Caltrans District 5 has been actively working on the project initiation document (PID). RTC staff recommends that the RTC send a letter of support to Caltrans to include the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing project on the 2016 SHOPP project list.

**Attachments**

1. RTC Letter of Support to Caltrans
2. Highway 17 Project Fact Sheet
3. Map of Project Location
4. Letter from the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County

S:\RTC\TC2015\TC0515\Hwy17 wildlife tunnel\SR_Land trustSCC-wildlifecrossing.doc
May 7, 2015

Mr. Timothy Gubbins  
District Director  
California Department of Transportation  
District 5  
50 Higuera Street  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-5415

Re: 2016 SHOPP - Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project

Dear Mr. Gubbins:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) expresses their support to include the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project on the 2016 SHOPP project list. The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County has been collaborating with Caltrans to create a safe passage for wildlife across Highway 17. This project has overwhelming support from the community to address the high wildlife fatalities and driver safety issues. Caltrans District 5 is now working on the Project Initiation Document (PID) for this project. Completion of the PID by June 2015 creates the opportunity for the wildlife undercrossing to be funded through the 2016 SHOPP.

The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County and community supporters of this project have taken some big steps to see that this project is realized. They have been actively engaged in protecting three properties on either side of Highway 17 near Laurel Curve to provide undeveloped wildlife habitat, ensuring the viability of the wildlife corridor. The Land Trust has spent $3.5 million to complete two land acquisitions, protecting 290 acres at the site. This includes $1 million from community donors showing their enthusiastic support for this project. The Land Trust is expected to complete the acquisition of a conservation easement on the third property in early 2016 for an additional $1.6 million. In addition to this investment, the Land Trust’s Board of Trustees has pledged to raise $1 million in private donations to complete the wildlife undercrossing. Please see attached letter, fact sheet and project map for additional history and need for this project as well as the financial commitments the Land Trust has made towards this project.

The RTC is pleased to offer support for this valuable project and recommend the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing project for the 2016 SHOPP project list.

Sincerely,

George Dondero  
Executive Director

Enclosures (3)

cc: Aaron Henkel – Caltrans District 5
Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project

A Dangerous Highway – for Wildlife and Humans
Highway 17 is the major freeway connection between the San Francisco Bay Area and the Monterey Bay Region. More than 55,000 vehicles travel the highway each day (20 million vehicles a year).

The dense traffic, concrete median barriers, and lack of culvert or bridge undercrossings make Highway 17 a major barrier for wildlife moving through the Santa Cruz Mountains. As a result, Highway 17 has proved deadly for wildlife and humans—thus making it one of the most dangerous highways in the state.

A Collaborative Solution
The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County is collaborating with Caltrans to create a safe passage (wildlife tunnel) for wildlife across Highway 17. Biologists at Pathways for Wildlife and the UCSC Puma Project have identified Laurel Curve as the most feasible location for such a tunnel.

The Land Trust is seeking to protect three properties totaling 460 acres to provide undeveloped habitat on either side of the highway, ensuring the viability of the wildlife corridor. To date, the Land Trust has completed two of these transactions (the “Mansion” and “McDougal” properties on this map) and has protected 290 acres at the site. We have a Letter of Intent to protect the third property (“Marywood” on the map) and expect to complete the acquisition of a conservation easement on that property in early 2016.
Caltrans’ internal planning has recognized the importance of the wildlife corridor at Laurel Curve. Region 5 staff has been actively collaborating with the Land Trust on the project and is advancing a funding proposal to build a wildlife tunnel as part of 2016 or 2018 State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP). With this support, the Land Trust is now focused on completing the third land protection effort and increasing our outreach to secure state funding for construction of the wildlife tunnel.

**The Best Possible Location**
The Laurel Curve project site has all the components necessary for a successful wildlife crossing and to reconnect habitat currently fragmented by Highway 17:

1. Data collected at the site shows that mountain lions and deer routinely try to cross the highway at Laurel Curve. Five mountain lions have been killed trying to cross in the past five years.
2. The high level of wildlife movement has resulted in weekly collisions with motorists and is a safety threat.
3. There are large, undeveloped properties on either side of the highway that facilitate wildlife movement.
4. The highway at Laurel Curve is built over a large natural drainage, an ideal place to install a culvert to allow animals to travel beneath the highway.
5. The wildlife corridor bridges two core habitat areas identified in several landscape-scale wildlife connectivity modeling efforts.

**Current Status**

1. The Land Trust has conserved the “McDougal” and “Mansion” properties, giving us control of the land on either side of the highway where a wildlife tunnel could be built.
2. The Land Trust has a Letter of Intent to purchase the Marywood property. The appraisal is complete and we are currently negotiating terms of the Option Agreement with the landowner.
3. Caltrans is working on Project Initiation Documents (PID) for the 2016 SHOPP cycle to build the tunnel. The PID will contain a preliminary design and budget for constructing the tunnel.
4. Caltrans faces significant hurdles in funding wildlife corridor projects. The Land Trust would like to develop a partnership with the Santa Cruz RTC that will leverage private and public funds to build the wildlife crossing much sooner than Caltrans would be able to on its own.
April 24th, 2015

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

Re: Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project 2016 SHOPP Request

Dear Mr. Dondero:

In 2011, The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County completed its Conservation Blueprint for Santa Cruz County. This two-year project sought input from the public and local experts to develop a plan that would guide the Land Trust's priorities for the next 25 years. One of the key realizations of this planning effort was how important habitat connectivity is to maintaining the rich biodiversity of our county and the surrounding region.

The Conservation Blueprint identified Highway 17, with its dense traffic, concrete median barriers, and lack of culverts or bridges, as the biggest barrier to wildlife movement through the Santa Cruz Mountains. As a result, Highway 17 has proved deadly for wildlife and humans—thus making it one of the most dangerous highways in the state.

The Land Trust has developed a project near Laurel Road (see attached map) that has the potential help permanently resolve this conflict. Our goal is to protect the critical habitat on either side of the highway and construct a wildlife undercrossing at Laurel Curve to facilitate animal movement across the highway. Caltrans Region 5, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the California Wildlife Conservation Board, The UCSC Puma project, and numerous bay area conservation organizations have identified the project as an important priority.

To date the Land Trust has spent $3,500,000 to protect 290 acres of the total 460-acre wildlife corridor. This included more than $1,000,000 dollar from 1800 donors to complete the first phase of the project. The Land Trust expects to spend an additional $1,600,000 dollars to complete that land acquisitions needed to make the project feasible. In addition to this investment the Land Trust’s Board of Trustees has pledged to raise $1,000,000 in private donations complete the wildlife undercrossing.
Caltrans Region is now working on a Project Initiation Document (PID). This PID creates the opportunity for the wildlife undercrossing to be funded through the 2016 SHOPP funding cycle. Our understanding is that the SHOPP process is very competitive and that local support is essential for the project to succeed. We therefore ask that the Santa Cruz RTC make a request to Caltrans to include the undercrossing project on the 2016 SHOPP project list.

Sincerely

Terry Corwin
President & CEO
Land Trust of Santa Cruz County
May 7, 2015

Mr. Timothy Gubbins  
District Director  
California Department of Transportation  
District 5  
50 Higuera Street  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-5415

Re: 2016 SHOOP - Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project

Dear Mr. Gubbins:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) expresses their support to include the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project on the 2016 SHOOP project list. The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County has been collaborating with Caltrans to create a safe passage for wildlife across Highway 17. This project has overwhelming support from the community to address the high wildlife fatalities and driver safety issues. Caltrans District 5 is now working on the Project Initiation Document (PID) for this project. Completion of the PID by June 2015 creates the opportunity for the wildlife undercrossing to be funded through the 2016 SHOOP.

The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County and community supporters of this project have taken some big steps to see that this project is realized. They have been actively engaged in protecting three properties on either side of Highway 17 near Laurel Curve to provide undeveloped wildlife habitat, ensuring the viability of the wildlife corridor. The Land Trust has spent $3.5 million to complete two land acquisitions, protecting 290 acres at the site. This includes $1 million from community donors showing their enthusiastic support for this project. The Land Trust is expected to complete the acquisition of a conservation easement on the third property in early 2016 for an additional $1.6 million. In addition to this investment, the Land Trust’s Board of Trustees has pledged to raise $1 million in private donations to complete the wildlife undercrossing. Please see attached letter, fact sheet and project map for additional history and need for this project as well as the financial commitments the Land Trust has made towards this project.

The RTC is pleased to offer support for this valuable project and recommend the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing project for the 2016 SHOOP project list.

Sincerely,

George Dondero  
Executive Director

Enclosures (3)

cc: Aaron Henkel – Caltrans District 5
Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project

A Dangerous Highway – for Wildlife and Humans
Highway 17 is the major freeway connection between the San Francisco Bay Area and the Monterey Bay Region. More than 55,000 vehicles travel the highway each day (20 million vehicles a year).

The dense traffic, concrete median barriers, and lack of culvert or bridge undercrossings make Highway 17 a major barrier for wildlife moving through the Santa Cruz Mountains. As a result, Highway 17 has proved deadly for wildlife and humans—thus making it one of the most dangerous highways in the state.

A Collaborative Solution
The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County is collaborating with Caltrans to create a safe passage (wildlife tunnel) for wildlife across Highway 17. Biologists at Pathways for Wildlife and the UCSC Puma Project have identified Laurel Curve as the most feasible location for such a tunnel.

The Land Trust is seeking to protect three properties totaling 460 acres to provide undeveloped habitat on either side of the highway, ensuring the viability of the wildlife corridor. To date, the Land Trust has completed two of these transactions (the “Mansion” and “McDougal” properties on this map) and has protected 290 acres at the site. We have a Letter of Intent to protect the third property (“Marywood” on the map) and expect to complete the acquisition of a conservation easement on that property in early 2016.
Caltrans’ internal planning has recognized the importance of the wildlife corridor at Laurel Curve. Region 5 staff has been actively collaborating with the Land Trust on the project and is advancing a funding proposal to build a wildlife tunnel as part of 2016 or 2018 State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP). With this support, the Land Trust is now focused on completing the third land protection effort and increasing our outreach to secure state funding for construction of the wildlife tunnel.

The Best Possible Location
The Laurel Curve project site has all the components necessary for a successful wildlife crossing and to reconnect habitat currently fragmented by Highway 17:

1. Data collected at the site shows that mountain lions and deer routinely try to cross the highway at Laurel Curve. Five mountain lions have been killed trying to cross in the past five years.
2. The high level of wildlife movement has resulted in weekly collisions with motorists and is a safety threat.
3. There are large, undeveloped properties on either side of the highway that facilitate wildlife movement.
4. The highway at Laurel Curve is built over a large natural drainage, an ideal place to install a culvert to allow animals to travel beneath the highway.
5. The wildlife corridor bridges two core habitat areas identified in several landscape-scale wildlife connectivity modeling efforts.

Current Status
1. The Land Trust has conserved the “McDougal” and “Mansion” properties, giving us control of the land on either side of the highway where a wildlife tunnel could be built.
2. The Land Trust has a Letter of Intent to purchase the Marywood property. The appraisal is complete and we are currently negotiating terms of the Option Agreement with the landowner.
3. Caltrans is working on Project Initiation Documents (PID) for the 2016 SHOPP cycle to build the tunnel. The PID will contain a preliminary design and budget for constructing the tunnel.
4. Caltrans faces significant hurdles in funding wildlife corridor projects. The Land Trust would like to develop a partnership with the Santa Cruz RTC that will leverage private and public funds to build the wildlife crossing much sooner than Caltrans would be able to on its own.
April 24th, 2015

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

Re: Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project 2016 SHOPP Request

Dear Mr. Dondero:

In 2011, The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County completed its Conservation Blueprint for Santa Cruz County. This two-year project sought input from the public and local experts to develop a plan that would guide the Land Trust’s priorities for the next 25 years. One of the key realizations of this planning effort was how important habitat connectivity is to maintaining the rich biodiversity of our county and the surrounding region.

The Conservation Blueprint identified Highway 17, with its dense traffic, concrete median barriers, and lack of culverts or bridges, as the biggest barrier to wildlife movement through the Santa Cruz Mountains. As a result, Highway 17 has proved deadly for wildlife and humans—thus making it one of the most dangerous highways in the state.

The Land Trust has developed a project near Laurel Road (see attached map) that has the potential help permanently resolve this conflict. Our goal is to protect the critical habitat on either side of the highway and construct a wildlife undercrossing at Laurel Curve to facilitate animal movement across the highway. Caltrans Region 5, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the California Wildlife Conservation Board, The UCSC Puma project, and numerous bay area conservation organizations have identified the project as an important priority.

To date the Land Trust has spent $3,500,000 to protect 290 acres of the total 460-acre wildlife corridor. This included more than $1,000,000 dollar from 1800 donors to complete the first phase of the project. The Land Trust expects to spend an additional $1,600,000 dollars to complete that land acquisitions needed to make the project feasible. In addition to this investment the Land Trust’s Board of Trustees has pledged to raise $1,000,000 in private donations complete the wildlife undercrossing.
Caltrans Region is now working on a Project Initiation Document (PID). This PID creates the opportunity for the wildlife undercrossing to be funded through the 2016 SHOPP funding cycle. Our understanding is that the SHOPP process is very competitive and that local support is essential for the project to succeed. We therefore ask that the Santa Cruz RTC make a request to Caltrans to include the undercrossing project on the 2016 SHOPP project list.

Sincerely

Terry Corwin
President & CEO
Land Trust of Santa Cruz County
Highlights of some recent transportation-related federal activities:

- The current extension of the MAP-21 law governing federal highway and transit programs expires on May 31.

- In addition, the federal Highway Trust Fund is expected to reach critically-low levels by July.

- Since there is little to no chance that a long-term MAP-21 reauthorization will be approved prior to May 31, Congress is likely to approve an extension of current law before that date.

- The length of that extension could be a “clean” extension through July, which would require no additional revenue into the Highway Trust Fund, or an extension that would last several months, which would require additional revenues.

- House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee Chairman Bill Shuster (R-PA) prefers an extension that would provide some certainty at least through the construction season.

- While the congressional committees with jurisdiction over highway and transit policy could be ready with reauthorization proposals in short order, there continues to be little activity on the revenue portion of the bill from the congressional tax-writing committees.

- Much of that delay has to do with the fact that those panels would prefer to consider transportation funding in the context of comprehensive tax reform – something that has not occurred in Congress since 1986.

- Meanwhile, the House Appropriations Committee recently began consideration of the FY 2016 Department of Transportation budget.

- While final funding levels will be dependent on funding levels determined through reauthorization, for now, the Committee essentially funded DOT programs that receive funds through the Highway Trust Fund at their current levels.

- However, programs that are funded outside the Highway Trust Fund did not fare as well in the House FY 2016 spending bill.

- Programs recommended for decreases included: Amtrak (-18%), New Starts rail projects (-9%) and the TIGER discretionary grant program (-80%).
RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the attached fiscal year (FY) 2015-16 RTC Work Program (Attachment 1) and authorize the Executive Director to make revisions in response to comments from Caltrans consistent with the approved RTC budget.

BACKGROUND

Each year the RTC works with Caltrans and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) to prepare a work program for the following fiscal year based on the budget approved by the RTC as well as state and federal requirements. The work program is required for RTC to receive federal and state transportation planning funds and must include the work necessary to meet federal and state transportation planning requirements. The RTC’s work program also includes all of the other work that the RTC performs. The work program provides summary information on the work that the RTC will perform with the state and federal planning funds as well as a summary schedule and work products.

DISCUSSION

RTC staff prepared a draft FY 2015-16 work program for the RTC and submitted it to Caltrans for review. The draft included as Attachment 1 has incorporated Caltrans comments and suggestions. Most of Caltrans comments suggested improved task and project descriptions and inclusion of safety of the transportation system throughout the document. Safety of the transportation system has always been one of the primary elements in the work of the RTC. Safety is one of the main goals of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan and reducing injury and fatal collisions by 50% by the year 2035 is one of its targets. Staff modified the work program descriptions to better illustrate that improving safety is part of most of the work of the RTC and added the possibility of producing a dedicated transportation safety plan for Santa Cruz County, as suggested by Caltrans. The RTC may receive some additional comments from Caltrans that may require further revisions to the work programs. As in past years, the FY 2015-16 RTC work program (Attachment 1) addresses state-mandated responsibilities and RTC priorities including:

- Implementation of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) in coordination and cooperation with AMBAG, neighboring
regional transportation planning agencies, Caltrans and local jurisdictions; and preparation of the next RTP and MTP;

- Production and implementation of the various required state and federal funding documents;
- Continuation of the Highway 1/HOV Lane project tiered environmental analysis;
- Completion of the grant funded passenger rail study and unified corridor investment plan;
- Completion of phase 1 of the unified corridors investment plan;
- Management, operation and planning for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line;
- Work to develop potential new transportation revenues to help meet continuously increasing transportation needs in the region;
- Continued work with project sponsors and funding agencies on securing funds for high priority projects for all modes of transportation;
- Implementation of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network master plan;
- Monitor and participate in local, state and federal efforts to address global warming;
- Participate in statewide efforts to authorize a new federal transportation funding bill and ensure that California and its regional agencies receive their fair share of federal funds
- Continued services to Santa Cruz area travelers through the Cruz511, SAFE callbox, Safe on 17 and Freeway Service Patrol programs, including coordination with partner agencies to ensure the best possible service.

Staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the attached proposed FY2015-16 RTC Work Program (Attachment 1) and authorize the Executive Director to make further revisions in response to comments from Caltrans consistent with the approved RTC budget.

SUMMARY

The RTC must prepare a work program to receive state and federal transportation planning funds. The proposed FY 2015-16 RTC work program includes state-mandated responsibilities and RTC priorities. The proposed FY 2015-16 work program has been reviewed by Caltrans and their comments and suggestions have been incorporated. Staff recommends that the RTC approve the proposed FY 2015-16 RTC Work Program (Attachment 1). Any additional comments received from Caltrans will be incorporated consistent with the RTC budget and state and federal requirements.

Attachments:
1. Final Draft FY 2015-16 Work Program
The fiscal year (FY) 2015-2016 work program for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) describes the activities to be accomplished during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2015 and ending June 30, 2016 and includes the following mandated responsibilities and SCCRTC priorities:

- implementation of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan and 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan in coordination and cooperation with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) the San Benito Council of Governments (SBCOG), local jurisdictions, Caltrans and other local and regional agencies; and initiation of work to produce the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan and 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/SCS;
- production and implementation of the various required state and federal funding documents;
- continued production of the Highway 1 Investment Program tiered environmental documents;
- management, operation, planning and improvement of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line;
- continuation of additional bridge rehabilitation work on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line;
- implementation of the master plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network;
- continued work to carry out the RTC’s responsibilities to monitor and coordinate with Caltrans and local agencies on timely implementation of state highway and local projects with state or federal funding participation;
- continued work with project sponsors and funding agencies on securing funds for high priority projects for all modes of transportation;
- continued services to Santa Cruz area travelers through the SAFE callbox, Safe on 17 and Freeway Service Patrol programs, including coordination with partner agencies to ensure the best possible service;
- implementation of the Rideshare/Cruz511 program for Santa Cruz County travelers;
- continuation of the Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition’s bicycle and pedestrian education programs;
- continued maintenance and enhancement of a variety of public information outlets;
- continued development and implementation of systems necessary to ensure that the RTC continues to function efficiently and effectively as an independent government agency;
- monitor and participate in local, state, and federal efforts to address global warming and sustainability;
- participate in statewide efforts to reauthorize the federal transportation law and ensure that California and its regional agencies receive their fair share of federal transportation funds; and
- pursuit of any and all funding sources for transportation projects in the region including the development of local funding sources as well as seeking other new sources.

Through the activities listed in this work program, the SCCRTC works to deliver a full range of safe, convenient, reliable and efficient transportation choices for the community.
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WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 101

Overall Work Program

Agency: SCCRTC
Project Manager: Luis Mendez, Deputy Director
Total Budget: $30,835

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>30,835</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State RPA</td>
<td>21,882</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>8,953</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,835</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,835</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Federal 0%

REVENUE

Project Description

Develop, maintain, and oversee the annual work program and budget to carryout the transportation planning activities of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) in accordance with federal, state and local requirements and available funding. This includes OWP development, coordination, and meetings with local, regional, state and federal agencies (including AMBAG, Caltrans, FHWA, TMC and San Benito COG) to ensure that the entire three-county region is meeting federal requirements. Additionally, this work element provides monitoring and review of policy and legislative activities that impact the production, coordination, implementation and requirements of the OWP. Further duties include quarterly reporting to verify progress in implementing the work program.

Project Product(s)

FY 2016-17 Overall Work Program and Budget and amendments; amendments to the FY 2015-16 OWP and Budget; quarterly and annual progress reports.

Federally Eligible Task

Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)

Develop and implement annual Overall Work Program and Budget 0%

Develop, implement and oversee the annual overall work program activities and budget in accordance with federal and state requirements in coordination with Caltrans, AMBAG and other partner agencies; and produce quarterly and annual progress reports.

Previous Accomplishments

Developed and adopted FY 2014-15 OWP and Budget; Processed amendments to the FY 2014-15 OWP and Budget; provided required quarterly and annual progress reports for transportation planning and project activities to SCCRTC, AMBAG, and Caltrans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finalize FY 2014-15 revenues and expenditures</td>
<td>Revenues and expenditures files</td>
<td>8/15/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Produce final FY 2014-15 work program quarterly report and provide to Caltrans and AMBAG</td>
<td>Final FY 2014-15 quarterly report</td>
<td>8/15/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prepare and adopt the annual fall FY 2015-16 budget and overall work program amendment</td>
<td>FY 2015-16 amendments and staff reports</td>
<td>10/31/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Produce FY 2015-16 quarterly work program reports and provide to AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>FY 2015-16 quarterly work program reports</td>
<td>04/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Related Documents/Activities</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prepare for and participate in annual OWP kick-off meeting with TMC, AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>Meeting with regional partners, agenda and materials</td>
<td>12/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop FY 2016-17 draft work program and budget and provide document to AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>Draft FY 2016-17 draft work program and budget</td>
<td>03/01/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare and adopt the annual spring FY 2015-16 budget and overall work program amendment and provide to AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>Amendment and staff report</td>
<td>03/31/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Participate in 2016-17 OWP development and coordination meetings with AMBAG, Caltrans and other agencies in the region</td>
<td>Meetings, agendas and materials</td>
<td>04/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Incorporate comments/suggestions into final draft FY 2016-17 OWP and provide document to AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>Final draft FY 2016-17 OWP</td>
<td>04/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Prepare and present final FY 2016-17 OWP to SCCRTC board for approval</td>
<td>Final OWP and staff report</td>
<td>05/15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Update the Continuing Cooperative Agreement (CCA) with AMBAG consistent with the OWP and submit to AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>Updated CCA &amp; staff report</td>
<td>06/15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Prepare other amendments to the FY 2015-16 budget and work program as necessary and submit to AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>Amendments and staff reports</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Description

SCCRTC as Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Santa Cruz county distributes Transportation Development Act (TDA) Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds for planning, transit, bicycle facilities and programs, pedestrian facilities and programs and specialized transportation in accordance with state law and the unmet transit needs process.

### Project Product(s)

- Transportation Development Act and State Transit Assistance Funds apportionments, allocations and claims
- Triennial performance audit and corresponding modifications
- FY 2014-15 Fiscal Audit

### Other Task (Nonfederal)

Manage, coordinate and distribute TDA and STA funds

### Previous Accomplishments

Every three years, SCCRTC contracts for triennial performance audits of the transit operators and itself to ensure that the agencies are meeting the requirements of state TDA law. In FY 2012-13 a triennial performance audit for FYs 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 was initiated and completed in FY 2013-14. Throughout fiscal years 2013-14 and 2014-15 the RTC has been working to implement the audit recommendations. Annually, SCCRTC oversees the fiscal TDA audits for the transit operators in Santa Cruz County and itself. In FY 2014-15 TDA fiscal audits were completed for FY 2013-2014.

### Task Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate review of appropriate TDA claims with advisory committees</td>
<td>Staff reports</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide staff support to Budget and Administration/ Personnel Committee</td>
<td>Agendas and staff reports</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coordinate annual unmet transit needs process, including outreach to traditionally underrepresented communities, and adopt resolution of unmet transit needs finding</td>
<td>Staff reports, presentation, information materials (Spanish), public outreach, meetings and resolution</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Corresponding Work and Deadlines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maintain records and pay claims for TDA, STA and other trust fund accounts.</td>
<td>Files, invoice processing and payments 06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assist transit operators with annual financial audits</td>
<td>Phone calls, emails 06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Implement recommendations in performance audit</td>
<td>Staff reports and modifications to processes and forms 06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Obtain TDA funds estimates from County Auditor Controller</td>
<td>Emails and estimate materials 7/15/15 1/15/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Monitor TDA revenue receipts, compare to estimates and adjust estimates as necessary</td>
<td>Reports to B&amp;A/P Committee and RTC 06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conduct the FY 2014-15 annual fiscal audit and implement suggested changes</td>
<td>Audit report and staff reports 6/30/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Produce staff assignment lists, performance evaluations and personnel actions</td>
<td>Assignment list, individual staff meetings, evaluation forms 03/31/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Prepare and submit to Caltrans the FY 2015-16 indirect cost allocation plan</td>
<td>ICAP report and staff report 08/31/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Produce and distribute annual financial report</td>
<td>Financial report and staff reports 06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Coordinate, meet, confer and negotiate with labor representatives</td>
<td>Meetings, agenda and information materials 6/30/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 112  Transportation Plans Coordination and Interagency Liaison

Agency: SCCRTC  Project Manager: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  Total Budget: $178,218

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>133,618</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State RPA</td>
<td>86,417</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>91,801</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>178,218</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>178,218</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Federal 0%

Note: No project development nor project implementation tasks included in this work element will be funded by Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) funds.

Note: No RPA funds will be used for the contractual work listed in this work element, which will be paid with local funds only and is for hiring legislation and regulation consultants who assist the RTC in obtaining information and producing reports to fully understand the implications of regulatory and statutory changes to transportation planning and funding and adequately communicate such changes and implications and implement them accordingly. Lobbying is not part of any work task under this work element.

**Project Description**

This is an ongoing element concerned with the coordination of regional transportation planning activities consistent with federal and state law to maintain a coordinated approach to transportation planning on a local, regional, state and federal level that addresses all aspects of the transportation system including safety.

**Project Product(s)**

Agendas, minutes, reports and presentation materials for Interagency Technical Advisory Committee meetings

Reports and presentation materials for RTC meetings

Agendas, notes and materials for meetings with representatives from local, regional and state entities

**Federally Eligible Task**

Coordinated the implementation of MAP-21 requirements as it relates to regional transportation planning

**Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding**

0%

**Previous Accomplishments**

The SCCRTC worked with AMBAG and TMC to ensure a coordinated effort for the production of the 2014 RTP/MTP and is currently working with those and other agencies on the production of the 2018 RTP/MTP. The SCCRTC held regular meetings of the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) and SCCRTC staff held meetings with Santa Cruz Metro, AMBAG, TMC, VTA, educational institutions, non-profits, local jurisdictions, and Caltrans, to discuss and implement coordination efforts.

**Task** | **Description** | **Deliverable** | **Completion Date**
---|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
1 | Collect, process and transmit information on funding, plans and related activities to facilitate interagency communication | Phone calls, emails, and information materials | 06/30/16 |
2 | Participate in, prepare and distribute agendas and staff reports for RTC and committee meetings | Agendas and staff reports | 06/30/16 |
Meet quarterly with Caltrans to coordinate planning and programming activities and prepare materials for meetings  
Teleconference, Agenda and meeting materials  06/30/16

Coordinate on planning and programming with other agencies throughout the state through participation in the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies group, the California Association of Councils of Government (CalCOG), the Central Coast Coalition and the California Transportation Commission  
Meeting participation, meeting notes, agendas  06/30/16

Participate in the MTP/SCS Steering Committee with AMBAG, TAMC and SBCOG to coordinate Santa Cruz County efforts with those of other transportation planning agencies in the region  
Agendas, materials, notes, communications and MTP/SCS  06/30/16

Participate in Santa Cruz METRO board meetings and Santa Cruz METRO/RTC management meetings and communicate with AMBAG to help ensure regional transit planning coordination  
Agendas, materials, notes, communications and coordinated transit plans  06/30/16

Continue to work with Caltrans, AMBAG and other partner agencies on improved planning for the movement of goods into, out of and through the region, including the Highway 101 freight study  
Communications with partner agencies, meetings  06/30/16

Work with the City of Watsonville, Caltrans Aeronautics and other partner agencies to update the master plan for the Watsonville airport  
Communications with partner agencies, meetings  06/30/16

Exchange information concerning transportation planning, and funding with local jurisdictions, Caltrans, AMBAG, Santa Cruz Metro, the Air District, UCSC, and other federal, state and local agencies  
Meetings, phone calls, emails and information materials  06/30/16

Prepare reports and materials for the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) to facilitate planning and programming coordination among all of the various transportation partners represented on the Committee - (public works departments, planning departments, transit district, UCSC, Caltrans, AMBAG, Air District)  
ITAC meetings, agendas and packets  06/30/16

Monitor and participate in efforts at the federal, state and local level related to reduction of VMT and other transportation planning and programming measures to reduce greenhouse gases (GHG) and address global warming  
Conference calls, meetings and notes  06/30/16

Monitor and participate in efforts at the federal, state and local level and with law enforcement agencies to address and improve the safety of the transportation system  
Conference calls, meetings and notes  06/30/16

Prepare for and participate in meetings of the AMBAG Board as an ex-officio representative  
Meetings and notes  06/30/16

Coordinate with business and community organizations, and task forces, including those who engage traditionally underrepresented communities, on transportation planning, and funding issues  
Presentations, phone calls, meetings and materials in Spanish  06/30/16

With the assistance of consultant services, stay informed on state and federal legislative, regulatory and budgetary changes and proposed changes affecting transportation to more effectively and efficiently coordinate current transportation activities with changing requirements - (consultant and RTC)  
Consultant reports, Staff reports and information materials  06/30/16

With the assistance of consultant services, communicate with legislative officials and others on the effective and efficient coordination of proposed legislative and budgetary changes with current transportation planning activities - (Consultants and RTC)  
Phone calls, emails, letters and meetings  06/30/16

Continue to work with Interagency Technical Advisory Committee members and other transportation partners to cooperatively develop and pursue grant opportunities for transportation studies and development of transportation plan components and funding  
Joint grant applications  06/30/16
| 18 | Develop partnerships with local agencies responsible for land use decisions to facilitate coordination of transportation planning with land use, open space, job-housing balance, environmental constraints, and growth management | Phone calls, emails, meetings, notes and information materials |
| 19 | Monitor and participate in efforts at the state and regional level to effectively implement the requirements of MAP-21, including federal rulemaking and performance measure requirements. | Phone calls, teleconferences, emails, notes and information materials |
| 20 | Participate in coordination of traveler information including quarterly meetings. | Communications with partner agencies, meetings |
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 113

Public Participation Program

Agency: SCCRTC
Project Manager: Karena Pushnik, Public Information Coordinator
Total Budget: $20,557

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>20,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description

This work element includes public participation activities that support the overall public participation program of the SCCRTC but are not attributable to a specific project, program or activity. This includes general maintenance of the RTC website and social media outlets and responding to general inquiries regarding the SCCRTC.

Project Product(s)

Well functioning website and social media outlets and updated general postings

Previous Accomplishments

In FY 2011-12 the SCCRTC overhauled its website and initiated a social media use policy. In FY 2012-13, the SCCRTC migrated the overhauled website to more current technology that offers more efficient maintenance and integration with social media outlets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide information to and solicit information from the community at large regarding the general functions and duties of the RTC using the media, internet, advertisements, in-office and partner organization contact distribution mechanisms and presentations to local groups as a means to involve the public in the transportation planning process</td>
<td>Updated and functioning website</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Use print and electronic media to disseminate and solicit information to and from traditionally underrepresented populations</td>
<td>Bilingual print and electronic media</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Broadcast regular RTC meetings and public hearings countywide on Community TV</td>
<td>Televised RTC meetings</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Utilize Spanish translation services during SCCRTC meetings, public workshops and public hearings</td>
<td>Translators at meetings</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Continue to produce and host the SCCRTC Transportation Café program on Community TV</td>
<td>Transportation café program</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continue to provide outreach to the community regarding ways to improve safety as users of the transportation system.</td>
<td>Bilingual print and electronic media and public presentations</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participate with Caltrans and the County of Santa Cruz on the public engagement process for the State Route 17 Access Management Plan</td>
<td>Bilingual print and electronic media and public meetings</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Description

This work element is to plan, develop and test an individualized marketing and research program for Santa Cruz County that empowers solo-drivers to switch modes with a special emphasis on attracting new transit riders. Targeted towards employment centers and in neighborhoods near major transit stops and high quality transit corridors, the program will deliver customized and relevant offers and information to unique consumer segments. Project tasks include: procuring consultant services; data collection and methodology; developing systems for pilot testing; and analyzing pilot testing. The project will conduct market research and produce a toolkit for providing personalized communications and encouragement to use alternative modes, especially transit, that can be applied in Santa Cruz County and communities statewide.

### Project Product(s)

User-Oriented Transit Travel Planning Project

### Previous Accomplishments

Since 2011, the SCCRTC has developed more than 40 web pages of customer self-service solutions dedicated to expanding travel choices in Santa Cruz County.

### Task Tracking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initiate project with partner agencies, produce a request for proposals (RFP) to secure consultant services and secure consultant</td>
<td>Partner meetings, agendas, RFP and consultant agreement</td>
<td>09/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Working with project partners research individualized marketing programs, document best practices, tools, materials and evaluation methods</td>
<td>List of practices, tools, materials and evaluations for individualized marketing</td>
<td>10/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Working with the selected consultant develop User-Oriented Transit Travel Planning testing, methodology and surveys (RTC and consultant)</td>
<td>Surveys, methodology and business operations systems for conducting pilot testing</td>
<td>12/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct and analyze User-Oriented Transit Travel Planning pilot testing at targeted workplaces and neighborhoods</td>
<td>List of targeted locations and analysis of testing</td>
<td>10/31/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prepare User-Oriented Transit Travel Planning Project Report and Toolkit for conducting an individualized transit marketing program in Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Final report on research findings and toolkit</td>
<td>02/28/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Supporting Documents</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop public participation program that includes outreach materials and presentations</td>
<td>List of stakeholders, meeting agendas, minutes and notes, presentation materials</td>
<td>02/28/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coordinate and manage project (RTC)</td>
<td>Agreements, Quarterly reports, OWP, agendas, invoices and billing</td>
<td>02/28/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 177**  
**Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)**  

**Agency:** SCCRTC  
**Project Manager:** Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner  
**Total Budget:** $462,500

**ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE:** FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>76,060</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>207,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>302,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>84,440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>462,500</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>462,500</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description**
SCCRTC Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) operates on Highways 1 and 17 in Santa Cruz County to assist stranded or stalled motorists, and to remove collisions and freeway debris that cause episodic traffic congestion. SCCRTC works closely with Caltrans and California Highway Patrol to implement the program.

**Project Product(s)**
Freeway Service Patrol towing services, invoices, service contracts, funding agreements, service statistics and reports

**Other Task (Nonfederal)**
Implement county level Freeway Service Patrol

**Previous Accomplishments**
In FY 2012-13, SCCRTC implemented FSP service on Highway 1 to alleviate congestion resulting from the Highway 1 Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes construction. In FY 2013-14, SCCRTC completed a procurement process and established new tow service contracts. In FY 2013-14, SCCRTC worked with Caltrans and the CHP to implement additional FSP service to mitigate congestion associated with a construction project on Highway 17. In 2014, the SCCRTC secured STIP funds for FSP service on Highway 1 for a two-year period. In 2014, SCCRTC replaced the PDA’s used for data collection with mini iPads and updated data collection software to improve data collection efficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administration: Provide supplies as needed, monitor use, evaluate future program needs, and process invoices for payment of service from contractors.</td>
<td>Tow truck service to motorists, invoices, purchase orders, statistics, and reports</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conduct quarterly training and informational meetings with Caltrans, CHP and tow operators and partner with TAMC for the quarterly trainings</td>
<td>Training sessions, agendas and materials</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continue to provide tow truck service to motorists through contracts with tow service providers and under supervision of the CHP (RTC, contractor, CHP)</td>
<td>Tow truck service to motorists, contracts for service, logs and invoices</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Represent agency at statewide oversight committee meetings to demonstrate effectiveness and to maintain and increase state funding for FSP program</td>
<td>Meeting participation, reports, presentations</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Task Type</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improve data collection techniques and enhance Personal Digital Assistants to improve truck tracking and vehicle dispatching capabilities.</td>
<td>Data reports and analysis</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Work with other freeway service programs within region to enhance the program’s cost-effectiveness</td>
<td>Cost effectiveness analysis</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare Annual Report</td>
<td>Annual report and presentation</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continue to promote the program and increase awareness</td>
<td>Outreach materials in English and Spanish</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Continue to implement and monitor the usage and effectiveness of FSP tow truck service in cooperation with CHP and Caltrans</td>
<td>Data reports and analysis</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coordinate FSP with neighboring counties</td>
<td>Phone calls, emails, letters and meetings</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Consider revisions to FSP services based on analysis of usage and availability of funding</td>
<td>Analysis and reports</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Maintain FSP data collection system and feed the data into the statewide FSP benefit/cost model to better reflect conditions of smaller FSP programs</td>
<td>Data reports and analysis</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Investigate and pursue potential new funding sources for FSP programs</td>
<td>Phone calls, emails, letters and meetings</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 178  
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

Agency: SCCRTC  
Project Manager: Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner  
Total Budget: $343,807

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency Amount ($)</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel 129,507</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies 214,300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 343,807</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Federal 0%

Project Description

The Santa Cruz County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) operates the County's highway callbox system and works with the California Highway Patrol and Caltrans on motorist aid and highway safety projects and programs.

Project Product(s)

Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies call box system and extra CHP enforcement to reduce collisions

Other Task (Nonfederal)

Maintain and implement SAFE program and provide extra CHP enforcement

Previous Accomplishments

During FY 1991/92, the first full year of this program, SCCRTC implemented the SAFE Motorist Aid Callbox System in Santa Cruz County. In 1999, SCCRTC SAFE as a partner with the CHP and Caltrans initiated the Safe on 17 program to reduce collisions on Highway 17 with enforcement, engineered improvements and education. The program has successfully helped to reduce collisions by almost 50% over its life time. In FY 2014-15, SCCRTC SAFE completed an analysis of call box usage and as a result will reduce the number of call boxes in the system and upgrade the remaining call boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Continue to work with contractors to provide reliable and efficient call box facilities and services</td>
<td>Roadside call box service</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complete mobility and site improvements as needed</td>
<td>ADA accessible call box sites</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Track DMV collection of SAFE funds to ensure accurate revenue collection</td>
<td>Revenue history</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continue to work with the CalSAFE Committee to coordinate on statewide issues related to Call Box and motorist aid systems</td>
<td>Coordinated and consistent services</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work with other SAFE agencies in the region to solicit new contracts for call box implementation and maintenance services</td>
<td>Maintenance contract</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continue to administer enhanced CHP enforcement as part of the SAFE on 17 Program to reduce collisions and improve the safety of the transportation system</td>
<td>Enforcement data and reports</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Continue the funding partnership with Metropolitan Transportation Commission to ensure continuation of the enhanced CHP enforcement on Hwy 17</td>
<td>Funding agreement and invoices</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continue to monitor and track collision and safety issues on Highways 1 and 17</td>
<td>Collision information</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Coordinate with Clatrans, the County of Santa Cruz, and emergency services on disaster preparedness and evacuation planning</td>
<td>Communications with partner agencies and disaster and evacuation plans</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Produce annual report for the Safe on 17 program and invoice MTC for funds</td>
<td>Annual report</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT: RIDESHARE/CRUZ511

AGENCY: SCCRTC

PROJECT MANAGER: Tegan Speiser, Cruz511 Manager

TOTAL BUDGET: $285,000

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>205,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>76,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>3,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>285,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Through Rideshare/Cruz511 SCCRTC provides information and direct services to Santa Cruz County area residents, visitors and employers to encourage the use of sustainable transportation modes; increase vehicle occupancy through carpooling, vanpooling and riding the bus; eliminate vehicle trips through telecommuting and compressed work weeks; and implements other Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies. The TDM program establishes the strategies that result in more efficient use of available transportation resources. The program promotes sustainable transportation choices and implements programs that result in emission reduction, regional traffic congestion and delay mitigation, and reduction in vehicle trips and vehicle miles travelled. The work is done in coordination with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the Council of San Benito County Governments, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the Metropolitan Transportation commission for the San Francisco Bay Area, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

PROJECT PRODUCT(S)

Rideshare/Cruz511 Program

FEDERALLY ELIGIBLE TASK

Promote sustainable transportation modes and choices region-wide through the coordination of incentives, promotional events, campaigns and information dissemination

PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Ride matching assistance; program/event promotion; regional coordination of TDM efforts; radio and TV interviews; newspaper articles and press releases; employer and college outreach; website development. Additional accomplishments include successfully completing 2013 Rideshare Week and 2012 Clean Air Month campaigns, funded in part by the Air District to educate and encourage sustainable transportation as a way to maintain good air quality. In FY 2014-15, the RTC incorporated 511 traveler information services to its rideshare program to increase traffic to the website to help grow the rideshare database and improve the opportunity for ridematching and use of alternative transportation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output/Output Category</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Update and maintain content and design of websites</td>
<td>Updated Rideshare/Cruz511 Website</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Operate 429-POOL hotlines and coordinate regional participation and access to the 511.org</td>
<td>Match lists, robust database</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>online ride matching system. Maintain online database of people interested in a ride match.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Direct, monitor, and document media communications related to program’s objectives and goals</td>
<td>Media releases, interviews, articles, etc.</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assist employers in promoting multi-modal travel options and services through transportation</td>
<td>Scatter maps, presentation materials, list of employers</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fairs and on-site presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop and apply a consistent set of evaluation measures for TDM projects and programs</td>
<td>Improved evaluation tools</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Participate in transportation-related air quality and climate change activities including</td>
<td>Improved PNR facilities, signs, and agreements; usage</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>those related to implementing State and Federal Clean Air Acts and other legislation such as</td>
<td>counts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB 32 and SB 375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Promote and facilitate access to existing park and Ride Lots and plan for future P&amp;R facility</td>
<td>Improved PNR facilities, signs, and agreements; usage</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>needs</td>
<td>counts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Develop and maintain information on TDM initiatives in the community</td>
<td>Data on TDM programs</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Research most effective methods and strategies to meet program objectives</td>
<td>Information on other programs</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coordinate with regional rideshare and transit service providers, promote transit services</td>
<td>Promotional materials and handouts</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Maintain the Cruz511 traveler information component</td>
<td>Website with traveler information regularly maintained</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Participate in periodic meetings of the Transportation and Air Quality Joint Marketing</td>
<td>Agendas, notes and action items</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Participate in tri-county coordination of outreach campaigns - i.e. Rideshare Week</td>
<td>Agendas, notes and action items</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Prepare and conduct community outreach, education, and promotional materials and provide</td>
<td>Promotional materials and handouts</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personalized ridematching services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional Travel Demand Model

**Agency:** SCCRTC  
**Project Manager:** Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner  
**Total Budget:** $35,557  
**Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner**

#### ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>% Federal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The contractual work listed in this work element is for collecting and reporting traffic volume, vehicle occupancy counts, and bicycle travel information

### Project Description

The SCCRTC's regional travel demand model work element involves collecting and reporting data on the county's transportation network for use by AMBAG in updating the regional travel demand model. It also involves coordinating with and assisting AMBAG on various data collection efforts and the improvement and more effective use of the regional travel demand model.

### Project Product(s)

- Traffic, vehicle occupancy and bicycle counts with GIS information as available
- Traffic count data on web page
- Improved regional travel demand model

### Federally Eligible Task

**Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)**

Collect data on the transportation network including traffic, vehicle occupancy and bicycle counts as well as origin and destination and household travel data; and work with AMBAG to update and improve the regional travel demand model  

0%

### Previous Accomplishments

SCCRTC collects traffic count data annually through consultant services and collects traffic count information to provide to AMBAG for improvement of the regional travel demand model. SCCRTC worked with AMBAG on the completion of an origin and destination study and additional surveys for the California Household Travel Survey to ensure a statistically significant level of data for a better regional travel demand model. In partnership with the Community Traffic Safety Coalition and UCSC, SCCRTC collected bicycle travel data and worked with AMBAG on regional travel demand model improvements to better incorporate the bicycle and transit modes. SCCRTC also worked with SC METRO on bus ridership surveys.

### Task Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate the collection of traffic volume and vehicle occupancy data at various locations throughout the county, using consultant services as budgeted and convert to GIS format - (Consultant and RTC)</td>
<td>Traffic count data</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Post count and historic traffic count data on RTC's website for easy access and reference by government agencies and members of the public</td>
<td>Webpage with count data</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coordinate traffic data collection and reporting with Caltrans, UCSC, AMBAG, the cities and the County</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide traffic count data to local, state and federal agencies, land use development proponents and members of the public as needed</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Continue working with AMBAG and Santa Cruz Metro on the inclusion of transit information in the travel demand model</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continue working with local jurisdiction, AMBAG and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) on coordinated and/or joint traffic counting services and/or reporting</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Work with AMBAG to improve the regional travel demand model to better incorporate various travel modes and be more usable for the development of regional planning and programming documents</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continue working to conduct bicycle counts - (Consultant and RTC)</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Assist AMBAG in the development and finalization of model outputs and scenario analysis</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Assist AMBAG to gather Santa Cruz County information required for model development and sketch planning tool</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Work with AMBAG on the coordination of the disaggregation and verification process of the model</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Continue working with AMBAG to assess how well the travel demand model can assess mode shift given new bike facilities</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with AMBAG and other partner agencies on potential enhancements to the regional travel demand model to determine the relationships between various land use-transportation factors and safety outcomes</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>17,226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FHWA PL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FHWA Part Plng</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>67,226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>67,226</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>167,226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>167,226</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Description
This work element is to develop a unified multimodal corridor investment plan for Santa Cruz County's three primary transportation routes - Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive and the rail line. Phase I of the project is the production of a subregional Santa Cruz County transportation model. The RTC will work with the Santa Cruz County Planning Department and Caltrans to hire a consultant and produce the model. Phase II is the prioritization of investments using the model and public input to draft goals and policies for the plan.

### Project Product(s)
- Santa Cruz County Unified Corridor Investment Plan

### Previous Accomplishments
In FY 2014-15 the SCCRTC secured a consultant to assist in the development of a subregional Santa Cruz County transportation model. The SCCRTC established and solicited input from the Project Team and a separate Technical Advisory Group. The SCCRTC completed an analysis of data needs, identified data collection strategies, identified performance measures and priority transportation projects to be analyzed, and defined methodologies for project analysis. The SCCRTC solicited public input on priority transportation projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corridor plan stakeholders team meetings to guide development of plan</td>
<td>stakeholder team participants, agendas, notes</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work with stakeholders and technical group to assess data availability and needs</td>
<td>list of available and needed transportation data</td>
<td>04/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collect new data to assemble data files and use in the subregional model</td>
<td>technical memorandum listing the data and assembled data files</td>
<td>08/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Reference Material</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Obtain public input on the development of the Santa Cruz County subregional model through public workshop and surveys</td>
<td>Workshop materials and of online survey</td>
<td>04/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Define performance metrics and methodologies for analysis</td>
<td>List of performance measures</td>
<td>04/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Work with hired consultant and stakeholders to complete subregional model for Santa Cruz County (RTC and consultant)</td>
<td>Subregional Santa Cruz County transportation model</td>
<td>11/31/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Present draft final model to stakeholders and RTC</td>
<td>Presentations and staff reports</td>
<td>12/31/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 614  Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning

Agency: SCCRTC  Project Manager: Cory Caletti, Bicycle Coordinator  
Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner
Total Budget: $64,753

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>34,753</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description

The objective of this program is to ensure the development of a regional pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure as an integral part of the overall transportation system for the Santa Cruz County and the AMBAG region. This helps to ensure a better integrated and connected transportation system across modes and helps to ensure a safer transportation system for non-motorists. This work element includes working with cities and the county to develop, update and implement bicycle and pedestrian plans and integrate bicycle and pedestrian planning in all transportation planning efforts, including project plans, corridor plans and studies, specific area plans, general plans, the regional transportation plan and the metropolitan transportation plan. Work with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County and AMBAG to ensure that the local bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts are the components that lead to a more robust and integrated bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure for the entire AMBAG region.

Project Product(s)

Bicycle Committee meetings and materials, updated bicycle plans, coordinated and safer multimodal transportation system

Federally Eligible Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning for a better developed and safer bicycle and pedestrian transportation network that is integrated with other modes and coordinated across the AMBAG region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Accomplishments

In FY 13-14 and FY 14-15, the SCCRTC and the Bicycle Advisory Committee reviewed and provided input into the Draft Monterey Bay Complete Streets Guidelines, AMBAG's regional bike model web tool, the final Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan, the 2014 Draft RTIP projects, Metro's Pacific Station Re-design and Draft Short Range Transit Plan, Draft Sustainable Santa Cruz County Plan and the RTC's rules and regulations. The Bicycle Advisory Committee worked to improve bicycle travel on Highway 1 as part of the centerline and shoulder rumble strip project. Through ad-hoc committees, the Committee examined and made recommendations on improvements for gap closures or other safety measures throughout the county, as well as assisting with bicycle safety observations conducted by the Health Services Agency.

Step  Description  Deliverables  Completion Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate and provide staff support for SCCRTC’s Bicycle Committee including the production of agendas, staff reports and minutes for six meetings per year.</td>
<td>08/14/2015, 10/16/2015, 12/11/2015, 02/12/2016, 04/15/2016, 06/17/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work with the City of Santa Cruz and the University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC) to modify and update their bicycle transportation plan into an active transportation plan ensuring that federal and state requirements are met and that bicycle facilities are coordinated with other modes and facilities throughout the region.</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Engage the public in the bicycle and transportation planning efforts including the Watsonville community through coordination with Jovenes Sanos, County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency and other community groups</td>
<td>06/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work with the local jurisdiction on implementation of their plans and policies to ensure that bicycle and pedestrian travel is adequately integrated and coordinated with other modes and across the region and with overall development to ensure a better integrated and safer multimodal transportation system and employment of a complete streets approach as required by AB 1358.</td>
<td>06/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pursue continued collection of bicycle count and mode split data</td>
<td>06/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continue working with AMBAG in its efforts to improve the regional travel demand model to include a bicycle component</td>
<td>06/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coordinate with and participate in Caltrans active transportation planning efforts, including the California Bike/Ped plan and the District 5 Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>06/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Coordinate with local, regional, state and federal agencies on bicycle and pedestrian planning and funding efforts</td>
<td>06/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Work with the County of Santa Cruz, Caltrans, local community groups, businesses and the public on planning for improved bicycle and pedestrian access and facilities in the San Lorenzo Valley that is coordinated with the regional bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and other transportation modes</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Work with the County of Santa Cruz, Caltrans and community groups on bicycle safety improvements including green bike lane treatments at select freeway interchanges throughout the county</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Provide input into the Draft Rail Feasibility Study, in particular on coordination between rail services and the bike/ped rail trail</td>
<td>12/31/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 615**

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects and Programs**

**Agency:** SCCRTC  
**Project Manager:** Cory Caletti, Bicycle Coordinator  
**Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner**  
**Total Budget:** $344,731

---

**ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>174,731</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fed Disc. (DEM 115L)(023</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>169,731</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>344,731</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>344,731</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Project Description**

The objective of this program is to encourage a safer bicycle and pedestrian transportation network through the funding, support and implementation of bicycle and pedestrian safety and education programs and projects working in partnership with the Community Traffic Safety Coalitions, Bike to Work, partner agencies, the local jurisdictions, the business community and the community at large.

**Project Product(s)**

Improved awareness and expanded bicycle and pedestrian transportation alternatives.

**Federally Eligible Tasks**

Coordinator and advance bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs in Santa Cruz County

**Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Continue financial support of the Bike to Work/School program, and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) - (Consultants and RTC)</td>
<td>Bike week 2016</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Continue funding and promoting the bilingual bicycle and pedestrian safety education program (Ride N’ Stride) at schools - (Consultant and RTC)</td>
<td>Approved allocations</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investigate methods to reduce vehicle travel by expanding and enhancing bicycle and pedestrian travel</td>
<td>Expanded bike and ped facilities</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continue to compile and update digitized bikeway information to be provided to the public as a roadway layer through the County’s GIS webpage</td>
<td>Digitized map information</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Continue outreach and administration of Bicycle Hazard and Pedestrian Access Reports to identify network deficiencies</td>
<td>Completed reports</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In FY 2012-13 the RTC completed Phase III of the bicycle parking subsidy program. In 2014, the RTC completed a master plan and environmental document for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network project and program to fund for two initial segments. In 2015, the RTC completed a bike route signage plan. The RTC worked to improve tracking of the bicycle hazard reporting program.
| 6 | Continue working with the Pedestrian Safety Task Force to implement the findings of the report “Improving Safety and Accessibility of Sidewalks in Santa Cruz County” | Improvements to sidewalks 06/30/16 |
| 7 | Implement a Bicycle Route Signage system through coordination with local jurisdictions, bicycle advocates and community members. Identify routes and seek funding. | Bike route signage plan 06/30/16 |
| 8 | Implement, promote and seek funding for the Bikes Secure bicycle parking subsidy program | Bike rack applications and rack installations 06/30/16 |
| 9 | Implement the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) master plan; continue to apply for funding for additional rail trail segment implementation, coordinate with local jurisdictions and produce guidelines and policies as directed by the Commission. | Funding, implementation plans, guidelines and policies 06/30/16 |
| 10 | Continue updating and distributing the Santa Cruz County Bikeways Map | Updated bikeways map 06/30/16 |
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 621  
Elderly & Disabled & Americans with Disabilities Act

Agency: SCCRTC  
Project Manager: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner  
Total Budget: $64,753

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Federal 0%

Project Description

To plan and coordinate the delivery of transportation services to the elderly and persons with disabilities, and to achieve economies of scale among human service and transportation agencies. Additionally, this work element identifies the transportation needs of traditionally underserved groups (elderly, persons with disabilities, persons of color, and low-income) and assesses the adequacy of the transportation system to meet those needs.

Project Product(s)

Agenda packets and minutes of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

Inclusion of transportation needs of elderly and disabled into transportation planning and programming efforts and documents

Federally Eligible Task

Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)

Administer and conduct Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meetings

0%

Previous Accomplishments

SCCRTC worked with AMBAG and other regional and local partner agencies to produce the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan. The SCCRTC Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee established the Pedestrian Safety Work Group to work on accessible pedestrian planning. SCCRTC holds E&D Transportation Advisory Committee meetings regularly to coordinate with public transit operators and social service providers. The RTC continues to work to implement the planning efforts of the report titled “Safe Paths of Travel: Projects, Results and Continuing Efforts” funded by an Environmental Justice Planning grant through Caltrans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide staff support to the E&amp;D Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Agenda, agenda packet and minutes</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implement the accessible pedestrian planning program through the Pedestrian Safety Work Group (subcommittee)</td>
<td>Annual report summarizing activities</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continue to coordinate with local public, private, and non-profit entities involved in providing specialized transportation, including Community Bridges, the Volunteer Center, SCMTD and its Metro Advisory Committee (MAC) to ensure that all planning documents incorporate the needs of the elderly, disabled and low income communities.</td>
<td>Phone calls, meetings, reports and presentations</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work with the E&amp;D Transportation Advisory Committee to conduct outreach to the elderly, disabled and low income communities in the region on transportation needs to be included in RTP, MTP, RTIP and FTIP.</td>
<td>Public meetings, outreach materials, reports and presentations</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Update the Guide for Specialized Transportation and provide other public information materials on transportation planning and programming for specialized transportation</td>
<td>Updated public information materials</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Review project plans to ensure consistency with Regional Transportation Plan policies for improved access to elderly and disabled individuals.</td>
<td>Project summaries and comments</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Update the Coordinated Public Transit Human Service Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Updated plan</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Work to ensure that transportation planning and programming at all levels in the region consider and incorporate the needs of the elderly, disabled and low income communities</td>
<td>Improved planning and programming documents</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 622
Transportation Planning for the Region

Agency: SCCRTC
Project Manager: Grace Blakeslee, Senior Transportation Planner
Total Budget: $152,590

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>132,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RPA</td>
<td>98,604</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>53,986</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>152,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>152,590</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Federal: 0%

Project Description
The focus of this work element is implementation of the existing transportation plans for the region, preparation of the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Santa Cruz County and coordination with AMBAG and other regional agencies on the production of the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Additionally, rules regarding regional transportation planning established by the federal transportation acts, will continue to be implemented. This work element also includes working with local jurisdictions to ensure that regional transportation policies and projects are included in local jurisdiction planning activities. Staff will also continue work on incorporating sustainability into all transportation planning documents and activities for the region.

Project Product(s)
Updates to the 2014 RTC and 2035 MTP/SCS and production of the 2018 RTP and 2040 MTP/SCS and updates
Environmental review of 2018 RTP

Federally Eligible Task
Update the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) to produce a 2040 MTP

Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)
0%

Previous Accomplishments
SCCRTC worked with AMBAG and regional partners to complete the 2035 MTP/SCS and the 2014 RTP, which includes sustainability considerations and significant outreach to the community. SCCRTC also worked with AMBAG and other regional partners to complete environmental review for the plans.

Task | Description | Deliverable | Completion Date
1   | Work with other entities in the region on long-range transportation planning activities within the region, including timelines, public participation efforts, updated project costs and revenue estimates, environmental documentation, and other efforts that may produce economies of scale in the production of the 2018 RTP and 2040 MTP/SCS | Components of RTP and MTP/SCS | 06/30/16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work with AMBAG, local jurisdictions, the public and other entities in the region to realize the goals and policies, including safety improvement goals, for the Santa Cruz County sections of the 2035 MTP and the 2014 RTP employing sustainability analysis and public outreach strategies that include bilingual outreach and public meetings</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Implement a comprehensive public participation and outreach program for amendments of the current MTP and RTP that includes public workshops, public meetings, printed materials, web site information, public surveying, segments of the Transportation Cafe television program, bilingual outreach, Facebook posts, media releases, radio, etc.</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continue to work with AMBAG, Caltrans and local agencies to implement the Metropolitan Transportation Plan’s projects, policies, sustainability and safety goals through the various planning and capital improvement programming actions</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Working with local jurisdictions, AMBAG, and other partner agencies, identify and document transportation facilities, projects and services required to meet regional and interregional mobility and access needs consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Work to develop potential new transportation revenues to help meet continuously increasing funding shortfalls listed in the MTP and that will help to implement the MTP; this may include researching/implementing a county-wide traffic impact fee</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans and AMBAG on implementing regional planning and transportation safety requirements enacted through the federal transportation acts</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Apply the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS) process to the implementation and amendments of the MTP and RTP to ensure a more sustainable transportation planning process.</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ensure that relevant goals, policies, projects, funding and other elements of the MTP are incorporated into other planning documents within the region such as the RTP, general plans, etc. to ensure that all other planning documents that include transportation are consistent with the MTP.</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ensure that projects proposed for federal, state or local funding are consistent with the MTP</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Continue to participate in Caltrans system planning activities including the California Transportation Plan, Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan, District 5 System Management Plan, Transportation Concept Reports, and Ramp Metering Development Plan</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional and state planning documents coordinated with local plans</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Public outreach and other materials and review of progress toward goals and policies in MTP and RTP
2. Outreach materials, surveys, questionnaires, community TV program, and internet content, including Spanish materials
3. Programming documents that reflect MTP and RTP policies, goals and priorities
4. Phone calls, emails, meetings, outreach materials
5. Analysis of revenue options
6. Planning documents consistent with federal requirements
7. STARS analysis of MTP and RTP
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 641  
Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP)

Agency: SCCRTC  
Project Manager: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  
Total Budget: $317,461

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>247,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>105,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>317,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FHWA PL and RPA funds are not used for the administration of capital programs included in Steps 13 -17 below

Note: Contractual work under this work element is paid for by local funds and is for assistance with the analysis of programming criteria or potential development of funding sources

Project Description
Administer and monitor federal aid funding programs whose projects are included in the federal transportation improvement program, including programs identified in MAP-21 such as the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This includes the production, maintenance and amendments of programming documents required for federally funded and regionally significant projects. The work also includes assisting project sponsors with compliance of requirements to receive the funds and deliver the federally funded and regionally significant projects. This work element also includes leveraging the federal funds to secure any required match and funding from other sources to deliver as many regionally significant transportation projects as possible. Produce and implement the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to secure State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for federally funded and regionally significant projects to ensure delivery of as many regionally significant projects as possible that are included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Work with regional and state partners on appropriate implementation of the federal transportation act, MAP-21, in California.

Project Product(s)
FY 2014/15 to FY 2017/18 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and amendments
Funding applications and decisions for Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)
Amendments to the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program and State Transportation Improvement Program
Development of the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Federally Eligible Task
Production and maintenance of the MTIP and other programming documents to secure funding and delivery of federally funded and regionally significant projects.
Implementation, administration and monitoring of federal aid funding programs

Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In FY 2014-15 SCCRTA programmed Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds for projects on federal-aid routes and regionally significant projects. SCCRTA also assisted project sponsors in delivering federally funded projects.
Initiate preparation of the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to ensure full funding and delivery of projects in the MTP/SCS and MTIP

Prepare application and programming process for the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Solicit and receive projects for the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Review and rate projects for RTIP and STIP including their potential to improve safety of the transportation system; produce draft programming recommendations and program funds

Work with AMBAG to Prepare amendments to the MTIP and any supporting programming documents such as the RTIP and STIP as needed

Coordinate with AMBAG, Caltrans and other entities as needed on all Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) amendments and amendments of other programming documents such as the Regional Transportation Improvement and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) that impact the FTIP

Conduct planning and project activities (including corridor studies, project initiation documents and other transportation planning studies) to identify and develop candidate projects for the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - (RTC and Consultant)

Monitor the state and federal transportation budgets and work with Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission on obtaining funding for federally funded and regionally significant projects included in the FTIP, STIP and RTIP

Monitor federal actions with regard to federal transportation act reauthorization, extensions and appropriations to ensure full funding and delivery of projects in the MTP and MTIP

Program funds for projects through federal and state funding programs that provide funding for regionally significant projects included in the MTIP such as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)

Monitor the implementation of RSTP, STIP, HSIP, TAP and HBR-funded projects, with an emphasis on project delivery, timely use of funds and compliance with all Federal and state laws and California Transportation Commission guidelines to ensure delivery of federally funded and regionally significant projects

To streamline delivery of qualifying and approved regionally significant projects, exchange federal RSTP funds for State funds through the State’s RSTP Exchange program

Assist local agencies in filing and monitoring funding allocation requests to deliver regionally significant projects

Work with AMBAG and Caltrans to monitor both major and minor state highway projects and to fulfill project monitoring and project delivery responsibilities

Work with AMBAG, our counterpart regional agencies, Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on the development of implementation policies and procedures for federal and state funding programs

Prepare state and federally-mandated information and reports for AMBAG, Caltrans, FHWA, and the CTC

Reports

Improved funding procedures

06/30/16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Monitor development of performance measures as part of MAP-21 implementation to maximize efficiency of implementation of the MTP and MTIP</td>
<td>Reports, communications with state and federal agencies</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Implement a comprehensive public participation and outreach program for production of the various programming documents and funding decisions that includes public workshops, public meetings, printed materials, web site information, public surveying, segments of the Transportation Cafe television program, bilingual outreach, social media, media releases, Outreach materials including materials in Spanish and to traditionally underrepresented communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Investigate and evaluate the feasibility of a county wide development impact fee for regional transportatin projects</td>
<td>Communications with partner agencies</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Description
This work element is to complete a passenger rail study for Santa Cruz County. The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and Caltrans will work in conjunction with Santa Cruz METRO, the rail operator and local partners to evaluate the feasibility and ridership potential for commuter and intercity passenger rail service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. In-kind contribution for Iowa Pacific participation not included in federal reimbursement rate. Tasks include collecting and incorporating public input on the draft study; collecting and compiling data; technical analysis of service scenarios - including refining ridership, cost, and and revenue estimates.

Project Product(s)
Santa Cruz County Passenger Rail Study

Previous Accomplishments
In FY12/13 SCCRTC staff submitted an application for the Caltrans planning grant, based on consultation with several stakeholders. In August 2013 the SCCRTC secured a 5304 grant for this study. In FY 2013-14, the RTC secured a consultant contract for the required consultant work. In FY 2014-15 consultants finished most of the work and produced a draft study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initiate, manage and coordinate the project, including establishment and amendments of the work program, prepare and release request for proposals, and secure a consultant</td>
<td>OWP amendments, meeting notes, Request for proposals, consultant contract, final schedule and work plan</td>
<td>12/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop and implement a public outreach program that includes public meetings and workshops, presentations, surveys, new releases, outreach materials and efforts to include traditionally under represented communities</td>
<td>Comprehensive public involvement plan, staff reports, news releases, website, meeting preparation, flyers, presentations, notes, summary of public input</td>
<td>11/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Working with selected consultant and peer group, prepare Passenger Rail Feasibility Report that includes goals, objectives and outcomes; methods to measure performance; and analysis of potential service scenarios (RTC and consultant)</td>
<td>Goals, objectives, outcomes, performance measures, analysis and final report</td>
<td>10/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grant Administration</td>
<td>Quarterly reports, OWP, Final Report and Invoices</td>
<td>12/31/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 682  
Rail/Trail Authority (SCCRTC)

Agency:  SCCRTC  
Project Manager: Luis Mendez, SCCRTC  
Total Budget: $905,881

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>185,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>555,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>615,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>25,871</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>130,881</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>905,881</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>905,881</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description

This work element involves management and development of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way and planning for improved future uses. The Regional Transportation Commission is also planning to institute recreational passenger rail service. The possibility of potential bicycle and pedestrian paths using the right-of-way adjacent to the rail line is shown within the bicycle pedestrian projects work element.

Project Product(s)

SCCRTC meeting materials; Implementation plan for recreational rail service; agreements with operators; leases

Other Task (nonfederal)

Ownership and management of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way and its operation

Previous Accomplishments

In FY 2012-13, the SCCRTC completed the purchase of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line from Union Pacific and selected Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway (a company of Iowa Pacific Holdings) to operate freight and passenger service. Working with SCCRTC and the community, SC&MB Railway initiated a tourist train service for the Christmas holiday period and has operated for three years. In FY 2014-15, the RTC completed rehabilitation work on four bridges, including reconstruction of the La Selva Beach trestle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish contracts and systems to effectively, efficiently and reliably operate the freight service, maintain the rail line and manage the ownership of the property</td>
<td>Service contracts, leases, property management policies</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Investigate lease possibilities, update old leases and secure new leases</td>
<td>Updated leases</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coordinate operation of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, including current and future uses, with operators, shippers, partner agencies and local jurisdictions</td>
<td>Operation agreements</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Responsible Task</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work with rail service operators on the development of additional recreational rail service between Santa Cruz and Davenport</td>
<td>Rail service plan and implementation</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seek planning grants funds for the production of feasibility studies and implementation plans for various types of passenger and transit service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line; work done with grants from successful applications may be done under separate work elements.</td>
<td>Grant applications</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Guide consultant and contractor work on the rehabilitation of structures of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line and other improvements in cooperation with SC&amp;MB Railway</td>
<td>Meetings, agendas, minutes, phone calls</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Seek funding for other necessary improvements to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line in cooperation with SC&amp;MB Railway and other regional partners</td>
<td>Funding applications and requests</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Review and participate in the production of the State Rail Plan and regional rail service efforts that could benefit Santa Cruz County travelers</td>
<td>Plan production materials and State Rail Plan</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Continue to work with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the Coast Rail Coordinating Council, Caltrain, AMTRAK and Caltrans Division of Rail to support the establishment of a rail station at the Pajaro station for any new or expanded rail passenger service on the coast mainline</td>
<td>Meetings, phone calls, email, reports, presentations</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 683  Highway and Roadway Planning (SCCRTC)

Agency: SCCRTC  Project Manager: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  Total Budget: $102,783

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>102,783</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State RPA</td>
<td>62,981</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>39,802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>102,783</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>102,783</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Federal: 0%

Project Description

This work element is for the planning work necessary to maintain and improve the roadway and highway system for efficient movement of people and goods. The work includes participation and coordination with Caltrans on the State Highway Operations and Protection program and any other planning documents and efforts to improve the operation and safety of the state highway system. The work also includes participation with local jurisdictions and other partner agencies in their planning efforts to improve the operation and safety of the highway and roadway system and intersections of the system. This element also includes working with Caltrans, AMBAG and other regional agencies on the effective movement of goods into, out of and through Santa Cruz County.

Project Product(s)

- Project concept report for Highway 1 in the north coast
- Highway 17 corridor study
- Highway 101 Freight Mobility Study with Connection to Santa Cruz County along Highway 129
- Improved operation, safety and mobility on the region's highway and roadway system

Federally Eligible  Task  Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans and local agencies on the development of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) to ensure that well in advance of its drafting the regional and interregional safety and mobility needs of the Santa Cruz County highway system are considered for inclusion in the draft document. This includes coordination with Caltrans and the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee at meetings and other communications means.</td>
<td>Communications with partner agencies and information materials</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ongoing coordination with Caltrans and local agencies on implementation of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>Coordinated SHOPP</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Work with local jurisdictions on preparation and update of a regional and local roads assessment to establish roadway funding needs and priorities for inclusion in programming documents.

4. Prepare public information materials in English and Spanish for identified highway and roadway needs and priorities to communicate to decision makers and the public the need for funding these priorities.

5. Work with Caltrans, the CHP and other transportation partners through the Traffic Operation Systems (TOS) Oversight Committee and Safe on 17 Task Force to identify safety, mobility and operations needs, priorities and improvements for inclusion in planning and programming documents.

6. Work with Caltrans, the CHP, County Public Works and the community to produce the State Route 17 Access Management Plan, including development and implementation of public engagement activities.

7. Work with Caltrans, resource agencies and local partners to produce a project concept report for Highway 1 in the north coast at Scott Creek.


10. Review and participate in the production of the Highway 101 freight study led by AMBAG.

11. Review and participate in the development of the California Transportation Plan, California Freight Mobility Plan, the Caltrans District 5 System Management Plan, Transportation Concept Reports, Ramp Metering Development Plan and Central Coast Coalition products.

12. Work with Caltrans and local agencies to implement strategies of the State Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) appropriate to Santa Cruz County and investigate the possibility of developing a dedicated transportation safety plan for Santa Cruz County.

06/30/16
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 684
Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program (SCCRTC)

Agency: SCCRTC
Project Manager: Kim Shultz Senior Transportation Planner
Total Budget: $1,154,968

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>256,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>845,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>53,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,154,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description

SCCRTC is responsible for tasks including the implementation of the Project Approval/ Environmental Documents (PA/ED) phase for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program, which includes HOV Lanes and bicycle and pedestrian crossings. Through this investment program the SCCRTC will produce a tiered environmental document with project level environmental review for auxiliary lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive and a bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing at Chanticleer. The remainder of the corridor will be analyzed at a programmatic level to assist with future investments on sections of the corridor.

Project Product(s)

Tiered environmental documents for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program and a project level analysis for the Highway 1 41st-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes project

Other Task

Project Approval/ Environmental Documents (PA/ED) for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program and the Highway 1 41st-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guide the consultant work, in cooperation with the Project Development Team, Caltrans, local, and regional agencies on the completion of the tiered environmental documents for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program and the 41st to Soquel auxiliary lanes</td>
<td>Meetings, agendas, minutes</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participate in the Project Development Team (PDT) oversight</td>
<td>Communication with team members</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coordinate with Caltrans and the consultant team to meet all funding and project reporting requirements.</td>
<td>Reports, invoices</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement public outreach plans for the environmental documents project and construction project including outreach to traditionally underrepresented communities</td>
<td>Public meetings, outreach materials in English and Spanish</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Coordinate public outreach efforts with other RTC projects and other local and regional agencies, and respond to concerns from residents and businesses</td>
<td>Coordinated outreach, responses to public</td>
<td>06/30/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Fiscal Year 2015-16 SCCRTC Work Program Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>Fed Grant 5304</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Caltrans FSP</th>
<th>RTC SAFE</th>
<th>MTC SAFE</th>
<th>Federal Earmark</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WE101</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE102</td>
<td></td>
<td>691,318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>691,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE112</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>178,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE113</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE176</td>
<td></td>
<td>119,995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE177</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>207,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>462,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>293,807</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>343,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE179</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE251</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE611</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>67,226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE614</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>34,753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE615</td>
<td></td>
<td>169,731</td>
<td></td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>344,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE621</td>
<td></td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE622</td>
<td></td>
<td>98,604</td>
<td>53,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE641</td>
<td></td>
<td>67,116</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>105,345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>317,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE681</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>66,809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE682</td>
<td></td>
<td>290,881</td>
<td></td>
<td>615,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>905,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE683</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,981</td>
<td>39,802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,154,968</td>
<td>1,154,968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,581,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>269,995</td>
<td>1,918,579</td>
<td>207,500</td>
<td>293,807</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,024,968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>