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.
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.

4. Approve draft minutes of the August 6, 2015 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Accept draft minutes of the August 10, 2015 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

6. Accept draft minutes of the August 11, 2015 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accept draft minutes of the August 20, 2015 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee meeting

**POLICY ITEMS**

No consent items

**PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS**

No consent items

**BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS**

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

9. Approve a Request for Proposals for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Fiscal Years 2012-13 through 2014-15 Triennial Performance Audits

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

10. Accept monthly meeting schedule

11. Accept correspondence log

12. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to Santa Cruz Metro regarding Revisions to ParaCruz Customer guide from the RTC Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
   b. Letter to Senator Jim Beall regarding support for SBx1-1 Transportation Funding from RTC staff

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

14. Accept information items
   a. President’s Special Acknowledgement Award – Workers’ Compensation Program from the Special District Risk Management Authority (SDRMA)

REGULAR AGENDA

15. Commissioner reports – oral reports

   (George Dondero, Executive Director)

17. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. District Director’s Report
   b. Highway 129 Realignment Fact Sheet

18. Report from Washington – oral report
   (Congressman Sam Farr)
19. Monterey County Rail Project Update
   *(Christina Watson, Principal Transportation Planner, Transportation Agency for Monterey County)*
   
   a. Staff report
   b. Kick-Start project flyer
   c. Pajaro/Watsonville Station flyer

20. Public Input on the Draft Passenger Rail Study
   *(Karena Pushnik and Rachel Moriconi, Sr. Transportation Planners)*
   
   a. Staff report
   b. Online: Comments received (430+) as letters, emails and comment forms ([www.sccrtc.org/rail-study-comments](http://www.sccrtc.org/rail-study-comments))
   c. Summary of Survey Results (2600+ responses)
   d. Summary of comments received on the Draft Report and planned amendments to Final Report
   e. Summary of Public Outreach and Media

   *(Kim Shultz, Sr. Transportation Planner)*
   
   a. Staff report

22. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Update
   *(Rachel Moriconi, Sr. Transportation Planner)*
   
   a. Staff Report
   b. 2016 STIP Reprogramming
   c. Santa Cruz County STIP Projects

23. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

   **CLOSED SESSION**

24. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-EXISTING LITIGATION. (Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 of the Government Code) Santa Cruz Superior Court Case No. CV182123

25. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 of the Government Code: one case

26. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Initiation of litigation pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 of the Government Code: one case
OPEN SESSION

27. Report on closed session

28. Next meetings

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 1, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean Street, 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

A RTC Commissioner retreat has been scheduled in lieu of the regularly scheduled September 17, 2015 Transportation Policy Workshop (TPW). The retreat is scheduled for 8:30 a.m. and will be held at the Pajaro Dunes at 500 Sandpiper Lane, Watsonville, CA.

HOW TO REACH US

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

Watsonville Office
275 Main Street, Suite 450, Watsonville. CA 95076
phone: (831) 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
- Boulder Creek Library
- Branciforte Library
- Capitola Library
- Felton Library
- Garfield Park Library
- La Selva Beach Library
- Live Oak Library
- Santa Cruz Downtown Library
- Scotts Valley Library
- Watsonville Main Library

For information regarding library locations and hours, please check online at www.santacruzpl.org or www.watsonville.lib.ca.us.
On-line viewing: The SCCRTC encourages the reduction of paper waste and therefore makes meeting materials available online. Those receiving paper agendas may sign up to receive email notification when complete agenda packet materials are posted to our website by sending a request to info@sccrtc.org. Agendas are typically posted 5 days prior to each meeting.

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

HOW TO REQUEST

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

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

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

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

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

Members present:
- John Leopold
- Randy Johnson
- Ed Bottorff
- Cynthia Chase
- Bruce McPherson
- Zach Friend
- Dennis Norton
- Don Lane
- Jimmy Dutra
- Greg Caput
- Ryan Coonerty
- Aileen Loe (ex-officio)

Staff present:
- George Dondero
- Luis Mendez
- Yesenia Parra
- Jennifer Rodriguez
- Cory Caletti
- Kim Shultz

2. Oral communications

None

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

A handout for Item 22 was distributed.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

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

5. Approved draft minutes of the June 4, 2015 Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies meeting

6. Accepted draft minutes of the June 8, 2015 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accepted draft minutes of the June 9, 2015 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

8. Accepted draft minutes of the June 18, 2015 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee meeting

9. Approved draft minutes of the June 25, 2015 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

No consent items

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

11. Approved Amendment #3 of the Central Coast Coalition MOU

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

12. Approved Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) Appointments

13. Approve out of state travel authorization – Moved to regular agenda as Item 19.1at the request of Commissioner Johnson

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

14. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

15. Accepted correspondence log

16. Accepted letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
a. Letter to the County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department regarding the County of Santa Cruz’s rail-with-trail grant application from the RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee

b. Letter to Caltrans District 5 regarding the City of Santa Cruz grant application for the Bay Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Project from the RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee

c. Letter to RTC Commissioners regarding the recommendation for the development of a Santa Cruz Yacht Harbor Transportation Plan from the RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee

d. Letter to RTC Commissioners regarding the request for the Bicycle Advisory Committee’s 40th year anniversary celebration from the RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee

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

18. Accept information items

   None

REGULAR AGENDA

19. Commissioner reports – oral reports

   Commissioner Johnson welcomed everyone to Scotts Valley.

   Commissioner Caput inquired about the railroad tracks on Walker Street and Riverside.

   In response to Commissioner Caput’s question, Commissioner Friend stated that bids for the project have been solicited and are due soon. Brett Wallace, General Manager for Iowa Pacific, said that the main line was taken care of and the siding will be taken care of by the end of next week.

19.1 Approve out of state travel – Formerly Item 13 on the consent agenda.

   Commissioners asked several questions about the request for out of state travel that included: the need to send 2 staff members, whether this type of training was available on-line and the benefits to the RTC. They also noted that payroll was a significant function for the agency.

   George Dondero, Executive Director, stated that the payroll function is a necessary function for the agency and that having 2 staff members trained was important to ensure payroll was processed efficiently and correctly.

   Commissioner Johnson moved and Commissioner Friend seconded to authorize out-of-state travel for 2 RTC staff members to attend the Paylocity Client Conference on October 21-23, 2015 in Rosemont, Illinois. The motion passed
with Commissioners Leopold, Johnson, Lane, Friend, Coonerty, McPherson, Dutra, Norton, Chase, and Bottorff voting “aye” and Commissioner Caput voting “nay.”

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

   George Dondero, Executive Director, reported on the Passenger Rail Feasibility Study and the over 3 thousand responses that were received during the comment period: staff will provide a summary at the September or October RTC meeting. He also noted that staff received requests to explore “trail only” alternatives and said the research process would require funding and time and that the commission would receive reports regularly on the request for “trail only.”

   Mr. Dondero said that the Golden Gate Railroad Museum (GGRM) had secured donated materials and equipment, which are currently being stored on the rail line property. RTC staff is still negotiating a lease agreement with GGRM.

   Mr. Dondero also reported that he participated in the July 28th Aspiring Counties meeting in Sacramento and relayed information received on several bills affecting transportation.

   Commissioners discussed the fact that the RTC has already voted not to include a “trail only” option; the difficulty in securing funding for the original purchase; and the cost of the research. They also discussed the need to become a self-help county to be competitive for grants, given the current funding situation.

21. Caltrans report and consider action items

   Aileen Loe distributed the 2015 *Mile Marker report*. She also reported that the Americans with Disability Act was celebrating 25 years and that Caltrans received a 1.1 billion dollar grant to spend over 30 years for upgrades to pedestrian facilities and to remove barriers for people with disabilities. Ms. Loe announced that Caltrans is currently accepting nominations for their newly formed State Wide Technical Advisory Committee “Active Transportation Program (ATP).”

22. Federal Land Grants Application (FLAP) for a north coast rail trail segment of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network
   *(Cory Caletti and Ginger Dykaar, Senior Transportation Planner)*

   Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner, presented her staff report. She reported that the RTC was awarded a 6.3 million dollar grant from the California Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) for the Monterey Bay Scenic Sanctuary Trail (MBSST) project’s 5-mile segment in the north coast. In order to receive the award, the RTC must commit to an additional match of $300,000. The RTC secured this grant thanks to the contributions made by both the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County and the California Coastal Conservancy who provided a total match of $3,950,000. If the RTC accepts the grant a review committee would need to be established to ensure proper oversight and ensure all requirements are met. Ms. Caletti noted that the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County would be taking a request to their board asking for funding to assist the RTC with the required $300,000 match.
Commissioners thanked RTC staff, the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County and the Coastal Conservancy for their work and funding allocation to secure this grant. They discussed options for funding other segments and the need for on-going maintenance for each segment.

**Amelia Conlen**, Bike Santa Cruz County, urged the commission to approve the resolution and thanked the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County and the Coastal Conservatory for their contributions.

**Piet Canin**, Ecology Action, said the trail is a great asset for Santa Cruz County and a safe alternative along Highway 1 for cyclists. He would like the City of Santa Cruz to accelerate permits and noted that the proposed sales tax measure is important to have funding for transportation needs.

**Stephen Slade**, Deputy Director of Land Trust for Santa Cruz County, confirmed that the request for additional funding will be discussed at the next board meeting.

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner Chase seconded to approve the resolution *(Resolution 32-15)*:

1. Authorizing the Executive Director to accept the grant award of $6.3 million in FLAP grant funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Central Federal Lands (CFL) Division for design, environmental review and construction of a 5-mile segment of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail in the north coast; and

2. Committing the RTC to provide an additional $300,000 in matching funds for the 5-mile segment of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail in the north coast to complete the funding need for the $10,550,000 project; and

3. Authorizing the Executive Director to enter into any necessary agreements to fund and implement the project.

The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Leopold, Johnson, Lane, Friend, Coonerty, Caput, McPherson, Dutra, Norton, Chase, and Bottorff voting “aye.”

23. **State Legislative Update**

George Dondero, Executive Director, presented his staff report on several state legislative actions impacting transportation, including: no new funding this year through the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the impact due to the reduction on the excise tax on gasoline. The RTC continues to closely monitor other legislation that could potentially impact transportation funding, which includes Senate Bill X1-1.

Commissioners discussed the importance of becoming a self-help county and the need to write to legislators communicating the transportation concerns in Santa Cruz County.
24. Commuter Committee

Luis Mendez, Deputy Director, presented his staff report.

Commissioner Johnson expressed his concern that motorist needs and concerns are not being heard and that his request for a commuter committee would have addressed this.

Commissioners also discussed the additional staff time and associated cost needed for another committee; the fact that existing committees have the ability to incorporate a member to represent motorists; and the difficulty staff already faces in maintaining members on existing committees.

Aileen Loe, Caltrans stated that the RTC addresses all forms of transportation needs and that the current Caltrans grant awarded to the RTC for public outreach would be a good tool to ensure all concerns are heard.

Commissioner Caput moved and Commissioner Lane seconded to accept the report. The motion passed with Commissioners Leopold, Caput, Lane, Friend, Coonerty, McPherson, Dutra, Norton, Chase, and Bottorff voting “aye” and Commissioner Johnson voting “nay.”

25. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

Commissioners adjourned to closed session at 10:53 a.m.

CLOSED SESSION

26. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9: one case

27. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Initiation of litigation pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9: one case

OPEN SESSION

28. Report on closed session

Commissioners reconvened to open session at 11:40 a.m. and there was no closed session report.

29. Next meeting

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 1, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean Street, 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

The meeting adjourned at 11:41 a.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra  
Staff

Attendees:  
Heather Adamson Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments  
Piet Canin Ecology Action  
Stephen Slade Land Trust  
Amelia Conlen Bike Santa Cruz County  
Gine Johnson County of Santa Cruz  
Brett Wallace Iowa Pacific  
Mark Westerfield Iowa Pacific  
Alex Clifford Metro
1. Call to Order: 6 pm

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
Kem Akol, District 1
David Casterson, District 2, Chair
Peter Scott, District 3
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
Melissa Ott, City of Santa Cruz
Andy Ward, City of Capitola
Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola (Alt.)
Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)
Leo Jed, CTSC, Vice-Chair
Emily Glanville, Ecology Action/Bike to Work

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

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

**Unexcused Absences:**

**Excused Absences:**
Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
Jim Cook, District 2 (Alt.)
Rick Hyman, District 5
Myrna Sherman, City of Watsonville
Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work (Alt.)
Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)
Amelia Conlen, District 4
Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
Lex Rau, City of Scotts Valley

**Guests:**
Eric Friedrich, Santa Cruz METRO Transit District
Senior Transportation Planner
Claire Fliesler – City of Santa Cruz Transportation Planner
Marty Demare – Member of the Public

3. Announcements – Cory Caletti provided information regarding final award of a Federal Lands Access Program grant for a north coast rail trail project, and a brief summary of the quantity of surveys and comments received on the Draft Rail Feasibility Study.

4. Oral communications – Marty Demur, a member of the public, commented on the value of electric bikes, the need for more charging stations for electric bikes and asked for recommendations on which agencies he should contact to request more recharging stations. Emily Glanville provided flyers for a planned FORT fundraiser. Kem Akol announced an upcoming public meeting regarding
the Harbor’s parking study. An update was provided on the Highway 1 resurfacing and rumble strip installation project.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

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

6. Accepted draft minutes of the June 8, 2015 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accepted summary of Bicycle Hazard reports

8. Accepted letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee to Caltrans in support of the City of Santa Cruz Bay Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Project grant application

9. Accepted letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee to the RTC requesting that the RTC develop a Santa Cruz Yacht Harbor Transportation Plan

10. Accepted letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee to the RTC requesting a celebratory event honoring the Committee’s 40th year anniversary

REGULAR AGENDA

11. City of Santa Cruz Active Transportation Plan (ATP) development – Claire Fliesler, City of Santa Cruz Transportation Planner, summarized the City’s development of an ATP, completion schedule and upcoming public workshops. She also asked Committee members for ideas regarding priority projects and indicated that she would return at a future meeting with a draft list once that’s been compiled.

12. Watsonville Transit Center redesign – Erich R. Friedrich, Santa Cruz METRO Senior Transportation Planner, presented plans for a redesign of the Transit Center in Watsonville and shared a video of 3 different renderings. He indicated that one of the three options will be presented to the METRO board in September.

13. Updates related to Committee functions – Claire Fliesler indicated that the City of Santa Cruz is reapplying for a Bicycle Friendly Community designation from the League of American Bicyclists (LAB). The City had previously received a silver level designation which expired in 2010. Bike Santa Cruz County is taking the lead in compiling the application with assistance from a number of volunteers. RTC staff will serve as one of LAB’s reviewers.

14. Adjourned – 8:03 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 19, 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

Draft Minutes

Tuesday, August 11, 2015

Regional Transportation Commission Office
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

1. Call to Order – 1:35 pm

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
Kirk Ance, CTSA, Community Bridges, Lift Line
Pam Arnsberger, 2nd District
Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA
John Daugherty, Metro Transit
Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
Sally French, Social Services Provider-Disabled
Brent Gifford, 1st District
Clay Kempf, Social Service Provider for Seniors
Cara Lamb, Potential Transit User

**Excused Absences:**
Debbi Brooks, Social Service Provider – Persons of Limited Means

**Unexcused Absences:**
Michael Molesky, Social Service Provider Disabled

**Others Present:**
Claire Fliesler. City of Santa Cruz
Scott Hamby, City of Scotts Valley
Leslyn Syren, Metro

**RTC Staff Present:**
Cathy Judd
Rachel Moriconi

**Alternates Present:**
April Warnock, Metro ParaCruz

3. Oral Communications

- Pam Arnsberger will email a summary document to Karena Pushnik to add to the October E&D TAC meeting agenda regarding paratransit use around the country.
- Claire Fliesler thanked committee members for support letter for Bay Street Sidewalk Completion Grant application.

4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agenda

**CONSENT AGENDA**

*Action: The motion (Berkowitz/Ance) - to approve the consent agenda - carries.*

**Ayes:** Kirk Ance, Lisa Berkowitz, Veronica Elsea, Sally French, Brent Gifford, Clay Kempf, Cara Lamb

**Nays:** None

**Abstain:** None
5. Approved minutes from June 9, 2015 meeting

6. Received 6/18/15 letter from E&D TAC to Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District regarding Structural Deficit

7. Received letter from E&D TAC to City of Santa Cruz supporting Bay Street Sidewalk Completion Grant application

8. Recommended that RTC approve changes for First District Representative (Patti Shevlin to Brent Gifford)

9. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report

10. Received RTC meeting highlights

11. Received Information Item
   a. Article: Role of Transportation for Older Adults
   b. Article: Volunteer Senior Ride

12. Received Agency TDA Reports
   a. Volunteer Center – 3rd Quarter FY 14/15
   b. Community Bridges – 3rd Quarter FY 14/15

13. Received Agency Updates
   a. Volunteer Center
   b. Community Bridges
   c. Santa Cruz Metro – June 26, 2015 packet

REGULAR AGENDA

14. Active Transportation Plan – Claire Fliesler, City of Santa Cruz, provided background on the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) for the City of Santa. The Active Transportation Plan is optional; however, elements align with the current funding program, include and expand on the requirements of the Bicycle Transportation Plan, and can serve as a tool to implement components of the City’s General Plan and Climate Action Plan. Public outreach is scheduled for August and September 2015. A stakeholder group of active transportation users and advocates will meet regularly to provide input on specific components.

Ms. Fliesler asked members to share information about the Active Transportation Plan providing a short statement and/or forwarding the link to the City’s webpage; www.cityofsantacruz.com/activetransportation for the plan, where comments may be submitted.

15. Revisions to ParaCruz Customer Guide – April Warnock, METRO, discussed the Draft METRO ParaCruz Customer Guide approved by the METRO board that includes changes for efficiencies and alignment to METRO fixed route service. Discussion included:
   - Opposition to wording in the Draft METRO ParaCruz Customer Guide that refers to door-to-curb service as it raises concerns about the safety of individuals with cognitive impairments. Members would like to make sure that door-to-door service be maintained and stated in the Draft METRO ParaCruz Customer Guide
• Include a sentence for clarity to the ‘Will-Call Returns’ information to let riders know that re-dispatching rides will cost $16.00
• Include in the Draft METRO ParaCruz Customer Guide that the E&D TAC be included as an Advisory body to METRO
• Add information that guest fares will cost the same as the fee for the rider
• Concerns about no-shows and/or re-dispatching a ride and the ability of the rider to pay the fee without prior information regarding the fee

Action: The motion (Kempf/Arnsberger) -- for the E&D TAC to write a letter in opposition of door-to-curb service in the Draft METRO ParaCruz Customer Guide and request that METRO ParaCruz maintain door-to-door service -- carries.

Ayes: Lisa Berkowitz, Veronica Elsea, Sally French, Brent Gifford, Clay Kempf, Cara Lamb
Nays: None
Abstain: Kirk Ance, April Warnock

Action: The motion (Berkowitz/Lamb) -- to approve the Draft METRO ParaCruz Customer Guide as presented with recommended changes to include:
• Fare information in the ‘Quick Guide’ for re-dispatching rides
• Adding the E&D TAC as an advisory committee to METRO ParaCruz
• Fee information for guest fares

carries.

Ayes: Lisa Berkowitz, Veronica Elsea, Sally French, Brent Gifford, Clay Kempf, Cara Lamb
Nays: None
Abstain: April Warnock

16. Scotts Valley Transportation Development Act Claim – Scott Hamby, City of Scotts Valley Public Works discussed the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim for the City of Scotts Valley to install rectangular rapid flashing beacon style crosswalks at three heavily traveled unprotected locations in Scotts Valley:
• 241 Kings Village Road
• 8 Bean Creek Road
• 151 Vine Hill School Road

Members discussed that a speech message alone is unsafe for unsighted pedestrians and not sufficient for ambient sounds near the crosswalks.

Action: The motion (Gifford/Ance) -- for the E&D TAC to approve the TDA claim for the City of Scott Valley contingent upon adding recommended modifications for audible accessible pedestrian component beacons at all three locations -- carries.

Ayes: Lisa Berkowitz, John Daugherty, Veronica Elsea, Sally French, Brent Gifford, Clay Kempf, Cara Lamb
Nays: None
Abstain: None

17. Update Guide for Specialized Transportation – Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Planner, discussed the update for the ‘Guide to Specialized Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities’. RTC staff is working on updates and requested update information to complete this project and requested that information be submitted within a week. Members requested that the font size be increased for ease of use.

18. Pedestrian Safety Workgroup Update – Veronica Elsea, Pedestrian Safety Workgroup Chair mentioned that the group is continuing distribution of the brochure ‘What Pedestrian and Motorists Want Each Other to Know’. The group is in the early stages working on a draft brochure for ‘What Pedestrians and Bicyclists Want Each Other to
Know’. Ms. Elsea mentioned that there is still a vacancy on the workgroup. The next meeting of the Pedestrian Safety Workgroup is on September 8 at 10:00 am in the RTC conference room.

19. Adjourned at 3:48 pm

Respectfully submitted, Cathy Judd, RTC Staff
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DRAFT MINUTES

Thursday, August 20, 2015, 1:30 p.m.
SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT
Eliza Yu, AMBAG
Taylor Bateman, Scotts Valley Planning
Teresa Buika, UCSC
Erich Friedrich, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro)
Scott Hamby, Scotts Valley Public Works
Steve Jesberg, Capitola Public Works and Planning Proxy
Kelly McClendon, Caltrans District 5
Joshua Spangrud, Santa Cruz Public Works and Planning Proxy
Steve Wiesner, County Public Works and Planning Proxy

STAFF PRESENT
Ginger Dykaar
Rachel Moriconi
Kim Shultz

OTHERS PRESENT
Eric Child, Santa Cruz Resident
Gina Schmidt, AMBAG

1. Call to Order: Chair Wiesner called the meeting to order at 1:30pm.

2. Introductions: Self introductions were made.

3. Oral Communications: None.

4. Additions/ Changes to consent and regular agenda: None.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Approved minutes of the June 18, 2015 ITAC meeting. Hamby moved and Spangrud seconded approval of the minutes. The motion passed with Hamby, Jesberg, McClendon, Spangrud, Wiesner, and Yu voting “yes”. Buika and Friedrich abstained.

6. Received State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Semi-Annual List of Programmed/Funded Projects

REGULAR AGENDA

7. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents - Verbal updates from project sponsors
UCSC: Teresa Buika reported that project design for the Active Transportation Program-funded (ATP) bicycle path safety project is underway.

Caltrans: Kelly McClendon reported that the Highway 1 rumble strip and paving project from Western Drive to the San Mateo County line is scheduled to be completed in winter 2016. Highway 9 construction is scheduled for completion in mid-October. Highway 1/17 shoulder widening and northbound SR 1 merge lane extension will start construction in October. Highway 152 paving is completed; ADA upgrades on Highway 152 near Holohan/College and pedestrian facility upgrades on Highway 9 near San Lorenzo Valley High School, Highway 1 near Graham Hill Road, and Highway 1 near Freedom Boulevard are anticipated this fiscal year. Erich Friedrich requested that Caltrans coordinate with METRO on planned construction near San Lorenzo Valley schools.

City of Santa Cruz: Josh Spangrud reported that surveying and environmental review for Segment 7 of the Rail Trail is underway. Speed feedback signs near Gault and Westlake schools, and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) at Broadway and Riverside Drive have been installed. Paving projects are planned for later this year. Lighting will be added on the river levy. In response to questions from Teresa Buika, it was noted that water projects that include traffic control and a PG&E project on Mission Street are anticipated to be completed by September 17. Mr. Spangrud shared information and a flyer about the Corridor Planning project and Active Transportation Plan development and meetings.

METRO: Erich Friedrich reported that the concept design for Pacific Station is done and that METRO’s board is anticipated to approve a conceptual design for the Watsonville Transit Center in September. The Green Valley bus stop improvement project is also done. On the operations side, METRO is starting a comprehensive system evaluation and will look at high quality transit corridors, possibly consolidating and eliminating some routes.

Capitola: Steve Jesberg reported that the Capitola/Bay Avenue Roundabout is at 30% design, with right-of-way utility undergrounding anticipated to take one year. Rail pathway conceptual design work is done, with construction scheduled for Spring 2016. Paving work citywide is also in process.

Scotts Valley: Scott Hamby reported that design work for storm damage repairs in the Caltrans right-of-way are underway. The city is revising its Transportation Development Act (TDA) claim in response to comments from the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) in order to include audible RRFB at three crosswalks.

AMBAG: Eliza Yu reported on the Planning Director’s Forum and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) implementation and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/SCS update. She reported that AMBAG provided comments on the Cap-and-Trade Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC), noting the application and scoring process was complicated and not transparent, and that guidelines on how disadvantaged communities are defined should be revised.

Bateman arrived.
RTC: Staff reported that the RTC received extensive input on the Draft Passenger Rail Feasibility Study. The Highway 1 tiered environmental document is scheduled for circulation this fall. Work continues on the county-level travel demand model. The RTC received a $6.3 million Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) grant for a north coast section of the Rail Trail.

County Planning: Steve Wiesner reported that several storm damage repair projects are under construction, that San Lorenzo Water District pipeline work on Graham Hill Road and 17th Avenue/Felt slurry seal work are nearing completion, and that PG&E is conducting gas main testing throughout the county. The county is also working on a full bridge replacement on Old County Road, and will be going to bid for the new Felton Covered Bridge roof and the Twin Lakes beachfront project. Kim Shultz commended the County on the Nelson Road storm damage project.

8. **Stand Alone Bike Model Tool**

Gina Schmidt provided an overview and demonstration of the AMBAG Bike Model Tool, which allows entities to look at the comparative vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas benefits of bicycle projects, utilizing information on topography, travel surveys, and the regional travel demand model. ITAC members expressed appreciation for the tool which can be of assistance in development of funding applications.

9. **2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Update**

Eliza Yu, AMBAG provided information on the MTP/SCS update and provided an overview of the Draft Public Involvement Plan. She requested that Committee members submit comments on the plan by the end of August. Teresa Buika suggested AMBAG edit the document to differentiate between environmental justice and involvement of underserved communities. She also requested that colleges and universities be included in the list of stakeholders. In response to questions, it was noted that the timeline was included in the March 2015 ITAC packet. AMBAG is currently collecting input from local jurisdictions for the growth forecast.

10. **METRO’s Draft Bus Stop Guide**

Erich Friedrich reported that METRO has developed a draft Bus Stop Guide to provide guidance to local jurisdictions and developers on design, construction and placement of amenities at bus stops. He requested input on the draft and requested the “Development Review Checklist for Consideration of Transit” (Appendix A-1) be provided to developers and local jurisdiction encroachment permit staff. He noted that the draft was reviewed by the Metro Advisory Committee (MAC). ITAC members expressed appreciation for having the information in a consolidated document. Mr. Friedrich noted that the guide is a “living” document and requested feedback on the document.
11. **Caltrans Transportation Concept Report Updates**

Kelly McClendon reported that Caltrans Transportation Concept Reports for State Routes 35 and 236 focus on maintenance, include a discussion about possible relinquishment to the County or State Parks if desired, and recommend small-scale modifications. Committee members discussed some of the benefits and challenges of changing state routes to local roads and Caltrans’ efforts to bring permitting and route plans in line with the state strategic plans.

12. **Funding Program Updates**

The Committee received updates on several state and local funding programs:

- **Caltrans Planning Grants** – Call for Projects August 17, applications due October 30. Information will be online: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html)
- **State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)** – currently no STIP capacity for the two new years of STIP; many projects to be re-spread (delayed) statewide
- **Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)** – anticipated RTC “Call for Projects” Fall 2015
- **Active Transportation Program (ATP)** – CTC Staff Recommendations available by September 15, program adoption October 21-22, 2015
- **AB2766** – Air District approval scheduled for September 16, 2015
- **Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC)** – Draft Revised Guidelines anticipated Fall 2015, call for projects anticipated January 2016
- **FY15/16 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program** applications due November 1, 2015

13. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

*Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY14 - 15 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY15 - 16 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY15 - 16 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>591,100</td>
<td>602,922</td>
<td>601,300</td>
<td>-1,622</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>99.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>788,200</td>
<td>803,964</td>
<td>801,800</td>
<td>-2,164</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>99.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>791,871</td>
<td>807,709</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>616,700</td>
<td>629,034</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>822,300</td>
<td>838,746</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>719,449</td>
<td>733,838</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>601,300</td>
<td>580,629</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>801,800</td>
<td>758,764</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>739,331</td>
<td>835,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>524,400</td>
<td>524,826</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>699,200</td>
<td>699,732</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>853,689</td>
<td>812,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,549,340</td>
<td>8,628,404</td>
<td>1,403,100</td>
<td>-3,786</td>
<td>-0.04%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
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AGENDA: September 3, 2015

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director

RE: Release Request for Proposals for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Fiscal Years 2012-13 to 2014-15 Triennial Performance Audits

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) authorize the Executive Director to release a request for proposals (RFP) for the production of the required triennial performance audits for fiscal years (FY) 2012-13 through 2014-15.

BACKGROUND

State law requires triennial performance audits of local transportation planning agencies and transit operators who receive Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds. The audit determines compliance with state requirements and evaluates the efficiency, effectiveness and economy of operations. The performance audit guidebook produced by Caltrans states:

“While meeting the legal requirements for conducting a performance audit is important, a performance audit also provides an opportunity for an independent, objective and comprehensive review of the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the entity being audited. The audit has other benefits, including:

- Provides management with useful information to assess past activities and provides insight for future planning efforts;
- Provides management with a review and evaluation of an agency’s organization and operations;
- Presents an opportunity to utilize auditor expertise which can supplement staff work; and
- Assures public accountability for the use of public funds.”

DISCUSSION

The most recent triennial performance audits were completed in early 2014 and covered fiscal years (FY) 2009-10 through 2011-2012. Therefore, it is necessary to
begin the work to produce the triennial performance audits for the next three-year period, FY 2012-13 through FY 2014-15. The audits must be done by an outside independent auditor. Every three years the RTC releases a request for proposals (RFP) and goes through a procurement process to hire a consultant to conduct the audits.

Attachment 1 is a draft RFP with a scope of work for the audits. The scope of work is the same as was used for the previous triennial performance audits and includes performance audits of the RTC and Santa Cruz METRO. Although not legally required, the scope of work also includes audits of Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center. The audit work will include visits to the various agencies being audited and interviews with their staff. The auditor will also interview some RTC and Santa Cruz METRO board members. After completion, the audit reports will be submitted to the State Controller.

**Staff recommends that the RTC authorize the Executive Director to release an RFP for the production of the required triennial performance audits for fiscal years 2012-13 through 2014-15.** The cost of the audits is estimated to be about $30,000 and will be covered by Transportation Development Act funds. Staff will return to the RTC with a recommendation on hiring an auditor after vetting all of the proposals received.

**SUMMARY**

State law requires triennial performance audits of the RTC and Santa Cruz METRO. Although not required the audits include Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center. The audits are produced by an outside independent auditor and the RTC conducts a procurement process to select the auditor. Staff recommends that the RTC authorize the Executive Director to release a request for proposals (RFP) for the production of the required triennial performance audits for fiscal years (FY) 2012-13 through 2014-15.

**Attachments:**
1. Draft RFP for Triennial Performance Audits
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DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
2015 TRIENNIAL PERFORMANCE AUDITS FOR SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Introduction

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Santa Cruz County is soliciting proposals to conduct performance audits of the RTC, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center for fiscal years 2012/13 through 2014/15. The audits must be conducted in compliance with relevant sections of the California Transportation Development Act. The RTC further expects that the performance audits will be conducted consistent with the “Performance Audit Guidebook for Transit Operators and Regional Transportation Planning Entities” issued by the California Department of Transportation.

Proposal Due Date

Interested firms must submit four hard copies and one electronic copy (in PDF format) of their proposal to the RTC offices (1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060) no later than 5:00 p.m., Friday, October 02, 2015. Postmarks will not be accepted.

Scope of Work

The contractor shall provide consulting services as necessary to complete the following work items:

1. Triennial Performance Audit of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC).
2. Triennial Performance Audit of the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD).
3. Triennial Performance Audit of Agencies providing specialized transit services: Community Bridges (CB) and the Volunteer Center (VC).

General information about RTC, SCMTD, Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center is included in Attachment A.

The audits must meet all requirements of California state law relating to performance audits of planning entities and operators, and the provisions of this request for proposals.

Specifically, the contractor shall perform performance audits which comply with all provisions of Sections 6662.5 and 6664.5 of the California Administrative Code. The performance audit shall evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy of the operation of the entity being audited and shall be conducted in accordance with the Performance Audit Guidebook prepared by Caltrans.
The evaluation of the performance of the RTC as Regional Transportation Planning Agency shall include, but not be limited to:

a. The manner and extent to which the RTC complies with legal and regulatory requirements, including its planning mission and its responsibility in administering transportation funding.

b. The manner and extent to which the RTC operations and planning objectives have responded to prior performance audit recommendations.

c. Review of RTC functions, including interviews with RTC management, staff and governing board, as well as with operators under the RTC jurisdiction. Supplemental interview with other regional agencies and State or federal agencies may be appropriate to gather more detailed information about any areas of concern.

d. The manner and extent to which the RTC’s financial records are managed.

e. A preliminary audit report or management letter discussing the evaluation of performance and recommendations for improvements or additional functional audits.

f. A final report.

The evaluation of the performance of Transit Operators (SCMTD), shall include, but not be limited to:

a. The manner and extent to which the transit operator has complied with legal and regulatory requirements and with the Regional Transportation Plan.

b. Progress toward the goals included in the Regional Transportation Plan.

c. Evaluation of progress in responding to prior performance audit recommendations.

d. Analysis of the transit performance indicators identified in the Performance Audit Guidebook and state law, which include 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.

e. Review of SCMTD functions, to identify any concerns over inefficient or ineffective performance. Supplemental interview with other regional agencies and State or federal agencies may be appropriate to gather more detailed information about any areas of concern.

f. Preliminary management letters and a final report.
The Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center provide specialized transportation services and they do not receive Article 4 TDA funds. These agencies receive the funds from the City of Santa Cruz, which acts as the claimant under Article 8, Section 999400(c). However, for the purpose of this performance audit, the indicators, which are consistent with Sections 99246 and 99247 of the California Public Utilities Code, will be utilized where applicable.

**Presentation of the Final Report**

The work of the contractor shall include a presentation of the final audits to the Regional Transportation Commission and to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Board of Directors in April 2016. In addition to the final presentation, the consultant shall meet with Regional Transportation Commission staff and Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District staff as necessary to complete the project. It is expected that the contractor will fully brief the staff and be familiar with the claimant’s operations, as they relate to TDA, before issuing a final report and recommendations.

**Timeline and Budget**

The services of the consultant shall begin immediately following the execution of a professional services agreement. It is anticipated that this contract will begin in early November 2015. The services shall be completed in a professional manner within six months from the date of initiation of the agreement.

**Contact Information**

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is the lead agency and client for all aspects of this project. Questions and correspondence should be directed to:

George Dondero, Executive Director  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Telephone: (831) 460-3200

Specific questions regarding this RFP can also be directed to Daniel Nikuna, Fiscal Officer at (831) 460-3217; email: dnikuna@sccrtc.org.

**Audit Oversight**

The work of the contractor will be supervised by the Regional Transportation Commission in consultation with representatives of the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District.
INSTRUCTION TO PROPOSERS

Consultant Selection Schedule

Issue Request for Proposals          September 4, 2015
Proposals Due                        October 2, 2015 by 5:00 p.m.
Review of Proposals/Interviews if necessary October 12 – 16, 2015
RTC Board Approves Selected Firm     November 5, 2015
Notice to Proceed                    November 6, 2015

Proposal Content and Organization

The intent of this RFP is to encourage responses which meet the stated requirements and which propose the best methods to accomplish the work within the stated budget.

1. **Transmittal letter**: Include summary of the proposal, applicant or firm name, and name, title, address, email, phone number, and original signature of an individual with authority to negotiate on behalf of and to contractually bind the proposer, and who may be contacted during the period of proposal evaluation.

2. **Audit Plan and Technical Approach**: Detailed description of your approach to the project, including proposed work program, schedule, and end products to be produced.

3. **Project Management**: Explanation of the project management system and practices to be used to assure that the project is completed within the scheduled time frame and budget, and to assure that the required products are of high quality.

4. **Consultant Team**: Names, qualifications, and expected time commitment of all professionals who will work on the project, including any subcontractors, and organization chart for this project.

5. **Consultant Qualifications and References**: Related projects, including project description and contact name, address, and phone number of clients.

6. **Conflict of Interest**: List any past, current or upcoming projects by your firm or professionals that may result in an actual or perceived conflict of interest with this performance audit report.

7. **Cost Proposal**: Prepare a detailed cost proposal for the work to be performed. The cost summary should include a breakdown of costs. Costs shall be segregated to show staff hours, rates, and classification, and administrative overhead for each task. Cost proposals shall be submitted in a separate sealed envelope.

Submittal of Proposals

1. Four hard copies and one electronic copy (in PDF format) of their proposal must be received in the Regional Transportation Commission office (1523 Pacific
Avenue; Santa Cruz, CA 95060), no later than **5:00 pm on Friday, October 2, 2015**. If selected for further consideration, firms should be available for oral interviews October 12 - 16, 2015. However, at the discretion of the Regional Transportation Commission, the selection of a consulting firm may be made without oral interviews.

2. Costs to prepare the proposal shall be born by the proposer.

3. The RTC reserves the option to reject any or all proposals, wholly or in part.

4. This request does not constitute an offer of employment or contract.

5. Any contract entered into as a result of this request will contain a clause that the consultant will abide by the Fair Employment Practice Act.

6. The RTC reserves the right to award the contract to the firm that presents the proposal which, in the judgment of the RTC, best demonstrates the ability to conduct the audit, which shall include, but not be limited to, understanding of the purpose and requirement of the audit; approach to be followed and tasks to be performed; relative allocation of resources to key tasks; experience in public transit, performance auditing, and issues and functional area(s) to be analyzed; education and specific experience of the project team; and consideration of the cost proposal.

**Proposal Evaluation and Selection Process**

1. The RTC’s Executive Director and staff will review the written proposals and, if necessary, invite two or more firms to an oral interview during the week of **October 12, 2015**. The RTC reserves the right to select a consultant based solely on the written proposals and not convene oral interviews.

2. Based upon the written proposal, the interview, reference checks and cost, the RTC Executive Director will recommend a preferred auditor to the RTC on **November 5, 2015**. After RTC approval, the Executive Director will contact the firm selected as the preferred firm and attempt to negotiate a contract. If in the RTC’s Executive Director’s opinion, negotiations are not progressing toward a successful conclusion, the RTC Executive Director may negotiate with one other qualified firm.

3. The RTC reserves the right to amend the scope of work prior to the contract being signed, and reserves the right to amend the above process if it does not result in a contract.

**Method of Payment**

Payments will be made on a progress basis by task structured to meet the cash flow requirements of the consultant. Retention of 10% of the full contract amount will be held until after the work has been satisfactorily completed and accepted by the RTC.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE**  
*September 2015 Through November 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/](http://www.sccrtc.org/meetings/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Day</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Meeting Time</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/3/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/15</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Safe on 17/Traffic Operations Systems</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop - CANCELLED</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commissioner Retreat</td>
<td>8:30 am</td>
<td>Pajaro Dunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee – note special date and time</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Pajaro Dunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/15</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/15</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee – note special date due to Columbus Day Holiday</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</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  
Pajaro Dunes – 500 Sandpiper Ln – Watsonville, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Letter Type</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>TO First</th>
<th>TO Last</th>
<th>TO Organization</th>
<th>FROM First</th>
<th>FROM Last</th>
<th>FROM Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/12/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>06/12/15</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Rail Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/26/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/26/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Donlon</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/15/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/15/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td>FY15 LCTOP Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/17/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/17/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Moriconi</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>Department of Transportation Administering Agency-State Master Agreement No. 00483S and the Program Supplement Agreement No. ON79 Rev. 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/22/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Hale</td>
<td>TAMC Santa Cruz Branch Line Passenger Rail Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/25/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/25/15</td>
<td>GKY</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Dzendzel</td>
<td>New Project Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/28/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/28/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Line Passenger Rail Feasibility Study</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Maura F</td>
<td>Twomey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Line Passenger Rail Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John W</td>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Files</td>
<td></td>
<td>Railroad Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Fein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Whitelaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Karon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>McPheeters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on RTC Passenger Rail Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rhia</td>
<td>Gowen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Colligan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>DeBoer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Wil</td>
<td>Mundy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Charles M</td>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commuter Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Powers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My Rail/Bike/Walk Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correspondence Log

**September 3, 2015**

<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>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Siri</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ryan J</td>
<td>Whitelaw</td>
<td>Pacific Appraisers</td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Malone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Zenack</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Dall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rails/Trails Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>Edmundson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail/Trail Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Longinotti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>TO Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>FROM Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Lawless</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Passenger Trains from Watsonville, Santa Cruz and San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Dorfan</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ros</td>
<td>Munro</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>Kremer</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Wedge</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Huether</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Brieger</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Trains Going from Santa Cruz to...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Maura F</td>
<td>Kelsea</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</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>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Enda</td>
<td>Brennan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Speer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Service Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Maura</td>
<td>Twomey</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FY2014/15 Fourth quarter FHWA PL Invoice and the Quarterly Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>William R</td>
<td>Tysseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Feasibility Study Draft Report for the Santa Cruz Branch Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Piercy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</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>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Padula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail Announcement Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Burroughs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Medwin</td>
<td>Schreher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Wilhusen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Cohar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Smallman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Dall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment Regarding Rails/Trails Project in Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</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>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Menchine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Kichar</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Railroad!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Renner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Krohn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Previtali</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dwight</td>
<td>Trowbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</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>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Delaney</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Rail Study Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Shippen</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC Org Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large Profits Drive Criminal Drug Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>G Craig</td>
<td>Vachon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Records Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/03/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>There Is No Global Warming Second Chance</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>08/04/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bud</td>
<td>Colligan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for Additional Study of Rail Trail Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/06/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Conlen</td>
<td>Bike Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Support Letter to Accept the FLAP Grant Award and Commit an Addition $300k Towards the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/06/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>DeLucia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Light Rail Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>Pico</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail-Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>08/06/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>Kenville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rails Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/07/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clinton-FBI—A Political Control Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/10/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Train Operator Internet Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/10/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marijuana Reclassified from Schedule I to Schedule IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date 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>
<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>08/08/15</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>Explaining the Science of Global Warming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09/15</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>Malaysia Airlines Flight 370 Abduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09/15</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>A Practical Assessment of Environmental Damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Program Supplement Agreement No. 009-N to Administering Agency-State Agreement No. 05-6149R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stacey and Witbeck, Inc</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Contract RT34036 - Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Bridge Supports, Repairs, and Member Replacement Project Final Request for Equitable Adjustment 01 - Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/15</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>What is the Risk of Pollution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/15</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>National Security Cyber Attacks and Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/15</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>Future of the Santa Cruz METRO</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>08/11/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Aptos-Rail-Trail-Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Security Circle is Bigger Than Clinton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/13/15</td>
<td>Memorandum</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Law Office of C. Patrick Stoll</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td>Letter Agreement for Legal Service Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Myrna</td>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail to Receive Multi-Million Dollar Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Undermining National Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Metro Housing &amp; Urban Redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Many Santa Cruz Politicians Want More Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Brown, Cruz, Walker, and Fiorina on Global Warming</td>
<td></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>08/18/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Program Supplement Agreement No. 009-N to Administering Agency-State Agreement No. 05-6149R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/19/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McClendon</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FY2014-2015 Invoice #4 for the Rural Planning Assistance Funds (State Highway Account) in Accordance the OWPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/19/15</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinie</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Reimbursement for Federal Funds Invoice #11b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/19/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dene</td>
<td>Bustichi</td>
<td>SCMTD, Chair Board of Directors</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Elsea</td>
<td>SCCRTC, Chair B&amp;D TAC</td>
<td>Revisions to ParaCruz Customer Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/20/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 08/20/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Regional Water Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/20/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 08/20/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Advancement in Diabetic Medical Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/20/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 08/20/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Transpiration Capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 19, 2015

Dean Bustichi, Chair Board of Directors
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
110 Vernon St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: Revisions to ParaCruz Customer guide

Dear Board of Directors and Chair Bustichi:

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

At its meeting on August 11, 2015 the E&D TAC reviewed the draft version of the revised ParaCruz customer guide. The purpose of this letter is to request that Santa Cruz Metro continue its “door-to-door” service and not introduce a “door-to-curb” option, even if requested by customers. The Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) has strong concerns for the safety of people with cognitive impairments, which are hard to assess and can change quickly.

For instance, customers with early or undiagnosed dementia, could appear fully coherent in conversation, yet may easily become disoriented or lost when trying to find their way from the paratransit vehicle to their destination. Several committee members recounted past incidents where people did become lost, explaining the heart break of participating in the search party or bringing bad news to family members. Other committee members who regularly evaluate those facing the early stages of dementia in their professional capacities explained how difficult it is to make such a diagnosis and how rapidly a person’s condition and capability can change. While Metro drivers and staff get to know regular customers and serve them well, they are not trained to diagnose dementia or recognize changes in its status. Members expressed concern that this policy could place undue burden and/or liability on well-meaning Metro drivers and intake staff.

It was suggested that by allowing "door-to-curb" service, the minimum ADA requirement, ParaCruz service would be more efficient because a driver would not be required to take the extra 5 minutes to escort each passenger to the destination building. In its discussion the committee noted Metro's past history of providing great customer service, going above and beyond the minimal amount of assistance and interaction required. It was also noted that under the current policy, many drivers would wait by the vehicle and watch to insure that passengers safely reached their destination. Such a response does allow passengers to independently go into a building while providing the opportunity for a driver to intervene if a passenger should become disoriented or lost.

Improvement in efficiency is not worth the potential risk to passenger safety, or grief experienced by families and Metro staff or potential liability resulting from any passenger failing to safely reach his or her destination.
The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee urges Metro to continue to provide "door to door" service for all ParaCruz customers, keeping everyone safe, and leaving rules and guidelines clear and easy to follow by Metro drivers and staff.

Sincerely,

Veronica Elsea, Chair
Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

Cc: Alex Clifford, CEO and General Manager
August 24, 2015

Honorable Jim Beall  
Member, California State Senate  
State Capitol, Room 5066  
Sacramento, CA  95814  
Via FAX: (916) 651-4915

RE:  **SBx1-1 (Beall), Transportation Funding. (as amended July 14, 2015)**  
Notice of Support

Dear Senator Beall:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) supports SBx1-1, which would provide much needed funding to address some of the overwhelming backlog of preservation and maintenance. We especially appreciate your strong commitment to the local roadway network, in designating nearly 50% of the projected revenues to cities and counties for pavement repairs and the incentive to provide 5% of the funds to counties that are able to pass a new local sales tax measure for transportation. While the bill does not dedicate new funding for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which SCCRTC has used to fund a mix of highway, local road, transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects; we are also hopeful that requiring the Board of Equalization to make adjustments to the gas tax based on the consumer price index will bring some level of stability to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

In Santa Cruz County, with the gasoline tax value continually dwindling and not keeping pace with the cost to operate and maintain the local roadway network, the backlog of pavement maintenance needed in Santa Cruz County has grown to over $150 million. Unfortunately, even with the commitment of gas taxes and several local funding sources, less than $12 million a year is available to improve local pavement conditions. Without this additional funding, 25% of local streets and roads will be in failed condition in a very short 10 years.

We cannot stress enough the importance of acting on the transportation funding shortfall. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue. For these reasons, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) supports SBx1-1 (Beall).

Sincerely,

George Dondero  
Executive Director  
SCCRTC

cc:  Senator Monning, Assemblymember Alejo, Assemblymember Stone

s:\legislative\2015\current\SBx-1-1 (Beall) transportation funding support.docx
Describe the specific project that could improve transportation in Santa Cruz County.

FIX THE POTHOLES. MT. HERMON ROAD.

Location of project (check all that apply):

- Not sure

If you checked "Not sure", please explain:

BETWEEN SCOTTS VALLEY AND FELTON

Provide beginning and end points of project, cross streets, nearest address, direction of travel as best you can.

BETWEEN SKYPARK DRIVE AND GRAHAM HILL ROAD, TRAVELING TOWARDS FELTON.

How will this project improve the transportation system in Santa Cruz County?

THE POTHOLES DAMAGE CARS OR MAKE US SWERVE TO MISS THEM.

Name

CYNTHIA DZENDZEL

Email

cyndzen@earthlink.net

---

From: Ginger Dykaar
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2015 10:03 AM
To: cyndzen@earthlink.net
Cc: Karen Pushnik; Cathy Judd
Subject: potholes - Mount Hermon Rd

Hi Cynthia,

Your request to fix the potholes on Mount Hermon Rd has been sent to Santa Cruz County Public Works. They have added them to their list of pavement repair needs that they are actively working on. Thank you for providing your input on transportation project needs.

Ginger Dykaar

Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Direct 831.460.3213 | Main Office 831.460.3200
Watsonville 831.768.8012

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Regional Transportation Commission  
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 8:12 AM  
To: Cory Caletti  
Subject: FW: RTC: Coastal Rail Trail to Receive Multi-Million Dollar Grants

From: Myrna Sherman [mailto:cyclingbuddie@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 4:10 AM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission  
Subject: Re: RTC: Coastal Rail Trail to Receive Multi-Million Dollar Grants

A big congratulations for the money but why do we need to wait 3 years to start the project?

Thanks,

Myrna Sherman  
League Cycling Instructor #4610  
League of American Cyclists  
Education Director  
Santa Cruz County Cycling Club  
831-419-1174

Hi Myrna: Thanks for the congratulations. To answer your question, it takes some time to design the project, get permits, get environmental clearance (because of the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Protection Act which involves mitigating for impacts to wetlands, or other natural habitats distributed by either the path or the construction process), and finally put the project out to construction bid, then built it (making sure that construction happens during the season that impacts the environment and nearby fish or other habitats the least). Building any infrastructure is way more complicated than it seems. While this is a path, it can be considered a roadway for all practical purposes.

Hope this sheds some light. Feel free to share with others that have the same question.

~ Cory

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner  
Regional Transportation Commission  
831.460.3201
August 12, 2015

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

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

Dear Mr. Montesino:

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

A “paid” claim for the purposes of this recognition represents the first payment on an open claim during the prior program year. Your agency’s efforts have resulted in no “paid” workers’ compensation claims for the prior 5 consecutive program years including 2014-15. This is an outstanding accomplishment that serves as an example for all SDRMA members!

It is through the efforts of members such as Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission that SDRMA has been able to continue providing affordable workers’ compensation coverage to over 415 public agencies throughout California. While 271 members or 65% in the workers’ compensation program had no “paid” claims in program year 2014-15, 123 members or 30% had no paid claims for the prior 5 consecutive years.

In addition to this annual recognition, members with no “paid” claims during 2014-15 earn 2 credit incentive points (CIPs) reducing their annual contribution amount and members with no “paid” claims for the prior 5 consecutive program years will earn 3 additional bonus CIPs. Also, members without claims receive a lower “experience modification factor” (EMOD) which also reduces their annual contribution amount.

On behalf of the SDRMA Board of Directors and staff, it is my privilege to congratulate the Governing Body, management and staff of Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission for their commitment to proactive loss prevention and safety in the workplace.

Sincerely,
Special District Risk Management Authority

David Aranda, President
Board of Directors
President's Special Acknowledgement Award

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SPECIAL DISTRICT RISK MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
HEREBY GIVES SPECIAL RECOGNITION TO

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

The President's Special Acknowledgement Award is to recognize members with no "paid" claims during the prior five consecutive program years in the Workers' Compensation Program. A "paid" claim for the purposes of this recognition represents the first payment on an open claim during that same period. Congratulations on your excellent claims record!

David Aranda, SDRMA Board President

August 12, 2015
Date
District Director’s Report
A quarterly publication for our transportation partners

US 101/San Juan Road Interchange Completed
Caltrans and its local transportation partners will celebrate the recent completion of the US 101/San Juan Road interchange on July 17 near the project site. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and the California Transportation Commission will participate in the event featuring several state, county and local representatives.

The $49 million project removed three major at-grade intersections and constructed a single interchange, converting this segment of US 101 from expressway to freeway. The new facility improves safety and operations by reducing conflicts that cause collisions and delays during peak travel times.

New Grant Cycle Coming
Strategic Partnerships Sustainable Communities

D5 Engineer Honored
Senior Transportation Engineer Debra Larson recently received the 2015 Karl Moskowitz Transportation Award for outstanding management and engineering. Larson has served in many positions, including investigations, non-standard special provisions approvals and project review. As the District Traffic Safety Engineer, she has implemented many safety improvements, including curve realignments, wet weather and sight distance projects, crash cushion and end treatment upgrades, and installations. She also defends Caltrans in legal cases.

Recycled Water for Landscaping
Construction is nearing completion on the US 101 recycled water project in San Luis Obispo. The $1.8 million project will use recycled water to irrigate about 43 acres of planting along the highway in the city and remove five potable water meters in the landscape area. Other major features include using recycled water for the District Office and Shop 5 landscaping, and carrying the flow to the shop’s wash rack and water truck hydrant. Two other projects are installing smart irrigation controllers in four of the District’s five counties. These reduce water usage, shut off automatically and notify workers of system malfunctions.

Please Submit Maintenance Service Requests at the Following Link: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/msrsubm
**Class IV Bikeway Guidance Forthcoming**

Caltrans is developing design criteria for Class IV bikeways. A recent summit was held in Sacramento with stakeholders to share ideas and concerns. Class IV bikeways are also referred to as *cycle tracks*, or separated bikeways, and feature exclusive use for bicycling adjacent to a roadway. Protection from vehicle traffic is provided using various elements such as grade separation, flexible posts, inflexible physical barriers or on-street parking. Assembly Bill 1193 requires Caltrans to establish minimum safety design criteria for these facilities by Jan. 1, 2016. The design criteria:

- Is established cooperatively with local agencies.
- Includes facility design speed, minimum widths and clearances, grade and curvature radius, pavement surface, traffic control devices actuation and more.

**Mile Marker Summer Edition Released**

The 2015 *District 5 System Management Plan* (DSMP) is the District’s 20-year vision for managing the state’s transportation system. It features the *District Profile*, *Management Plan* and *Project List*. The first section describes the District’s setting and context, environmental resources and multimodal systems. The second category details goals, objectives and strategies for achieving the department’s new mission, vision and goals. The third section provides the District’s 20 to 25-year list of multimodal improvements identified in state and local planning documents.

The DSMP identifies objectives for meeting Caltrans’ 2015-2020 Strategic Management Plan’s five major goals:

- Safety and health
- Stewardship and efficiency
- Sustainability, livability and economy
- System performance
- Organizational excellence

The 2015 *District 5 System Management Plan* (DSMP) is the District’s 20-year vision for managing the state’s transportation system. It features the *District Profile*, *Management Plan* and *Project List*. The first section describes the District’s setting and context, environmental resources and multimodal systems. The second category details goals, objectives and strategies for achieving the department’s new mission, vision and goals. The third section provides the District’s 20 to 25-year list of multimodal improvements identified in state and local planning documents.

More information is available at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/ctjournal/MileMarker/index.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/ctjournal/MileMarker/index.html)
### 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>Hwy. 17 Laurel Curve NB Shoulder Widening (1C1804)</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley from 0.3 Miles North of Glenwood Cutoff to 0.5 Miles South of Glenwood Drive (PM 9.4-10.1)</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>Project completed and approved on 7/15/15</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>Hwy. 1 North County Pavement Preservation and Rumble Strips (05-1C8604)</td>
<td>Near City of Santa Cruz from Western Drive to San Mateo C/L (PM 20.2-37.4)</td>
<td>Pavement preservation and install rumble strips</td>
<td>May 13, 2015 – Fall 2015</td>
<td>$10.7 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>Granite Construction Company</td>
<td>Work resumed May 13, 2015. Rumble strip installation is ongoing. Anticipated completion in winter, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 9 Pollution Source Control (0Q5904)</td>
<td>At and near Boulder Creek at various locations from 0.9 mile south of Glengarry Rd to 0.2 mile north of McGaffigan 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 at Location 1 (PM 3.7, between Santa Cruz and Felton) until October 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 is provided for autos. A signed detour route is also provided for bikes.</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>4. <strong>Hwy. 129 Curve Realignment (05-0T540_)</strong></td>
<td>East of Watsonville between 0.4 mile west of Old Chittenden Rd and 0.1 mile east of Chittenden underpass (PM 9.5-10.0)</td>
<td>Curve realignment</td>
<td>Fall, 2015</td>
<td>$5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Most of the roadwork will be done with one-way signal traffic control with about 7-10 days of full closures at the end of the project. Construction start may be delayed until spring if weather is an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Hwy. 1/17 Shoulder Widening (05-1A870_)</strong></td>
<td>On Route 1 from the NB merge with Route 17 to the NB off-ramp to Ocean Street (PM 16.9-17.2)</td>
<td>Extend the SR 1 NB #1 lane to extend the merge with the SR 17 SB #2 lane</td>
<td>Fall, 2015</td>
<td>$1.1 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Construction anticipated beginning October. Work may be delayed until spring if weather is an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Hwy. 152 Accessible Pedestrian Signals (05-1G280)</strong></td>
<td>14 intersections in Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Install accessible pedestrian signals</td>
<td>Winter, 2016</td>
<td>$1.7 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Locations: SR 1 in Santa Cruz (3) SR 17 in Scotts Valley (2) SR 129 in Watsonville (3) SR 152 in Watsonville (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Hwy. 152 ADA (05-1E020)</strong></td>
<td>Near Watsonville from Wagner Avenue to Holohan Road</td>
<td>ADA compliance (install sidewalks)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$3.5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Fact Sheet

Location:
In Santa Cruz County from 0.4-mile west of Old Chittendon Road to 0.1-mile east of Chittendon Underpass.

Description:
The project will realign the highway to the north approximately 60 feet to increase the curve radius and sight distance at this location.

Purpose and Need:
Run-off-the-road and cross-centerline collisions are occurring at the project location. The objective of this project is to reduce the frequency and severity of collisions occurring within the project limits.

Schedule:
Construction is scheduled for fall, 2015 with a scheduled completion of fall, 2016, weather permitting. The project will include a temporary traffic signal and one-lane traffic control. We are anticipating a five-day full closure toward the end of the project.

Funding:
The project is funded through the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). It is included in the SHOPP Safety Improvement Program. The current construction estimate is approximately $5 million.

Contact:
Doug Hessing, Project Manager
Doug.Hessing@dot.ca.gov
(805) 549-3386

View Eastbound – Postmile 9.8
View Westbound – Postmile 9.9

Photo Source: Bing
The Transportation Management Plan for this project requires temporary traffic control to provide for the reasonably safe and effective movement of all road users through and around construction zones while protecting users, workers, emergency responders, and equipment.

Traffic information will be posted throughout construction with changeable message signs as well as construction area signs. Additional information will be shared through the District 5 project information website at the following address:

http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist05/projects/

A button will be placed at the signals at each end of construction to allow bicyclists to extend the signal length to accommodate passage.

General Information

Passenger Vehicles:
Most vehicles connecting between Watsonville and Gilroy can use SR 152 to avoid construction-related traffic.

Trucks:
SR 152 has multiple truck advisories and restrictions. This includes king-pin-to-rear-axle (KPRA) distance posted at 30 feet near Watsonville and Gilroy. There is also a restriction on trucks/combinations over 45 feet between Carlton Road and Watsonville Road.

North - Traffic to and from Gilroy and surrounding areas

All Vehicles:
Traffic on US 101 can take the San Juan Road exit, turn right on Carpenteria Road, continue on Rogge Lane, and turn left on SR 129.

Traffic on eastbound SR 129 can turn right on Rogge Lane, continue on Carpenteria Road, turn left on San Juan Road, and access US 101 via the San Juan Road interchange.

There will be electronic message signs, road closure signs, and detour signs posted throughout the area.

South - Traffic to and from Salinas and surrounding areas

General Information

Weather Information:
The construction schedule may change due to weather conditions. Please refer to the project website for the latest project updates, including potential changes to the construction schedule.

Other Resources:
California State Transportation Agency:
http://www.calsta.ca.gov

California Department of Transportation:
http://www.dot.ca.gov
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RECOMMENDED ACTION
RECEIVE update on the Rail Extension to Monterey County and the Coast Daylight projects.

SUMMARY
This report provides a project update on the Rail Extension to Monterey County and the Coast Daylight projects. TAMC staff will present an update at the meeting.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
The capital cost of the Rail Extension Kick-Start project is estimated at $70 million in year-of-expenditure dollars; this amount has been secured through state grant and bond funding. The Coast Daylight project has varying cost estimates pending completion of track rights negotiations with Union Pacific. The capital cost of the Pajaro/Watsonville station, a stop for both projects, is estimated at $23 million. TAMC is seeking funding for this station now.

DISCUSSION
The Rail Extension to Monterey County would extend Capitol Corridor passenger rail service from Santa Clara County south to Salinas. The service will start with two daily round trips between Salinas and Sacramento, expanding to up to six round trips as demand warrants. The project provides an alternative to the highly congested US 101 corridor to access to jobs, education, and health care, and improves interregional transportation and air quality. It also promotes mixed-use, transit-oriented development, affordable housing, livable communities and economic growth around stations.

In April 2013, TAMC decided to pursue the first phase of the project, called the “Salinas Rail Extension Kick-Start project”, with state-only funding. TAMC adopted an EIR addendum in August 2013. The Kick-Start project includes improvements at the Salinas Station, a two-train layover facility, track improvements in Gilroy to allow for run-through service, and minor improvements to the Gilroy, Morgan Hill and San Jose Tamien stations. The Kick-Start project is estimated to cost a total of $70 million, including funds expended on planning and environmental review. Attachment 1 is the Kick-Start project flyer.

The Coast Daylight project is a joint Caltrans/Amtrak effort headed up by the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC), chaired by Supervisor Dave Potter and staffed by Pete Rodgers, Administrative Director at the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG). The project is an extension of the existing Pacific Surfliner trains that currently run between Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo. The project calls for one daily round trip on the existing Union Pacific-owned tracks between downtown San Francisco and
downtown Los Angeles (or San Diego), to complement the existing Amtrak Coast Starlight service. Currently, the planned stops in Monterey County are in Pajaro/Watsonville, Salinas, Soledad and the City of King. The project relies on local jurisdictions to construct any stations that may be required.

The Pajaro/Watsonville multimodal rail/transit station project is part of the Capitol Corridor extension project. The station would be served by both rail services, and could also be a station for future passenger service on the Santa Cruz Branch Line. The cost estimate for this station is $23 million. TAMC has applied for state and federal funding for this project. Attachment 2 is a station flyer.

TAMC staff will attend the meeting to present on these rail projects.

Approved by: [Signature]
Debra L. Hale, Executive Director
Date signed: 8/18/15

Attachments:
1. Kick-Start project flyer
2. Pajaro/Watsonville station flyer
CAPITOL CORRIDOR EXTENSION TO SALINAS

PROJECT OVERVIEW, OPERATIONS PLAN & INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County, as the local lead agency, grante agency and owner of the project, proposes to extend passenger rail service from Santa Clara County south to Salinas.

The project would function as an extension of existing state-sponsored Capitol Corridor intercity passenger rail service, operated and maintained by the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority.

The service will start with two round trips, expanding to up to six round trips as demand warrants.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Kick-Start:
- A downsized Salinas station: Lincoln Avenue extension, improved car and bike parking facilities, two-train layover facility
- Track and platform improvements at Gilroy, Morgan Hill, and Tamien

Future Phases:
- A new station at Pajaro/Watsonville (connection to the Santa Cruz branch line)
- Expansion of the Salinas train station and layover facility
- A new station at Castroville (connection to the Monterey branch line)

Track access rights and track improvements to 38 miles of existing Union Pacific Coast Mainline track between Gilroy and Salinas.

PROJECT BENEFITS

Provides an alternative to the highly congested US 101 corridor to access to jobs, education, health care and interregional transportation in Silicon Valley and the San Francisco Bay Area.

Promotes mixed-use, transit-oriented development, affordable housing, livable communities and economic growth around the three stations.

825 new jobs created in an area with high unemployment

$2.2 million saved annually in avoidance of highway accidents

40 tons annual reduction in carbon monoxide, a smog-forming toxic gas.

34 tons annual reduction of carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas and contributing factor in global climate change, as a result of reducing total vehicle miles traveled on the regional road and highway network.

1 ton annual reduction in volatile organic compounds, also smog-forming toxic gases.

150,000 estimated annual ridership

66% estimated farebox recovery

Extensively collaborative endeavor and has regional and statewide support, as well as support from every Congressional Representative along the rail corridor.

PROJECT TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Design</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>START OF SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rail Mileage from San Jose to Salinas: 68 Miles

- Proposed Passenger Rail
- Altamont Corridor Express
- Caltrain
- Capitol Corridor
- San Joaquin
- Proposed Santa Cruz Service
- Proposed Monterey Light Rail
- Amtrak Coast Starlight
- Existing Station
- Proposed Station
Project costs do not include required new trainsets to support the Capitol Corridor service extension.

**DRAFT TRAIN SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Train #1</th>
<th>Train #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>5:06 a.m.</td>
<td>6:01 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castroville</td>
<td>5:16 a.m.</td>
<td>6:11 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>5:31 a.m.</td>
<td>6:26 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>6:00 a.m.</td>
<td>6:55 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>6:14 a.m.</td>
<td>7:09 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamien</td>
<td>6:32 a.m.</td>
<td>7:27 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Diridon</td>
<td>6:37 a.m.</td>
<td>7:32 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>7:43 a.m.</td>
<td>8:40 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>9:48 a.m.</td>
<td>10:40 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento (PM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>2:10 p.m.</td>
<td>3:35 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>4:03 p.m.</td>
<td>5:28 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Diridon</td>
<td>5:14 p.m.</td>
<td>6:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamien</td>
<td>5:19 p.m.</td>
<td>6:50 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>5:37 p.m.</td>
<td>7:08 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>5:51 p.m.</td>
<td>7:22 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>6:20 p.m.</td>
<td>7:51 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro/Watsonville</td>
<td>6:35 p.m.</td>
<td>8:06 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castroville</td>
<td>6:35 p.m.</td>
<td>8:06 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>6:45 p.m.</td>
<td>8:16 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISTANCES & TRAVEL TIME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salinas-Gilroy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas-San Jose (skip stop)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1 hour, 31 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy-San Jose (Caltrain)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>approx. 51 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose-San Francisco (Caltrain)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>min. 1 hour (Baby Bullet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose-Sacramento (Capitol)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>min. 3 hours, 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROJECT COST**

$69.7 MILLION

- **$23.4 Million** State Transportation Improvement Program
- **$20.0 Million** Traffic Congestion Relief Program
- **$18.1 Million** Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)
- **$7.2 Million** Proposition 116 Rail Bond
- **$1 Million** Local Funding (Various Sources)
PAJARO/WATSONVILLE MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION STATION
Rail Extension to Monterey County

DESCRIPTION
• New rail platform, car and bike parking
• MST/Santa Cruz Metro bus transfer facility
• Bicycle and pedestrian improvements
• Stop on Capitol Corridor (Salinas to Sacramento)
• Stop on Coast Daylight (San Diego to San Francisco)
• Stop on Coast Starlight (Los Angeles to Seattle)

BENEFITS
• Reduces vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions
• Serves disadvantaged communities of Pajaro and Watsonville
• Facilitates access to jobs, health care, education and shopping
• Expands transportation options
• Promotes economic development

COST ESTIMATE
• $23 million

DELIVERY STATUS
• State environmental document is complete
• Conceptual designs at 60%
• Construction could start as early as 2017

CONTACT: Transportation Agency for Monterey County • 55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, CA 93901 • Phone (831) 775-0903
AGENDA: September 3, 2015

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Karena Pushnik and Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planners
RE: Public Input on the Draft Passenger Rail Study

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission:

1. Review the hundreds of letters, emails, and comment forms submitted to the RTC by the July 31, 2015 deadline regarding the Passenger Rail Feasibility Study - Draft Report (available for review online at: www.sccrtc.org/rail-study-comments);

2. Review the summary of over 2,600 responses to the survey about the findings of the Draft Report (Attachment 1); and

3. Review the summary of comments and topics to be updated or added to the final Passenger Rail Study (Attachment 2).

BACKGROUND

In order to expand mobility options along the most heavily traveled areas of the county, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) acquired the 32-mile Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, which generally parallels the coast between Davenport and Watsonville/Pajaro.

This irreplaceable transportation corridor runs the length of the county and has the potential to provide multiple mobility benefits to the community well into the future. Current, planned, and potential future uses of the rail corridor include freight and recreational passenger rail services, a new bicycle/pedestrian path next to the tracks, and new rail transit or intercity rail service connecting with local bus transit and planned regional and state rail service. The RTC used voter-approved bond funds designated for expanding passenger rail service and state transit funds to purchase the rail line from Union Pacific Railroad in October 2012.

With the rail line under public ownership, the RTC received a transit planning grant from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to analyze rail transit options on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Rail transit is regularly scheduled public transportation service, with established fares on fixed guideway railroad tracks. In May 2014, the RTC awarded a contract to a team headed by Fehr & Peers, a
consulting firm specializing in transit planning, to conduct the study. Agencies with experience in planning and implementing rail transit provided peer review of technical information, and local agencies and stakeholders also provided input at several points during development of the study. The study was prepared in partnership with Santa Cruz METRO, Iowa Pacific/Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway, and Caltrans who provided oversight as members of the Project Team.

DISCUSSION

The Passenger Rail Feasibility Study – Draft Report analyzes a range of rail transit options on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line between Santa Cruz and Watsonville/Pajaro based on goals and objectives developed with community input in Summer 2014 and service scenarios and evaluation metrics approved by the RTC in September 2014.

Public outreach

On May 21, 2015 the Draft Study was released for public review. At its June 4 meeting, the RTC established July 31 as the close of the comment period. A broad range of public outreach activities were conducted to encourage community participation in the review of and discussion about the findings in the draft study. Information about the study was included in the RTC’s web newsfeed, Facebook and Twitter pages, as well as through newsletters, news media, local businesses, and community groups. Flyers and the Fact Sheet on the study were also distributed at a public open house and other multiple venues. Presentations on the study were made to local technical stakeholders and community groups, RTC Advisory Committees, the METRO board, and other community groups and service clubs. In addition, the RTC’s Passenger Rail Study webpage included the Draft Report, Executive Summary, links to an online survey and comment form to gather community feedback, maps, and responses to Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ). Attached is a list of outreach activities and related media coverage (Attachment 3).

There was wide-spread public participation and engagement, with thousands of people providing input on the draft study via an online survey, emails, comment forms, letters, and at a variety of meetings. In addition to the project webpage: www.sccrtc.org/rail, the Draft Study was available for review at the downtown Santa Cruz, downtown Watsonville, Aptos, and Live Oak libraries, as well as the RTC offices and Capitola City Hall. Both the June 4 RTC meeting in Watsonville and evening open house in Live Oak were well attended.

Input Received

The hundreds of written comments received on the Draft Study by the July 31, 2015 comment deadline are publically-available online at: www.sccrtc.org/rail-study-comments. Additional comments received after the close of the comment period are listed in the correspondence log (included in the board packet). Input provided through over 2,600 online survey responses is summarized in Attachment 1.
Survey respondents indicated support for public transit on the Branch Rail Line right-of-way (73%) and Rail Transit in Santa Cruz County (65%). When asked about different service characteristics, respondents indicated a preference for frequent service, with more station stops in more areas of the county, with the highest ridership, even if it means slower trains and it costs more. Survey respondents indicated the most important factors for evaluating rail transit included reducing traffic, providing more transportation options, and environmental benefits/emission reduction. The most important factors for respondents deciding that they would take rail transit include predictable travel times, ease of connections to final destinations, and station proximity to destinations. Notably, the survey was designed as a tool to familiarize the community with some of the findings from the report and to get a sense of how the report was received in the community by the self selected, non-random survey respondents.

Comments received ranged from strong support for any type of rail service on the corridor, to support of certain types or frequency of rail service, to voicing concerns about potential impacts or certain aspects of scenarios analyzed, to strong opposition to any type of rail, to opposition of any activity on the rail line, and other comments in between. Overall, more respondents expressed support for rail transit than opposed it. A few central themes of comments from those opposed to rail transit included concerns about cost, horn noise, number of daily trains, and coordination with the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) in the rail corridor. Those supportive of the project often focused on the mobility, environmental, and economic benefits of rail transit.

While answers to many comments and questions submitted to the RTC are already addressed in the study, staff and the consultant team recommend providing clarification and additional information on many topics raised by members of the public, Commissioners, RTC Committees, interest groups and partner agencies. Attachment 2 provides a summary of the comments received and recommended amendments for the final report.

Some of these topics include:

- **Service to Watsonville** – Given strong community interest in providing service to Watsonville, staff and the consultant team recommend that the Preferred Service Alternatives in Chapter 8 be replaced with a description of options/parameters for a hybrid scenario that serves Watsonville during peak commute hours. This hybrid combines elements of other scenarios already studied.
- **Vehicle Technology** – Expand discussion about vehicle procurement and potential vehicle options, including vehicles that are low and zero emission.
- **Noise** – Provide additional information about regulations, options for lower horn noise, and quiet zones.
- **Ridership** – Expand explanation about ridership forecasts including station assumptions, demographics, mode split, and other factors that went into the ridership model.
• Costs – Expand discussion of costs. The forthcoming Unified Corridors Plan could include comparable costs and subsidies of other transportation modes, and economic impacts/benefits
• Station Access – Expand discussion about how riders would get to/from stations, bus system integration, other amenities such as shuttles, secure bicycle storage, and parking management
• Street Crossing – Add discussion about typical crossing gate time on local streets, based on other rail systems
• Land Use – Add more discussion about the potential of rail service to affect development patterns and provide for projected growth, especially related to affordable housing and employment
• Trail coordination – Additional information will be included about coordination of corridor uses and areas where right-of-way widths and constraints should be explored in more detail during design engineering phases.
• Train Speeds – Include more detail about train speeds, including maximum and average speeds, and that speeds can vary based on station locations, track curvature, bridges, street crossings, and vehicle technology
• Hours and Frequency – Discuss trade-offs between ridership, service hours and costs
• Freight – expand discussion about Common Carrier rights and responsibilities
• METRO Coordination: Expand information about bus and rail funding sources and service coordination.

As the Passenger Rail Feasibility Study is a planning-level document and given that the project budget and scope are based on funding received from the Caltrans transit planning grant, some comments or detailed questions will not be addressed in the Final Passenger Rail Feasibility Study. Revisions to the report will not include conducting new analysis such as: additional ridership forecasts, alternate rail operations model development and runs, additional funding scenario or capital cost analysis, and/or otherwise quantitative evaluation of new alternatives. If the RTC decides to conduct more detailed analysis of passenger rail in the future, some of the comments would instead be evaluated in a project-level environmental document, through construction design engineering, or through a detailed service planning effort in the future.

Section 9 of the study, which describes implementation steps, will be expanded to document items that could be evaluated in future stages. The final report will also include discussion about when and how the community might make decisions about the greatest possible benefit of future options in the rail corridor, the risk in making rushed or irrevocable decisions, and the value of maintaining transportation options given unknown future needs and circumstances.

Administrative edits to the text, including grammatical, formatting, clarification or editorial corrections will also be made. Fehr & Peers is preparing the final report for presentation to the RTC later this year.
SUMMARY

The RTC was awarded a transit planning grant to analyze passenger rail transit service along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. The study focuses on public rail transit options within the most populated sections of the rail corridor. The study includes cost, ridership, and funding information for a range of transit service scenarios. Written comments received on the draft report are online at: [http://www.sccrtc.org/rail-study-comments](http://www.sccrtc.org/rail-study-comments). Input provided through an online survey is summarized in Attachment 1. A summary of input received by the July 31 deadline by topic, including proposed amendments for the final document is provided in Attachment 2. Additionally, the consultant team and staff are considering input received as they prepare the final report to include grammatical, formatting, clarification or other minor editorial corrections. The final document will be presented to the RTC later this year. Public outreach activities are listed in Attachment 3.

Attachments:
- Online: Comments received (430+) as letters, emails and comment forms ([www.sccrtc.org/rail-study-comments](http://www.sccrtc.org/rail-study-comments))
- 1. Summary of Survey Results (2,600+ responses)
- 2. Summary of comments received on the Draft Report and planned amendments to Final Report
- 3. Summary of Public Outreach and Media
Survey Results: Q1 Possible Corridor Uses

*Q2 percentages included responses “4” & “5”; Q8 sums “very important” and “extremely important”.

2015 Survey Results: Transit Service

Q1: Support for Public Transit on the Line

- Support (73.1%)
- Support w/caveats* (6.0%)
- Oppose (19.9%)

Q15: Support for Rail Transit in Santa Cruz

- Yes (64.9%)
- Unsure (7.7%)
- No (27.5%)

*Caveats included “If infrequent” and “On limited sections”
2015 Survey Results: Service Scenarios

**Q3: General Service Preference**
- Unsure (20.0%)
- More stops but slower trains (53.3%)
- Fewer stops & faster travel times (26.7%)

**Q6: Service Implementation**
- Neither (10.9%)
- Serve more areas, even if costs more (42.7%)
- Unsure/Other (24.8%)
- Start small and then expand (21.6%)

---

**2015 Survey Results: Q6 Service Options**

**Headways**
- Every 15 minutes or less (11.2%)
- Every 30 minutes (48.6%)
- Every hour (14.5%)

**Schedules Options**
- Most frequent peak hours (50.0%)
- Operate on weekends (45.0%)

*Questions allowed more than one answer selection*
2015 Survey Results: Evaluation Factors

Q2: When evaluating rail transit - most important factors
- Reduce number of cars on the road – 75.7%
- Provide more transportation options – 69.7%
- Environmental benefits/emission reduction – 69.4%
- Ridership: Increase transit ridership – 68.9%

Q8: Deciding to take transit – most important factors
- Predictable travel times – 76.6%
- Ease of connection to final destination – 64.6%
- How close stations are to final destination – 62.6%
- Security at stations – 59.1%

*Q2 percentages included responses “4” & “5”; Q8 sums “very important” and “extremely important”

2015 Survey Results: Support and Concerns

Q14: Reasons to support the rail line project
- Provides mobility for those who cannot drive
- Other transportation is publicly funded, rail should be also
- Rail provides transportation options
- Traffic and emissions concerns require car alternatives

Q13: Areas of concern regarding the rail line project
- Capital and operating costs
- Rail could compete with other projects for funding
- Rail means narrower trail and need for trail bridges
- Noise from trains
Q9: How often would you ride the train?

- Never (16.6%)
- 1-3 days per week (27.4%)
- A few times per month (27.8%)
- A few times per year (19.6%)
- 4+ days per week (11.0%)
Attachment 2
Summary of Comments and Planned Updates for the Final Rail Transit Study

The following is a summary of comments received on the Passenger Rail Feasibility Study-Draft Report by topic and recommendations on updates to make in the final study. Comments were received by the RTC via emails, comment forms, an online survey, and at meetings held from May 21, 2015 to July 31, 2015. The written comments received during the comment period are available on the RTC website (www.sccrtc.org/rail-study-comments). While this summary does not include every unique comment, additional information will be provided in the Final Study document in response to most comments and questions received during the comment period. However, answers to some questions and comments are beyond the scope of this study and would not be explored until detailed analysis is done in later phases of study, including project-level environmental documentation, design engineering, or operational service planning; or as part of a comparative unified corridors plan. Notably, answers to many of the comments and questions received are already in the document or provided in the "Frequently Asked Questions" on the RTC website.

GENERAL

- More respondents expressed support for rail transit on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line than expressed opposition.
- Many respondents that expressed general support for rail transit proposed specific parameters (e.g. service area, station locations, vehicle types, cost, service hours) for a preferred service scenario.
- Concerns expressed by those opposed to rail transit often focused on the number of daily trains, cost, ridership estimates, horn noise, and trail integration.

SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS

- SERVE WATSONVILLE: Strong support for serving Watsonville to address congestion and equity. Some suggested a “hybrid” scenario, with peak or commute hour service to Watsonville and regular local service between Westside Santa Cruz and Apts/Cabrillo throughout the day. Recommendation: Outline a hybrid scenario that serves Watsonville, which combines elements of other scenarios already studied.
- REGIONAL RAIL CONNECTIONS: Support for regional rail connections at Pajaro to provide both links for Santa Cruz County residents to travel to places outside the county and for visitors to come to Santa Cruz County without their vehicles, many citing that regional connection would be key to project success and/or funding. Connections to Monterey were also encouraged. Recommendation: Addressed in document, Scenario J.
- HOURS and FREQUENCY: Concerns were expressed that 60 trains a day is too many. Others requested that trains run frequently so service is convenient for regular use. Some respondents wanted frequent service throughout the day (not just peak periods). Some communicated importance of late night service for students and workers with non-traditional hours. Some were opposed to early morning or late
night service. Some requested that train service operate on holidays.
Recommendation: The sample service scenarios identified a range of service hours to understand differences in costs and ridership. Expand explanation that actual service hours would be established with public input during service planning (similar to bus system service planning).

- SPEED: Concerns that trains traveling 45-60 mph would be too fast in neighborhoods. Recommendation: Clarify that under the scenarios analyzed, trains are traveling 25-35 mph on average and provide information on regulations regarding train speeds.

- FARES: Requests for a unified fare card that works on buses. Request for affordable fares. Requests that rider fares cover a higher percentage of the cost. Recommendation: Add additional information about fare collection and rate options used by transit systems and general information on how fare amounts can impact ridership, especially for people with different income levels.

- SPUR LINE: Requests for service to downtown Santa Cruz via Chestnut Street, to Harvey West businesses, and to San Lorenzo Valley; suggestions to reach out to Big Trees. Recommendation: Although the RTC-owned Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line includes the wye area near Depot Park to Laurel Street, this study focuses on the main portion of the Branch Rail Line between Santa Cruz and Watsonville/Pajaro. Coordination with Big Trees/Roaring Camp to extend service toward Harvey West and the San Lorenzo Valley could take place in the future.

- OVER-THE-HILL: Interest in expanding future train service to the Bay Area north through the Santa Cruz mountains. Recommendation: Expand discussion on history of rail corridor over “the hill” and current conditions. This study focuses on the existing RTC-owned Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

VEHICLES:

- VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY: High level of interest in lighter, smaller, quieter, more efficient vehicles than traditional commuter trains. Interest in energy options other than diesel. Recommendation: Expand information on current and potential future vehicle options, including rail transit vehicles that are low and zero emission. General information about available vehicle technologies/types is already included in the document.

- VEHICLE DESIGN: Requests that trains have the capacity to accommodate many bikes, large baggage (surfboards, kayaks, etc.), dogs and restrooms. Recommendation: Given the high level of community interest in this feature, specifications for rail transit vehicles will include accommodations for transporting bicycles. The specifics would be decided at future stages. Vehicle design and floor plan would undergo public review prior to vehicle procurement/purchase.

STATIONS:

- STATION LOCATIONS: Concern expressed that proposed stations are not close enough to major destinations and employment centers, such as UCSC, Dominican Hospital, the Capitola Mall, and Cabrillo College. Suggestion that downtown station
be moved to the north leg of the wye (by old Depot Park station) to be closer to
downtown and Laurel St. buses serving UCSC, others suggested that Westside Santa
Cruz be considered the primary UCSC station instead of Bay St. **Recommendation:**
Expand discussion regarding access to/from stations, coordination with Metro buses,
and future development plans.

- **AMENITIES:** Suggestions that stations include bathrooms and concessions/retail
  (latter to finance project) and wi-fi in stations/on trains to enhance trip productivity.
  **Recommendation:** Update text to clarify that detailed station design would be
decided at future stages of rail transit development.

- **PARKING:** Comments that additional parking at stations is needed, and that
  permitting may be appropriate to prevent spill over into neighborhoods.
  **Recommendation:** Expand general discussion of parking to identify policy decisions
  and experience in other areas, and coordination needed with local jurisdictions for
  parking restrictions. The location and size of park-and-ride lots could be analyzed in
  future stages of rail transit development.

**COST**

- **COSTS & FUNDING:** Concerns expressed about the total cost, that cost would
  outweigh benefits, cost per rider, that funding (including ongoing Operating &
  Maintenance) is uncertain, and that considerable support by taxpayers would be
  required. Comments that project will be more expensive in the future, so investment
  should happen now. **Recommendation:** Expand discussion about cost and funding
  methodology.

- **ALTERNATIVE SPENDING OPINIONS:** Support expressed for spending funds on other
  transportation projects, including widening Highway 1, expanding Metro bus service,
  and fixing local roads. Comments that rail construction costs less than widening
  Highway 1. **Recommendation:** Clarify in document unique funding sources that can
  only be used for rail transit. Consider comparative information about other
  transportation modes as part of Unified Corridors project.

- **METRO FUNDING:** Concern that rail project would dilute funds to Metro.
  **Recommendation:** Expand discussion about funding available and requirements for
  specific types of funding.

**RIDERSHIP**

- **RIDERSHIP MODEL:** Ridership numbers were thought to be either too optimistic
  (high) or too conservative (low), especially for Watsonville. Clarification requested on
  how the ridership numbers were generated, including Santa Cruz specific factors
  (students, tourists), growth projections, and how rail transit ridership might affect
  congestion on Highway 1 and local arterial roads. Concern was expressed that those
  who do not currently ride the bus would not switch out of their cars, or that Santa
  Cruz does not have the density to support rail. **Recommendation:** Expand Chapter 5
discussion about the ridership forecasting methodology including an appendix with
the input factors used. Modify text related to the AMBAG travel demand model to
clarify about model capabilities.
TIMING

- TIMING: Comments that the project is taking too long, a 10 year time line is too long. **Recommendation:** The 10 year timeframe is estimated for a system procuring new vehicles. A more detailed schedule would be developed after a preferred service alternative is identified.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS

- NOISE: The #1 impact concern voiced was noise. In particular, horn noise was of greatest concern, though there was some concern regarding the noise from vehicles. Many people reported being bothered by the horn noise from the Train to Christmastown in Santa Cruz and voiced opposition to the rail project if that volume of horn/duration of signal were to be used. Support expressed for Quiet Zones, though some are concerned that Quiet Zone crossing warnings would still be too loud. **Recommendation:** Add additional information on horn options and regulations, quiet zones, rail infrastructure and vehicles.

- ENVIRONMENT: Belief was expressed that the rail project would have positive environmental impacts and reduce emissions in general. Concern was expressed about emissions from trains on nearby neighborhoods. Strong support was expressed for creating environmentally-friendly alternatives to automobile travel. Belief expressed that Highway 1 creates too much pollution via congestion. **Recommendation:** Environmental benefits and impacts would be evaluated in more detail in a future environmental documentation phase. Add text on state (Caltrans), regional (RTC and AMBAG), and local sustainability goals and plans.

- ECONOMY: Belief expressed rail project would be good for the economy, specifically providing access to jobs and increasing mobility options for visitors. **Recommendation:** Add additional information from local jurisdictions on economic development plans.

- LAND USE: Concerns and/or support that rail transit could result in densification around stations. Some believe this will create an undesirable urban feel, while others believe it will curb urban sprawl and preserve agricultural land, support the state-mandated Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), support construction of affordable housing options, and/or encourage new employers to locate in Santa Cruz County. Others stated that rail could provide access to recently approved development, such as Aptos Village. **Recommendation:** Add additional information from local jurisdictions and AMBAG on development plans and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

- CROSSINGS: Strong concern was expressed about potential traffic impacts that rail transit (especially with the maximum studied - 60 trains/day) would have at street crossings, and that more information should be included in the study. **Recommendation:** Add discussion about typical crossing gate time on local streets, based on other rail systems and factors that might impact crossings.

- CONGESTION RELIEF: Many respondents commented rail transit would reduce congestion, some others believe it will not. Many focused on the need for more reliable and faster alternatives to driving or riding buses on congested roads.
Recommendation: Clarify in document that rail transit would increase travel choices by providing an additional travel option with reliable travel times.

- PROPERTY VALUES: Concern that rail project would negatively affect nearby property values. Comments that the rail project would positively affect property values and economic activity near stations, particularly in commercial areas. Recommendation: Provide general information about the effect of rail systems in other areas.

- ACCESS TO COAST: Some concern expressed that rail transit would restrict beach access; the Coastal Commission stated it would enhance beach access. Recommendation: Coastal access would be analyzed in the environmental document.

INTEGRATION WITH OTHER MODES:

- ACCESS TO STATIONS: Many questions about access to and from the rail transit system or “first/last mile” and total trip time. Strong support for using bicycles to access rail transit. Other suggestions include shuttles, ride pools, a bike/pedestrian bridge to Cabrillo. Recommendation: Add discussion about access options to stations.

- BUS COORDINATION: Comments strongly support Metro bus and rail service working in tandem as an integrated transit network. Specifically, a system of feeder busses to the rail line is suggested, with many suggesting that current Metro routes will need to be modified. Recommendation: The report includes information about the current transit routes, assumes funding sources currently used for bus operations would not be used for rail operations, and includes information about a coordinated transit network. The Metro Transit District is part of the project team and regularly reevaluates its routes.

- Trail/MBSST: Strong support for the trail. Some supported a trail only option. Others supported combined trips using trail and rail to go longer distances, especially for people with limited mobility. Questions about safety, access to, and width of the trail, including need for additional bridges and the locations of sidings. Recommendation: Expand discussion in document on integration and coordination of trail and rail and right-of-way widths.

- BIKES: Strong support for allowing bicycles on trains, including a bike-specific car similar to Caltrain. Strong support for covered/secure bike parking at stations, inclusion of bike sharing systems, as well as the need to improve bicycle facilities around stations (in addition to MBSST). Recommendation: Note strong support for integrated bicycle facilities, amenities and accommodation of bikes on rail transit vehicles in the final report. Specific details about vehicle and station amenities would be determined in future project stages.

- RECREATIONAL TRAINS: Respondents generally less supportive of recreational trains than rail transit. Concerns expressed that rail line would only benefit tourists. Others expressed belief that tourists using the train would be of benefit to the economy and reduce tourist-related congestion. Support for recreational trains to Davenport, Coast Dairies and other north coast public lands. Recommendation: Expand discussion about current and future recreational passenger rail services.

- OTHER MODES: Other ideas for modes/use of the rail line (besides the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail/Coastal Rail Trail) include: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Railbus, Personal Rapid Transit (PRT), monorail, a new road, waste removal, and utility location (water, broadband). Recommendation: The scope and budget of this
analysis limited the analysis of rail transit technologies to those widely used in the United States. Additional discussion will be added about potential rail transit vehicle options, including vehicles that are low and zero emission.

- FREIGHT: Comments that there is limited demand for freight and that rail transit should have priority use of the rail line. Requests for clarification about the requirements for providing freight service and how freight and passenger rail would function together, including vehicle or temporal separation requirements. Comments that nighttime freight service could be unpopular. Recommendation: Provide additional clarification under “Regulatory Setting” and “Integration/Coordination with Freight Service” in Chapter 9 about federal and state rules, regulations, and protections for designated Common Carriers providing freight service.

Other comments not included above:

**SUPPORT OPINIONS**

- Start rail service as soon as possible
- Rail line is great resource - be brave, think big
- Transportation alternatives – rail and trail - are needed, especially because of congestion and growth
- Do not remove the tracks – will be an important future asset
- Transit here should be more like Europe/East Coast/Portland
- Bus is not a viable alternative, is stuck in traffic
- Study was well written

**OPPOSE OPINIONS**

- Trains should not run through residential neighborhoods
- V2V technology will surpass rail technology
- Rail right-of-way should only be used for a trail, no trains
- Train will ruin beauty/peace
- Survey/study was poorly written
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passenger Rail Study - Draft Report Outreach</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Document Released for Public Review</td>
<td>5/21/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Period Close (70 days)</td>
<td>7/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Meeting/Consultant Presentation in Watsonville (morning)</td>
<td>6/4/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open House in Live Oak (evening)</td>
<td>6/4/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Website</td>
<td>Document available online 5/21/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Survey available online 6/4-7/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey in Spanish 6/23-7/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQ</td>
<td>Posted on RTC website 7/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact Sheet</td>
<td>Overview of study and how to provide input Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>Regarding meetings and document 5/21-6/4/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &quot;cards&quot;</td>
<td>-Distributed at meetings and events June/July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eNews: Rail/Youth/Trail/Highlights/Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Announce w/ Report</td>
<td>5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Report &amp; Meeting Info</td>
<td>5/27/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meeting/Open House Reminder</td>
<td>6/1/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Survey Focus</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Survey/Comment Close Reminder</td>
<td>6/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Survey Closes in 3 weeks</td>
<td>7/8/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Final days to comment</td>
<td>7/28/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>RTC Facebook (FB) Posts 5/21 &amp; 7/28/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twitter 5/21 &amp; 7/28/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next Door 6/1 &amp; 7/27/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document at Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz 5/21/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watsonville 5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aptos 6/3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live Oak 6/5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Outreach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Releases 5/22 &amp; 7/29/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSA 5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- KUSP 5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- KSCO 5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- KZSC 5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- KAZU 5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CTV meeting info 5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Smarts, Sentinel 5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentinel Editorial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTC Chair &amp; Vice Chair 7/26/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Media Meetings/Calls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Meetings/Calls</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentinel</td>
<td>7/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Times</td>
<td>6/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Publishing Group</td>
<td>6/17/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Calendars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Calendars</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentinel</td>
<td>5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Times</td>
<td>5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Pub Group</td>
<td>5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz.com</td>
<td>5/22/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Newsletters, Emails, Website, and Social Media Posts by others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newsletters, Emails, Website, and Social Media Posts by others</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information sent to Chambers</td>
<td>5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Rail Coordinating Council</td>
<td>5/22/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Leopold FB Posts on Study</td>
<td>6/2 &amp; 6/4/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Leopold Newsletter</td>
<td>6/2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Santa Cruz County - FB Post</td>
<td>6/2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Jimmy Dutra FB Post on Study</td>
<td>6/3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civinomics</td>
<td>6/9/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Chamber Newsletter</td>
<td>6/18/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Chamber email</td>
<td>6/29/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak Neighbors Yahoo Group</td>
<td>6/30 &amp; 7/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Health in All Policies (HiAP)</td>
<td>7/7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMC Rail Policy Committee</td>
<td>7/8/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Rotary - eNews</td>
<td>7/16/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Trust</td>
<td>7/17/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV Chamber.&quot;Bits &amp; Blogs&quot;</td>
<td>7/21/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civinomics</td>
<td>7/28/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology Action Action Alert</td>
<td>7/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Rail &amp; Trail (FORT)</td>
<td>7/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Chamber Endorsement</td>
<td>7/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Santa Cruz</td>
<td>7/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Cycling Club (SCCCC)-Roadrunner Newsletter</td>
<td>Jul–Aug 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville Website Banner</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV Chamber.&quot;Bits &amp; Blogs&quot;</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RTC & Advisory Meetings/Presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTC &amp; Advisory Meetings/Presentations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTC Board</strong></td>
<td>6/4/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Open House Workshop</strong></td>
<td>6/4/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) Rail Policy Committee</td>
<td>6/1/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Study Technical Stakeholder</td>
<td>6/8/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Bicycle Committee</td>
<td>6/8/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&amp;D TAC)</td>
<td>6/9/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)</td>
<td>6/18/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Valley Stakeholders/Interest Groups</td>
<td>7/6/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Stakeholders/Interest Groups</td>
<td>7/8/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITAC-email reminder to submit comments</td>
<td>7/14/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presentations at Other Entities' Meetings**

| Santa Cruz Business Council                        | 6/10/15 |
| METRO Board                                        | 6/12/15 |
| SC Chamber Community Affairs Committee             | 6/11 & 7/9 |
| SC Rotary                                          | 6/12/15 |
| Commission on the Environment                      | 7/15/15 |
| Penny University                                    | 7/27/15 |
| Capitola/Aptos Rotary                              | 7/30/15 |

**Events**

| Pleasure Point Fest                                 | 6/27/15 |
| Bike Friendly Watsonville                           | 6/27/15 |
| Jewish Cultural Festival Aptoa                      | 6/28/15 |
| First Friday Santa Cruz                             | 7/3/15 |
| Farmers Markets                                     |        |
| - Watsonville - Fri                                 | 7/24/15 |
| - Santa Cruz - Wed                                  | 7/8/15 |
| - Aptos - Sat                                       | 6/27/15 |
| Capitola City Hall                                  | 6/25/15 |
| Watsonville City Hall                               | 7/7/15 |
| Santa Cruz City Hall                                | 6/23/15 |
| City of Wats - Streetscape Mtg                      | 7/1/15  |
| Watsonville Flea Market                             | 7/26/15 |
### Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Cruz Sentinel</strong></td>
<td>Street Smarts</td>
<td>5/24/2015</td>
<td>Ramona Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>6/3/2015</td>
<td>Samantha Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>6/7/2015</td>
<td>DeCinzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op-Ed</td>
<td>6/19/2015</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>6/25/2015</td>
<td>DeCinzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op-Ed</td>
<td>6/27/2015</td>
<td>Bruce Sawhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op-Ed</td>
<td>7/4/2015</td>
<td>Lou Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>7/5/2015</td>
<td>DeCinzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op-Ed</td>
<td>7/11/2015</td>
<td>Ryder/Colligan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op-Ed</td>
<td>7/25/2015</td>
<td>Amelia Cohen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op-Ed - RTC</td>
<td>7/25/2015</td>
<td>Chair Leopold &amp; VC Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastlines</td>
<td>7/27/2015</td>
<td>Sentinel staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>7/30/2015</td>
<td>Samantha Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>7/31/2015</td>
<td>Don Miller &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter to Ed</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Register-Pajaronian</strong></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>6/2/2015</td>
<td>Eric Chalhoub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>6/5/2015</td>
<td>Eric Chalhoub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Times</strong></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>6/17/2015</td>
<td>Anne-Marie Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Times Publishing Group</strong></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>Noel Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Noel Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Noel Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RADIO:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KUSP</strong></td>
<td>PSAs</td>
<td>regularly</td>
<td>Karena Pushnik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Report</td>
<td>5/29/2015</td>
<td>Gary Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Report</td>
<td>6/3/2015</td>
<td>Gary Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KSCO</strong></td>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td>5/28/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>7/30/2015</td>
<td>Karena w/ Rosemary Chalmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KSBW</strong></td>
<td>Story</td>
<td>6/5/2015</td>
<td>Phil Gomez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KION</strong></td>
<td>Story</td>
<td>7/9/2015</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OnLINE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progressive Railroading</strong></td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>5/27/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

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

BACKGROUND

The Tiered Environmental Document for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program includes a program level vision for the long term improvement of Highway 1, between Morrissey Boulevard and San Andreas/Larkin Valley Road (Tier I project), and project level analysis for the construction of auxiliary lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive and a bike/pedestrian overcrossing at Chanticleer Drive (Tier II project). The requirement to produce a tiered environmental document was a condition placed upon the RTC by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) due to changes in the emphasis and scrutiny placed on major projects (in excess of $500M) when funding for an entire project is not yet secured. Completion of the Tiered Environmental Document will allow the RTC to carry out the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program over time as funds become available.

DISCUSSION

Since the last status report progress has been made on the project with the target release of the Draft Tiered Environmental Document holding steady at Fall 2015. The environmental document and support technical studies successfully completed review by Caltrans’s Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) team. The purpose of this final Caltrans review cycle was to assure the quality of all the documents meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). As of this writing, the administrative draft document is under review by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for compliance with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). Comments are expected from FHWA by the end of August and the team will respond to any comments and make updates to all reports as necessary and resubmit the draft document to FHWA for final review and approval to release the draft documents to the public. The target date for release of the environmental documents is late October.
In preparation of the final document review cycles, a botanical survey of the entire corridor was conducted in April and June to document if any of the special-status plant species with a potential to occur were in fact present within the project impact area. This information was used to update the Natural Environmental Study (NES), a technical study supporting the environmental impact report. No special-status plant species were observed during these surveys.

This survey will need to be repeated in the Spring and Summer of 2016 in the area of the Tier II project, between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive, for inclusion in the final environmental document. This information will also be used for the preparation of a Habitat Monitoring and Mitigation Program that will identify necessary environmental mitigation actions and guide the prospective construction project.

The project provides a 60 day public review period, from late October to late December. Staff anticipates holding a public hearing in early December to allow stakeholders and interested parties sufficient time to familiarize themselves with the subject matter and a period of time after the public hearing to clarify outstanding issues and submit any comments. All comments must be addressed in the final environmental document and any changes made to the project as a result of those comments will be highlighted in the final documents. Staff anticipates the response to public comments to take 3-4 months depending on the volume of comments received.

The FY 2015 budget reserves $595,000 for future year expenses to complete the Tiered Environmental Document. State and Federal approval of the environmental document is anticipated in December 2016.

SUMMARY

The Draft Tiered Environmental Documents for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program are currently under review by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) with a target date for public release of the documents anticipated in late October. A 60 day public review period is proposed with comments due at the end of December 2015 and approval of the final environmental document in December 2016.
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
REGARDING: State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Update

RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), as the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Santa Cruz County, is responsible for selecting projects to receive certain state and federal transportation revenues, including State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds. Caltrans develops and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopts a Fund Estimate in August of odd years, showing anticipated revenues available for STIP projects over the next five-years. While each county in the state receives a share of funds to program (based on formulas established under SB45 in 1997), STIP projects selected by the RTC are subject to concurrence from the California Transportation Commission (CTC), which makes the final determination on which projects are programmed statewide, what year they are programmed, and when to release (allocate) funds to individual projects.

Each new STIP includes projects carried forward from the previous STIP and any amendments (including new projects when funding is available) proposed by regional agencies in their Regional Transportation Improvement Programs (RTIPs) and by Caltrans in its Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

DISCUSSION

Typically in the fall of odd years the RTC issues a “call for projects” soliciting applications for transportation projects to receive the county’s formula share of STIP funds. Historically, Santa Cruz County’s share of STIP funds has been $3 to $5 million per year and the RTC has programmed funds to a wide range of projects – including highway, local road, bicycle and pedestrian, rail, and transit projects. However, at its August 27, 2015 meeting, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) is adopting a Fund Estimate for the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) which has no funding capacity for programming new projects and instead many projects already programmed will be delayed.
As reported at past meetings, the shortfall in STIP funds is the result of the reduction of the state excise tax on gasoline that went into effect on July 1, 2015, the so-called “gas tax swap” of 2010 - under which transportation bond debt service is repaid off the top from the excise tax on gasoline, and CTC decisions to prioritize the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) for other flexible state and federal transportation revenues. Attachment 1 is a chart prepared by Caltrans showing how the shortfall impacts the STIP year to year, starting in FY15/16. Attachment 2 is a list of projects in Santa Cruz County that could be impacted.

While regional agencies statewide had hoped that during the “Extraordinary Session on Transportation and Infrastructure” that the State Legislature would increase funding for the STIP, Caltrans and the CTC’s decision not to postpone the STIP Fund Estimate adoption is a disappointing sign that the Legislature and Governor Brown are unlikely to approve increased STIP funding in any transportation funding package. SB X1-1 (Beall), which was discussed at the August RTC meeting, proposes many avenues to increase transportation revenue to goods movement corridors, the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) and local streets and roads. Specific to the STIP, the bill proposes to reset the excise tax to 17.3 cents/gallon and proposes that the Consumer Price Index (CPI) apply to all excise tax. While this would not immediately increase funding for the STIP, it could minimize the major hit the STIP is currently taking. Staff will provide any updates on legislative negotiations and proposals that could impact the STIP at the September 3 RTC meeting.

SUMMARY

Typically in the fall of odd years the RTC issues a call for projects for new State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds anticipated to be available over the next five years. However, due to changes in state law and a drop in the excise tax on gasoline, no new STIP funding is available for programming this year and regions are being asked to delay some projects.

Attachments:
1. 2016 STIP Reprogramming
2. Santa Cruz County STIP Projects
2016 STIP Reprogramming Exercise
Data Source: Draft 2016 STIP Fund Estimate

- Blue bars represent dollar amounts of projects programmed by FY in the 2014 STIP when funding levels were assumed to be higher.
- Red bars are the new, much lower, funding capacity estimates.
- Yellow represents the dollar amounts needed to be shifted to later FY's to bring the STIP back in alignment with new lower funding estimates.
- The tiny gap in FY 20-21 represents the $46 million of new programming capacity for the entire 2016 STIP period.

**Outcome**
With very few exceptions, all projects will be delayed one or two fiscal years due to lack of timely funding.

---

**Graph by Kurt Scherzinger**

Caltrans - Transportation Programming

July 1, 2015
# Santa Cruz County STIP Projects

Some projects will need to be respread (delayed) through 2020/21 in 2016 STIP

All figures in 000's (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>RTIP #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>TOTAL STIP</th>
<th>Current STIP by Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Totals by Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>SC 25</td>
<td>Rt 1/9 Intersection modifications</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Co</td>
<td>CO 73</td>
<td>Casserly Rd Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Co</td>
<td>CO 74</td>
<td>Freedom Blvd Cape Seal (Hwy 1 to Pleasant Vly Rd)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>RTC 04</td>
<td>Planning, programming, and monitoring</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>RTC 01</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>RTC 30</td>
<td>Rt 1 Mar Vista bike/ped overcrossing</td>
<td>6,564</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>RTC 24F</td>
<td>Rt 1, 41st Ave/Squel Av Aux Lns &amp; bike/ped bridge</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>WAT 01</td>
<td>Rt 1 Harkins Slough Rd interchange (10S-041)</td>
<td>7,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>WAT 38</td>
<td>Airport Blvd at Freedom Blvd modifications</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>WAT 40</td>
<td>Airport Boulevard Improvements (east of Westgate Drive/Larkin Valley Road to east of Hanger Way)</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>WAT 41</td>
<td>Sidewalk Infill Harkins Slough Road and Main Street</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>TRL07SC</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network: Segment 7 Natural Bridges Dr to Pacific Ave</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>TRL18L</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network: Lee Rd to Slough Trail Connection</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reserved for Rt 1, 41st Ave/Squel Av Aux Lns & bike/ped bridge - Construction | 2,000 |
| Share Balance- due to cost savings from Nelson Road ($339k) and lapsed project - Park Ave Sidewalks ($200k) | 539 |

Acronyms:
- Components - R/W: Right-of-way; Const: Construction; E&P: Environmental and Project Report; PS&E: Plans, Specifications, and Engineering (design)
- RTIP: Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
- STIP: State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)