Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

AGENDA

Thursday, October 1, 2015
9:00 a.m.

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

NOTE
See the last page for details about access for people with disabilities 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 Cervantes
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.

**MINUTES**

4. Approve draft minutes of the September 3, 2015 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Accept draft minutes of the September 16, 2015 SAFE on 17/Traffic Operations Systems meeting

6. Approve draft minutes of the September 17, 2015 Commissioner Retreat meeting

7. Approve draft minutes of the September 17, 2015 Budget and Administration/Personnel 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
9. Approve easements for Murray Street Bridge Widening Project (Resolution)

10. Approve Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Allocation Request from the City of Scotts Valley for $33,800 for the Scotts Valley Crosswalk Safety Improvement Project (Resolution)

11. Approve Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim for the RTC Administration, Planning, and Operations (Resolution)

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

12. Approve the Regional Transportation Commission meeting schedule for 2016

13. Approve CalPERS health benefit contribution rates for plan year 2016 (Resolution)

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

14. Accept monthly meeting schedule

15. Accept correspondence log

16. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies

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

18. Accept information items

REGULAR AGENDA

19. Commissioner reports – oral reports

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

21. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. District Director’s report
   b. Project Update – Santa Cruz County Fact Sheet

22. Rail Motorcar Excursion on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line 
   (Luis Mendez, Deputy Director)
      a. Staff report
      b. NARCOA Frequently Asked Questions about the Motorcar Hobby
23. 2040 Regional Transportation Plan and Environmental Impact Report
   (Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. 2040 RTP Work Plan
   c. 2040 RTP Schedule
   d. Cost-Sharing Agreement with AMBAG for 2040 MTP/SCS/RTPs EIR

24. Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16 Budget and Work Program
   (Luis Mendez, Deputy Director)
   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution amending the FY 2015-16 RTC Budget and Work Program
   c. TDA Estimates and Revenues

25. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

   CLOSED SESSION

26. 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

27. 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

28. 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

29. Report on closed session

30. Next meetings

   The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 5, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main Street, Suite 400, Watsonville, CA.

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 15, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.
HOW TO REACH US

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

Watsonville Office
275 Main Street, Suite 450, Watsonville. CA 95076
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. (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.

AVISOS SOBRE EL TITULO VI A BENEFICIAIOS
La RTC conduce sus programas y otorga sus servicios sin considerar raza, color u origen nacional de acuerdo al Título VI del Acta Sobre los Derechos Civiles. Cualquier persona que cree haber sido ofendida por la RTC bajo el Título 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 Título VI, East Building, 5th Floor-TCR, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, Washington, DC 20590.
1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

Members present:
Patrick Mulhearn
Don Lane
Virginia Johnson
Greg Caput
Ryan Coonerty
Dennis Norton

Randy Johnson
Jimmy Dutra
Karina Cervantez
Cynthia Chase
Ed Bottorff
Aileen Loe (ex-officio)

Staff present:
George Dondero
Yesenia Parra
Jennifer Rodriguez

Rachel Moriconi
Kim Shultz
Karena Pushnik

2. Oral communications

Brian Peoples, Aptos Rail Trail, said there will be an Aptos Rail-Trail neighborhood meeting on Thursday, September 17, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. at the Rio Sands Hotel in Aptos and invited all.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

A handout for Item 16 was distributed.

CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Norton moved and Commissioner Coonerty seconded the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, R. Johnson, Caput, Coonerty, Norton, Dutra, Chase, Cervantez, Bottorff, V. Johnson, and Mulhearn voting “aye.”
MINUTES

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

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

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

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

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

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

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

10. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

11. Accepted correspondence log

12. Accepted letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies

   a. Letter to Santa Cruz Metro regarding Revisions to ParaCruz Customer guide from the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

   b. Letter to Senator Jim Beall regarding support for SBx1-1 Transportation Funding from RTC staff

13. Accepted miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues
14. Accepted information items
   a. President’s Special Acknowledgement Award – Workers’ Compensation Program from the Special District Risk Management Authority (SDRMA)

REGULAR AGENDA

15. Commissioner reports – None

   Commissioner R. Johnson and Commissioner Dutra joined the meeting at 9:07 a.m.


   George Dondero, Executive Director, reported on his Community Leadership visit to Seattle, Washington and Victoria, British Colombia. He also read a letter, from the Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce on the Passenger Rail Feasibility Study, and stated that the letter is notable for its understanding of the context in which the Rail Feasibility Study was conducted.

17. Caltrans report and consider action items

   Aileen Loe announced that Caltrans is offering a monetary award to members of the public for a contest to identify innovative ideas that would improve the transportation systems and prevent underage drinking. She also noted that the Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning (STP) grant application period is open until the end of October.

   Commissioner Dutra thanked Caltrans for the Watsonville projects.

   Rachel Wooster, reporter at the Santa Cruz Mountain Bulletin, noted the community frustration related to the delayed Highway 9 construction project and the impacts to commuters. Ms. Wooster passed out a packet on her research for her article on the Highway 9 closure.

   Aileen Loe thanked the community for their patience. She said that this has been a complicated project. She described the project and process to prevent sedimentation to the river. She also noted that Caltrans encountered delays due to complicated site conditions. In regards to the missed community meeting, it was a misunderstanding and Caltrans would be happy to attend a community meeting.

   Chair Lane moved agenda item 18 to later on in the agenda to allow time for Congressman Farr to arrive.
19. Monterey County Rail Project Update – *Taken out of order ahead of Item 18*

Debby Hale, Executive Director at the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), introduced Christina Watson, Principal Transportation Planner. Ms. Watson gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Rail Extension to Monterey County and Coast Daylight projects. Information was provided on the projects’ benefits, challenges, funding status, and timeline.

Commissioners discussed STIP funding impacts; fare recovery projections; the potential of this project to expand job opportunities in the San Jose area; and the ease of travel to San Francisco and eventually Los Angeles once this project is complete.

**Chris Mann**, Director at Granite Rock, said Granite Rock leases part of the right-of-way in Sand City and wanted to know whom to contact.

**Brian Peoples**, noted a current trend for the use of express buses like the ones being used by high-tech industry. He said travel by train would take longer.

**Eric Child**, Santa Cruz resident, asked if this project will add to or replace the current service from San Jose to Gilroy.

**Lowell Hurst**, Watsonville resident, said that train connection in South County opens up opportunities and that bus and train schedules need to work together.

The Commission moved agenda item 20 to later in the agenda to allow for extended time to discuss the agenda item after Congressman Farr arrives.

21. Highway 1 Project – Status Report – *Taken out of order ahead of Item 20*

Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner, presented his staff report. Mr. Shultz informed that the Tiered Environmental Document for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program is currently being reviewed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the expected public release is late October with an already extended comment period of 60 days to review.

Commissioners discussed extending the comment period.

**Brian Peoples**, discussed the need for cradle to grave Hwy 1 projects like the HOV lanes; metering lights, and temporary auxiliary lanes.

**Jack Nelson**, Co-Chair Campaign for Sensible Transportation, noted that going through the entire document would require additional time and an extended comment period is needed.
Paul Elerick, asked for clarification on the Mar Vista and Chanticleer overpasses.

Commissioner V. Johnson motioned and Commissioner Coonerty seconded to direct staff to request that Caltrans extend the public comment review period for the Tiered Environmental Document for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Coonerty, Caput, Norton, Bottorff, R. Johnson, Chase, Cervantez, Dutra, Mulhearn, and V. Johnson voting “aye.”

22. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Update – Taken out of order ahead of Items 20 and 18

Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner, presented her staff report on state legislative activities and bills that have affected STIP funding. Ms. Moriconi provided information on how the lack of funds will delay transportation projects in Santa Cruz County. She stated that the RTC will continue working with project sponsors on timelines and if needed, the Commission will re-evaluate the priorities of projects later this year.

Commissioners discussed already programmed projects that may be delayed; the process of establishing project priorities; completion of projects that have been stagnant; the gas tax swap; general obligation bonds; STIP program rules and accessing funds; and expressed overall frustration with the unreliability of state transportation funding and the need for more stable local revenues.

Lowell Hurst, stated that with fuel taxes decreased, the improvement of fuel efficiency vehicles, and alternative fuels, there will be a decrease in funding for transportation projects.

18. Report from Washington – Taken out of order after Item 22

Congressman Sam Farr reported on federal legislative issues and the repercussions of opposing tax increases. He said that there is currently a deficit in transportation funding and that relying on federal funds for transportation improvement plans would make the future of transportation planning unreliable. Congressman Farr noted that local governments are going to have to manage themselves and seize their own opportunities to make investments. He stated that if we continue to use assets that are here and with clever thinking and planning, we can expand local businesses and provide new job opportunities. Congressman Farr thanked RTC staff and Commissioners for their leadership on the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Master Plan. He noted the importance of access to the coastline and the benefits of the rail trail.
The Commission presented Congressman Farr with an American Planning Association Award in recognition of his significant role in contributing to the MBSST Master Plan.

Commissioners thanked Congressman Farr for championing the way for projects the commission has been working on through the years.

Alex Clifford, CEO at Santa Cruz Metro, thanked Congressman Farr for his understanding of the challenges of state of good repair and complications of transit rider benefit, and on being an advocate for transportation funding.

Piet Canin, Ecology Action, thanked Congressman Farr on his vision of connecting cities and getting funds earmarked.

Amelia Conlen, Director, Bike Santa Cruz County, thanked Congressman Farr for his leadership and said that the rail trail will have the biggest impact on non-cyclists.

Dave Wright, Aptos resident, thanked Congressman Farr and commended the RTC for their inclusiveness and work on the rail trail.

Brian Peoples, thanked Congressman Farr for his work and said the rail trail is not wide enough to accommodate both rail and trail.

Micah Posner, Santa Cruz City Council, thanked Congressman Farr on being a visionary for the rail trail and his rare leadership.

20. Public Input on the Draft Passenger Rail Study – Taken out of order after Item 22

Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner presented a PowerPoint presentation with a summary of survey responses, comments received, and public engagement outreach efforts. Ms. Pushnik stated that the RTC will take into consideration the input received by members of the public. Feed back to the consultants includes: clarification of information on: hybrid scenarios to include Watsonville; range of sample rail service concerning costs and ridership; train speeds in neighborhoods; technology options; cost and funding methodology; ridership forecasting; train horns and quiet zones; local jurisdictions economic development plans; gate crossing times; access to stations and parking; and densification for edits in the final report. The report is expected to be ready for public review by the end of this year.

Commissioners discussed the distinction of rail and public transit; how the survey questions were determined; the naming of the study to reflect its nature; people using cars versus using public transportation; implications of costs and financial feasibility; competing modalities; additional information needed for infrastructure investments; short term and long term investments; utilization of the study and successful community engagement; all around
community in favor of the trail; the value of the rail to the tourist industry; and matching rigor and additional information on destination for all projects.

**Dave Wright**, said that he supports the rail and trail for environmental purposes and to alleviate the economic cost of living in this county. Mr. Wright stated that the study is consistent with feasibility information from past projects, Santa Cruz has the density, and the corridor is wide enough.

**Micah Posner**, complimented staff on the responses received and stated that in the long term ridership numbers would go up because the community is more likely to try new things and the stations would have a profound positive effect on land use.

**Bruce Sawhill**, Co-Chair, Friends of the Rail and Trail, commended the study and stated that it would take extensive funds to recreate the resources we already have from scratch. Mr. Sawhill said the rail line is valuable and needs to be used.

**Miles Reiter**, Chairman, Driscolls, said the right of way has limits and advocates for the trail to be priority because it will be the most utilized and more beneficial than a rail with trail.

**Brian Peoples**, said the unreliability of funding, the widening of the highway will be more cost effective. Mr. Peoples stated that heavy vehicles don’t belong close to homes and supports factual reasoning.

**Jack Nelson**, shared a story on his Los Angeles highway driving experience and commented about the impact on neighbors with the increase in vehicles on the highway if widened. Mr. Nelson stated he supports the more efficient rail.

**Christy Marten**, Santa Cruz business owner, noted the need for more elements to be added to the Executive Summary to reflect the community feedback and stated that she feels the rail will change the tone of the town.

**Bill Malone**, said he is in favor of the rail and thinks the tracks are an irreplaceable asset. Mr. Malone stated that only if you give people alternatives, can they take it.

**Mark Mesiti-Miller**, Civil Engineer, expressed his excitement for a reliable alternative transportation service and said that much can be learned from listening to the critics. Mr. Mesiti-Miller quoted Roslyn Carter on leadership.

**Paul Elerick**, said he supports work on the feasibility study and the rail, and that TAMC’s projects are a good start.
Bud Colligan, CEO of South Swell Ventures, stated that he read all of the comments and concluded that the majority is opposed to the rail. Mr. Colligan noted the need for clarification on the speed of the trains and wait times at stations.

Chris Mann, stated that future studies should have random samples and surveys to make adequate reports that can be utilized to make decisions

Lowell Hurst, stated that we need to keep moving forward and getting information out to the public because the rail is feasible.

23. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

Commissioners adjourned to closed session at 11:49 a.m.

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

No report

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 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.

The meeting adjourned at 12:13 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Rodriguez, Staff

Attendees:
Alex Clifford  Santa Cruz METRO
Amelia Conlen  Bike Santa Cruz County
Barry Scott  Rio Del Mar Resident
Bill Malone
Brian Peoples  Aptos Rail Trail
Bruce Sawhill  Friends of the Rail Trail
Bud Colligan  South Swell Ventures
Carl Arnett
Chris Mann  Granite Rock
Christine Watson  Transportation Agency for Monterey County
Christy Marten  Santa Cruz business owner
Daniel Kostele
Debbie Hale  Transportation Agency for Monterey County
Eric Child  Santa Cruz resident
Heather Adamson  Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
Jack Nelson  Campaign for Sensible Transportation
James Swofford
Kate Roberts
Lowell Hurst  City of Watsonville
Mark Mesiti-Miller
Micah Posner  Santa Cruz City Council
Miles Reiter  Driscolls, Inc.
Paul Elerick  Campaign for Sensible Transportation
Peter Detlefs  County Administrators Office
Piet Canin  Ecology Action
Rachel Wooster  Santa Cruz Mountain Bulletin
Will Menchine
JOINT MEETING OF
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY TRAFFIC OPERATIONS SYSTEMS (TOS) OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
AND
SAFE ON 17 TASK FORCE

DRAFT MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2015
10:00am-12:00pm

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz

TOS Oversight Committee and Safe on 17 Task Force Meeting Participants
Christopher Cook, Caltrans D5, Program/Project Management
Lt Scot Loetscher, San Jose CHP
Lt Brian Hawkins, Santa Cruz CHP
Officer Trista Sharp, Santa Cruz CHP
Kelly McClendon, Caltrans D5, Planning
Brandy Rider, Caltrans D5, Planning
Earl Sherman, Caltrans D4, Maintenance
Ruben Herrara, Caltrans D4, Maintenance
Bruce McPherson, Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors
Nicole Stewart, CHP, Monterey Dispatch
Heather Adamson, AMBAG
Ramin Bolourchian, Caltrans D4, Transportation Management Center
Mona Raby, Redwood Estates Service Association
Kieran Kelly, representing Santa Clara County Supervisor Ken Yeager
Marshall Ballard, Valley Transit Authority (VTA)
Gine Johnson, representing Santa Cruz County Supervisor Bruce McPherson
Eric DeGroodt, Caltrans D5, Maintenance
Bertha Roman, Caltrans D5, Program/Project Management
Susana Cruz, Caltrans D5, Public Information
Patty Ciesla, Santa Clara County Fire Safe Council
Dan Medeiros, Land Trust of Santa Cruz County
Gary Richards, San Jose Mercury News, (teleconference)
Jacques van Zeventer, Caltrans D5, Traffic Management, (teleconference)
Doug Hessing, Caltrans D5, Program/Project Management(teleconference)
Scott Hamby, City of Scotts Valley Public Works (teleconference)
Kim Shultz, Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
Amy Naranjo, Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Ginger Dykaar, Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1. **Introductions** - Introductions were made.

2. **Additions or Deletions to the Agenda** - none

3. **Reviewed and Accepted Minutes of the March 11, 2014 Joint TOS Oversight Committee and Safe on 17 Meeting**

4. **Received Information Items**

   Ginger Dykaar provided a brief update on the new 3-year extra enforcement contract between RTC and CHP. The contract with MTC has also been amended. RTC and MTC will continue to provide $50,000 per year each for extra enforcement for the next 3 years.

   Ginger Dykaar presented the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) Program Update. Funds are provided by Caltrans for Freeway Service Patrol on both Hwy 1 and Hwy 17. The allocation of funds for Santa Cruz County FSP has been reduced for the FY 15/16 fiscal year by $33,000, an approximately 15% reduction. The allocation is based on a formula that includes population, the number of freeway lane miles, and the amount of congestion. Prior to the detectors being put in place on Hwy 1, Caltrans estimated the amount of congestion in SCC. Now that we have detectors on Hwy 1, these detectors can provide real data on the amount of congestion but since we do not have detectors on Hwy17 near the summit where congestion often occurs, the algorithm assumes that there is no congestion. RTC would like to work with Caltrans to discuss what options may be available for adding detectors on Hwy 17 in order to substantiate the congestion here. Due to this funding decrease, RTC staff is currently evaluating how best to reduce FSP hours and will take into consideration the times of day when there are fewer assists. Summer weekend hours may need to be reduced or eliminated and a reduction in weekday service may also be necessary.

   Amy Naranjo presented information on the RTC 511 traveler information service website – Cruz511 that was launched in May 2015. The site has been designed to view on smart phones, tablets and computers and features: Real time traffic information, incident information, traffic cameras, multimodal info and trip planning tools, Google’s transit trip planner, specialized transportation, emergency alerts and more.

   Ginger Dykaar presented a summary of the 2014 Safe on 17 Annual Report. The 2014 Safe on 17 Annual Report shows that the total number of injury and fatal collisions was the highest in 2014 since 2005. Similarly the total number of collisions in 2014 is the highest since 2005. This increase may be just a normal variation or could be due to other factors including traffic volume changes, decrease in the number of total citations issued and/or an increase in distracted driving using cell phones. The number of overtime citations have been about the same over the last many years but there has been a decrease in the number of regular citations. Opportunities to increase the regularly scheduled enforcement on Hwy 17 or optimize the current efforts during high collision times would be beneficial.

   Lt Hawkins with Santa Cruz CHP stated that the number of citations is not representative of the complete level of services that CHP is providing to increase safety on highways. Their efforts have shifted to more preventative strategies that will modify behavior in the long run rather than the penalty approach of issuing citations. Preventative strategies include increased public education to all
age groups, from youth to seniors. Lt Hawkins (Santa Cruz CHP) and Lt Loetscher (San Jose CHP) both expressed the challenges that CHP has been facing due to a reduced workforce and high turnover in both offices. CHP has been working to create incentives for officers to stay in San Jose where the cost of living is high such as encouraging local kids to participate in the “Explorer” program that provides training for young men and women to explore their future in law enforcement.

Articles/Public Feedback - The packet contains a news article written by Gary Richards from the San Jose Mercury News about the increase in collisions on Hwy 17 as shown in the 2014 Safe on 17 Annual Report.

5. Received Update on California Highway Patrol Safe on 17 Program Statistics and Public Information Efforts

Collisions and Citations, San Jose - Lt Scot Loetscher with San Jose CHP stated that so far this year there were zero fatalities on the Santa Clara side of Hwy 17, but a higher number of property damage only collisions and injury collisions. Lt Loetscher’s assessment is that even though the number of injuries has increased, the injuries are less severe this year than previous years. Lt Loetscher expressed that he has noticed that the traffic has been increasing since the low during the economic downturn of 2007-2008.

Ginger Dykaar expressed that there is a location on Hwy 17 NB north of Summit Rd where there have been a number of collisions. Lt Loetscher stated that the CHP officers find the locations where more enforcement may be needed and they have been targeting this area in particular. Ramin Bolourchian from Caltrans D4 TMC will investigate the possibility of placing a dynamic speed warning sign at this location.

Collisions and Citations, Santa Cruz - Officer Sharp from Santa Cruz CHP stated that so far the total collisions and injury collisions have decreased since last year and there have been no fatalities on the Santa Cruz County side of Highway 17. There has been a substantial reduction in number of collisions near Laurel Curve due likely to the placement of the median barrier and the high friction surface treatment on the SB side of the highway approaching Laurel Rd. There are more collisions near Glenwood now. CHP is focusing their efforts on days with inclement weather. The number of officers that patrol Highway 17 is reduced to one officer/day for a 10 hour shift in comparison to the late 1990’s when there were three officers/day with eight hour shifts each.

Public Information - CHP Santa Cruz have been working hard on modifying driving habits to improve safety and gain public trust. CHP offers monthly training to youths, seniors and incorporates the message of safety on Highway 17 in all of their public affairs activities.

Enforcement Hours - Ginger Dykaar mentioned that both Santa Cruz and San Jose have a plan for spreading extra enforcement hours throughout the year at approximately 40-60 hours per month.

6. Received Caltrans District 5 Highway 17 Project Update

Kelly McClendon presented the public outreach component of the Access Management Study for the Hwy 17 corridor from Granite Creek Rd in the City of Scotts Valley to Summit Rd. Strategies include interactive web mapping tool, workshops, surveys, social media, outreach booths at local events,
focused small group meetings, and leader interviews. Outreach will be bi-literate and culturally fluent and will occur this fall and spring with the Summary Findings Report completed by July 2016.

Dan Madeiros from the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County presented the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing project. The Conservation Blueprint Plan developed by the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County emphasized Highway 17 as a significant barrier for wildlife to cross and identified Laurel Curve as the ideal location for building a wildlife crossing due to the large undeveloped properties in this area. Land Trust has since purchased or is planning to purchase over 400 acres in this area. The Land Trust has been working with Caltrans on this project. Caltrans has developed the Project Initiation Document (PID) for this project and the project has been advanced for the 2016 SHOPP. In the PID, two design options were identified with costs up to $12 million. Brandy Rider from Caltrans, D5 Planning, stated that Caltrans is trying to get the project programmed through the SHOPP but that it did not compete well given only $7M available for mitigation projects statewide. Dan Medeiros stated that the Land Trust will raise funds to cover some of the costs of this project.

Christopher Cook from Caltrans D5 expressed that the Laurel Curve Shoulder Widening project on the northbound side of Hwy 17 near Laurel Rd has been completed. He also discussed the Hwy 1/17 merge lane project that will improve safety by increasing the number of lanes from 3 to 4 lanes so that 2 lanes will not be merging into one. Only restriping and improving crash pads on guard rails will be required. Project should start October 30, 2015 and take about 60 to 90 days.

7. Received Caltrans District 4 Highway 17 Project Update

Earl Sherman from Caltrans D4, stated that there are no major construction projects planned for Hwy 17 on the Santa Clara County side. There is a project on Hwy 17 north of Hwy 9 to replace signage. CT maintenance continues to be challenged recruiting people due to high cost of living in area. Graffiti, litter and illegal encampments are major maintenance issues that continue to take time away from other work.

8. Received Traffic Operations Systems Updates

Traffic Management Center (TMC) Update - Ramin Bolourchian, Caltrans D4, TMC discussed how Caltrans received an email from a member of the public expressing his concern over using the CMS on Hwy 1 near 41st Ave for nonemergency messages during morning commute times due to the increased traffic congestion. Ramin expressed appreciation to Caltrans D5, Public Information Office for their response to the public’s concern. Ramin stated that Caltrans has over 150 to 200 messages per year that they are required to post on the changeable message signs as part of Caltrans’ mission to improve highway safety. There have been a number of complaints about the CMS on Hwy 1 near 41st Ave causing traffic congestion. He stated that Caltrans’ intent is to not use this CMS for nonemergency messages during peak periods although a few messages were posted over the last year. Caltrans has analyzed travel time data available from INRIX to determine whether there are increases in congestion when this CMS sign is posted but they have not seen an increase over the already congested NB roadway during the morning commute. The day on which the gentleman expressed his concern about the CMS causing congestion, also showed that CHP slowed traffic to remove debris on the road which did increase the congestion in this area. Regardless of whether the CMS messages on the Hwy 1 sign near 41st Ave cause real or perceived delay, Caltrans intent is to not post nonemergency messages during the morning peak period at this location.
Communications Update - Nicole Stewart, CHP Monterey Dispatch, stated that there is an increase in call volume to the dispatch center and a decrease in staffing. In order to optimize work flow, they have eliminated the faxing of sigalerts. Sigalerts are on website and are provided via email.

Traffic Operation Equipment Update - Jacques van Zeverter stated that there are a number of detectors on Hwy 1 but only two on Hwy 17. Perhaps through the Access Management Study, Caltrans will be able to provide operational detectors on Hwy 17 but there is nothing currently planned. The focus of the Traffic Operations group is 90% health and reliability of equipment. There are limited resources for any additional efforts. Contact Julie Gonzalez, Caltrans D5, about improving the detection on Highway 17. If you see any problems with detectors on Hwy 1, please let Caltrans know so can work toward goal of 90% health and reliability.

Callbox System - CHP, Caltrans and the RTC have approved a reduction plan for the call box system in SCC. A map of the boxes to be removed and the ones that will remain is shown on page 36 of the packet. All remaining boxes will be made ADA compliant. RTC staff is working with Caltrans permitting to get this work completed.

9. Received Major Incident Review

The task force discussed the overturned tea truck incident on Hwy 17 and the five car pileup with fatality on Hwy 1.

10. Received Additional Items - none

11. Approved Next Meeting Date
Joint Safe on 17 Task Force & TOS Oversight Committee Meeting – Wednesday, March 9, 2016
10:00am to 12:00pm at San Jose California Highway Patrol, 2020 Junction Ave, San Jose, CA 95131

Respectfully submitted by

Ginger Dykaar
1. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 8:50 a.m.

Members present:
- Jimmy Dutra
- Cynthia Chase
- Greg Caput
- Dennis Norton
- Ryan Coonerty
- Zach Friend
- Don Lane
- John Leopold
- Bruce McPherson
- Lowell Hurst (alt.)
- Ed Bottorff
- Virginia Johnson (alt.)
- Patrick Mulhearn (alt.)
- Micah Posner (alt.)
- Mike Rotkin (alt.)

Staff Present:
- George Dondero
- Yesenia Parra
- Karena Pushnik
- Luis Mendez

1. Oral communications

**Jack Nelson**, Campaign for Sensible transportation urged Commissioner and the public to get on board the train to show leadership for climate change.

**Brian Peoples**, Aptos Rail Trail would like to partner with the Commission to help work on the stand still traffic condition. He noted he supports HOV lanes and toll roads and encouraged the Commission to take a look at vehicle technologies. He also announced the Aptos Rail Trail meeting scheduled for September 17, 2015 at 6:00 pm at the Rio Sands Hotel.

**Carey Pico** Rio Del Mar Improvement Association is concerned about the way information was presented on the Rail Feasibility Study. He lives near the
tracks so if passenger rail was feasible he would support it. He does not think the Rail property is wide enough to have both rail and trail. He also does not think there is enough funding to support passenger rail.

Commissioner Leopold said that the rail line purchase brought the community together and created a topic that the community was excited about and has begun to share creative ways of using it.

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

**CONSENT AGENDA**

No consent items

**REGULAR AGENDA**

3. Commissioner Retreat

Commissioners discussed: funding, project priorities and the importance of becoming a self help county.

4. Next meetings

The next SCCRTC 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 next meeting of the Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, October 15, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer

Attendees:
Jack Nelson Campaign for Sensible Transportation
Brian Peoples Aptos Rail Trail
Carey Pico Rio Del Mar Improvement Association
MINUTES

Thursday, September 17, 2015
1:30 pm
Pajaro Dunes
105 Shell Drive Watsonville CA

Members Present
Commissioner Ryan Coonerty
Commissioner John Leopold
Commissioner Greg Caput

Commissioner Bruce McPherson
Commissioner Alternate Tony Gregorio

RTC Staff
George Dondero
Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra
Daniel Nikuna

Meeting called to order at 1:38 pm.

1. Introductions none

2. Additions or changes to consent and regular agenda-None

3. Oral communications-None

CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner McPherson seconded the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously, with Commissioners Leopold, McPherson, Coonerty and Caput voting “aye.”

4. Accepted monthly TDA revenue report

5. Approved minutes of the February 12, 2015 meeting

6. Accepted fourth quarter FY2014-15 warrants and credit card reports
REGULAR AGENDA

7. Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16 Budget and Work Program

Luis Pavel Mendez presented the report.

Commissioner Caput departed the meeting and Commissioner Alternate Gregorio took his place.

Commissioners discussed the closure of the RTC satellite office in Watsonville; the analysis for the San Lorenzo River walkway and the grant for the Bike signage project that has been recommended for funding.

Commissioner McPherson moved and Commissioner Coonerty seconded to recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the proposed amended fiscal year (FY) 2015-16 Budget and Work Program.

Motion passed unanimously with Commissioners McPherson, Coonerty, Leopold and Commissioner Alternate Gregorio voting “aye.”

8. The meeting adjourned at 2:03 p.m.

The next Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 12, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. in CAO Conference room, 701 Ocean St., Santa Cruz CA

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra
Administrative Services Officer
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### TDA REVENUE REPORT
#### FY 2015-2016

<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>872,384</td>
<td>64,675</td>
<td>8.01%</td>
<td>102.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>616,700</td>
<td>629,034</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>822,300</td>
<td>838,746</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>719,449</td>
<td>733,838</td>
<td>0</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>2,275,484</td>
<td>60,889</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

I:\FISCAL\TDA\MonthlyReceipts\[FY15-16.xlsx]FY2016
RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to provide the easements to the City of Santa Cruz that it needs for construction of the Murray Street Bridge Widening Project for a negotiated amount of $11,500.00.

BACKGROUND

The City of Santa Cruz is working to make improvements to the Murray Street bridge over the Santa Cruz Small Craft Harbor. In this area, Murray Street runs next to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way and is not far from the railroad track. Therefore, the City of Santa Cruz requires a temporary construction easement from the RTC and an easement for rail line right-of-way property that has been used for decades for a small portion of Murray Street as it approaches the bridge. The required easements are shown on Attachment 2.

DISCUSSION

The proposed City of Santa Cruz project at the Murray Street Bridge over the harbor consists of seismic retrofit and widening to include wider shoulders, sidewalks and railings. During the project development work, the City of Santa Cruz discovered that the existing alignment of Murray Street as it approaches the bridge from the west has been using a portion of rail line right-of-way for decades without the documented right or authorization to do so. In addition, the City of Santa Cruz will require a temporary construction easement over a portion of the rail line right-of-way for construction safety purposes.

The City of Santa Cruz produced an appraisal of the easements needed from the RTC. RTC staff enlisted the services of the Santa Cruz County Real Property Division to analyze the appraisal and produce their own assessment of the value of the easements needed for the project. Based on the appraisal, the City of Santa Cruz initially offered $3,200 for those easements. The assessment by the Santa Cruz County Real Property Division provided a range in value for these easements of about $8,000 to $18,000. One of the main reasons for the significant difference is that the City of Santa appraisal concluded that the City of Santa Cruz already
possessed prescriptive rights to the portion of the rail line right-of-way that has been used for decades for the current alignment of Murray Street and no value was assigned to that easement. However, based on analysis by the County Real Property Division and legal counsel, prescriptive rights cannot be asserted against rail road rights-of-way or public property.

In the end a price of $11,500 was negotiated, which is within the range of value provided by the Santa Cruz County Real Property Division. Therefore, **Staff recommends that the RTC adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to provide the easements to the City of Santa Cruz that it needs for construction of the Murray Street Bridge Widening Project for a negotiated amount of $11,500.00.**

**SUMMARY**

The City of Santa Cruz requires easements from the RTC to construct the Murray Street Bridge Widening project, which will provide seismic improvements and wider shoulders and sidewalks. Based on an appraisal and assessment by the Santa Cruz County Real Property Division, a price of $11,500 for these easements was negotiated. Staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution to provide the easements to the City of Santa Cruz for $11,500.

**Attachments:**

1. Resolution authorizing the Executive Director to provide easements to the City of Santa Cruz for the Murray Street Bridge Widening project.
2. Easements required by City of Santa Cruz for Murray Street Bridge project
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission on the date of October 1, 2015, on the motion of Commissioner duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO PROVIDE EASEMENTS TO THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ FOR THE MURRAY STREET BRIDGE WIDENING PROJECT

WHEREAS, in October 2012, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) became the owner of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Rail Line) right-of-way; and,

WHEREAS, Murray Street in the City of Santa Cruz runs adjacent to the Rail Line right-of-way; and

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Cruz is working to widen the Murray Street Bridge over the harbor and requires a temporary construction easement for the project; and

WHEREAS, Murray Street as it approaches the bridge over the harbor has been using some Rail Line right-of-way for decades without the documented right to do so and the City of Santa Cruz requires an easement; and,

WHEREAS, RTC staff negotiated a price of $11,500.00 for these easements based on an appraisal and analysis by the Santa Cruz County Real Property Division;

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

1. The Executive Director is authorized to provide to the City of Santa Cruz the easements that it needs for the construction of the Murray Street Bridge Widening project for the negotiated price of $11,500.00.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

________________________

John Leopold, Chair

ATTEST:

________________________

George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: RTC Fiscal, City of Santa Cruz Public Works
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No Obligation Other Than Those Set Forth Herein Will Be Recognized
**To:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**From:** Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner  
**Re:** City of Scotts Valley Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Request for $33,800 for Scotts Valley Crosswalk Safety Improvement Project

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve by resolution the City of Scotts Valley’s $33,800 Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Claim for the Scotts Valley Crosswalk Safety Improvement Project.

---

**BACKGROUND**

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) was established by the State Legislature in 1971. The TDA provides one of the major funding sources for public, specialized, bicycle and pedestrian transportation in California.

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission allocates Article 8 TDA funds for bikeway and pedestrian projects to local jurisdictions according to the RTC Rules & Regulations using a population formula. TDA funds allocated to a local jurisdiction may be rolled over from one fiscal year to the next.

As stated in the Rules and Regulations, a TDA Article 8 claim from local jurisdictions shall include a description of the project adequate for review by the RTC and its advisory committees; justification for the project including a statement regarding its consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan; estimated cost of the project including other funding sources; and a statement agreeing to maintain the funded project in the condition outlined in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

Allocation requests with pedestrian components must be reviewed by the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee prior to consideration by the RTC.

**DISCUSSION**

Attached is a letter and claim form from the City of Scotts Valley with details about the projects (Attachment 1). Specifically, the city is requesting the installation of rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) style crosswalks, with an audible notification component, at three heavily traveled locations:
1. **241 Kings Village Road** – near the post office  
2. **8 Bean Creek Road** – provides a connection to the Scotts Valley Middle School (approximately 590 students)  
3. **151 Vine Hill School Road** – near Vine Hill Elementary (approximately 550 students) and Siltanen Park

Flashing beacons have been shown to increase the compliance by vehicles to yield to pedestrians thereby reducing the chance that pedestrians may be struck, particularly by drivers unable to see the pedestrian when a yielding vehicle is blocking the drivers view. A fact sheet for the flashing beacons is attached to the claim form.

The original TDA claim from the city did not include audible components; however, the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) took unanimous action at their August meeting to recommend that the RTC approve the claim contingent on inclusion of this safety component for all three locations. The E&D TAC noted that adding visual aids to crosswalks without audible notification actually makes the crosswalk more dangerous for the visually impaired as they are not aware of what happens when the button is pushed to cross the street. Some audible notification’s volume controls are based on ambient noise levels at the time of use; loud enough to hear in busy/loud areas and low enough so that only the user can hear in more quite areas. The revised TDA claim includes a flashing beacon with an audible message when activated.

The City Council of Scotts Valley approved the revised claim with the inclusion of the audible component at their September 16 meeting.

**The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the RTC approve by resolution the TDA claim from the City of Scotts Valley for the Crosswalk Safety Improvement Project (Attachment 2).**

**SUMMARY**

The City of Scotts Valley submitted a TDA Article 8 allocation request for Crosswalk Safety Improvement Project to install audible flashing beacons at three locations. The allocation request from the city totals $33,800, which is currently available in their TDA fund apportionment.

Attachments

1. Article 8 TDA Allocation Claim Form from the City of Scotts Valley  
2. Resolution approving TDA Claim
September 17, 2015

George Dondero  
Executive Director, SCCRTC  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

SUBJECT: CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY TDA CLAIM – LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Dear Mr. Dondero:

Please find the attached Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim Form for the Scotts Valley Crosswalk Safety Improvement Project.

Enclosed please find:
- Claim Form
- Project location maps – Attachments 1, 2, & 3
- Resolution No. 1907.1
- Equipment price quotation
- Specification sheet for solar powered RRFB with audible support

I have personally examined and am familiar with the information submitted in this document and all attachments. The information is true, accurate, and complete.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to call me at (831) 438-5854.

Sincerely,

Scott Hamby  
Public Works Director  
shamby@scottsvalley.org

c: Stephan H. Ando, City Manager
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Ped Projects

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

Project Information

1. Project Title: Scotts Valley Crosswalk Safety Improvement Project

2. Implementing Agency: City of Scotts Valley

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

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $33,800

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 2015/2016

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims: ☒ Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Scott Hamby
   Telephone Number: 831-438-5854   E-mail: shamby@scottsvillage.org

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Jo Fleming
   Telephone Number: 831-706-7384   E-mail: jo.fleming@envirocentives.com

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): Install rectangular rapid flashing beacon style crosswalks at three heavily traveled locations in Scotts Valley. Two of the locations are located at public school sites and the third connects the Scotts Valley Post office to the Kings Village Shopping Center. All of the locations have existing unprotected crosswalks.

   1. 241 Kings Village Road (Post Office) – 8,107 vehicles per day: This cross walk location connects the Post Office with Kings Village Shopping Center. This popular shopping center is home to Nob Hill Foods, the Scotts Valley Cinemas, Ace Hardware and many other stores and restaurants. Kings Village Road is heavily traveled as it is the location of the Metro Station, Library, Community Center, Senior Center, SV Parks and Recreation offices and the City’s very popular Sky Park. The new RRFB at this location would also include an audible message when activated. This long straight portion of the road is heavily used and lends itself to high traffic speeds.

   2. 8 Bean Creek Road – 5,400 vehicles per day: This location connects the Scotts Valley Middle School to the west side of Bean Creek Road. With no other crosswalk in the area this is the only way for pedestrians to cross from the high density residential area on the west side of Bean Creek Road to the east side of the street where the school is located. This area sees heavy foot traffic from middle school students before and after school. The new RRFB at this location includes an audible message when activated.
3. **151 Vine Hill School Road – 1,458 vehicles per day:** Vine Hill School Road is the location of Vine Hill Elementary School and Siltanen Park. A parking lot located across the street on the south side of Vine Hill School Road is a pick up and drop off location for the elementary school and also the only parking for Siltanen Park that is busy seven days and evenings a week. The park is home to a children’s day care facility, Scotts Valley Girls Softball, Little League Baseball, youth and adult soccer leagues and adult softball leagues. This is an extremely heavily used crosswalk in a long straight portion of the road that lends itself to high traffic speeds if motorist are not made aware of foot traffic. The new RRFB at this location includes an audible message when activated.

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program:

   1. **The exact number to be served by the Kings Village Road location is difficult to estimate; however, more than 8,000 vehicles per day travel this road.** This is a heavily used crosswalk as there are 40 retail stores and businesses in the shopping center that are directly connected to the post office via this crosswalk.

   2. **589 students at the middle school plus nearby residents will be served by the Bean Creek location.**

   3. **554 students plus parents will be served by the Vine Hill School Road location in addition to 100 to 200 residents using the park each weekday afternoon and evening.** On a typical Saturday or Sunday Siltanen Park will have 500-1,500 users.

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

    See attachments 1, 2 & 3

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

    All of the crosswalks proposed for Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) are existing and unprotected. This project will greatly enhance the safety of all who utilize these crosswalks.

12. Consistency and relationship with the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy:

    Policies (p. 4-3 of RTP): Improve multimodal access to and within key destinations; Close gaps in the bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicles; Safety: prioritize funding for safety projects and programs that will reduce fatal or injury collisions; Safety: Encourage projects that improve safety for youth.

    **RTP Project #SV-P05 – Citywide Sidewalk Program**

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

    **Installations of RRFBs at unprotected crosswalks already have a proven track record.** The following is one example taken from a September 2010 US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Transportation Report on the effects of RRFBs:

    - The installation of the two beacon system increased yielding compliance from 18% to 81%.

    - Yielding compliance increased from 81% to 88% following the installation of the four-beacon system at these sites.
• The percentage of drivers yielding at more than 100ft doubled over the baseline condition during the four-system treatment. Many of the drivers yielded at distances much greater than 100ft after the RRFB system was installed. This outcome reduced the chance that a pedestrian may have been struck by drivers due to the inability to see the pedestrian when a yielding vehicle blocked the view of the driver in the passing vehicle.

• The effects of the RRFB on driver yielding persisted for two years, and there was no tendency for them to decrease in effectiveness.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):
   There will be no impact on other modes of travel.

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule:

   Capital Projects – OR ATTACH PROJECT BUDGET

Project Start Date: November 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date <em><strong>/</strong></em></td>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Purchased equipment City installation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>December 31, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 31, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,800</td>
<td>$38,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDA Requested (this claim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,800</td>
<td>$33,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior TDA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 3: City Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in "Other":

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

17. TDA Eligibility:

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

All Claims
☑ A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.

☑ Resolution from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims
☐ Evidence of environmental review for capital projects

Local Agency Certification:

I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature [Signature] Title: Public Works Director Date: September 17, 2015

This TDA Claim Form has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC’s Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html).
RESOLUTION NO. 1907.1

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY SUPPORTING THE USE OF TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) FUNDING FOR THE CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY CROSSWALK SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

WHEREAS, The Installation of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) at unprotected crosswalks have a proven track record; and

WHEREAS, Installations of RRFBs systems have shown to increase vehicle yielding compliance from 18 to 81%; and,

WHEREAS, The percentage of drivers yielding at more than 100ft doubled over the baseline condition, many drivers yield at distances much greater than 100ft after the RRFB system was installed; and,

WHEREAS, This outcome reduced the chance that a pedestrian may have been struck by drivers due to the inability to see the pedestrian when a yielding vehicle blocked the view of the driver in the passing vehicle; and,

WHEREAS, The effects of the RRFB on drivers have persisted for two years with no tendency for them to decrease in effectiveness; and,

WHEREAS, The City of Scotts Valley has identified three unprotected crosswalks with high traffic and heavy pedestrian use as ideal locations for RRFBs.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that at the following three unprotected crosswalk locations the City of Scotts Valley will install RRFBs with audible notification to further increase pedestrian safety:

1. 241 Kings Village Road (Post Office) – 8107 vehicles per day: This crosswalk location connects the Post Office with Kings Village Shopping Center.
2. 8 Bean Creek Road – 5,400 vehicles per day: This location connects the Scotts Valley Middle School to the west side of Bean Creek Road.
3. 151 Vine Hill School Road – 1,458 vehicles per day: This location connects Vine Hill Elementary School and Siltanen Park to the parking lot to the south side of Vine Hill School Road; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that for the protection of school children and all pedestrians using unprotected crosswalks, the City of Scotts Valley supports the use of TDA funds for the installation of RRFBs at the aforementioned locations and hereby urges the Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission to approve the City of Scotts Valley's TDA Local Transportation Funds Claim Request of $33,800.
This resolution was adopted on the 16th day of September, 2015, at a duly held regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Scotts Valley, by the following vote:

AYES: AGUILAR, BUSTICHIN, JOHNSON, LIND

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: REED

ABSTAIN: NONE

Approved: 
Dene Bustichi, Mayor

Attest: Tracy Ferrara, City Clerk
PRICE QUOTATION – JZM031015H REVISED 8/25/15

City of Scotts Valley
3/10/15

JAM Services is pleased to provide the following price quotation for the subject project.

Kings Village Rd Crosswalk
QTY (2) SC315 RRFB w/Dual Lightbar, XAV2E PPB and 4” Round Mount
UNIT PRICE: $4,880.00  TOTAL PRICE: $9,760.00

QTY (4) W11-2 FYG 30x30
UNIT PRICE: $150.00     TOTAL PRICE: $600.00

QTY (4) W16-7p FYG 24x12 (2 Right, 2 Left)
UNIT PRICE: $50.00      TOTAL PRICE: $200.00

SUBTOTAL: $10,560.00

Scotts Valley Middle School Crosswalk
QTY (2) SC315 RRFB w/Dual Lightbar, XAV2E PPB and 4” Round Mount
UNIT PRICE: $4,880.00  TOTAL PRICE: $9,760.00

QTY (4) S1-1 FYG 30x30
UNIT PRICE: $150.00     TOTAL PRICE: $600.00

QTY (2) W16-7p (L) FYG 24x12
UNIT PRICE: $50.00      TOTAL PRICE: $100.00

QTY (2) W16-7p (R) FYG 24x12
UNIT PRICE: $50.00      TOTAL PRICE: $100.00

SUBTOTAL: $10,560.00

Vine Hill School Crosswalk
QTY (2) SC315 RRFB w/Dual Lightbar, XAV2E PPB and 4” Round Mount
UNIT PRICE: $4,880.00  TOTAL PRICE: $9,760.00

QTY (4) S1-1 FYG 30x30
UNIT PRICE: $150.00     TOTAL PRICE: $600.00

QTY (2) W16-7p (L) FYG 24x12
UNIT PRICE: $50.00      TOTAL PRICE: $100.00

QTY (2) W16-7p (R) FYG 24x12
UNIT PRICE: $50.00      TOTAL PRICE: $100.00

SUBTOTAL: $10,560.00

Prices include delivery, but are net of applicable sales tax. If I can be of further assistance, please contact me at 925-455-5267. Thank you - Jason Momaney
Pedestrian-actuated warning system for uncontrolled marked crosswalks

RRFBs have been found to provide vehicle yielding rates between 72 and 96 percent for crosswalk applications, including 4 lane roadways with average daily traffic (ADT) exceeding 12,000*.

Advanced User-Interface
The SC315 Gen III features an on-board user interface and display for quick configuration and status monitoring. It allows for simple in-the-field set-up adjustment to flash duration, ambient settings, and night intensity. Settings are broadcasted automatically to all units in the system.

Simplified Installation
All components, including the battery or AC power supply, Energy Management System (EMS) and optional audible push button controller are housed in one compact, purpose-built enclosure. The system also incorporates a wire routing and termination system for clean and efficient installation.

Compatibility
Compatible with the Carmanah R920 RRFB. Interchange solar and AC power models within the same application.

Trusted
With thousands of installations in the field, Carmanah solar beacons and solar LED lights have become the benchmark in traffic applications and other transportation applications worldwide.

Expand your possibilities:
Available in both AC and solar power models, the SC315 Gen III brings new capabilities to the Carmanah RRFB product line:

- Audible push button support
- Solar-power performance even in partially shaded applications
- Use both solar and AC power models in the same application

Carmanah is backed by a worldwide network of distribution partners. REPRESENTED IN YOUR REGION BY:

* U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, Publication No. FHWA-HRT-10-043 - Effects of Yellow Rectangular Rapid-Flashy Beacons on Yielding at Multilane Uncontrolled Crosswalks*
RESOLUTION NO. 05-16

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission on the date of October 1, 2015 on the motion of Commissioner duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ALLOCATING $33,800 IN ARTICLE 8 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) FUNDS TO THE CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY FOR CROSSWALK SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

WHEREAS, the City of Scotts Valley submitted a FY 15-16 claim for $33,800 for Crosswalk Safety Improvements and has sufficient unallocated Article 8 TDA revenues;

WHEREAS, the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee has reviewed the TDA project funding request pertaining to their charge and recommend approval; and

WHEREAS, the proposed project is consistent with the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan and the claimant agrees to maintain funded projects for a period of 20 years;

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

1. Hereby allocates $33,800 to the City of Scotts Valley for Crosswalk Safety Improvement Project to install flashing beacons with an audible component at three locations.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________
John Leopold, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Exhibit A: TDA Article 8 Allocation Request Claim Form from the City of Scotts Valley

Distribution: City of Scotts Valley Public Works
RTC Fiscal
RTC E&D TAC Staff
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Daniel Nikuna, Fiscal Officer
RE: FY2015-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim from the RTC for Administration, Planning and Operations

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) approving the FY2015-16 Article 3 and Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claim (Attachment 2) for RTC administration ($538,542) and RTC planning services ($642,808).

BACKGROUND

The Transportation Development Act (TDA), established by the State Legislature in 1971, designates ¼% of the state sales tax for certain transportation projects, programs, and administration. Each year, consistent with the RTC’s Rules and Regulations and the Transportation Development Act (TDA), some of the funds are used for RTC programs. The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) must submit a claim for TDA funds for RTC administration and planning. Also, the RTC must approve a resolution in order to access the funds.

DISCUSSION

Attached is a claim in the amount of $1,181,350 (Attachment 2) for Transportation Development Act funds for administration and planning services in FY2015-16. This claim is consistent with the proposed October 1, 2015 RTC budget (see separate agenda item) and it reflects funds allocated to the RTC based on the Auditor Controller’s revenues estimate for FY2015-16. Any future changes to the current estimate will be reflected in subsequent budget amendments. Staff recommends that the RTC adopt the resolution approving the claim for TDA funds (Attachments 1).

SUMMARY

In order to access funds for the operations of RTC programs in FY2015-16, approval of the attached claim and resolution is needed.

Attachments:
1. Resolution Approving Article 8 Claim for Administration and Planning
2. SCCRTC Article 3 and Article 8 Claim
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

on the date of October 1, 2015
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FY2015-16 CLAIM UNDER ARTICLE 3 AND
ARTICLE 8 OF THE TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FOR
ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING SERVICES BY THE
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

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

1. Under PUC Section 99233.1, a claim from the Santa Cruz County
Regional Transportation Commission for Transportation
Development Act Administration is approved in the amount of
$538,542.

2. Under PUC Sections 99233.2, 99233.9 and 99402, a claim from the
SCCRTC for planning services to accomplish the Commission’s FY
2015-16 work program is approved in the amount of $642,808.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS
NOES: COMMISSIONERS
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

John Leopold, Chair

George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: SCCRTC Fiscal
October 1, 2015

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

RE: FY2015-16 CLAIM FOR FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING SERVICES

Members of the Regional Transportation Commission:

This letter constitutes a claim of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission for Transportation Development Act Article 3 and Article 8 funds for the purpose of providing transportation planning and administrative services, as outlined in the Regional Transportation Commission’s FY2015-16 work program and the Commission’s Rules and Regulations.

The amounts requested under each fund source are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article 3 — TDA Administration</td>
<td>$538,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 8 — TDA Planning</td>
<td>$642,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,181,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This claim is consistent with the Commission’s FY2015-16 proposed October 1, 2015 budget.

Sincerely,

Daniel Nikuna
Fiscal Officer

Cc: RTC Fiscal
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM

Project Information

1. Project Title: RTC TDA Planning and RTC TDA Administration

2. Implementing Agency: SCCRTC

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

4. Article 3 TDA Administration funding requested this claim: $538,542
   Article 8 TDA Planning funding requested this claim: $642,808

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

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the TDA which authorizes such claims: Article 3 & 8 TDA Administration and Planning

7. Contact Person/Project Manager
   Name: Daniel Nikuna, Fiscal Officer; Telephone Number: (831) 460-3200

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Rachel Moriconi
   Telephone Number: (831) 460-3203   E-mail: rmoriconi@scrcrtc.org

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

TDA-Administration: SCCRTC as Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Santa Cruz county distributes Transportation Development Act (TDA) Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds for planning, transit, bicycle facilities and programs, pedestrian facilities and programs and specialized transportation in accordance with state law and the unmet transit needs process. This task involves maintaining day-to-day operations of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and implementation of the claims process for TDA funds, including:

- Implement fiscal, personnel and administrative functions for Commission operations – including staff hiring, assignment lists, and performance evaluations; fiscal, personnel and administrative policies, procedures and systems.
- Manage, coordinate and distribute Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds (Local Transportation Fund and State Transit Assistance), including apportionments, allocations and claims.
- Coordinate review of appropriate TDA claims with advisory committees.
- Maintain records and pay claims for TDA, STA and other trust fund accounts.
- Manage, distribute and monitor funds that flow through the RTC budget.
- Provide staff support to the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee.
- TDA Fiscal Audits and Internal Financial Statements
- TDA Triennial Performance Audit and implement recommendations in performance audit
- Prepare and submit to Caltrans the FY 2015-16 indirect cost allocation plan (ICAP).
- Coordinate annual unmet transit needs process, including outreach to traditionally underrepresented communities, public hearing and adopt resolution of unmet transit needs finding.
- Assist transit operators with annual financial audits.
- Obtain TDA funds estimates from County Auditor Controller.
- Monitor TDA revenue receipts, compare to estimates and adjust estimates as necessary.
- Produce and distribute annual financial report.
- Prepare and submit to State Controller the FY 2015 Financial Transactions Report and 2015

**TDA-Planning:** These funds are used on the following planning projects. Additional information on these projects and programs is available in the RTC Overall Work Program.

- Regional Planning Coordination: coordination of regional transportation planning activities consistent with federal and state law to maintain a coordinated approach to transportation planning on a local, regional, state and federal level; includes RTC, Interagency Technical Advisory Committee, citizen advisory committee meetings, and coordination meetings with other agencies; tracking state and federal legislation
- Regional Transportation Plan development, including planning and implementation in coordination with AMBAG for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
- Unified Corridor Study model development
- Transit Planning
- Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Specialized Transportation Planning, including the Bike Signage Plan, Pedestrian Safety Workgroup projects, and review of specialized transportation programs.
- Highway and Roadway Planning: including planning and coordination with Caltrans and local jurisdictions regarding road system needs and funding options
- Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line planning, including rail transit service analysis.
- Public information program, including implementation of the regional Public Participation Plan, public outreach, and response to public inquiries.
- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Programming funds, monitoring projects
- Monitoring and providing input on state and federal legislative actions which could impact planning or implementation of transportation projects.
- Transportation monitoring, including data collection, providing data and input for the regional travel demand model.
- Pass through TDA funds to the Community Traffic Safety Coalition ($100,000) and Bike to Work ($50,000)

9. **Project Location/Limits:** **Santa Cruz County – RTC**

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

These funds are needed to implement the multimodal programs and projects overseen by the RTC and to ensure funds to other entities are used efficiently and effectively, as well as to meet the obligations and responsibilities of the RTC as the Transportation Planning Agency established per TDA statutes under California Government Code Section 29532.1f.

11. Project Goals:

- Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program (ex. increase use of facility/service, decrease collisions, etc.):
  - Ongoing review of budget and operations by RTC and public; reports on RTC projects and programs; quarterly reports on the Overall Work Program (OWP); TDA fiscal and performance audits.

- Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program (ex. number of new or maintained bike miles; number of people served/rides provided):
  - The RTC serves all travelers in Santa Cruz County through planning, project development and project implementation covering the entire region.

12. Consistency and relationship with the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Is program/project
listed in the RTP and/or consistent with a specific RTP Goal/Policy? Yes – consistent with the following goals from the 2014 RTP:
- Goal 1: Improve access to jobs, schools, health care and other regular needs in ways that improve health, reduce pollution and retain money in the local economy.
- Goal 2: Reduce transportation related fatalities and injuries for all transportation modes.
- Goal 3: Deliver access and safety improvements cost effectively, within available revenues, equitable and responsive to the needs of all users of the transportation system and beneficially for the natural environment.

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

14. Estimated Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule:
   What is the total project cost? Administration: $735,318; Planning: $2,206,579
   Is project fully funded? Yes
   What will TDA funds be used on (ex. administration, brochures, engineering, construction)?
   - Administration & Planning

15. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution: Biannually in two equal installments

16. TDA Eligibility:

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

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

**Administration**
- Continue to implement administrative and personnel changes to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Commission operations
- Develop policies, procedures and systems as needed to ensure effective and efficient operation of agency
- Implement, as appropriate, recommendations of the Triennial Performance Audit
- Monitor grants and revenues
- Prepare budget and work program, and manage cash flow
- Annual fiscal audit

**Planning**
- Implementation of state and federally-mandated planning and programming
- Monitor and participate in efforts at the federal, state and local level related to global warming
- Develop and implement public participation programs
- Produce and distribute RTC agency reports and project fact sheets
- Coordinate with AMBAG, TARC, Santa Cruz METRO, Caltrans, and local jurisdictions on Regional
Transportation Plan (RTP) and Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) update and implementation

- Continue working with AMBAG to collect data for the Regional Travel Demand Model, RTP, MTP/SCS and other planning efforts
- Monitor state and local highway projects
- Complete the Passenger Rail Feasibility Study
- Complete Phase I of the Unified Corridor Plan

18. List the recommendations provided in your last Triennial Performance Audit and your progress toward meeting them. Describe the work your agency has undertaken to implement each performance audit recommendation and the steps it will take to fully implement the recommendation. For any recommendations that have not been implemented, explain why the recommendation has not been implemented and describe the work your agency will undertake to implement each performance audit recommendation. Describe any problems encountered in implementing individual recommendations.

Performance Audit Recommendations to the SCCRTC:

R1. Enhance recruitment efforts to fill vacant positions on the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee.
   - RTC staff has expanded recruitment efforts, including evaluation of methods to reimburse member travel expenses to meetings.

R2. Receive the Annual State Controller Report from Santa Cruz Metro.
   - The recommendation has been implemented with the receipt of annual reports.

R3. Consider development of an annual report for Commute Solutions.
   - The Commute Solutions program has been revamped based on program evaluation, with ridematching services now merged into the broader Cruz511 Traveler Information program.

R4. Update the SCCRTC Rules and Regulations.
   - Implemented; revised Rules and Regulations were approved by the Commission on 8/7/2014.

Local Agency Certification:

This TDA Claim has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC’s Budget, SCCRTC’s Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html). I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Name: Daniel Nikura  Title: Fiscal Officer  Date: 9/15/15
RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the proposed 2016 meeting schedule for the RTC’s regular meetings and Transportation Policy Workshop (TPW) meetings.

BACKGROUND

Every year the RTC approves the schedule of RTC and TPW meetings for the following year. Three meetings are scheduled to take place in the City of Watsonville in order to provide a greater opportunity for those who live and work in the southern part of the county to participate in RTC meetings. One meeting is scheduled to take place in each of the other cities in the county. The remaining five meetings are scheduled to take place at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers. This is consistent with the RTC meeting schedules of the past several years.

DISCUSSION

RTC meetings are generally held on the first Thursday of the month and TPW meetings are held on the third Thursday of the month. Due to the end of the year holidays, the January RTC meeting is generally on the second or third Thursday of the month.

The proposed RTC meeting schedule for 2016 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 21</td>
<td>Santa Cruz City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 5</td>
<td>Capitola City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed RTC TPW meeting schedule for 2016 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Cancelled due to holiday schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18</td>
<td>RTC Offices, Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>RTC Offices, Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>RTC Offices, Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>RTC Offices, Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23*</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18</td>
<td>RTC Offices, Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>RTC Offices, Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>RTC Offices, Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>RTC Offices, Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>RTC Offices, Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All RTC and TPW meetings start at 9:00 am. Agenda packets are posted on the RTC website http://sccrtc.org/meetings/commission/agendas/ one week prior to the meeting.

TPW meetings are tentative until confirmed at the prior regular RTC meeting. Staff recommends that the RTC approve the proposed RTC and TPW meeting schedules. To provide further opportunity for people who live or work in the southern part of the county to participate, and per the RTC Rules and Regulations, the RTC scheduled one TPW meeting in the City of Watsonville.

SUMMARY

Every year the RTC approves a schedule for RTC and TPW meetings for the following year. For 2016 three RTC meetings and one TPW meeting will be held in the City of Watsonville, to provide more opportunities for people who live or work in the southern part of the county to participate. Staff recommends that the RTC approve the proposed RTC and TPW meeting schedules for 2016.
TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer

RE: CalPERS health benefit contribution rates for plan year 2016

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) to continue providing CalPERS Health Benefits to RTC employees pursuant to the approved Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).

BACKGROUND

Medical insurance is currently offered to all RTC active and retired employees through the CalPERS Health Benefits Program as established in the Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with the RTC’s two bargaining groups and in the Executive Director’s employment agreement. As per these agreements, the RTC contributes to the cost of the employee’s health insurance premiums at levels established by each Memoranda of Understanding with the Community of RTC Employees (CORE), the RTC Association of Middle Management (RAMM), and the Executive Director’s employment contract. Currently, all of the RTC bargaining agreements are identical in terms of the amounts that the RTC contributes toward employee and dependent health premiums. The amount contributed by RTC for retired employees and their dependents is set at a lower amount than for active employees with annual increases as required by law.

The CalPERS Health Benefits Program is governed by PEMHCA, the Public Employees Medical and Hospital Care Act. To offer employee benefits through this program, the RTC must abide by PEMHCA rules and annually adopt and file resolutions with CalPERS regarding health insurance contribution rates for the upcoming year. Resolutions must be filed by November of the preceding year to establish the following year’s contribution amounts.

DISCUSSION

The current Memoranda of Understanding for both the Community of RTC Employees (CORE) and the RTC Association of Middle Management (RAMM) specify the percentage of health insurance premiums to be paid by the RTC and by employees respectively based on the premium costs set each year by CalPERS per the calendar. Premium and contribution rates for 2016 are included in
Attachment 2. Premium payments made for the Executive Director are consistent with those provided to employees in the bargaining units.

The attached resolution (Attachment 1) reflects the contribution levels and provisions established in the MOUs currently in effect until March 2018.

**SUMMARY**

To continue in the CalPERS Health Insurance program governed by the Public Employees Medical and Hospital Care Act (PEMCHA), the RTC must comply with the rules and regulations set forth by PEMCHA and submit a resolution by November 2015 that sets the contribution rates for health insurance premiums for the upcoming year. The resolution before you today fulfills this commitment to meet the PEMHCA rules. Staff recommends that the RTC adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) outlining the RTC’s health insurance contribution amounts for RTC active employees and retirees for calendar year 2016.

**Attachments:**
1. Resolution for CalPERS Health Benefits – All Employees
2. CalPERS/RTC Health Plan Rates for 2016 and MOU excerpt

S:\RTC\TC2015\TC1015\Administrative Items\CalPERS\2015-10-01-CalPERS-SR.docx
RESOLUTION NO.
Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
RESOLUTION FIXING THE EMPLOYER'S CONTRIBUTION UNDER THE
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT

WHEREAS, (1) Government Code Section 22892(a) provides that a local agency contracting under the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act shall fix the amount of the employer's contribution at an amount not less than the amount required under Section 22892(b)(1) of the Act, and

WHEREAS, (2) Government Code Section 22892(c) provides that a contracting agency may fix the amount of the employer's contribution for employees and the employer's contribution for annuitants at different amounts, provided that the monthly contribution for annuitants is annually increased to equal an amount not less than the number of years the contracting agency has been subject to this subdivision multiplied by 5 percent of the current monthly contribution for employees, until such time as the amounts are equal; and

WHEREAS, (3) Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, hereinafter referred to as Public Agency is local agency contracting under the Act for participation by members of the Community of RTC Employees Unit, RTC Association of Middle Managers and the Executive Director now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, (a) That the employer's contribution for each employee shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his/her enrollment, including the enrollment of his/her family members in a health benefits plan up to a maximum of $965.37 per month with respect to employee enrolled for self alone, $1829.12 per month for an employee enrolled for self and one family member, and $2377.86 per month for an employee enrolled for self and two or more family members, plus administrative fees and Contingency Reserve Fund Assessments.

RESOLVED, (b) That the employer's contribution for each annuitant shall be the amount necessary to pay the full cost of his/her enrollment, including the enrollment of his/her family members in a health benefits plan up to a maximum of $807 per month with respect to employee enrolled for self alone, $857 per month for an employee enrolled for self and one family member, and $913 per month for an employee enrolled for self and two or more family members, plus administrative fees and Contingency Reserve Fund Assessments; and be it further

RESOLVED, (c) That Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission has fully complied with any and all applicable provisions of Government Code Section 7507 in electing the benefits set forth above.

Adopted at a regular/special meeting of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 9:00 a.m this 1st day of October 2015.

Signed: _________________________________
(John Leopold, Chairman)

Attest: _________________________________
(George Dondero, Secretary)
## RTC Employees and Retirees
### Medical Plan Rates - 2016
**Coverage Effective:** January 1 2016 through December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Code</th>
<th>Monthly Premium</th>
<th>RTC Contribution</th>
<th>EE Cost For Plan</th>
<th>EE Cost Admin 0.32% of Premium</th>
<th>Total EE Cost</th>
<th>EE PAY PERIOD COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLUE SHI ELD HMO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3011</td>
<td>1,016.18</td>
<td>965.37</td>
<td>50.81</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>54.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>3012</td>
<td>2,032.36</td>
<td>1,829.12</td>
<td>203.24</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>209.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>3013</td>
<td>2,642.07</td>
<td>2,377.86</td>
<td>264.21</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>272.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>BLUE SHI ELD NETVALUE</em> HMO</em>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1,033.86</td>
<td>965.37</td>
<td>68.49</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>71.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>2,067.72</td>
<td>1,829.12</td>
<td>238.60</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>245.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>2,688.04</td>
<td>2,377.86</td>
<td>310.18</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>318.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anthem Select HMO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>721.79</td>
<td>721.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>876.65</td>
<td>876.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1,722.27</td>
<td>1722.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anthem Traditional HMO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>855.42</td>
<td>855.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>1,710.84</td>
<td>1710.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2,224.09</td>
<td>2224.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAI SER HMO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(San Jose &amp; SF Bay Area Residents Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>2821</td>
<td>746.47</td>
<td>746.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>2822</td>
<td>1,492.94</td>
<td>1492.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>1,940.82</td>
<td>1940.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERS CHOICE PPO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3201</td>
<td>798.36</td>
<td>798.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>1,596.72</td>
<td>1596.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>3203</td>
<td>2,075.74</td>
<td>2075.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERS Select+ PPO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>730.07</td>
<td>730.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1,460.14</td>
<td>1460.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1,898.18</td>
<td>1898.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSCare PPO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>889.27</td>
<td>889.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>3252</td>
<td>1,778.54</td>
<td>1778.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>3253</td>
<td>2,312.10</td>
<td>2312.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Health Care</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>955.44</td>
<td>955.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1,910.88</td>
<td>1,829.12</td>
<td>81.76</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>87.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>2,484.14</td>
<td>2,377.86</td>
<td>106.28</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>114.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Code</td>
<td>Monthly Premium</td>
<td>RTC Contribution</td>
<td>EE Monthly Costs</td>
<td>EE PAY PERIOD COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EE Cost For Plan</td>
<td>EE Cost Admin 0.32% of Premium</td>
<td>Total EE Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td>RETIREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,016.18</td>
<td>807.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,032.36</td>
<td>857.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE+2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,642.07</td>
<td>913.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAXIMUM MONTHLY RTC CONTRIBUTION**

- **EE** = employee only
- **EE+1** = employee plus one dependent
- **EE+2** = employee plus two or more dependents
## Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
### THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE

**October 2015 Through December 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>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 – <strong>note special date due to Columbus Day Holiday</strong></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>
<tr>
<td>12/3/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/15</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/15</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/15</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**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/27/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>thewiredwoman</td>
<td>Freight Usage on the Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Clones</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Mark H</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td>Long Marine Lab</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion/Construction Problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Ahrens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Corser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Salesin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Brook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Kern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</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>08/28/15</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>08/28/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Simonton</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Vickie</td>
<td>Winkler</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Leadership of an Explosive Situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>California-Santa Cruz Historic Regional Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Salina</td>
<td>Flores</td>
<td>Soundwall Advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Littlejohn</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Burick</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correspondence Log
### October 1, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dean Cutter</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica Hansen</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dennis Brand</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 09/02/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Woutje Swets</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>09/02/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Melanie Dominguez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>09/02/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>What is Santa Cruz Transportation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bud Colligan</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>09/02/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Some Sanctuary City Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kelly McClendon</td>
<td>Invoice #5 for the Santa Cruz County Unified Corridor Investment Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kelly McClendon</td>
<td>Invoice #5 for the Rail Passenger Study Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td>Cell Phone communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td>EPS's Environmental Criteria?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td>Obama's Vacuum Mission Creep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Scott Haywood</td>
<td>SCVTA</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>Envision Silicon Valley - Support for electric Highway 17 Express Buses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/09/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td>Russian Military Build-up in Syria, 'Unprecedented'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td>The OPM Data Breach</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>GDy 09/12/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Sloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>GDy 09/14/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Fitler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 09/15/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Cochran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 09/15/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Garin</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-----Original Message-----
From: mhcarr@ucsc.edu [mailto:mhcarr@ucsc.edu]

Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 8:50 AM
To: DOT D05Info D5
Subject: traffic congestion/construction problem

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by mhcarr@ucsc.edu on July 30th, 2015 at 08:50AM (PDT).

question: Traffic on Hwy 1 northbound was (and continues to be) a parking lot for hours this morning from State Park Drive to the Changeable Message Sign (CMS) between Hwy 1 and Soquel Drive. The sign, designed for Amber Alerts and other emergency notifications, read slow down and save lives. That message, which has no emergency value whatsoever, created stop and go traffic for hours and miles that translates to (1) 1000s of hours of lost work, income and productivity to individuals, counties and the state, (2) enormous increases in emissions that deteriorates air quality and enhances global warming, and (3) increases anxiety that impacts mental health of 100s of individuals. This should NEVER happen again! Whoever is responsible for the decision to use that sign for this purpose should be reprimanded and CalTrans should apologize publicly for this ridiculous decision and action. There is no excuse for the negative impacts CalTrans has on people's lives when this action is taken. I expect an e-mail reply (1) explaining this action and (2) what actions you will take in response to my comment (which I am sending to Santa Cruz County supervisors, the local newspaper (Santa Cruz Sentinel) and our local state representative, Mark Stone).

e-mail: mhcarr@ucsc.edu

--
Mark H. Carr, Professor
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Long Marine Laboratory
100 Shaffer Road
University of California
Santa Cruz, California 95060
Office: 831-459-3958
Fax: 831-459-3383
http://bio.research.ucsc.edu/people/carr/

-----Original Message-----
From: Jones, Colin@DOT
Sent: Wednesday, August 05, 2015 3:06 PM
To: mhcarr@ucsc.edu
Cc: patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us; maureen.mccarty@asm.ca.gov
Subject: FW: traffic congestion/construction problem

Mr. Carr,

Thanks for your inquiry. Yes, this northbound Hwy. 1 electronic message sign near 41st Avenue in Capitola was activated with the 'Slow Down and Save A Life' message on Thursday, July 30 and was turned off at 10:06 am that morning. The message was originally scheduled to run for five days until Aug. 3 but we deactivated it due to traffic impacts. It is Caltrans policy to display real-time traffic safety and congestion information on these signs, however we are an active participant in safety campaigns/messages and other emergency messages like Amber Alerts in coordination with the California Highway Patrol and the Office of Traffic Safety. In addition, we work closely with the Governor's Office to display important messages like 'Serious Drought, Limit Outdoor Watering'. These non-emergency messages are more common on state highways and have protocols and guidelines for their use.

Since a primary mission of Caltrans is safe, orderly movement of traffic and activation of this sign has contributed to heavy delays on northbound Hwy. 1, our District 5 central coast office will coordinate better with Caltrans Dist. 4 (Bay Area), which has jurisdiction over this particular sign, to review these guidelines/protocols and prevent added delays from their activation. One specific thing we can evaluate is restricting non-emergency messages during busy commute times like weekday mornings along Highway 1 in Santa Cruz County which you referred to.

Again, we appreciate your concern and apologize for the traffic delay inconvenience on Thursday morning, July 30.
Sincerely, Colin Jones  
Public Affairs Manager  
Caltrans District 5  
805-549-3189

----------- Forwarded message -----------
From: Wooster, Lawrence W@DOT <larry.wooster@dot.ca.gov>
Date: Thu, Aug 13, 2015 at 2:14 PM
Subject: RE: traffic congestor/construction problem
To: "Jones, Collin@DOT" <collin.jones@dot.ca.gov>, "mhcarr@ucsc.edu" <mhcarr@ucsc.edu>
Cc: "patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us" <patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us>, "maureen.mccarty@asm.ca.gov"<maureen.mccarty@asm.ca.gov>, "Van Zeventer, Jacques@DOT" <jacques.vaneventer@dot.ca.gov>

Mr. Carr,

I apologize for not getting back to you sooner. I was on vacation last week. I apologize for any real or perceived delay caused by the message on the CMS you reference, but let me assure you that the CMS regulations do allow for this type of message.

I manage the public safety campaigns that are run on the CMS each year. All of our public safety campaign messages (Click it or Ticket, Slow for the Cone Zone, Report Drunk Drivers, etc.) are agreed upon by three agencies: Caltrans, the CHP and the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS). In almost every case, the messages are run in conjunction with either a media campaign at the state or federal level and/or with increased enforcement by CHP.

The federal regulations for the CMS usage are in Section 2L of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) (http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/kno_2009r1r2.htm). Our state regulations are almost identical and can be found in section 2L of the California MUTCD (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffics/engineering/mutcd/ca_mutcd2012.htm).

The CMS are designated as traffic control devices 2L.01.01, and can only display the following:

1) Traffic operational, regulatory, warning, and guidance information. (Section 2L.01.03)

2) Incident management and route diversions; warnings of adverse weather conditions; special event information associated with traffic controls or conditions; controls at crossing situations; lane, ramp, and roadway control information; priced or other managed lane information; travel times; warning situations; traffic regulations; speed control; and destination guidance. (Section 2L.02.01)

3) Safety messages, transportation-related messages, emergency homeland security messages, and AMBER Alerts. (Section 2L.02.02)

Recently, Caltrans has also been authorized to use the CMS to display similar information to the AMBER Alerts (make, model, license #) for Blue Alerts (vehicles with suspects believed to have assaulted a peace officer) because those suspects would pose a clear danger to the travelling public and the drought messages that Colin references below (due to the fact that the Governor declared a State of Emergency related to the drought).

We have 130 days of public safety messages scheduled for this year.

All of our CMS safety campaign messages are sent to our 12 Transportation Management Centers (TMC) and our satellite TMC (Kingvale) via memorandums that have the following protocol in them:

This message shall be preempted when the CMS is needed for any of the following: emergency notifications, AMBER alerts, incidents, major closures or travel times.

CMS selected to display travel times are at locations that are decision points for commute drivers. Approximately 15 percent of the total CMS statewide display travel times during the morning and evening commute hours.

CMS that are in remote locations, experiencing technical problems, in areas that have negative traffic impact or may cause additional congestion should not be utilized.
Close communication between law enforcement and Caltrans is necessary to assure the use of these elements is not contributing to negative traffic impacts.

To date, we have only had to de-activate a few signs, and typically we find that back-ups attributed to a CMS are actually due to some other traffic issue (weave, incident, queues caused by other issues). In this case, I do not know if the sign area has an active CCTV, detection, or regular patrols by CHP or Caltrans, so I do not know if slowing traffic was detected or not and if the sign was subsequently blanked or not.

In reference to this specific message, “slow down and save a life”, the campaign was run for the first time this year following a letter to the Caltrans Director that was signed by 4 of the higher level Doctors, Directors, and Chairs from the Santa Clara Valley Medical Center trauma unit requesting a speed safety message because of the high number of injuries and fatalities caused by high speed crashes. They referred to the thousands of deaths each year, many of which they have to deal with in their trauma center, and appealed to the Department to assist with messages to the public. Upon review by CHP, OTS and Caltrans, we concurred that speeding is indeed a statewide safety issue, so we agreed to run some campaigns on the CMS in conjunction with increased speed enforcement by CHP.

Again, if any backup was created by the message, but I suspect it was due to some other issue, because we have no reports of slow traffic at any other of the CMS locations that the message was run.

If you are interested, you can see the video “WA_Seattle_Wave” at this website: http://newmexicoits.com/training-videos-1.aspx

The video shows what happens to queues that develop due to an incident, and how someone stuck in that queue will not know what caused the congestion when they finally reach open traffic. This is one of the reasons we leave it to the TMCs and field personnel to identify if traffic is actually slowing at a CMS or if there is another cause for the slowing.

Do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss this or want additional information.

Thank you,

Lawrence Wooster, PE
Chief, TMC and Incident Management Ops
1120 N Street, MS-36
Sacramento, CA 95814

WK: (916) 654-6104
WCL: (916) 214-8470
FX: (916) 651-9053
PCL: (916) 832-0473

CDR Lawrence Wooster, CEC, USN
Operations Officer (N3R)/Senior LNO
Navy Expeditionary Combat Command

On Mon, Sep 14, 2015 at 3:47 PM, Ginger Dykaar <qdykaar@sccrtc.org> wrote:

Hello Dr. Carr,

Thank you for expressing your concern about use of the changeable message sign (CMS) on Highway 1 northbound between 41st Ave and Sequel for nonemergency safety messages during peak morning commute periods. Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) staff has reviewed the CMS activation reports from Caltrans from the past year and will be discussing this issue at the Safe on 17 Task Force/Traffic Operations System Oversight Committee Meeting this Wednesday (9/16) from
10:00am-12:00pm in the RTC Conference room (1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz). Generally, these meetings are attended by representatives of CHP, Caltrans, planning/funding agencies, and Transit Districts. The meetings are open to the public. The agenda packet for the meeting can be found at the following link - http://www.sccrtc.org/meetings/tos-safe-on-17/meetings/. The minutes from the meeting will also be provided at this link upon acceptance by the RTC board.

For more information about the Traffic Operations System Committee, please see the following page of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) website http://www.sccrtc.org/meetings/tos-safe-on-17/.

Regards,

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: Ginger Dykaar
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 8:30 AM
To: Mark Carr
Cc: Karena Pushnik
Subject: RE: CMS concern

Hello Dr. Carr,

There was a discussion at the Safe on 17 Task Force/Traffic Operations System (TOS) Committee meeting last Wednesday on the use of the changeable message sign on Highway 1 near 41st Ave. Below are the draft minutes from the meeting on this item. The minutes still need to be accepted by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the Safe on 17/Traffic Operations Committees but I do not foresee any revisions to this item.

Traffic Management Center (TMC) Update - Ramin Bolourchian, Caltrans D4, TMC discussed how Caltrans received an email from a member of the public expressing his concern over using the CMS on Hwy 1 near 41st Ave for nonemergency messages during morning commute times due to the increased traffic congestion. Ramin expressed appreciation to Caltrans D5, Public Information Office for their response to the public’s concern. Ramin stated that Caltrans has over 150 to 200 messages per year that they are required to post on the changeable message signs as part of Caltrans’ mission to improve highway safety. There have been a number of complaints about the CMS on Hwy 1 near 41st Ave causing traffic congestion. He stated that Caltrans’ intent is to not use this CMS for nonemergency messages during peak periods although a few messages were posted over the last year. Caltrans has analyzed travel time data available from INRIX to determine whether there are increases in congestion when this CMS sign is posted but they have not seen an increase over the already congested NB roadway during the morning commute. The day on which the gentleman expressed his concern about the CMS causing congestion, also showed that CHP slowed traffic to remove debris on the road which did increase the congestion in this area. Regardless of whether the CMS messages on the Hwy 1 sign near 41st Ave cause real or perceived delay, Caltrans intent is to not post nonemergency messages during the morning peak period at this location.

The complete set of minutes for the Safe on 17/TOS Sept 16 meeting can be found in the RTC agenda packet for the October 1, 2015 meeting that will be posted this Thursday at the following link.
http://www.sccrtc.org/meetings/commission/agendas/

Thank you again for communicating your concern to the RTC.

Regards,

Ginger

-----------------------------

Ginger Dykaar
RTC | 831.460.3213
From: Salina Flores [mailto:salinaflores@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2015 11:54 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Soundwall advice

Hi Kim,

I was wondering if you know the first steps on how to petition for a soundwall? Our home backs up to highway 1 without any type of barrier and it’s very hard to live with the noise. I have been here 10 years and I am still waiting for the day they build a soundwall. Anyways, you have give me updates on the Highway 1 project in the past so I was hoping maybe you can lead me in the right direction for assistance.

Thank you
Salina Flores

On Tuesday, September 1, 2015 11:14 AM, Kim Shultz <kshultz@sccrtc.org> wrote:

Hello Salina,

Unfortunately, there is no separate funding source for the construction of soundwalls. Soundwalls are constructed as a mitigation action associated with highway operation or capacity improvements. State and federal funding requires meeting noise reduction targets to justify the public expense of building soundwalls. Note, there were no soundwalls constructed south of the La Fonda Avenue Overcrossing adjacent to Harbor High School as the school is set back from the highway and the projected noise reduction thresholds were not meet in that instance. However, the residences on the mountain/northbound side of the highway are closer to the highway and the noise reduction threshold was meet and soundwalls were constructed as part of the Highway 1 Soque/Morrissey project.

Please remind me where you live Salina and I may be able to provide more advice.

Regards,
Kim

-----------------------------
Kim Shultz, Highway 1 Project Manager/Senior Planner
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3208

From: Salina Flores [mailto:salinaflores@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 11:21 AM
To: Kim Shultz
Cc: Regional Transportation Commission
Subject: Re: Soundwall advice

Hi Kim,

Thank you for the information. I am just not sure if we will ever get a soundwall or will be eligible for one-so my husband and I are always trying to figure out if we should look into moving if it never happens-so we live at 2548 Gary Drive Soquel, CA 95073. The freeway is right behind our backyard. We were hoping there was some hope with the expansion of Highway 1 in the future but not sure if that is even in the plans to go past 41st avenue if there was funding?

Thank you
Salina

On Tuesday, September 1, 2015 11:48 AM, Kim Shultz <kshultz@sccrtc.org> wrote:

Salina,

The RTC does indeed plan on improving the highway down to San Andreas/Larkin Valley Road. Funding constraints are the biggest obstacle. The next project, currently under preliminary design/environmental review is auxiliary lanes on Highway 1 between Soquel and 41st Avenue. Construction is scheduled for Spring 2019, subject to available funding. Since state and federal funding is so problematic, the RTC is considering putting a sales tax measure on the ballot in November 2016 that would roughly double (on average) the amount of funds available for transportation projects in Santa Cruz county.

If a transportation sales tax measure was successful in getting the support of 2/3 of the voters in 2016, we could immediately start planning the next section of highway improvements which would be auxiliary lanes between Bay/Porter and Park Avenue. In that scenario we would be in position to start construction as early as 2021. If we must rely on existing state and federal funds it will be considerably later.
I hope that is of some relief,

Kim

------------------------------
Kim Shultz, Highway 1 Project Manager/Senior Planner
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3208

------------------------------
From: Salina Flores [mailto:salinaflores@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 12:05 PM
To: Kim Shultz
Cc: Regional Transportation Commission
Subject: Re: Soundwall advice

That is great to know that you Kim!! I really appreciate your advice-and sharing your knowledge. I will check the webpage for updates every so often to see if any progress has been made.

Thanks!
Salina Flores!

------------------------------
You are welcome Salina.

I am in process of updating the Highway 1 webpage which has been off-line for some time now. We are preparing to release the draft environmental document for improving the length of Highway 1 (Morrissey to San Andreas/Larkin Valley) at a program level (long term vision) as well as the next project as previously mentioned (between 41st and Soquel). We expect to release the environmental document in late October/early November.

So stay tuned – that would be a good time for you and your neighbors to lobby for soundwalls to be constructed as part of the early phases of a project. Also, staff expects the RTC Board to make a decision no later than March 2016 on the expenditure plan (where the money would be spent) on a transportation sales tax measure. That is another good time to express your wishes.

Good luck,
Kim

------------------------------
Kim Shultz, Highway 1 Project Manager/Senior Planner
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3208
From: Woutje Swets [mailto:woutje.swets@cmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 2:14 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: August 6 agenda question

Dear Mr. Mendez,

I spend some time reading the August 6 Agenda and am puzzled about item # 20, last paragraph. "Commissioners discussed the fact that the RTC has already voted not to include a "trail only" option."

Does that mean that a trail only option is not going to be investigated?

Thank you,

Woutje Swets

Woutje Swets
Vanguard Realtors
1142 Soquel Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
831-278-2447

On Wed, Sep 2, 2015 at 1:07 PM, Karena Pushnik <kpushnik@sccrtc.org> wrote:

Woutje Swets –

Luis Mendez is out of the office.

Regarding your question, I believe you are referring to the minutes for the Regional Transportation Commission's August 6 meeting included in the upcoming September 3 RTC packet. Under the Director's Report, the Commissioners discussed their unanimous decision a few years back associated with the environmental document for the Monterey Bay Scenic Trail Master Plan not to include a trail only option. This was in the context of discussing the RTC Board's decisions and direction over the last decade to acquire the rail corridor to expand transportation options for the community including freight rail (goods movement), passenger rail (transit and recreational) and a bicycle/pedestrian trail.

Per Federal Railroad Administration regulations and the rail right of way purchase agreements, Iowa Pacific (doing business locally as the Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway) is the federally recognized Common Carrier and currently owns the freight operating rights on the Santa Cruz Branch Line which includes rights and protections.

The board has not changed their position to retain all transportation options in this continuous transportation corridor.

Your email will be provided to the RTC Board for their consideration.

Thank you.

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

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news

From: Woutje Swets [mailto:woutje.swets@cmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 1:27 PM
To: Karena Pushnik
Subject: Re: FW: August 6 agenda question-Swets,W
Hello Karena,

The survey that was just finished surely had lots of suggestions for a trail-only option (with the understanding that the funding of a couple of million would have to be paid back). That is still way cheaper than the initial costs and continued funding and unkeep requirements if the rail and train option were to be chosen.

Your sentence **The board has not changed their position to retain all transportation options in this continuous transportation corridor** flies in the face of what the survey results were and I sure hope that the board will include a trail-only option in their discussions. Please confirm that this is going on a future agenda!

Thank you,
Woutje

Hello Woutje -
Here is a link to the survey results by 2600 people: [http://www.sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/SurveyResults.pdf](http://www.sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/SurveyResults.pdf)

Your comments will be made available to the RTC board for their consideration.
Thank you.

. . . . . .
Karena Pushnik
RTC | 831.460.3210
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


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.

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.

Debra Larson and Director Malcolm Dougherty
**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 Mile Marker: A Caltrans Performance Report* summer edition is now available online. The plain language report addresses how well Caltrans is protecting and improving California’s transportation system. The latest issue features a revamped report card of new performance measures reflecting a dramatic change in Caltrans’ priorities and increased focus on sustainability. Overall, it shows what’s working well, what isn’t, and what needs improving.

More information is available at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/ctjournal/MileMarker/index.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/ctjournal/MileMarker/index.html)

---

**DSMP Complements Caltrans’ Strategic Plan**

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
## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hwy. 1 North County Pavement Preservation and Rumble Strips (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, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Anticipated completion in winter, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 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-Fall 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 mid-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>
<tr>
<td>3. Monterey-Santa Cruz ADA (0R510)</td>
<td>On SR 1 and SR 9 at various locations (other locations in Monterey County)</td>
<td>Construct curb ramps, sidewalks, and modify signal and lightings</td>
<td>Fall 2015 – Fall 2016</td>
<td>$1.9 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia (BR)</td>
<td>Pacific Infrastructure, Vacaville, CA</td>
<td>SCR County locations: SR 1 at Freedom Blvd SR 1 at Graham Hill Rd SR 9 at SLV High School</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. Hwy. 129 Curve Realignment (0T540)</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. Hwy. 1/17 Shoulder Widening (1A870)</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 (BR)</td>
<td>Granite Construction, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Contract awarded on 9/8/15. Construction anticipated beginning October. Work may be delayed until spring if weather is an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hwy. 152 Accessible Pedestrian Signals (1G280)</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>Scheduled to advertise on 9/21. 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. Hwy. 152 ADA (1E020)</td>
<td>Near Watsonville from Wagner Avenue to south of 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>On schedule for January, 2016 PA&amp;ED.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)  
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director  
RE: Rail Motorcar Excursion on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line  

---  

RECOMMENDATIONS  

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Approve a rail motorcar excursion on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for October 10, 2015 organized by the North American Railcar Operators Association (NARCOA) for a fee of $300.00; and

2. Authorize the Executive Director or his/her designee to approve licenses for future rail motorcar excursions as long as the RTC is indemnified, appropriate insurance is provided, all appropriate safety requirements and practices are followed, approval is secured from SC&MB Railway and a reasonable fee for the license is paid.

---  

BACKGROUND  

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approved temporary licenses to the North American Railcar Operators Association (NARCOA) for motorcar excursions on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line in 2013, 2014 and 2015. Excursions began in Felton and Davenport and ran to Watsonville and back. The events include local rail motorcar enthusiasts and attract participants from across the country. Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay (SC&MB) Railway works with NARCOA to ensure a safe event. NARCOA would like to do a motorcar event again on October 10, 2015.

NARCOA is a non-profit organization dedicated to the preservation and safe, legal operation of railroad equipment historically used for maintenance of way. NARCOA has about 1,800 members who own rail motorcars and run them in organized NARCOA excursions. Excursions can be as short as 10 miles and as long as 800 miles. According to the NARCOA website, rail motorcars generally weigh 600 to 1,000 pounds and have small 1 or 2 cylinder engines. However, a few motorcars can be between 1,500 and 5,000 pounds and have 4, 6 or 8 cylinder engines. NARCOA carries a $10 million railroad liability policy for these excursions and provides safety training and certification for their operations.

DISCUSSION  

NARCOA asked SC&MB Railway and RTC for permission to do an excursion on October 10, 2015 from Watsonville to Bonny Doon Beach and back. It is anticipated
that about 30 individual motorcars will participate in the excursion. The rail motorcars would be brought to Watsonville on trailers by their owners. SC&MB Railway will work with the participants to unload the cars and place them on the track. SC&MB Railway staff would be along with the excursion to help ensure safety. The proposed NARCOA excursion will add visitors to Santa Cruz County’s visitor economy. Based on research done by RTC staff, NARCOA excursion participants are very conscientious visitors who have a high regard for safety. NARCOA has organized events on the Santa Cruz Big Trees and Pacific Railroad facilities for many years.

For the April 2015 2-day excursion license, the RTC charged NARCOA $500. For this 1-day excursion, RTC staff proposes to charge NARCOA $300. In addition, NARCOA will pay SC&MB Railway to help ensure the safety of the event. Therefore, staff recommends that the RTC approve a NARCOA rail motorcar excursion on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for October 10, 2015 for a fee of $300.00.

The temporary license for the NARCOA excursion will include indemnification of the RTC and insurance and safety requirements. Attachment 1 is a list of frequently asked questions about NARCOA and their excursions. Additional information about NARCOA and their excursions is available at www.narcoa.org.

These motorcar excursions have occurred on the Santa Cruz Brach Rail Line a few times. They seem to fit well with the activity on the rail line. The excursion groups are well received, respect safety and coordinate with others accordingly. They always provide indemnification to the RTC and insurance coverage. They are also willing to pay a reasonable fee for the license to operate on the rail line. Therefore, staff recommends that the RTC authorize the Executive Director or his/her designee to approve future licenses for rail motorcar excursions on the rail line as long as the RTC is indemnified, appropriate insurance is provided, all appropriate safety requirements and practices are followed, approval is secured from SC&MB Railway and a reasonable fee for the license is paid.

SUMMARY

The RTC has issued licenses to the North American Railcar Operators Association (NARCOA) for motorcar excursion on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. NARCOA is requesting to run an excursion again. RTC staff recommends that the RTC approve a NARCOA excursion on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for October 10, 2015 and authorize the Executive Director to approve future licenses for rail motorcar excursions as long as the RTC is indemnified, safety requirements and practices are followed, insurance is provided, a reasonable fee is charged, and it is approved by the SC&MB Railway.

Attachments:

1. NARCOA Frequently Asked Questions about the Motorcar Hobby
Frequently Asked Questions about the Motorcar Hobby

1. **What is that “thing” on your trailer?**
   That is a Railroad Motorcar, sometimes called a “Speeder”. Smaller models, like this one, were used routinely to inspect the many miles of track for defects. Larger versions would carry half a dozen workers and pull a few trailers loaded with spikes and tools, to handle track maintenance. Use of motorcars has been phased out over the past couple decades in favor of Hy-Rail vehicles, which are standard road vehicles with retractable guide wheels that can operate on road or rail. Although these “speeders” have a top speed of only about 30 m.p.h., they were so nicknamed because compared to the manually powered pump cars they replaced, they were much faster.

2. **What do you do with it?**
   Motorcar owners belong to several clubs which obtain permission from railroads to operate on their tracks. These clubs are under the organizational umbrella of the North American Rail Car Operators Association (NARCOA). With permission of the railroads, members operate their motorcars on excursions ranging from one day to over a week in almost all parts of the U.S. and Canada. Many of these excursions are in remote and very scenic areas that are impossible to see from the highway and thus provide an experience not available by other means of transportation.

3. **How do you get permission to use your motorcar on a railroad track?**
   We rent the tracks for our outings from the many small railroad companies which have taken over former branch lines of the major carriers (as well as some large railroads in the U.S. and Canada). Often smaller railroads operate trains only on weekdays, so a group of motorcars on a Saturday or Sunday does not cause the coordination problems the larger lines would have. We have developed an excellent reputation within the rail industry for our attention to safety through operator training, self-imposed safety rules and mechanical standards for our motorcars. We know that our operation must be viewed as a positive experience for the railroad to invite us back year after year.

4. **Do you need any special training to be able to operate a motorcar?**
   Yes. NARCOA members who desire to operate motorcars must become “licensed”. They must first obtain and learn the NARCOA rule book which prescribes procedures for safe operation and mechanical standards to which all motorcars must be maintained. A written test must be passed on the contents of the rule book. New operators must then be “Mentored” on their first excursions by an experienced operator who has been designated to act as an instructor. Only after passing these written and practical tests is a new operator allowed to operate a motorcar in a NARCOA sanctioned event. Each motorcar is inspected by a NARCOA qualified safety inspector prior to each excursion to be sure it meets mechanical standards.
5. What happens when you meet a train?
Train meets are never accidental, but always planned events. On smaller railroads we operate on days when there are no trains. Our groups are always lead by a specially qualified NARCOA “Excursion Coordinator”. In addition, many railroads provide Hy-rail vehicles with railroad staff at the front and rear of our group. On busier railroads where train meets occur, our group leaders maintain radio contact with the railroad dispatcher and the crews of all trains we are scheduled to meet. We generally proceed into a siding or passing track and wait for the train. All operators and passengers are required to leave their motorcars and stand on the side away from the passing train for safety reasons. From the railroad’s perspective, we are treated the same as a train.

6. What happens when you come to a busy highway crossing?
We always yield the right-of-way to automotive traffic. In addition to brake lights, each car carries a red flag that is lowered by the operator to warn the following motor car that he is approaching a road crossing and stopping or slowing to check for traffic. If traffic is encountered, we stop, wait for the automobile to cross and then proceed. When we cross busy multi lane highways, we stop, wait for the rest of the group to catch up, and send trained personnel in safety vests with red flags ahead to stop all highway traffic before crossing the road as a group.

7. How safe is the hobby?
NARCOA members pride themselves in maintaining an extremely high level of safety. Although no statistics are available, it is possible that a motorcar participating in a NARCOA sanctioned excursion is the safest form of any type of recreational vehicle travel in the world. Due to our strict attention to safety, any type of mishap is rare and usually limited to a minor incident.

8. How many horsepower is the engine?
Most of the two and four person motorcars commonly operated on our excursions have a 20 horsepower Onan 4 cycle engine. Some restored older motorcars use the original 2 cycle 5 horsepower engine. Since we travel at low speeds, more power is not required or even desirable.
10. Is it possible for members to operate Hy-rail vehicles?
At the discretion of the excursion coordinator, privately owned hy-rail vehicles can be permitted to operate. They can be very useful for carrying spare parts, extra baggage or running into town if something is needed.

11. How far apart do the motorcars travel during an excursion?
We keep close enough to each other to maintain visual contact with the car in front, never getting closer than a safe distance that will allow for stopping should the car ahead come to a sudden halt.

12. What is the role of the NARCOA Excursion Coordinator?
The Excursion Coordinator is the excursion leader, liaison with the railroad and person in charge of the operation. He assumes responsibility for and has the authority to be certain each participant is in compliance with all NARCOA and railroad rules. He is the ultimate authority on any decisions made for situations not covered by published rules.

13. What type of people participate in the hobby?
The motorcar fraternity is a very mixed and friendly group. There are professors and programmers, farmers and physicians, teachers and truckers, as well as police officers, engineers, firemen, plumbers, and many retired people. Almost all of them have good mechanical skills for restoring and repairing motorcars. Many of them travel, with their motorcars on towed trailers, in pickups, SUVs, and motor homes; others have family sedans or station wagons. Although certainly much less expensive than flying or boating, it is still not a hobby for the financially challenged.

14. What is traveling in a motorcar like?
Riding in a motorcar provides a perspective on rail travel that most people never experience. One is seated perhaps only two feet above the top of the rail and can see directly ahead and to both sides, similar to the view a locomotive engineer has, but even better. Travel is relatively slow, generally averaging less than 20 miles per hour. Every culvert, bridge, road crossing, tunnel, and building along the rails is seen from an uncommon vantage point. Because motorcars are so uncommon, they attract much attention from people along the track. When we pause for lunch or other extended periods of time in populated areas small crowds often gather to look and ask questions.

Most motorcars have a windshield and roof for protection from the wind and rain. Most also have sides and backs (sometimes made of canvas) with doors (or opening flaps) and windows. Many are fully enclosed with metal or fiberglass bodies. These are the most desirable for rain or cold weather.

Most excursions cover 50 to 120 miles in a day. The average hobbyist uses his motorcar 500 to 1,000 miles a year. A very few, mostly those participating in the longer trips, run as much as 2,500 to 3,000 miles a year.

15. How can I get more information on the motorcar hobby and NARCOA?
Visit the NARCOA Web Site at:
   http://www.narcoa.org

NARCOA
P.O. Box 321, Dry Ridge, KY 41035
North American Railcar Operators Association
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner
RE: 2040 Regional Transportation Plan and Environmental Impact Report

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):
1. Receive information and provide input on the development of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP);
2. Authorize staff to coordinate with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and the San Benito Council of Governments (SbCOG) on the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and Regional Transportation Plans;
3. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into agreements related to the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Regional Transportation Plans including an agreement with AMBAG to contribute $60,000 for environmental review of the 2040MTP/RTPs.

BACKGROUND

As the regional transportation planning agency (RTPA) for Santa Cruz County, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for developing, implementing and regularly updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Santa Cruz County. The RTP is a state-mandated plan that identifies transportation needs in Santa Cruz County over the next twenty-plus years. It estimates the amount of funding that will be available over this timeframe and identifies a financially constrained priority list of projects. This planning effort is a critical component to project implementation as it provides a forum for setting the direction of transportation in our county over the next 20 plus years, it positions our community to receive federal, state or local funding for projects, and helps facilitate collaboration on projects. Individual projects listed in the RTP must still undergo separate design and environmental processes, and can only be implemented as local, state and federal funds become available. The RTP also includes information on the state of the transportation system in Santa Cruz County with discussions on highways, local streets and roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit services, specialized transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities, and airports.

The RTPs adopted by RTPAs in Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties are incorporated into the federally-mandated Metropolitan Transportation Plan/state-
mandated Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), which is prepared by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). The current RTP was adopted by RTC in June 2014 at the same time as the MTP/SCS was adopted by AMBAG and the 2014 RTPs by Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and San Benito Council of Governments (SbCOG).

**DISCUSSION**

The next Santa Cruz County RTP and AMBAG MTP/SCS are scheduled for adoption in June 2018. These documents will provide transportation plans through 2040 and will be referred to as the 2040 RTP and 2040 MTP/SCS. The RTP and AMBAG MTP/SCS are being updated after four years based on state law requirements to update the RTP every four or five years and SB 375 requirements to sync the adoption of the regional housing element (RHNA) that occurs every 8 years with the adoption of the MTP.

Regional coordination between AMBAG, RTC, TAMC and SbCOG is required for development of the 2040 MTP/SCS and RTPs. The Santa Cruz County RTP must be consistent with and plan for a transportation system that supports the California Senate Bill 375-mandated Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), which is included in the MTP. To ensure that Santa Cruz County’s transportation needs are adequately represented, and to promote consistency, RTC staff needs to meet regularly with AMBAG, TAMC, and SbCOG regarding the RTPs and MTP/SCS development. **Staff recommend that the RTC authorize staff to coordinate with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and the San Benito Council of Governments (SbCOG) on the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and Regional Transportation Plans.**

**2040 RTP Work Plan**

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan consists of three main elements; the Policy Element, the Financial Element, and the Action Element.

- The Policy Element identifies the goals, policies, and measurable outcomes/targets that guide transportation funding decisions and prioritization.
- The Financial Element identifies funds anticipated to be available for transportation projects and the outstanding funding needs over the next 20 plus years.
- The Action Element of the RTP identifies specific projects, programs and actions necessary to implement the policy element of the RTP. As required by state and federal law, the project list shows which projects could be funded within the projected funds identified in the Financial Element (Constrained) and which would require new revenues above and beyond those anticipated over the next twenty-plus years (Unconstrained).
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan underwent a major update in 2014, starting with a major re-visioning of the goals and policies. The RTC voluntarily adopted a sustainability framework for the 2014 RTP using the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS). Goals, policies, targets and projects and programs were identified, evaluated and prioritized to achieve a more sustainable transportation system - where sustainability is defined as balancing economic, environmental and equity interests. The 2014 RTP considered not only mobility, safety and maintenance needs, but also economic vitality and public and environmental health (such as obesity and GHG and other emissions). The 2014 RTP assessed how well the financially constrained priority project list performed in advancing the goals of the RTP.

The adopted 2014 RTP also included a funding strategy to pursue a local transportation ballot measure and a vehicle registration fee. These measures, if they pass, will provide local funds for key transportation components and enable our county to leverage greater levels of state and federal funding.

Given the significant re-visioning of the RTP for 2014, the 2040 RTP will be an update. The draft work plan for the 2040 RTP is outlined in Attachment 1 and the schedule in Attachment 2. Public participation will be emphasized in all aspects of plan development through public hearings, fact sheets, web pages, email distributions, news releases, workshops and presentations at local and regional community events and meetings.

2040 RTP and MTP/SCS EIR

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) will be prepared for the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Sustainable Communities Strategy, which will also serve as the EIR for the county-level RTPs. As a programmatic document, the 2040 MTP-SCS/RTPs EIR presents a region-wide assessment of potential impacts on the physical environment and identifies strategies to avoid or mitigate significant environmental effects. This document is intended to inform public decision-makers, responsible or interested agencies and the general public of the potential environmental effects of the 2040 MTP/SCS and RTPs. The 2040 MTP-SCS EIR does not provide a detailed analysis of individual projects. Projects will undergo a separate environmental review process, conducted by their agency sponsors, once they actually receive funding and are ready to proceed. One environmental document for all of the MTP and RTPs within the AMBAG region was completed for the 2035 MTP/SCS and the 2014 RTPs. There is significant cost savings in completing a combined environmental review document.

As the lead agency under CEQA for the 2040 MTP/SCS and RTPs EIR, AMBAG has the primary responsibility for approving the “project”. The RTC, as a responsible agency under CEQA, will review and provide comments on the Draft EIR focusing on areas which will require decisions to be carried out by or approved by the RTC in the future. The RTC will consider adoption of the EIR findings in concert with adoption of the 2040 RTP after the EIR is certified by AMBAG.
RTC staff recommends that the RTC authorize staff to coordinate with and enter into agreements as may be needed with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and the San Benito Council of Governments (SbCOG). Staff recommends that the RTC contribute $60,000 for the Environmental Impact Report for the 2040 MTP/SCS and RTPs. Agreements may include a Cost Sharing Agreement with AMBAG for development of the environmental review of the 2040 MTP/SCS/RTPs (Attachment 3), Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) defining responsibilities for joint RTP/MTP development, and/or related RTP grant agreements.

SUMMARY

The RTC is responsible for developing the Regional Transportation Plan for Santa Cruz County. The next RTP will be a minor update to the 2014 RTP and is planned for adoption in June 2018 in coordination with AMBAG and the 2040 MTP/SCS. The 2040 RTP will be developed to identify the transportation needs for the county over the next 20 plus years. Regional coordination between RTC, AMBAG, TAMC and SbCOG both in developing the plans and performing the environmental review will ensure consistency and provide cost savings.

Attachments:
1. 2040 RTP Work Plan
2. 2040 RTP Schedule
3. Cost-Sharing Agreement with AMBAG for 2040 MTP/SCS/RTPs EIR
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1. **Coordination with Partner Agencies**
   a. Meet regularly with Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), and San Benito Council of Governments (SbCOG) to discuss development of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS)
   b. Provide data to AMBAG as necessary to incorporate Santa Cruz County projects into the AMBAG regional travel demand model (RTDM) and the AMBAG region 2040 MTP/SCS
   c. Review draft 2040 MTP/SCS produced by AMBAG

2. **Public Outreach and Involvement**
   a. Utilize the 2015 Public Participation Plan as developed by AMBAG that meets requirements of the California Transportation Commission RTP guidelines, SB 375 and MAP-21 requirements for public participation
   b. Develop outreach materials throughout RTP development including fact sheets, web pages, web news, email notices, news releases
   c. Encourage public participation on the main elements of the RTP, includes soliciting input from RTC Advisory Committees, interest groups, and the general public
   d. Consult with resource agencies as required by the RTP Guidelines
   e. Consult with local jurisdictions and other project sponsors
   f. Coordinate public outreach effort with work on “Sustainable Transportation Prioritization Plan for Santa Cruz County” as funded by Caltrans through the Sustainable Communities grant funds
   g. Coordinate public workshops with AMBAG regarding investment priorities for 2040 MTP/SCS
   h. Analyze feedback and respond to comments received
   i. Attend local and regional community events and meetings

   a. Incorporate lessons learned from 2014 RTP
   b. Incorporate MAP 21 performance measures as appropriate
   c. Ensure policies are consistent with SCS
   d. Review goals and policies with RTC, RTC committees, and the public
   e. Recommend changes to goals and policies based on input received
   f. Approve draft goals and policies and provide to AMBAG and EIR Consultant

4. **Update Financial Element – Revenue and Cost Projections**
   a. Identify funding sources available (dedicated and discretionary), including sources used by project sponsors to operate, maintain, and construct transportation projects and programs
   b. Identify any new funding options
   c. Coordinate with AMBAG, TAMC and SbCOG to establish assumptions for financial projections
   d. Update financial projections through 2040
   e. Escalate project and services costs to expected year of delivery
   f. Review funding projections and assumptions with RTC board
   g. RTC provide input and approve draft financial element
   h. Provide financial projections to AMBAG and EIR consultant
i. Include updated discussion about state and federal funding eligibility trends based on reductions in gas consumptions and greenhouse gas emissions

5. Update Action Element – Project List
   a. Solicit project ideas and costs from local jurisdictions, public, RTC Advisory Committees
   b. Work with AMBAG to provide input on new database for organizing project lists and update project list database
   c. Develop complete list of projects (both constrained and unconstrained)
   d. Evaluate projects for consistency with goals and policies, SCS, and local plans
   e. RTC approves 2040 RTP complete project list
   f. Work with AMBAG on scenario analysis to differentiate financially constrained and unconstrained projects
   g. Create draft Constrained and Unconstrained Project Lists, with input from RTC
   h. Coordinate with AMBAG on public workshops for public input on constrained project list
   i. Seek input from local jurisdictions and RTC Advisory Committees on draft constrained project list
   j. RTC provide input and approve constrained project list
   k. Assign projects to five year time frames included in plan
   l. Map projects

6. Plan Performance
   a. The 2014 RTP included an analysis of how well the plan performed in advancing the goals/targets of the plan based on the financially constrained project list
   b. For the 2040 MTP/SCS, VMT and GHG measures will be analyzed by AMBAG using the regional travel demand model (RTDM) to assess ability to meet revised SB 375 targets for the AMBAG region
   c. Santa Cruz County VMT and GHG reductions will be provided by AMBAG from the RTDM results to assess performance of the 2040 RTP
   d. Baseline performance monitoring based on available data will be considered
   e. Other targets in RTP will not be analyzed for how well the plan performs as the 2040 RTP will be a minor update

7. 2040 RTP Document
   a. Minor updates and revisions will be made to the 2014 RTP document, including name change to reflect target year to be consistent with the regional MTP
   b. Discuss revised California Air Resource Board Targets for AMBAG region
   c. Information from new transportation and related studies will be incorporated, where appropriate
   d. Previously collected data will be updated, as needed
   e. Revise text to address new state and federal requirements
   f. Release draft for public review
   g. Recommend changes for Final based on input received
   h. Prepare Final RTP
8. **Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Preparation**
   a. Agreement with AMBAG for EIR for the 2040 MTP/SCS and RTPs of Santa Cruz County, Monterey County and San Benito County
   b. Meet regularly with AMBAG, TAMC, SBCOG and consultant to discuss development of EIR for 2040 MTP/SCS and RTPs
   c. Review notice of preparation (NOP) for EIR
   d. Review draft EIR

9. **RTP and EIR Release and Distribution**
   a. Update distribution lists
   b. Send notice of availability to interested parties
   c. Focus on electronic distribution (web, email)
   d. Provide a minimum of 30 day review period
   e. Review draft RTP and EIR with RTC and RTC Committees
   f. Hold public hearing on RTP
   g. Receive and incorporate comments
   h. Present Final RTP/EIR Adoption
   i. Complete Notice of Determination
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Solicit New Projects & Updates
Jan-April 2016

Project Ideas Due
April 2016

Solicit Input on Goals, Policies, & Targets
Nov 2015-Feb 2016

Approve Draft Goals, Policies, & Targets
Mar 2016

Approve Draft Complete Project List
June 2016

Update Financial Projections
Apr-Nov 2016

Release Draft RTP/MTP-SCS/EIR
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Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave | Santa Cruz, CA | 95060
831.460.3200 | www.sccrtc.org
THIS AGREEMENT is both a project cost reimbursement and collaborative project agreement between the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments hereinafter referred to as "AMBAG," and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, hereinafter referred to as "SCCRTC."

WHEREAS, AMBAG and SCCRTC have a long-standing relationship and mutual responsibility for transportation planning in Santa Cruz County; and

WHEREAS, AMBAG and SCCRTC are each responsible for the development of, at a minimum, a 20-year long-range transportation plan outlining anticipated projects and policy direction for their respective areas of responsibility; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), including the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and SCCRTC's Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) are each considered a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, it has been determined that an environmental review of the 2040 MTP/SCS and RTP will need to be prepared; and

WHEREAS, SCCRTC agrees to designate AMBAG as the Lead Agency pursuant to CEQA for the preparation of the collective environmental review; and

WHEREAS, AMBAG and SCCRTC agree that joint development of the environmental review is desirable and each agrees to participate in the selection of a consultant to conduct environmental review on their 20 plus-year long-range transportation plans and enlist CEQA services from that consultant; and

WHEREAS, the parties hereto desire to enter into an Agreement calling for the mutual development of one environmental review covering SCCRTC's 2040 Regional Transportation Plan in addition to AMBAG's 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (such collective environmental review referred to hereinafter as "Project"); and

WHEREAS, AMBAG shall also enter into separate cost sharing agreements with the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies for Monterey and San Benito Counties allowing for their 2018 Regional Transportation Plans to also be covered by the same environmental review as SCCRTC's RTP and AMBAG's 2040 MTP/SCS.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the promises and mutual covenants herein contained, the parties hereto agree to the following:
1. **Scope of Work**

AMBAG shall secure separate cost sharing agreements with the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies for Monterey and San Benito Counties that stipulates the same scope, term, payment procedures, and EIR revision clauses as this agreement to cover those agencies' proportionate share of the Project to be completed under this agreement. AMBAG shall submit executed copies of those agreements to SCCRTC prior to the issuance of a Notice to Proceed on environmental analysis for the Project and prior to the issuance of any invoice by AMBAG to SCCRTC under this agreement.

SCCRTC shall furnish its proportionate share of personnel, materials, services and facilities necessary for collaboration on the Project and will work collectively with AMBAG and the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies for Monterey and San Benito Counties on developing a Request for Proposals for an environmental review consultant, including the Project's Scope of Work.

AMBAG shall produce a scope of work collectively with all of the participating agencies for the combined MTP/SCS/RTP EIR that meets all of the appropriate state requirements and needs of all of the participating agencies and shall conduct a procurement process collectively with all of the participating agencies meeting state and federal procurement requirements to secure an environmental consultant for the combined MTP/SCS/RTP EIR.

AMBAG shall enter into an agreement with an EIR consultant selected mutually by all the participating agencies and require the consultant to produce the combined MTP/SCS/RTP EIR that meets State requirements for such a document and the SCCRTC’s and other RTPA’s needs and requirements. AMBAG shall require the EIR consultant to indemnify and insure SCCRTC to the same extent as AMBAG under the consultant agreement.

2. **Term**

This Agreement is effective August 31, 2015 and shall end on August 31, 2018, or 30 days after the Lead Agency files the Project's Notice of Determination, whichever occurs last. The period of performance may be extended by six months upon written agreement of all the parties.

3. **Project Cost and Payments**

The Project costs for consultant services shall not exceed the amount of $250,000 except as provided below. AMBAG and SCCRTC agree to pay the Project costs shown below, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other RTPAs</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AMBAG will provide overall Project management and will receive Project consultant invoices and pay the invoices upon satisfactory completion of consultant work. Upon submission to SCCRTC by AMBAG of executed cost sharing agreements between AMBAG and the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies for Monterey and San Benito Counties and execution and forwarding of a Notice to Proceed to the Project consultant by AMBAG, SCCRTC will forward to AMBAG, Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000) to be held and paid out by AMBAG for consultant invoices. SCCRTC agrees to the following payment schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issuance of Notice to Proceed to Project Consultant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2017</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2017</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30, 2017</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intent of this payment schedule is to provide for the timely payment of consultant invoices by AMBAG through partial prepayment, without imposing significant burden on SCCRTC through total prepayment. At the end of the Project, if the Project consultant invoices less than the aforementioned Project cost, AMBAG shall return to SCCRTC its share of the remaining non-invoiced amount.

All costs incurred under this Agreement shall be based on actual costs and are subject to audit. Substantiating documents (e.g., travel receipts, invoices, etc.) shall be retained by AMBAG and AMBAG shall keep an accurate accounting of all costs incurred in the performance of the Project for this Agreement, including providing summary reporting information to SCCRTC. No additional amounts shall be required of SCCRTC unless proposed increased costs are first approved by SCCRTC in writing.

4. **MTP/SCS/RTP EIR Manager**

AMBAG designates Ms. Heather Adamson as the 2040 MTP/SCS/RTP EIR Manager who shall be responsible for the professional conduct of the Project covered by this Agreement and liaison between the Project consultant and SCCRTC. AMBAG shall promptly notify SCCRTC of any change in 2040 MTP/SCS/RTP EIR Manager.

5. **Responsible Agency Representatives**

SCCRTC designates Ms. Ginger Dykaar as the SCCRTC Representative responsible for the participation in, response to, review and oversight of the products of the Project, and for amendments to this Agreement. SCCRTC shall promptly inform AMBAG of any change to its Representative.

6. **Scope of Work Revisions**

Any significant changes in the performance of this Agreement as outlined in the Project Scope of Work incorporated herein shall be in writing and require mutual authorization by the 2040 MTP/SCS/RTP EIR Manager and the SCCRTC Representative.
7. **Administrative Representative**

AMBAG designates Ms. Maura Twomey as the Administrative Representative who shall be responsible for the contractual and administrative aspects of the Agreement. Questions and correspondence of an administrative nature shall be directed to the Administrative Representative at AMBAG, 445 Reservation Road, Suite G, Marina, CA 93933-0809.

8. **Allowability of Costs**

There shall not be any deviation from the project budget without prior written approval by AMBAG and SCCRTC. The allowability of costs shall be determined in accordance with the OMB Circular 2 CFR Chapter I and II, Part 200 et al. as of December 2013. All requests for budget amendments approval shall be in writing and mutually agreed to by AMBAG and SCCRTC boards. AMBAG shall carefully monitor costs and performance of the consultant, takes such steps as necessary to ensure that the Project be completed on time and on budget, and shall alert SCCRTC on an expedited basis of any questions or concerns in the costs or timely completion of the Project.

9. **Termination**

Either of the parties may terminate this Agreement at any time with or without cause, through a written Notice of Termination. Such Notice by one party will result in the termination of this Agreement among both parties. Such Notice will provide not less than forty-five (45) calendar days for AMBAG to refund to SCCRTC any remaining funds held for completion of this Agreement which are no longer required to pay consultant work for work performed prior to the date of receipt of the Notice of Termination.

10. **Indemnification**

Each party shall defend, indemnify, and save harmless the other party against all claims, demands, suits, damages, costs, expenses, losses, or liability, in law or in equity, of every kind and nature whatsoever, arising out of or resulting from the negligent acts or omissions of the indemnifying party (which shall include the indemnifying party's officers, agents, employees or volunteers) in the performance of this agreement.

11. **Disputes**

In the event of a dispute arising out of the performance of this Agreement, any of the parties shall send a written Notice of Dispute to the other parties. Within five working days of receipt of such notice, the notified parties shall respond and agree to a meeting for the purpose of discussing the dispute and the facts giving rise to the dispute. In the event of a dispute arising out of the performance of this Agreement, the party alleging this dispute shall send a written Notice of Dispute to the other parties. Within five working days of receipt of such notice, the notified parties shall respond and agree to a meeting for the purpose of the dispute if possible.
If resolution of the dispute cannot be reached, the affected parties may file appropriate litigation within six months thereafter.

12. Project Records

Financial records, supporting documents and other records pertinent to this agreement shall be retained by AMBAG for a period of three (3) years from the date of submission of the final expenditure report, except that records pertaining to audit, appeals, litigation or settlement of claims arising out of performance of this Agreement shall be retained until such audits, appeals, litigation or claims have been disposed of.

All Project records, including but not limited to original data and primary data-yielding materials, secondarily derived tables and figures, and statistical tabulations and other summaries, pertinent to this Agreement, shall be made available by Project consultant to AMBAG and SCCRTC for a period of four (4) years from the termination date of this Agreement.

13. Nondiscrimination

To the extent provided by law and any applicable agency regulations, this Agreement and any program assisted thereby are subject to the policies against discrimination:

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI Assurance executed by California under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794; and
- The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat 327, as amended) and the U.S. DOT implementing regulations (49 CFR 27, 37, and 38); and
- The implementing regulations issued pursuant thereto by the California Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration; and
- Any assurance of compliance with AMBAG and SCCRTC have filed in accordance with any applicable agency regulations.

14. Severability

If any provision of this Agreement, or the application thereof to any person, place, or circumstance, shall be held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, unenforceable, or void, the remainder of this Agreement and such provisions as applied to other persons, places, and circumstances shall remain in full force and effect.

15. General Provisions and Certifications

AMBAG and SCCRTC certify that it is in compliance with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations.
16. **Entire Agreement**

This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement and understanding between AMBAG and SCCRTC and supersedes any prior or contemporaneous agreement or understandings if any. Any changes or modifications shall be accomplished by a written amendment to this Agreement executed by the duly authorized representative of each party.

17. **Choice of Laws**

This Agreement shall be interpreted and applied according to the laws of California and shall be deemed to have been entered into in California as of the effective date set forth in Paragraph 2 above.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement on the month, day and year specified below.

_________________________________________  Date: ________________

Maura Twomey  
Executive Director  
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments

APPROVED AS TO FORM

_________________________________________  Date: ________________

Don Freeman, AMBAG Legal Counsel

_________________________________________  Date: ________________

George Dondero  
Executive Director  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

APPROVED AS TO FORM

_________________________________________  Date: ________________

Brooke Williams, SCCRTC Legal Counsel
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the amended FY 2015-16 budget and work program as show on Exhibit A of Attachment 1.

BACKGROUND

In March of each year, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approves a budget and work program for the upcoming fiscal year. In the fall, the RTC amends the budget and work program to incorporate information from prior year end balances, new projects or funds, updated estimates, and other necessary changes. The proposed amended FY 2015-16 budget and work program was reviewed by the B&A/P Committee at their September 17, 2015 meeting.

DISCUSSION

The proposed amended FY2015-16 budget is balanced and implements the RTC’s priority projects and on-going programs. Proposed budget changes are discussed below. Explanations for specific line items in the budget are included as notes.

Transportation Development Act (TDA) (pp. 1, 2 & 17 of amended budget)

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

FY 2014-15 TDA Estimates and Revenues - As required by state law, the RTC obtains TDA revenue estimates from the County Auditor-Controller and uses those
estimates for budgeting purposes. As shown on Table 1 below, the total of actual revenues and interest received in FY 2014-15 was $80,928 lower than estimated.

### Table 1: FY 2014-15 TDA Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2014-15 Estimate</th>
<th>Actual Received</th>
<th>Difference of Revenue to Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>8,630,543</td>
<td>8,549,340</td>
<td>-81,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,275</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,640,543</td>
<td>8,559,615</td>
<td>-80,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2015-16 TDA Revenue** - In March 2015, the RTC approved a FY 2015-16 budget, which was amended in June, with the TDA revenue estimates provided by the County Auditor Controller in January 2015. The Auditor Controller’s estimate of $8,628,404 is unchanged; therefore, apportionments to TDA recipients are also unchanged.

**TDA Reserve Fund** - The RTC’s rules and regulations establish a TDA reserve fund of 8% of revenues. TDA revenues for FY 2014-15 did not meet the estimate; therefore, the RTC used TDA reserve funds to keep its apportionment commitments to TDA recipients. As a result, the TDA reserve fund in this proposed budget is at 7.18%. The proposed budget does not include a reduction in TDA apportionments in order to build the TDA reserve back to the 8% target. If revenues in FY 2015-16 surpass projections, those revenues can be used to return the reserve fund to the 8% target. Currently, TDA funds for FY 2015-16 are about $60,000 above projections (Attachment 2). TDA revenues can vary significantly from month to month. Staff will continue to monitor TDA revenues, and if revisions seem necessary, staff will return to the B&A/P Committee and the RTC with appropriate recommendations.

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

Each year the California State Controller provides an estimate of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds. Santa Cruz METRO is the only transit agency in Santa Cruz County authorized to use STA funds. The RTC allocates all of the STA funds to Santa Cruz METRO. For FY 2015-16 the State’s estimate has not changed.

**Proposed Budget Amendments**

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

**Administration Budget (p. 4)** - The administration budget includes several carryovers from FY 2014-15. $30,000 is budgeted for the triennial performance audit that must be done in this fiscal year. Staff proposes closing RTC’s field office in Watsonville resulting in a savings of about $6,000 per year. The current lease
term expires in December 2015. The RTC established the Watsonville field office a few years ago in an effort to provide to the Watsonville community better access to information and services of the RTC. RTC staff has been available at the Watsonville office about half of the time and RTC staff has held meetings at the Watsonville office with members of the Watsonville community. In the years that the RTC has maintained the Watsonville office, Watsonville community members have not visited the RTC office to request information or assistance from the RTC. Much of the information and services provided by the RTC are available through the internet or by phone. However, the RTC has established a greater presence in Watsonville by making staff available for participation with community groups and efforts in Watsonville. The RTC will remain committed to having a significant presence and participation in Watsonville and providing good service to the Watsonville community. RTC staff will continue to be available to participate with community groups and efforts in Watsonville, attend meetings and involve the Watsonville community in the RTC’s efforts.

CRUZ511/Rideshare (p. 5) - The budget for the RTC’s traveler information and rideshare program includes a lower carryover of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Exchange funds than previously anticipated. Some federal RSTP funds were not exchanged for state funds as is routinely done. This makes more of the state RSTP Exchange funds available to other projects in the county.

Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) (pp. 6 & 7) - The SAFE and FSP budgets include updated estimates along with carryovers from FY 2014-15. FSP state funds are based on a formula that includes highway congestion as a variable. Because Santa Cruz County is a small county with less overall congestion than in larger more urbanized counties, it has always been challenging for Santa Cruz County to be allocated the resources necessary for Caltrans to fully measure highway congestion. As a result Caltrans Headquarters held the congestion variable for the FSP formula steady for Santa Cruz County based on past congestion measured. Caltrans Headquarters said that it could no longer do that and used the congestion measures that are available through equipment installed on the highways as is done for other areas. Unfortunately, the equipment is not always functional or insufficient to fully capture all of the congestion, especially on Highway 17. As a result, the FSP funds allocated to Santa Cruz County by formula were reduced by almost 18% or $37,000. RTC staff will work with Caltrans to implement measures that more fully capture the congestion that is seen on Highways 1 and 17 and increase the FSP funds allocated by formula.

Rail/Trail Authority Budget (p. 8) – The Rail/Trail Authority budget includes updated carryovers in funding and expenditures from FY 2014-15. Staff anticipates a greater level of revenues from leases, licenses and rights of entry on the rail line. Most of it is from a license provided to the City of Santa Cruz Water Department for a pipeline. Most of the additional revenues will be used for right-of-way maintenance and clean up, especially to better prepare for the upcoming winter.

Highway 1 Projects (pp. 9 & 10) – The budgets for the highway projects include updated carryover and estimates in both funding and expenditures. Unfortunately,
the Highway 1 auxiliary lanes construction project has not been closed out due to claims from the contractor. Very limited funds remain for the project to address and settle claims.

**Planning Program Budget (pp. 11, 12 and 13)** - The budget for the planning program includes carryover funds and expenditures from FY 2014-15, and recently secured grant funds for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network projects. It also includes the first installment ($5,000) of payment to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) for the environmental document for the next Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Federal planning (PL) funds received through AMBAG have not yet been secured for this fiscal year. Therefore, they have been removed from the budget and once the RTC secures the funds, they will be incorporated. The RTC used to receive about $250,000 per year in PL funds through formula. That changed a few years ago and the RTC has recently been receiving $65,000 per year after going through a significantly more rigorous and uncertain process.

**RTC Operating Reserve Fund (p. 15 of proposed amended budget)**

The RTC Rules and Regulations establish a 30% RTC operating reserve composed of an 8% cashflow reserve and 22% restricted reserve. The cashflow reserve is used for cash flow management consistent with the RTC budget because most of the funds that the RTC uses for its operations can only be received on a reimbursement basis. The restricted reserve will not be used without authorization from the RTC. With this proposed budget the total RTC operating reserve will be $818,146 or 26.5% making it less than 4% from reaching the 30% target.

**The B&A/P Committee and staff recommend that the RTC approve the proposed amended FY2015-16 Budget and Work Program (Exhibit A of Attachment 1).** Staff will continue to monitor all revenues, including TDA, seek additional revenues, and manage costs to maintain a sound budget. Staff will return to the B&A/P Committee and the RTC with recommendations as necessary, if budget changes are needed.

**SUMMARY**

The proposed amended FY 2015-16 Budget (Exhibit A of Attachment 1) incorporates information from FY 2014-15 year end balances, carryovers from the previous fiscal year, updated revenue and cost estimates, and other necessary changes. The B&A/P Committee and staff recommend that the RTC approve the proposed amended FY 2015-16 Budget and Work Program.

**Attachments:**
1. Resolution amending the FY 2015-16 RTC Budget and Work Program
2. TDA Estimates and Revenues
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RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of October 1, 2015
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2015-16 BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM FOR
THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

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

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

1. The FY 2015-16 Budget and Work Program for the Santa Cruz County Regional
Transportation Commission (RTC) are hereby amended as shown in Exhibit A; and

2. The Executive Director is authorized to adjust Transportation Development Act (TDA)
and State Transit Assistance (STA) revenue payments to recipients consistent with the
amended FY 2015-16 RTC budget.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS
NOES: COMMISSIONERS
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________________
John Leopold, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Attachments: Exhibit A - SCCRTC FY 2015-16 Budget as amended
Distribution: RTC Fiscal
EXHIBIT A

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
(SCCRTC)

FISCAL YEAR 2015-16 BUDGET

PROPOSED OCTOBER 1, 2015
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## PROJECTED REVENUE SUMMARY

**FY 2015-2016 BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FY15-16 APPROVED 06/25/15</th>
<th>FY15-16 PROPOSED 10/01/15</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Development Act (TDA):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor's 1/4 Cent Sales Tax Estimate</td>
<td>8,628,404</td>
<td>8,628,404</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous FY Revenues Budgeted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Estimate</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TDA Apportioned</strong></td>
<td>8,640,404</td>
<td>8,640,404</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Transit Assistance (STA)</strong></td>
<td>2,832,152</td>
<td>2,832,152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State planning funds (RPA and STIP PPM)</td>
<td>512,000</td>
<td>512,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>72,554</td>
<td>52,554</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>45,526</td>
<td>-109,474</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-65,000</td>
<td>Not yet secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Planning for Unified Corridor Plan</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit &amp; Transportation Planning grants</td>
<td>384,863</td>
<td>331,396</td>
<td>-53,467</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>426,345</td>
<td>574,571</td>
<td>148,226</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning/Other Total</strong></td>
<td>1,613,208</td>
<td>1,786,047</td>
<td>172,839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rideshare:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP &amp; RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>299,676</td>
<td>64,676</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE Funds</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Authority for Freeway Emergency (SAFE):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV Fees and interest</td>
<td>241,000</td>
<td>241,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - MTC SAFE and Partnership Planning Grant</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>52,807</td>
<td>152,807</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Grant</td>
<td>207,500</td>
<td>170,598</td>
<td>-36,902</td>
<td>Reduced allocation due to unavailable congestion data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange &amp; STIP</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP Reserves Budgeted and Interest</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-104,000</td>
<td>Not all RSTPX funds transferred to project in FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail/Trail Authority:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases and Licenses</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Increased revenue anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>615,000</td>
<td>567,822</td>
<td>-47,178</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer - in from TC Planning</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>130,881</td>
<td>262,188</td>
<td>131,307</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>1,154,968</td>
<td>1,530,549</td>
<td>375,581</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIA (state bond) &amp; other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RSTP Exchange Program</strong></td>
<td>4,085,815</td>
<td>9,756,861</td>
<td>5,671,046</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>20,323,735</td>
<td>27,205,324</td>
<td>6,881,589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPORTIONMENT SUMMARY

**FY 2015-2016 BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>FY15-16 APPROVED 06/25/15</th>
<th>FY15-16 PROPOSED 10/01/15</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Development Act (TDA): (1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>538,542</td>
<td>538,542</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning: Overall Planning</td>
<td>492,808</td>
<td>492,808</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike to Work</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike &amp; Pedestrian Safety (CTSC)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,181,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,181,350</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO</td>
<td>6,377,491</td>
<td>6,377,491</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit (Community Bridges/CTSA)</td>
<td>626,561</td>
<td>626,561</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
<td>74,591</td>
<td>74,591</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>14,197</td>
<td>14,197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>88,858</td>
<td>88,858</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>16,743</td>
<td>16,743</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>73,546</td>
<td>73,546</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>187,068</td>
<td>187,068</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,459,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,459,054</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TDA APPORTIONED</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,640,404</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,640,404</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA) - SCMTD</td>
<td>2,832,152</td>
<td>2,832,152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</td>
<td>1,613,208</td>
<td>1,786,047</td>
<td>172,839</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15 and new grant funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>349,676</td>
<td>64,676</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>343,807</td>
<td>443,807</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)</td>
<td>462,500</td>
<td>456,598</td>
<td>-5,902</td>
<td>Reduced Caltrans funding allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>905,881</td>
<td>1,040,010</td>
<td>134,129</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1</td>
<td>1,154,968</td>
<td>1,899,769</td>
<td>744,801</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>4,085,815</td>
<td>9,756,861</td>
<td>5,671,046</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,323,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,205,324</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,881,589</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) TDA apportionments are based on formulas in the RTC's Rules and Regulations. Balance not used for Planning and Administration is allocated to other TDA claimants as follows:

- 85.5% to SCMTD, 8.4% to Community Bridges and 1% to the Volunteer Center; remaining funds are proportionally allocated to cities and the county according to population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>805,500</td>
<td>557,582</td>
<td>(247,918)</td>
<td>805,500</td>
<td>(114,182)</td>
<td>740,818</td>
<td>11,907,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUZ511/Rideshare</td>
<td>383,147</td>
<td>201,882</td>
<td>(181,265)</td>
<td>383,147</td>
<td>(101,481)</td>
<td>336,666</td>
<td>2,235,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>456,617</td>
<td>331,607</td>
<td>(125,010)</td>
<td>456,617</td>
<td>(112,810)</td>
<td>443,807</td>
<td>9,671,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>372,000</td>
<td>334,419</td>
<td>(37,581)</td>
<td>378,060</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>378,060</td>
<td>2,460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>2,162,089</td>
<td>1,645,147</td>
<td>(516,942)</td>
<td>2,103,240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,103,240</td>
<td>11,907,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>4,651,994</td>
<td>3,639,523</td>
<td>(1,012,471)</td>
<td>4,651,994</td>
<td>(3,746,113)</td>
<td>1,040,881</td>
<td>12,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Env Docs &amp; Design</td>
<td>1,827,143</td>
<td>1,642,143</td>
<td>(185,000)</td>
<td>1,154,968</td>
<td>(672,175)</td>
<td>1,154,968</td>
<td>5,858,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Construction</td>
<td>1,249,087</td>
<td>1,174,087</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,249,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>2,162,089</td>
<td>1,645,147</td>
<td>(516,942)</td>
<td>2,103,240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,103,240</td>
<td>11,907,577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) Includes staffing shown on page 16
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### ADMINISTRATION
#### FY 2015-2016 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #102</th>
<th>FY15-16 APPROVED 06/25/15</th>
<th>FY15-16 PROPOSED 10/01/15</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Administration</td>
<td>538,542</td>
<td>538,542</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Funds</td>
<td>152,776</td>
<td>202,276</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>691,318</td>
<td>740,818</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>233,318</td>
<td>233,318</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and Supplies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rent</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
<td>- Close Watsonville field office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel/Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance, Rentals and Service</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Fixed Assets</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>- Increased cost for the Central Coast Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/Publication</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment Repair/Maintenance</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingency/Special Expense</strong></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Mainframe/Intranet</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer Software</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners' Stipend</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal &amp; Triennial Performance Audit</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>- For triennial performance audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report/Fact Sheets</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Payroll and Auditing Fees</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources/Employee Relations</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Consulting Services</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/website support, service &amp; programming</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Custodial - Janitorial Services</strong></td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision for RTC reserves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>507,500</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>691,318</td>
<td>740,818</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ELEMENT #179</td>
<td>FY15-16 APPROVED 06/25/15</td>
<td>FY15-16 PROPOSED 10/01/15</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>NOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare/CRUZ511</td>
<td>721,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15-16 FY15-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 WORK ELEMENT #179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 APPROVED PROPOSED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DIFFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 NOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rideshare/CRUZ511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 FY15-16 FY15-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 WORK ELEMENT #179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 APPROVED PROPOSED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 DIFFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 NOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Services and Supplies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Rideshare:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Telephone</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Membership</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Postage</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Other - Office Expense</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Transportation/Travel/Education</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Advertisement &amp; Promotion Materials</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Technical Support/Programming</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Bicycle Map Production and Printing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Cruz511 Technical Support</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Park &amp; Ride Lot Project</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>76,100</td>
<td>131,100</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Unappropriated Revenues:</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>13,010</td>
<td>9,676</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>349,676</td>
<td>64,676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
### Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Approved FY15-16</th>
<th>Proposed FY15-16</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMV Fees</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Partnership Planning Grant for 511 System</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Financial Assistance (MTC SAFE)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>52,807</td>
<td>152,807</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>343,807</strong></td>
<td><strong>443,807</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Approved FY15-16</th>
<th>Proposed FY15-16</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>129,507</td>
<td>129,507</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>214,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>314,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,000</strong></td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>343,807</strong></td>
<td><strong>443,807</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### FREEWAY SERVICE PATROL (FSP)
#### FY 2015-2016 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #177</th>
<th>FY15-16 APPROVED 06/25/15</th>
<th>FY15-16 PROPOSED 10/01/15</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Caltrans</td>
<td>207,500</td>
<td>170,598</td>
<td>-36,902</td>
<td>Reduced allocation due to unavailable congestion data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 RSTPX and STIP</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Interest</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 FSP Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-104,000</td>
<td>Not all RSTPX funds transferred to project in FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>462,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>456,598</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5,902</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY15-16 76,060</th>
<th>FY15-16 76,060</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Services and Supplies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>FY15-16 2,000</th>
<th>FY15-16 2,000</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Telephone &amp; Mobile Device Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Transportation/Travel/Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Liability Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Legal Counsel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Contingency/Special Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Towing</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>302,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>302,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unappropriated Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unappropriated Revenues:</th>
<th>FY15-16 84,440</th>
<th>FY15-16 78,538</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced Caltrans funding allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY15-16 462,500</th>
<th>FY15-16 456,598</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5,902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### RAIL/TRAIL AUTHORITY
#### FY 2015-2016 BUDGET

### WORK ELEMENT #682

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved 06/25/15</th>
<th>Proposed 10/01/15</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAIL/TRAIL AUTHORITY:</strong> 722100</td>
<td>FY15-16</td>
<td>FY15-16</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 STIP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Leases, Licenses &amp; Other Revenue</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Transfer from TC Funds</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>615,000</td>
<td>567,822</td>
<td>-47,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rail/Trail Authority Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>130,881</td>
<td>262,188</td>
<td>131,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>905,881</td>
<td>1,040,010</td>
<td>134,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries &amp; Benefits</strong></td>
<td>185,010</td>
<td>185,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and Supplies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Liability Insurance</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Rail line ROW clean up, maintenance &amp; signage</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Work to prepare for upcoming rainy season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consulting Services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Consultants for Rail Operations &amp; Property Management</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Haz Mat Investigation and Related Costs</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Site Management Plan</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 General Contingency</td>
<td>25,871</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>4,129</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Construction Management Consultant</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-40,000</td>
<td>RR bridge construction project completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Legal Counsel</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Potential legal claim from contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Rail line rehabilitation</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>615,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td>720,871</td>
<td>855,000</td>
<td>134,129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subtotal Services & Supplies | 720,871 | 855,000 | 134,129 | |

| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES** | 905,881 | 1,040,010 | 134,129 | |

**Note:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #683</th>
<th>FY15-16 APPROVED 06/25/15</th>
<th>FY15-16 PROPOSED 10/01/15</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>955,143</td>
<td>1,330,724</td>
<td>375,581</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes: Design</td>
<td>14,825</td>
<td>14,825</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes: PA/ED</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,154,968</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,530,549</strong></td>
<td><strong>375,581</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>256,958</td>
<td>216,958</td>
<td>-40,000</td>
<td>Updated estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICES AND SUPPLIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 HOV Lanes PA/ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/ED Consultant - Nolte Contract</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>938,744</td>
<td>313,744</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15 &amp; to begin work on final environmental documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/ED on Call Consultants</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/ED Public Information, materials, postage &amp; meetings</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Consultant</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>30,100</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Project Value Analysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Analysis (STARS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for future year expenses</td>
<td>38,185</td>
<td>111,422</td>
<td>73,237</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Morrissey-Soquel Aux Lane PA/ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/ED Legal Costs</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>803,185</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,298,760</strong></td>
<td><strong>415,581</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNAPPROPRIATED REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues:</td>
<td>14,825</td>
<td>14,825</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,154,968</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,530,549</strong></td>
<td><strong>375,581</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ELEMENT #683</td>
<td>FY15-16 APPROVED 06/25/15</td>
<td>FY15-16 PROPOSED 10/01/15</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>NOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 STIP Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CMIA Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15 &amp; to address legal claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Services and Supplies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hwy 1 Morrissey-Soquel Aux Lane Construction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Construction contract with contingency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>199,298</td>
<td>199,298</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Supplemental construction activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Traffic management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Traffic enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Miscellaneous other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Construction management consultant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,244</td>
<td>10,244</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Construction design support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,933</td>
<td>20,933</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Legal Counsel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98,745</td>
<td>98,745</td>
<td>- Carryover from FY 2014-15 &amp; to address legal claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 General Contingency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>329,220</td>
<td>329,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
## PLANNING REVENUES SUMMARY
### FY 2015-2016 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>APPROVED 06/25/15</th>
<th>PROPOSED 10/01/15</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>642,808</td>
<td>642,808</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>72,554</td>
<td>52,554</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>45,526</td>
<td>-109,474</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-65,000</td>
<td>Not yet secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Planning Grant</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>74,668</td>
<td>-25,332</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning Grants</td>
<td>169,995</td>
<td>141,860</td>
<td>-28,135</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>New grants for MBSST projects in north coast &amp; Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Planning for Unified Corridor Plan</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant</td>
<td>114,868</td>
<td>114,868</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>273,569</td>
<td>372,295</td>
<td>98,726</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUES:**

|       | 2,103,240 | 2,226,579 | 123,339 |

**Note:**
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### PLANNING EXPENDITURES
#### FY 2015-2016 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY15-16 APPROVED 06/25/15</th>
<th>FY15-16 PROPOSED 10/01/15</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff &amp; Overhead by Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Coordination</td>
<td>133,618</td>
<td>133,618</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Corridor Study</td>
<td>82,226</td>
<td>82,226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Program</td>
<td>30,835</td>
<td>30,835</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>60,672</td>
<td>60,672</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Signage Plan</td>
<td>15,417</td>
<td>15,417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Network</td>
<td>159,314</td>
<td>45,526</td>
<td>-113,788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More project specific work as a result of secured funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Projects</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>98,547</td>
<td>98,547</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>70,150</td>
<td>70,150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Rail Study</td>
<td>66,809</td>
<td>66,809</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan for MTP</td>
<td>132,590</td>
<td>132,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Travel Demand Model</td>
<td>20,557</td>
<td>20,557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>247,461</td>
<td>241,249</td>
<td>-6,212</td>
<td>Updated estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>102,783</td>
<td>102,783</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Staff and Overhead</strong></td>
<td>1,350,485</td>
<td>1,350,485</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike &amp; Ped Safety (Comm. Traffic Safety Coalition)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Signage Program</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boltage/Active 4me - Ecology Action</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Services (contracts)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Assistant</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documents for RTP/MTP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>to AMBAG for environmental consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBBST Projects - services and materials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>New grants for MBSST projects in north coast and Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>59,600</td>
<td>59,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger rail study consultant</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>21,399</td>
<td>-28,601</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC METRO for passenger rail study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Corridor Investment Plan Consultant</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>153,860</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTC Work Element Related Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Monitoring services</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Oriented Transit Travel Planning Materials</td>
<td>13,555</td>
<td>13,555</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td>752,755</td>
<td>876,094</td>
<td>123,339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>2,103,240</td>
<td>2,226,579</td>
<td>123,339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### PLANNING FUNDS SOURCE DETAIL
#### FY 2015-2016 BUDGET

### PLANNING DETAIL: 721600/721700/721750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Overhead</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>6 Regional Planning Coordination</td>
<td>133,618</td>
<td>26,838</td>
<td>20,363</td>
<td>86,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Unified Corridor Study</td>
<td>82,226</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>51,418</td>
<td>11,818</td>
<td>10,282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Work Program</td>
<td>30,835</td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>21,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Public Information</td>
<td>60,672</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>30,429</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Bike Signage Plan</td>
<td>15,417</td>
<td>13,143</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 MBSST Network</td>
<td>45,526</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 MBSST Projects</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>64,753</td>
<td>39,445</td>
<td>25,308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>98,547</td>
<td>17,102</td>
<td>81,445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>70,150</td>
<td>8,046</td>
<td>62,104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Passenger Rail Study</td>
<td>68,809</td>
<td>62,297</td>
<td>4,512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Regional Travel Demand Model</td>
<td>132,590</td>
<td>30,396</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>98,604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>241,249</td>
<td>28,523</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>67,116</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Highway &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>102,783</td>
<td>37,019</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>62,981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Staff &amp; Overhead</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,350,485</strong></td>
<td><strong>311,208</strong></td>
<td><strong>195,120</strong></td>
<td><strong>337,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,104</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>81,445</strong></td>
<td><strong>175,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,526</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,808</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>120,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</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>26 Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Bike &amp; Ped Safety (Comm. Traffic Safety Coalition)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Bike Signage Program</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Voltage/Active 4me - Ecology Action</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>876,094</strong></td>
<td><strong>331,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>177,175</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,764</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,865</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,550</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>53,860</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,280</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Work Element Related Items</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>31 Washington Assistant</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>26,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Environmental Documents for RTP/MTP</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 MBBST Projects - services and materials</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>59,600</td>
<td>6,836</td>
<td>52,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Passenger rail study consultant</td>
<td>21,399</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 SC METRO for passenger rail study</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>12,304</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Unified Corridor Investment Plan Consultant</td>
<td>153,860</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,860</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>876,094</strong></td>
<td><strong>331,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>177,175</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,764</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,865</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,550</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>53,860</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,280</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>2,226,579</td>
<td>642,808</td>
<td>372,295</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>114,868</td>
<td>21,865</td>
<td>119,995</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>45,526</td>
<td>74,668</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RSTP Exchange Program

### FY 2015-2016 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element #101</th>
<th>Approved 06/25/15</th>
<th>Proposed 10/01/15</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange Funds Budgeted - Carryover</td>
<td>4,055,815</td>
<td>9,726,861</td>
<td>5,671,046</td>
<td>Carryover from FY 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,085,815</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,756,861</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,671,046</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenues:
- Interest: 30,000
- RSTP Exchange Funds Budgeted - Carryover: 4,055,815

### Expenditures:
- City of Capitola
  - Clares Street Traffic Calming: 100,000
  - 38th Avenue Rehabilitation: 438,000
- Santa Cruz METRO Mainline Routes Runtime Recal: 15,385
- City of Santa Cruz
  - Soquel Ave at Frederick St Intersection Modifications: 188,000
- City of Scotts Valley
  - Mt. Hermon Rd/Scotts Valley Dr/Whispering Pines Dr Intersection Improvement: 346,000
- City of Watsonville
  - Freedom Blvd Reconstruction (Broadis to Alta Vista Ave): 900,000
- County of Santa Cruz
  - State Park Drive Improvement: 587,000
  - Calabasas Road Bike/Pedestrian: 9,095
  - Corralitos Road Left Turn: 117,091
  - Aptos Village Plan Improvements: 690,000
  - Davenport Road Repairs: 34,862
  - Empire Grade 2" Layer Seal: City of SC limits to 130' N of Heller Drive: 24,684
  - Empire Grade 2" Layer Seal (130' north of Heller Dr to 0.79 mi north of Heller): 67,472
  - Green Valley Rd 3" Layer Seal: Devon Ln to Melody Ln (0.58 mi): 20,877
  - Mt. Hermon Rd 3" Layer Seal: Graham Hill to 1000' N of Locatelli Ln: 218,927
  - Captola Road Slurry Seal (30th-17th Ave): 87,141
  - Portola Drive Cape Seal: E. Cliff to 24th: 122,340
  - Summit Rd Chip Seal (Soquel-San Jose Rd-Old SC Hwy): 129,527
  - 17th Ave. Cape Seal (Brommer - East Cliff): 241,000
  - East Cliff Dr. Cape Seal (12th to 17th Avenues): 147,000
  - Twin Lakes Beachfront: 200,000
  - County of Santa Cruz Open Street - HSA: 22,934
- SCCRTC
  - Bike Route Signage: 60,906
  - Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes: 185,000
  - Highway 1 HOV Lanes PA/ED: 870,000
  - Freeway Service Patrol: 135,000
  - Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network: 132,000
  - Boltage/Active 4me - Ecology Action: 25,000
- **Total Project Expenditures**: 3,531,000
- **Unobligated Funds**: 554,815
- **Total Expenditures**: 4,085,815
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TDA FUND (1)</th>
<th>RTC FUND (2)</th>
<th>RIDESHARE FUND (3)</th>
<th>RAIL/TRAAIL AUTHORITY FUND (4)</th>
<th>HWY 1 PA/ED &amp; ENG FUND (4)</th>
<th>HWY 1 CONSTR FUND (4)</th>
<th>SAFE OPERATING FUND (5)</th>
<th>FSP FUND (5)</th>
<th>RSTP EXCHANGE FUND (4)</th>
<th>STA FUND (6)</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance 7-01-15</td>
<td>2,054,063</td>
<td>1,392,717</td>
<td>292,536</td>
<td>460,724</td>
<td>369,220</td>
<td>496,231</td>
<td>16,066</td>
<td>9,726,861</td>
<td>38,260</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,846,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15 Revenues budgeted</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>Anticipated Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,055,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Budgeted to Reserves Fund</td>
<td>(620,176)</td>
<td>(607,302)</td>
<td>(262,188)</td>
<td>(1,515,724)</td>
<td>(369,220)</td>
<td>(182,296)</td>
<td>(152,807)</td>
<td>(6,255,241)</td>
<td>(1,409,774)</td>
<td>(1,085,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Carryover from FY 2014-15</td>
<td>(1,433,887)</td>
<td>(574,571)</td>
<td>(262,188)</td>
<td>(1,515,724)</td>
<td>(369,220)</td>
<td>(182,296)</td>
<td>(152,807)</td>
<td>(6,255,241)</td>
<td>(1,409,774)</td>
<td>(1,085,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Fund Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210,844</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161,128</td>
<td>16,066</td>
<td>3,501,620</td>
<td>38,260</td>
<td>3,769,292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Cashflow Reserve</td>
<td>(210,844)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,010</td>
<td>14,825</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,538</td>
<td></td>
<td>106,373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td>13,010</td>
<td>14,825</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,010</td>
<td>30,348</td>
<td>14,825</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76,625</td>
<td>94,604</td>
<td>3,769,292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reserve Funds**

| Reserve Target (8% target for TDA fund; 30% target for others) | 691,232 | 925,980 | - | - | - | - | 266,799 | 1,884,011 |
| Cashflow Reserve (0% target for TDA fund; 8% target for others) | 210,844 | - | - | - | - | - | 71,146 | 281,990 |
| Restricted Reserve (8% target for TDA fund; 22% target for others) | 620,176 | 607,302 | - | - | - | - | 195,653 | 1,423,131 |
| Total Reserve Funds | 620,176 | 818,146 | - | - | - | - | 266,799 | 1,705,121 |

**Reserve Fund Difference from Target**

| (71,056) | (107,834) | - | - | - | - | - | - | (178,890) |

**Notes:**

- Numbers in parentheses are negative numbers. All other numbers are positive numbers.
- Funds within each category (column) are restricted for use on projects/programs within that category.
- **Fund Balance (7-01-15)** = Balances of funds not used at the end of prior fiscal year.
- **Budgeted Carryover** = Portion of Fund Balance used in current fiscal year budget.
- **Unappropriated Revenues** = Amount of revenues designated for specific projects/programs that likely will not be expended in the current fiscal year, but will be needed in future years.
- (1) 8% reserve established in RTC Rules and Regulations for the TDA Fund; 7.18% available in this proposed budget
- (2) 3.6 month (or 30%) operating reserve target established in RTC Rules and Regulations for the RTC Fund; 3.18 months (or 26.51%) available in this proposed budget
- (3) Reserve for the Rideshare fund is included with the RTC Fund
- (4) Reserve funds not proposed for capital project funds
- (5) 3.6 month (or 30%) operating reserve target approved for the SAFE Fund to cover both SAFE and FSP operations
- (6) This is a pass-through fund, all receipts are paid to Santa Cruz Metro.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF POSITIONS:</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIONS</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Executive Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Deputy Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Fiscal Officer SCCRTC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Administrative Services Officer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Transportation Planner I-IV</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Accounting Technician</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Administrative Assistant I-III</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Transportation Planning Technician</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Paid Intern</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POSITIONS</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF POSITIONS:</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIONS</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Executive Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Deputy Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Fiscal Officer SCCRTC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Administrative Services Officer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Transportation Planner I-IV</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Accounting Technician</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Administrative Assistant I-III</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Transportation Planning Technician</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Paid Intern</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POSITIONS</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**TDA ALLOCATION BALANCES**

**FY 2015-2016 BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>FY15-16 PROPOSED 10/01/15</th>
<th>UNSPENT PRIOR ALLOCATIONS</th>
<th>AVAILABLE FUNDS 10/01/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Administration</td>
<td>538,542</td>
<td></td>
<td>538,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>642,808</td>
<td></td>
<td>642,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,181,350</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,181,350</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>6,377,491</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,377,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit</td>
<td>626,561</td>
<td></td>
<td>626,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
<td>74,591</td>
<td></td>
<td>74,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>14,197</td>
<td>155,304</td>
<td>169,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>88,858</td>
<td>333,085</td>
<td>421,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>16,743</td>
<td>75,427</td>
<td>92,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>73,546</td>
<td>273,386</td>
<td>346,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>187,068</td>
<td>596,685</td>
<td>783,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,640,404</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,433,887</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,074,291</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Allocations for the Cities and the County use the most recent population figures from the Department of Finance.
Glossary of Transportation Funding Terms Used in the SCCRTC Budget

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

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

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

**CMAQ:** see Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program

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

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

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

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program:** A federal funding program specifically for projects and programs which contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard. The SCCRTC programs CMAQ funds for Santa Cruz County. CMAQ funds for planning projects appear in the SCCRTC budget.

**c/o** Carryover. Funds carried over from prior fiscal years.

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

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

**Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Planning (PL) Funds from AMBAG:** These funds are derived from one percent "off the top" of the funds available to each State for federal highway projects. PL funds are to be used for metropolitan planning. Funds are available for use by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and are allocated by a formula established by Caltrans in consultation with the MPOs. Caltrans is responsible as the "pass through" agency for administering PL funds. AMBAG passes through a portion of its FHWA PL funds to the SCCRTC for regional transportation planning purposes.

**FHWA:** Federal Highway Administration

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

**FSP:** Freeway Service Patrol

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

**Proposition 116:** Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act of 1990 passed by the voters in November 1990, provided bond funds for passenger rail and other projects including $11 million for Santa Cruz County.

**Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP):** A federal funding program established by ISTEA to fund mass transit, highway, bicycle, pedestrian and local streets and roads projects. The SCCRTC programs STP funds for Santa Cruz County. Sometimes called RSTP for Regional Surface Transportation Program.

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

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

**RPA:** Rural Planning Assistance

**RSTP:** Regional Surface Transportation Program

**RSTPX:** Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange

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

**SAFE:** Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

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

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

**STA:** State Transit Assistance

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

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

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

**STIP:** State Transportation Improvement Program

**STP:** Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)

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

**TDA:** Transportation Development Act

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

**Transportation Development Act (TDA) Reserves:** This reserve fund is maintained in order to provide the full TDA allocations to TDA recipients in the event there is a shortfall in actual versus projected TDA revenues. Occasionally some TDA Reserve funds are allocated to a special project.
## Transportation Development Act (TDA) Estimates and Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY 06-07 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 07-08 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 08-09 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 10-11 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 11-12 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 13-14 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 14-15 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY 15-16 Auditor Controller Estimate</th>
<th>Difference of Actual to Estimate</th>
<th>Difference as % of Estimate</th>
<th>Cumulative % of Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>516,100</td>
<td>543,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>410,500</td>
<td>499,800</td>
<td>533,900</td>
<td>556,100</td>
<td>591,100</td>
<td>602,922</td>
<td>-1,622</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>99.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>688,100</td>
<td>724,300</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>547,300</td>
<td>666,400</td>
<td>711,800</td>
<td>741,500</td>
<td>788,200</td>
<td>803,964</td>
<td>-2,164</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>99.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>795,777</td>
<td>863,255</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>819,955</td>
<td>699,895</td>
<td>718,257</td>
<td>818,354</td>
<td>791,871</td>
<td>807,709</td>
<td>64,675</td>
<td>8.01%</td>
<td>102.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>522,100</td>
<td>599,500</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>458,300</td>
<td>486,400</td>
<td>556,500</td>
<td>596,900</td>
<td>616,700</td>
<td>629,034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>1,062,100</td>
<td>799,300</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>611,000</td>
<td>648,500</td>
<td>742,000</td>
<td>795,900</td>
<td>822,300</td>
<td>629,034</td>
<td>838,746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>644,010</td>
<td>638,280</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>776,432</td>
<td>804,308</td>
<td>733,930</td>
<td>732,985</td>
<td>719,449</td>
<td>733,838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN</td>
<td>584,700</td>
<td>583,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>465,300</td>
<td>502,700</td>
<td>510,100</td>
<td>534,300</td>
<td>557,700</td>
<td>601,300</td>
<td>580,629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td>777,600</td>
<td>778,200</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>620,400</td>
<td>670,300</td>
<td>680,100</td>
<td>712,400</td>
<td>728,800</td>
<td>801,800</td>
<td>758,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>583,478</td>
<td>543,629</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>607,400</td>
<td>510,760</td>
<td>625,667</td>
<td>632,278</td>
<td>802,890</td>
<td>739,331</td>
<td>835,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>488,600</td>
<td>494,300</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>385,100</td>
<td>412,600</td>
<td>441,300</td>
<td>475,600</td>
<td>504,100</td>
<td>524,400</td>
<td>524,826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>651,500</td>
<td>659,000</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>562,700</td>
<td>605,300</td>
<td>588,400</td>
<td>634,100</td>
<td>672,100</td>
<td>699,200</td>
<td>699,732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>734,297</td>
<td>652,069</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>605,859</td>
<td>631,912</td>
<td>756,557</td>
<td>759,038</td>
<td>780,261</td>
<td>853,689</td>
<td>812,340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,048,362</td>
<td>7,878,633</td>
<td>7,200,133</td>
<td>6,631,837</td>
<td>6,957,059</td>
<td>7,407,427</td>
<td>7,744,102</td>
<td>8,287,590</td>
<td>8,549,340</td>
<td>8,628,404</td>
<td>2,275,484</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>26.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Change</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>-2.11%</td>
<td>-8.61%</td>
<td>-7.89%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>7.02%</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>