Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

AGENDA

Thursday, June 4, 2015
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
Watsonville City Council Chambers
275 Main Street, Suite 400
Watsonville, CA

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

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

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

COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

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

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

2. Oral communications

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

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

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

CONSENT AGENDA

All items appearing on the consent agenda are considered to be minor or non-controversial and will be acted upon in one motion if no member of the RTC or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members of the Commission may raise questions, seek clarification or add directions to Consent Agenda items without removing the item from the Consent Agenda as long as no other Commissioner objects to the change.

MINUTES

4. Approve draft minutes of the May 7, 2015 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Accept draft minutes of the May 21, 2015 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

6. Receive information on the Unified Corridors Investment Study – Phase 1 Update

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

8. Approve amendments to the Fiscal Year 2014-15 Budget and Work Program (Resolution)
ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

9. Approve Executive Director’s Employment Agreement

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

10. Accept monthly meeting schedule

11. Accept correspondence log

12. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to Caltrans regarding City of Santa Cruz Active Transportation Program Grant Application for Branciforte Creek Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge from the RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee
   b. Letter to Caltrans regarding City of Watsonville Active Transportation Program Grant Application for Rail Trail Walker Street Project from the RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee
   c. Letter to Caltrans regarding RTC Active Transportation Program Grant Application for Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program from the RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee

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

14. Accept information items
   None

REGULAR AGENDA

15. Commissioner reports – oral reports

   (George Dondero, Executive Director)

17. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. District Director’s Report

18. Appreciation for completed murals on Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
   (Luis Mendez, Deputy Director)
   a. Staff Report
   b. Photos of completed murals
19. Draft Passenger Rail Feasibility Study  
(Karena Pushnik & Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planners)  
   a. Staff Report  
   c. Executive Summary  
   d. Fact Sheet  

20. Adjourn to special meeting of the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies  
   a. SAFE agenda attached separately  

21. Next meetings  

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 6, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the Scotts Valley City Council Chambers, 1 Civic Center Drive, Scotts Valley, CA.  

A special meeting of the Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, June 25, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the City of Santa Cruz Council Chambers, 809 Center Street, 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  

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
SCCRTC Agenda

June 4, 2015

- 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 http://sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/.

HOW TO REQUEST

❖ ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

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

❖ SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓÍN/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.
1. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m.

Members Present:
Aileen Loe (ex-officio) Ed Bottorff
Andy Schiffrin (alt.) Greg Caput
Bruce McPherson Jimmy Dutra
Cynthia Chase John Leopold
Dennis Norton Randy Johnson
Don Lane Zach Friend

Staff Present:
George Dondero
Luis Mendez Rachel Moriconi
Yesenia Parra Kim Schultz
Cory Caletti Jennifer Rodriguez
Karena Pushnik

2. Oral Communications

Jack Nelson, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, questioned whether there is evidence that highway construction leads to congestion relief.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Replacement page for Item 12, and additional pages for Items 18, 21, and 22 were distributed.

CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Schiffrin moved and Commissioner Lane seconded the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously, with Commissioners Norton, Lane, Johnson, Dutra, Caput, Friend, Leopold, McPherson, Chase, Bottorff and
Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin voting “aye”. Commissioner Friend and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin abstained from Item 4.

MINUTES

4. Approved draft minutes of the April 2, 2015 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

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

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

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

7. FY15-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 claims for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, the Ride ‘n’ Stride program, and the Bike to work program (Resolutions 22-15 and 23-15)

Item pulled by Commissioner Johnson. Chair Leopold placed the item on the regular agenda as item 17.1

8. Received Monterey Bay Region 2015 Public Participation Plan

9. Approved consultant contract for federal transportation/legislative assistant (Resolution 24-15)

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

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

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

12. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

13. Accepted correspondence log

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

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

16. Accepted information items

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

Commissioner Norton pulled item 16a. Chair Leopold placed the item on the regular agenda as item 17.2

**REGULAR AGENDA**

17. Commissioner reports

Commissioner Norton welcomed all. He shared his vision for the future of transportation stating that 40 feet behind the Capitola chambers, the rail corridor would be built to allow bicycle and pedestrian access and an option for a trolley.

17.1 Previously Item 7. In response to questions, Deputy Director Luis Mendez explained the process for putting items on the consent agenda versus the regular agenda, and the invoicing and monitoring process for the projects requesting funding.

Commissioner Johnson moved and Commissioner Alternate Schifferin seconded to adopt resolutions (**Resolutions 22-15 and 23-15**) approving claims for the FY 2015-16 TDA Article 8 funds for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, Ride ‘n Stride and Bike to Work programs. The motion passed unanimously, with Commissioners Norton, Lane, Johnson, Dutra, Caput, Friend, Leopold, McPherson, Chase, Bottorff and Commissioner Alternate Schifferin voting “aye”.

17.2 Previously Item 16a. Commissioner Norton asked staff to provide an update on the status of the Pajaro train station at a future meeting and directed staff to send a support letter for the Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s Tiger Grant application.
Commissioner Caput asked for an update on the needed track crossing repairs at Riverside Drive in Watsonville. Executive George Dondero responded that there are discussions with Iowa Pacific, the City of Watsonville and Caltrans currently underway.

18. Director’s Report – oral report

Executive Director George Dondero reported the following:

- The RTC was selected as a finalist for a $5 million Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) grant award for a rail trail segment west of Santa Cruz. He thanked The Santa Cruz County Land Trust and the Coastal Conservancy for their contribution to the required grant match.
- The RTC received a $230,000 Caltrans grant for community outreach using computer simulation and 3D software.
- Three agencies will receive Section 5310 grant funding thanks to the work of Transportation Planner Grace Blakeslee on the applications.
- Governor Brown’s new emission target will have an impact on RTC projects and impact other agencies.
- As part of Bike to Work Week, Ecology Action and Save-our-Shores sponsored a rail line clean up day with RTC staff participation.
- RTC provided funding for the Watsonville Open Streets event that will take place May 17, 2015;
- The RTC would be advertising for a paid intern for the summer

In addition, Mr. Dondero welcomed the RTC’s new Administrative Assistant, Jennifer Rodriguez

Commissioners congratulated staff on seeking and receiving several grants.

19. Caltrans report and consider action items

Aileen Loe noted the new issue of The Mile Marker Report: Caltrans Performance Report, 3rd edition was released. She noted the short fall in funding for projects under the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). She said the need is about $8 billion dollars just to preserve the current transportation system. However, the allocation of funds to the SHOPP is only $2 billion.

Commissioners thanked Caltrans for current safety projects in Ben Lomond; the process for median cleaning; City of Watsonville discussion on roundabouts; and crosswalks by St. Francis High School.

20. 9:30 PUBLIC HEARING 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs

Senior Transportation Planner Karena Pushnik presented the staff report. The RTC regularly solicits input to assess and prioritize the transportation needs of seniors, people with disabilities and low income individuals.
The Public Hearing was opened at 10:03 a.m. There were no public comments. Public hearing was closed at 10:04 a.m.

Commissioners discussed crossings at bus stops and analysis to compare previous years unmet needs.

Commissioner Friend moved and Commissioner Schiffrin seconded to adopt the 2015 Unmet Paratransit and Transit needs report and to consider unmet paratransit and transit needs as funding becomes available. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Norton, Lane, Johnson, Dutra, Caput, Friend, Leopold, McPherson, Chase, Bottorff and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin voting “aye”.

21. Bicycle Route Signage Program

Senior Transportation Planner Cory Caletti presented the staff report. Public outreach will be scheduled after phase 1 has been implemented.

Commissioners discussed the fine line between signs that serve as information and visual pollution; sign color requirements; total cost for sign implementation; including parallel routes; number of riders Santa Cruz County serves; changes to the proposed signs and presenting information to the Commission about the proposed grant application.

**Eric Child**, Santa Cruz pedestrian, said that the report seemed to ignore pedestrian needs and requested that the report make it clear that bicycle paths can and should be shared with pedestrians. He asked that funding be allocated for education so that the rules of the road would be better followed.

**Jack Nelson**, experienced bike rider, said that good signage would serve both bicycle riders and motorist. He also shared a letter from Amelia Conlen of Bike Santa Cruz County supporting the final report.

**Dan Attema**, asked if any of the signs would have to be redone once the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail was completed.

Commissioner Friend motioned and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin second to adopt the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage program-2015 Implementation Plan. Staff recommendation to adopt a resolution was delayed for the next upcoming RTC meeting.

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

22. Fiscal Year 2015-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims for the Volunteer Center, Community Bridges and Santa Cruz Metro

Senior Transportation Planner Karena Pushnik presented the staff report.
Kirk Ance, Community Bridges, Program Director said Lift Line provides 80 thousands rides per year.

Debbie Brooks, Volunteer Center Transportation Program, said that the program runs on volunteers who use their own vehicles. The service offers door to door rides for the most vulnerable seniors.

Alex Clifford, CEO of Metro, and Tom Hiltner, Grants/Legislative Analyst for METRO thanked the RTC for continued support and funding.

Commissioners discussed the effects on riders due to the METRO budget deficit; possible service cuts; sales tax measure to help with budget deficit; labor cost increases, concern for burdening the most vulnerable in the community and appreciation for the service that METRO provides.

Commissioner McPherson moved and Commissioner Friend seconded to adopt resolutions (Resolutions 24-15, 25-15, 26-15) to approve the FY 2015-16 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 funds claim in the amount of $626,561 from Community Bridges to provide transportation for seniors and people with disabilities, contingent on approval from the City of Santa Cruz to act as the claimant; and approving the FY 2015-16 TDA Article 8 funds claim in the amount of $74,591 from the Volunteer Center to administer the volunteer driver transportation program primarily serving seniors, contingent on approval from the City of Santa Cruz to acts as the claimant. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Norton, Lane, Johnson, Dutra, Caput, Friend, Leopold, McPherson, Chase, Bottorff and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin voting “aye”.

23. Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project

Executive Director George Dondero presented the staff report. He noted that Highway 17 traffic will not be disrupted as the tunneling will be done underneath the highway. Caltrans is working on the project initiation document while the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County is committed to raise $1 million dollars to complete the project.

Commissioner Caput departed the meeting.

Commissioners discussed the importance of making safe passages for wildlife and thanked the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County for their leadership on the project.

Commissioner Lane moved and Commissioner Schiffrin seconded to direct staff to send a letter of support to Caltrans to include the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing project on the 2016 State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) project list.

The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Norton, Lane, Johnson, Dutra, Friend, Leopold, McPherson, Chase, Bottorff and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin voting “aye”.
24. Federal Legislative Update

Commissioner Johnson departed the meeting.

Executive Director Dondero introduced Chris Giglio of Capital Edge. Mr. Giglio indicated that this is a critical time for transportation in Washington DC. He gave an update on legislation related to transportation and noted that having staff in Washington helps move projects forward.

25. Fiscal Year 2015-16 Overall Work Program

Deputy Director Luis Mendez presented the staff report.

Commissioner Schiffrin moved and Commissioner Lane seconded to approve the FY 2015-16 RTC Work Program and authorize the Executive Director to make revisions in response to comments from Caltrans consistent with the approved RTC budget. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Norton, Lane, Dutra, Caput, Friend, Leopold, McPherson, Chase, Bottorff and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin voting “aye”.

26. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

Commissioners adjourned to closed session at 10:45 a.m.

CLOSED SESSION

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

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

OPEN SESSION

29. Report on closed session

Commissioners reconvened to open session at 11:30 a.m. and there was no closed session report.

30. Meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m. Next meetings

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

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

Yesenia Parra, Staff

Attendees:

Eric Child
Tom Hiltner
Ray Cancino
Dan Medeiros
Lynn Lauridsen
Kirk Ance
Jack Nelson
Theresia Rogerson
Selena Garcia
Brian Peoples
Alex Clifford
Debbie Brooks
Dan Attema

METRO
Community Bridges
Land Trust of Santa Cruz County
Health Services Agency
Community Bridges/CTSA
Campaign for Sensible Transportation
County of Santa Cruz HSA/CTSC
County of Santa Cruz HAS/CTCS
METRO
Volunteer Center
1. Introductions

Chair Lane called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Members present:
Cynthia Chase  John Leopold
Don Lane  Greg Caput
Jimmy Dutra  Bruce McPherson
Andy Schiffrin (alt.)  Patrick Mulhearn (alt.)

Staff present:
George Dondero  Luis Mendez
Jennifer Rodriguez  Yesenia Parra
Karena Pushnik  Rachel Moriconi

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, encouraged Commissioners to believe the science on the carbon problem and consider it in their decision making.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Handouts were distributed for Item 5.

CONSENT AGENDA

No consent items
REGULAR AGENDA

Chair Lane moved Item 5 before Item 4.

4. Independent Polling of Voters for a Potential 2016 Ballot Measure
   (*Taken out of order after item 5*)

George Dondero, Executive Director, introduced Bill Tysseling, Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce, who introduced, Rich Pickard, General Counsel for Plantronics, Gary Merrill, and Interim Executive Director for the Santa Cruz County Business Council, and David Metz, partner with Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz and Associates.

Mr. Tysseling said that Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz and Associates conducted the polling survey. He said that population growth in Santa Cruz is having serious impacts on transportation. He also said that traffic congestion is a major deterrent to workforce and tourist attraction.

Commissioner Dutra arrived

Mr. Metz reviewed the survey results noting that the results indicate that the community supports a tax measure and that a strong campaign would be needed to ensure success.

Commissioners discussed time commitment, demographic factors of the community, and the impact of current events on survey results, and opposition to the tax increase affecting a campaign. They thanked the Business Council, Santa Cruz Chamber and Plantronics for sponsoring and working on the survey.

Responding to a question, Mr. Dondero stated that $15-16 million is the estimate for revenue generation with the tax measure. Mr. Tysseling will work closely with commissioners on next steps. Mr. Dondero said that details about the next steps and the plan for the tax measure would be discussed at upcoming TPW meetings.

Bill Malone, asked if there was evidence that widening Highway 1 would alleviate congestion.

Brian Peoples, agreed that widening Highway 1 would help with traffic congestion and supports the tax measure if the rail is not put in Aptos.

Jack Nelson, supports the tax measure. He also said congestion on Highway 1 is a serious problem and passed out information on a traffic study.

Piet Canin, Ecology Action, supports the tax measure and questioned the language of child safety in the poll and stated that the Rail Trail is a priority to the biking business community.
Paul Elerick, said the most important thing the Commission can do is be honest and detailed about plans with funds generated by the sales tax measure.

Bill Malone, said that he believes the business community should pay for their own economic interests in alleviating traffic congestion. He will not vote for the sales tax measure.

Randy Jones, Santa Cruz resident, asked how much time it will take to make improvements once there is funding and if those surveyed are aware of the time frame.

Kate Roberts, asked if there was anything unusual found in the survey results.

5. Golden Gate Railroad Museum (GGRM) presentation
   (taken out of order before item 4)

   Luis Mendez, Deputy Director, gave a brief summary on the proposal from the Golden Gate Railroad Museum (GGRM). Eric Child introduced the GGRM team: David Varley, Vice President, James Swafford, Fiscal Officer, and Garrett Brisbee, President.

   The Golden Gate Railroad Museum (GGRM) is a non-profit organization dedicated to the preservation of the legacy of Northern California railroad history. GGRM has expressed interest in relocating their museum and operations to the City of Santa Cruz and has been in negotiations with RTC staff, Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway, and the City of Santa Cruz.

   GGRM’s proposal will augment activities already offered by the Seaside Company and Big Trees. It plans to offer train excursions, educational programs and attractions for train enthusiast. Their proposal also includes improvements to the RTC rail property as well as new construction in the City of Santa Cruz and on the RTC rail property.

   Commissioners discussed the experience required to fundraise for this type of proposal, the benefits to the community, and requested that construction plans include the historic depot building.

   Brian Peoples, Aptos Rail Trail, said the GGRM proposal is viable and good for the community. He said that the plan to have a trail along the rail line is not feasible in Aptos and the tracks should be removed to allow for more space for the trail.

   Bill Malone, supports GGRM’s proposal and thinks it’s another attraction for Santa Cruz County. He does not support removal of the train tracks.
Becky Steinbruner, Santa Cruz County resident, supports GGRM’s move to Santa Cruz and seconds the motion to keep the tracks, stating rail and trail can coexist.

Kate Roberts, community member, asked GGRM if there are other areas being considered for GGRM’s relocation and if they had reviewed the Depot Park plan.

Jack Nelson, questioned if GGRM’s proposal would conflict or augment the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail plan and encouraged the RTC to ensure the plans integrate well.

Tom Padula, resident of Ben Lomond, thanked the RTC for the GGRM’s presentation and supports their relocation to Santa Cruz. He had been to GGRM’s Niles Canyon excursion and the tourism population is surprising. Mr. Padula believes the rail and trail can coexist and supports having rail service.

Paul Elerick, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, stated that he believes the GGRM’s Depot Park plan should be expanded further.

James Swofford, supports preservation of the track. He said the Commission is in a better position to seek funding for commuter services. Mr. Swofford pointed out that donated materials and services become the property of the Commission and branch line and qualify as local match towards grants such as the TIGER grant and other federal funding.

6. Amendments to Purchase and Sale Agreement with Union Pacific

Deputy Director, Luis Mendez presented the staff report.

Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin moved and Commission Dutra seconded to authorize the Executive Director to amend the purchase and sale agreement with Union Pacific to extend the date to resolve a rail line contamination issue with Granite Construction for one year to June 1, 2016.

The motion passed unanimously, with Commissioners Chase, Lane, Leopold, Caput, Mulhearn, McPherson and Dutra and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin voting “aye.”

7. Bike Route Signage Grant

Deputy Director Luis Mendez presented the staff report.

Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin moved and Commissioner Leopold seconded to approve a resolution authorizing the submittal of an application to the Active Transportation Program for implementation of the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program, authorizing the Executive Director or designee to execute and submit necessary agreements for implementation of the Active
Transportation Program project, and authorizing $50,000 in funds programmed in the FY 14-15 budget as a local match to the grant funding request to increase the competitiveness of the application.

The motion passed (Resolution 28-15) unanimously, with Commissioners Chase, Lane, Leopold, Caput, Mulhearn, Dutra and McPherson, Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin voting “aye.”

8. Passenger Rail Study Update (Oral Report)

Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner, distributed the draft Passenger Rail Study report. She noted that the public comment period is open until July 8th. She said that the results of the study would be presented at the June 4th RTC meeting by the consultant and that a public workshop is also scheduled for June 4th starting at 6:30 pm at the Simpkins Swim Center in Live Oak.

9. Meeting adjourned at 11:31 a.m.

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

The next meeting of the Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, June 25, 2015 at 9:00 am at the City of Santa Cruz Council Chambers, 809 Center St., Santa Cruz, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra, Staff

Attendees:

Heather Adamson  AMBAG
Nathan Goodman  Roaring Camp Railroad
Cliff Waters  Roaring Camp Railroad
David Varley  Golden Gate Railroad Museum
Eric Child  Golden Gate Railroad Museum
James Swafford  Golden Gate Railroad Museum
Garrett Brisbee  Golden Gate Railroad Museum
Paul Elerick  CFST
Piet Canin  Ecology Action
Tom Padula  Ben Lomond resident
Gary Merrill  Santa Cruz County Business Council
Jack Nelson  Campaign for Sensible Transportation
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Ginger Dykaar and Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planners
RE: Unified Corridors Investment Study- Phase 1 Update

RECOMMENDATION

RTC staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) receive information on Phase 1 of the Unified Corridors Investment Study.

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) was awarded a Partnership Planning grant of $211,085 from Caltrans for Phase I of the Unified Corridors Plan. The purpose of the Unified Corridors Plan (Phases I and II) is to identify transportation investments that optimize usage of the three parallel north-south transportation corridors in Santa Cruz County: Highway 1, Soquel Drive/Avenue and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, while advancing sustainability targets. Phase I of the project is to develop the modeling tools and Phase II will use the modeling tools to identify transportation investments that advance sustainable transportation targets. Following RTC and Board of Supervisors approval in December 2014, RTC entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the County of Santa Cruz to establish the roles, responsibilities and funding contributions associated with procurement and oversight of services for development of Santa Cruz County Modeling Tools. In March 2015, RTC entered into an agreement with Fehr & Peers to develop Santa Cruz County Transportation Modeling Tools for a total of $250,000. The Caltrans planning grant dedicated to the project will provide $150,000 for the work in that agreement. The County of Santa Cruz, as a funding and key project partner, will contribute $100,000 towards this project.

DISCUSSION

Interactive Survey

To ensure broad public participation on the Unified Corridors Investment Plan project, an interactive survey was designed and made available on the SCCRTC website. The interactive survey sought public input on the community’s values and uses for each of the three corridors included in the Unified Corridors Investment Plan. The survey queried the public about their visions for the best use of each corridor (including mode, trip length, trip purpose) and what improvements were needed to realize these visions. The public input will inform the Unified Corridors Investment Study goals, policies and performance measures to determine where funding should be prioritized on these corridors.
A summary of the results of the survey can be found in Attachment 1. The survey was open for the month of April. Nine hundred and ninety one people participated in the survey online. One survey was completed at the public workshop. The majority of the survey participants stated that the most important aspects of travel on both Highway 1 and Soquel Drive are safety, travel time and travel time reliability. The majority of the people surveyed stated that they are much more likely to use Highway 1 for accessing jobs and commercial centers, Soquel Ave/Dr for accessing local streets and neighborhoods, and the rail line for accessing recreation areas/beaches. Over 70% of survey participants said that passenger rail service is needed to improve transit. Approximately 70% of survey participants said that dedicated bicycle paths are needed to improve bicycle access along these corridors. Between 50 and 60% of survey participants stated that new sidewalks and pedestrian crossings are needed to improve pedestrian access along these corridors. Over 50% of survey participants said that improved signal synchronization is needed for automobile facility improvements. Over 40% of survey participants said that park and ride lots and high occupancy vehicle lanes on Highway 1 are needed to improve automobile facilities.

Public Workshop

RTC staff also designed and hosted a public workshop that was held on April 16, 2015 in Capitola. The workshop included a presentation, large group, and small group discussions about the community’s values and priority uses for each of the three corridors included in the Unified Corridors Investment Plan. The public provided input on their primary destinations along these three corridors, their most important concern when traveling, and the transportation improvements that are needed along each corridor (Attachment 2). The input obtained from the workshop will inform the performance measures and the transportation investments to be analyzed during Phase 2 of the Unified Corridors Investment Plan project.

Santa Cruz County Transportation Modeling Tools Development

The primary objective for developing Santa Cruz County transportation modeling tools during Phase 1 of the Unified Corridors Plan is to provide a fully functioning, non-proprietary, transportation model to analyze the multimodal transportation projects that will improve the local transportation system. Project objectives consider the Unified Corridors Investment Plan project goals, and the transportation modeling needs of local jurisdictions, Santa Cruz Metro and Caltrans. Santa Cruz County Transportation Modeling Tools will be designed to:

- Forecast the performance of the local transportation system as a result of future transportation and land use projects.
- Evaluate the impacts of multimodal transportation investments on sustainable transportation goals using performance measures.
- Inform decision makers and public about impacts of multimodal transportation investments along and between Santa Cruz County’s primary north and south transportation corridors.
- Enable local jurisdictions to independently conduct traffic impacts studies.
- Meet state and federal requirements for obtaining performance data to support request for transportation funding.
- Address challenges with measuring vehicle miles traveled at the local and project level to support development of sustainable transportation plans, climate action...
plans and, if appropriate, transportation analysis for the California Environmental Quality Act consistent with SB 743.

A model kick-off meeting was held on March 17, 2015 to update the local jurisdictions on the project and receive their input. RTC staff and Fehr & Peers have been reviewing data requirements, the availability and quality of data, and opportunities for new data collection. Existing traffic count data has been compiled and is being prepared for integration into the travel demand model. Highway and local roadway traffic counts including motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian have been made available from Caltrans, local jurisdictions and RTC. Transit data, American Community Survey data, household travel survey data are also being reviewed to determine any gaps in data. Additional traffic count data will be collected as needed to fill in any data gaps.

**RTC staff recommends that the RTC receive information on Phase 1 of the Unified Corridors Investment Study.**

**SUMMARY**

Phase 1 of the Unified Corridors Plan is being conducted to develop transportation modeling tools for Santa Cruz County. An interactive survey and a public workshop were held to solicit broad public participation. Fehr & Peers and RTC staff are currently in the data gathering and collection phase of the project and preparing the data for integration into the travel demand model.

**Attachments**
1. Summary of the Unified Corridors Investment Plan Survey Results
2. Summary of the Unified Corridors Investment Plan Public Workshop Results
Survey Information:
- County Population 271,804 (2014 U.S. Census estimate)
- 992 survey participants
- Survey accessed online at www.sccrtc.org
- Available April 1- April 30, 2015
- Input received will be considered when analyzing projects for the Unified Corridors Plan

Project Description: Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive, and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line are parallel transportation routes in Santa Cruz County between downtown Santa Cruz and Freedom Boulevard. The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is studying how these routes can work together as one unified corridor and serve the travel needs of Santa Cruz County residents and visitors. The area south of Freedom Boulevard where the three corridors diverge from one another is not included in this study.

Survey: Participate in this survey and tell us what transportation improvements on these routes would make Santa Cruz County's transportation system serve you better. Your input will guide development of the Unified Corridors Plan.
1. Where do you usually travel? On the map below, circle the two highlighted areas nearest to your destinations, even if it is not within the radius of the circle shown.

![Map of Santa Cruz County with highlighted areas](image)

2. How often do you travel on Soquel Avenue/Drive?

- Never
- Less than once a month
- One to three times per month
- One to four times per week
- Five or more times per week

![Bar chart showing frequency of travel](image)
3. How do you usually make this trip now on Soquel Avenue/Drive?

![Graph showing mode of transportation](image)

4. What is the closest starting point and ending point for this trip on Soquel Avenue/Drive. Select from the numbered points on the map below.

Starting point ___________ Ending point__________

![Map of Soquel Avenue/Drive with numbered points](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Point</th>
<th>1-Front</th>
<th>2-Morrissey</th>
<th>3-Capitola Rd.</th>
<th>4-Hwy 1 Interchange</th>
<th>5-41st</th>
<th>6-Park Ave.</th>
<th>7-State Park</th>
<th>8-Freedom</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trip you usually take on Soquel Avenue/Drive</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending Point</th>
<th>1-Front</th>
<th>2-Morrissey</th>
<th>3-Capitola Rd.</th>
<th>4-Hwy 1 Interchange</th>
<th>5-41st</th>
<th>6-Park Ave.</th>
<th>7-State Park</th>
<th>8-Freedom</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trip you usually take on Soquel Avenue/Drive</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How important are the following to you when traveling on Soquel Avenue/Drive.

![Bar chart showing importance ratings]

6. How often do you travel on any portion of Highway 1 between Mission Street and Freedom Boulevard?

![Bar chart showing frequency of travel]
7. How do you usually make this trip now on Highway 1?

8. What is the closest starting point and ending point for this trip on Highway 1. Select from the numbered points on the map below.

Starting point _________ Ending point________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Point Answer Options</th>
<th>1-Hwy 17 or Mission St.</th>
<th>2-Morrissey</th>
<th>3-Soquel</th>
<th>4-41st</th>
<th>5-Park Ave.</th>
<th>6-State Park</th>
<th>7-Freedom</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trip you usually take on Highway 1</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending Point Answer Options</th>
<th>1-Hwy 17 or Mission St.</th>
<th>2-Morrissey</th>
<th>3-Soquel</th>
<th>4-41st</th>
<th>5-Park Ave.</th>
<th>6-State Park</th>
<th>7-Freedom</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trip you usually take on Highway 1</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Please rate how important the following are to you when traveling on Highway 1.

10. How often would you travel on a multiuse bicycle and pedestrian path next to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line?
11. If there is a multiuse bicycle and pedestrian path next to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, what would be the closest starting and ending point of your trip? Select from the numbered points on the map below.
Starting point _________ Ending point________

12. Of these three routes, which route are you most likely to use to access:

![Bar chart showing route preferences]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel Avenue/Drive</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. What type of transit improvements are needed on Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive or the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line?

Survey responders also listed “Other” transit improvements including: high occupancy vehicle lanes on Hwy 1, transit signal priority, reduce cost, add routes for improved access to employers/schools, transit connections between Hwy 1, Soquel and rail line corridors, train access to Silicon Valley, smaller buses with neighborhood routes, safer bike and pedestrian access to bus stops, better on time transit performance, personal rapid transit, do not take away car lanes for dedicated transit lanes, nicer buses, more park & ride lots, and reduced speed for buses in certain areas.
14. Which location needs improvements to transit service the most? Choose one of the numbered locations on either Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive, or the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Select from the numbered segments on the map below. Location for improvement – segment #_________.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Highway 1</th>
<th>1-Hwy 17 to 41st</th>
<th>2-41st to State Park</th>
<th>3-State Park to Soquel Avenue/Drive</th>
<th>4-Front to Hwy 1 to Park Ave.</th>
<th>5-Hwy 1 to Park Ave.</th>
<th>6-Park Ave. to Freedom</th>
<th>Santa Cruz Branch</th>
<th>7-Santa Cruz Wharf to 8-17th to 47th</th>
<th>9-47th to Seascape</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select one location</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. What type of bicycle improvements are needed on Soquel Avenue/Drive or the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line?

Survey responders also listed “Other” bicycle improvements including: bike path separate from pedestrian path, unpaved trail along rail line, bicycle priority traffic signals, bicyclists required to have license, remove tracks on the rail line and build the bike/ped trail, bicyclists safety education, motorist awareness education for bicyclists safety, traffic law enforcement for bicyclists, charge bike tax, Chanticleer Ave bike/ped bridge and Mar Vista bike/ped bridge over Hwy 1, intersection redesign to improve bicyclists safety, bike lane maintenance, increase the “share the road” signage for motorists, reduce the “share the road” concept as it is dangerous, westbound bike path near Brookwood Dr, share sidewalks with pedestrians, and traffic calming.
16. Which location needs improvements to bicycle facilities the most? Choose one of the numbered locations on Soquel Avenue/Drive or the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Select from the numbered segments on the map below. Location for improvement – segment #_________.

![Map showing numbered locations for bicycle facility improvements.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Soquel Avenue/Driv</th>
<th>4- Front to Hwy 1</th>
<th>5- Hwy 1 to Park Ave.</th>
<th>6- Park Ave. to Freedom</th>
<th>Santa Cruz Branch Rail</th>
<th>7- Santa Cruz Wharf to 17th</th>
<th>8- 17th to 47th</th>
<th>9- 47th to Seascape</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select one location</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. What type of pedestrian improvements are needed on Soquel Avenue/Drive or the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line?
Survey responders also listed “Other” pedestrian improvements including: improved ADA accessibility, bike path separate from pedestrian path, lighted crosswalks, multiuse trail striping to designate pedestrian zones, sidewalk maintenance, improved intersection design for pedestrians, police rail trail once built for safety, Mar Vista bike/ped bridge, more speed limit signs to reduce traffic speeds, more bike/ped bridges over Hwy 1, prioritization of bicyclist/pedestrians on roadways, remove barriers on sidewalks such as phone poles and trees, reduce motor vehicle speeds, motorist awareness education for pedestrian safety, and timed crossing indicators.

18. Which location needs improvements to pedestrian facilities the most? Choose one of the numbered locations on Soquel Avenue/Drive or the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Select from the numbered segments on the map below. Location for improvement – segment #__________.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Soquel Avenue/Drive</th>
<th>4- Front to Hwy 1</th>
<th>5- Hwy 1 to Park Ave.</th>
<th>6- Park Ave. to Freedom</th>
<th>Santa Cruz Branch Rail</th>
<th>7- Santa Cruz Wharf to 17th</th>
<th>8- 17th to 47th</th>
<th>9- 47th to Seascape</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select one location</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. What type of automobile facility improvements are needed on Highway 1 or Soquel Avenue/Drive?

Survey responders also listed “Other” improvements including: widen Highway 1, roundabouts, more stop signs instead of roundabouts, ridesharing education, roadway maintenance, medians to prevent left hand turns out of commercial areas, Hwy 1 overpass at River St into Harvey West, remove the Soquel “hump” on Hwy 1, and school bus service.

20. Which location needs improvements to automobile facilities the most?
Choose one of the numbered locations on Soquel Avenue/Drive or Highway 1. Select from the numbered segments on the map below. Location for improvement – segment #_________.

Survey responders also listed “Other” improvements including: widen Highway 1, roundabouts, more stop signs instead of roundabouts, ridesharing education, roadway maintenance, medians to prevent left hand turns out of commercial areas, Hwy 1 overpass at River St into Harvey West, remove the Soquel “hump” on Hwy 1, and school bus service.
21. If the improvements you suggested are made, which route would you usually take for your trip?

- Highway 1: 35%
- Soquel Avenue/Drive: 15%
- Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line: 50%

22. If the improvements you suggested are made, which mode would you usually take for your trip?

- Automobile: 45%
- Transit: 15%
- Bicycling: 40%
- Walking: 0%
23. Where do you live in Santa Cruz County?

24. What is your age?

25. What is your employment status? Are you:
The bar chart shows the percentage distribution of respondents by employment status:

- **Employed Full-Time**: 60.0%
- **Employed Part-Time**: 10.0%
- **Retired**: 20.0%
- **A Student**: 0.0%
- **Something Else**: 5.0%

The chart indicates a significant majority of respondents are employed full-time.
Workshop Information:

- April 16, 2015 from 6:30pm to 8:00 pm
- Mid-County Senior Center, 829 Bay Avenue, Capitola
- 26 Participants
- Presentation and small and large group discussions
- Input received will be considered when analyzing projects for the Unified Corridors Plan

1 - Identify what type of transportation improvements are needed on each transportation route.

Transit

Highway 1
- Express transit – Live Oak to Watsonville
- Elevated light rail along Hwy 1 from UCSC to Airport Blvd

Soquel Ave/Dr
- Better connections are needed at every bus stop
- Faster travel times
- Greater frequency
- Bus stop improvements
- More routes – better connections
- Express transit – Live Oak to Watsonville

Rail Line
- Bikes on train
- Connection to CA rail
- Passenger rail
- Rail from Watsonville to UCSC
- Express transit – Live Oak to Watsonville

Other locations
- More stops at Pacific Shores - Bus #20
- Ferry from Seascape to 41st Ave
- Buses in neighborhoods
- Improved transit connections from Metro Center to VTA
- Light rail from Santa Cruz to San Jose

Bike

Highway 1
- Fenced bike lanes along rail line
- Mar Vista bike/ped bridge
Soquel Ave/Dr
- Buffered bike lanes
- Wider bike lanes
- Fill gaps in bike lanes
- Remove street parking to make room for wider bike lanes
- Green lane treatments through intersections and near highway on ramps

Rail Line
- Minimize car crossing along rail line
- Separated bike paths
- Construct rail trail

Other
- Safer bike lanes on 41st Ave

Automobile

Highway 1
- Toll booths along Hwy 1 (and 17)
- Widen highway
- Auxiliary lane between Soquel and 41st Ave
- Park and Ride lots

Soquel Ave/Dr
- Improve intersection at Soquel Ave and Frederick St.

Other
- Widen Hwy 17 to 6 lanes

Pedestrian

Rail Line
- Construct safe rail trail for walking
- Construct a better walking path across trestle over San Lorenzo River

Other
- Improve pedestrian path along Mar Vista from Hwy 1 to Seacliff
- New sidewalk connections - Rio Del Mar to Seascape
- New sidewalk connections - Speckles to Soquel
- New sidewalk connections – Summer and Clubhouse Dr
- Improved crosswalks across 41st
- Improved walking path near Shaffer Rd.
2 - Identify what is most important to you when traveling on these routes:

**Soquel Ave/Dr**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability: make it easier to predict how long it will take to get places</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety: reduce conflicts between cars, bicycles and pedestrians</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel times: reduce how long it takes to get places</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit services: provide transit connections</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low cost transportation options: make it less expensive to travel</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highway 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability: make it easier to predict how long it will take to get places</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety: reduce conflicts between cars, bicycles and pedestrians</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel times: reduce how long it takes to get places</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit services: provide transit connections</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low cost transportation options: make it less expensive to travel</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rail Line**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability: make it easier to predict how long it will take to get places</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety: reduce conflicts between cars, bicycles and pedestrians</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel times: reduce how long it takes to get places</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit services: provide transit connections</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low cost transportation options: make it less expensive to travel</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTH</td>
<td>FY13 - 14 ACTUAL REVENUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>556,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>741,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>818,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>596,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>795,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>732,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>557,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>728,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>802,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>504,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>672,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>780,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,287,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
I:\FISCAL\TDA\MonthlyReceipts\[FY14 - 15.xlsx]FY2014
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
RE: Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014-15 Budget & Work Program

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the amended FY 2014-15 budget and work program as shown on Exhibit A to Attachment 1.

BACKGROUND

In March 2014, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approved a budget for fiscal year (FY) 2014-15. The RTC has made amendments to the budget as necessary. Due to specific project needs it is currently necessary to consider amendments to the FY 2014-15 budget and work program.

DISCUSSION

Highway 1 Construction: Construction of auxiliary lanes on Highway 1 between Soquel Drive and Morrissey Boulevard was completed. Some additional work and closeout items remained which RTC staff and the construction management consultant have been working through with the contractor. Since the final work items have been completed, RTC must now pay for some of those items and the retention to the contractor. In addition, RTC has received the final invoice from the California Highway Patrol for enforcement associated with the project. The amount of enforcement was greater than anticipated. In order to pay for these invoices it is necessary to move funds from the contingency budget line to the budget lines corresponding to the completed work.

Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX): The RTC has an agreement with the State of California to receive state funds which can be used to deliver projects instead of federal funds programmed to the projects by the RTC. These funds are known as Regional Surface Transportation Exchange (RSTPX) funds. Participating in this exchange of funds allows the project sponsors to deliver the projects more quickly because they do not have to go through the federal process. Since the state already must go through the federal process for a variety of projects, the state uses the federal funds for its projects. At the end of each fiscal year Caltrans provides the RTC with the RSTPX funds that are available for that year. $2,927,837 is available in this fiscal year under this program and the RTC must amend its budget to incorporate these funds.
Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the amended FY 2014-15 budget and work program as shown on Exhibit A to Attachment 1.

SUMMARY

Due to specific project needs it is necessary to consider amendments to the FY 2014-15 budget and work program. Staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approved the proposed amended FY 2014-15 budget and work program as shown on Attachment 1.

Attachments:
   1. Resolution approving the proposed amended FY 2014-15 budget

S:\RTC\TC2015\TC0615\BudgAmd\FY1415BudgAmend.docx
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of June 4, 2015
on the motion of Commissioner Caput
duly seconded by Commissioner Coonerty

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2014-15 BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM FOR THE
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

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

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

1. The FY 2014-15 Budget and Work Program for the Santa Cruz County Regional
Transportation Commission (RTC) are hereby amended as shown in Exhibit A.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

John Leopold, Chair

ATTEST:

George Dondero, Secretary

Attachments: Exhibit A - SCCRTC FY 2014-15 Budget and Work Program as amended
Distribution: RTC Fiscal
AMBAG

S:\RESOLUTI2015\RES0615\BUDWPAMEND FY14-15doc.doc
## Highway 1 Construction: 722200

### FY 2014-2015 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #683</th>
<th>FY14-15 Approved 10/02/14</th>
<th>FY14-15 Approved 06/04/15</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>6 STIP Construction</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CMIA Construction</td>
<td>1,099,087</td>
<td>1,099,087</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,249,087</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,249,087</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,249,087</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,249,087</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Services and Supplies:

**Hwy 1 Morrissey-Soquel Aux Lane Construction:**

- Construction contract with contingency: 597,892, 677,925, 80,033 - To pay final invoices for retention and extra work
- Supplemental construction activity: 0, 0, 0
- Traffic management: 0, 0, 0
- Traffic enforcement: 50,000, 65,510, 15,510 - To pay final invoice from the CHP
- Miscellaneous other: 0, 0, 0
- Construction management consultant: 140,000, 140,000, 0
- Construction design support: 40,000, 40,000, 0
- On Call Consultants: 120,000, 120,000, 0
- General Contingency: 226,195, 130,652, -95,543 - To construction contract and traffic enforcement budget lines

**Subtotal Services & Supplies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14-15 Approved 06/04/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,249,087</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unappropriated Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14-15 Approved 06/04/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RSTP EXCHANGE PROGRAM: 722000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #101</th>
<th>FY14-15 APPROVED</th>
<th>FY14-15 APPROVED D</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/02/14</td>
<td>06/04/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### REVENUES:

- State RSTP Exchange Funds: $2,927,837 - FY 2014/15 funds per Caltrans agreement for exchange of programmed projects
- Interest: $30,000
- RSTP Exchange Funds Budgeted - Carryover: $10,280,013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL REVENUES</th>
<th>10,310,013</th>
<th>13,237,850</th>
<th>2,927,837</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURES:

- City of Capitola
  - Clares Street Traffic Calming: $100,000
  - 38th Avenue Rehabilitation: $438,000
- Santa Cruz METRO Mainline Routes Runtime Recal: $30,000
- City of Santa Cruz
  - Soquel Ave at Frederick St Intersection Modifications: $188,000
  - Broadway-Brommer/Arana Gulch Bike/Pedestrian Path: $390,000
- City of Scotts Valley
  - Scotts Valley Dr Slurry Seal and Restriping: $225,000
  - Mt. Hermon Rd/Scotts Valley Dr/Whispering Pines Dr Intersection: $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: $278,000
  - Apts Village Plan Improvements: $690,000
  - Davenport Road Repairs: $218,822
  - Empire Grade 2" Layer Seal: City of SC limits to 130' N of Heller Dr: $218,000
  - Empire Grade 2" Layer Seal (130' north of Heller Dr to 0.79 mi north of Locatelli Rd): $187,000
  - Green Valley Rd 3" Layer Seal: Devon Ln to Melody Ln (0.58 mi): $173,000
  - Mt. Hermon Rd 3" Layer Seal: Graham Hill to 1000' N of Locatelli Rd: $780,000
  - Bear Creek Rd Surface Seal (PM 4.75-PM 7.0): $492,738
  - Capitola Road Slurry Seal (30th-17th Ave): $289,000
  - Porter Street Overlay: Capitola Limits to 268' N/O Soquel Dr: $227,000
  - Portola Drive Cape Seal: E. Cliff to 24th: $200,000
  - Summit Rd Chip Seal (Soquel-San Jose Rd-Old SC Hwy): $450,000
  - County of Santa Cruz Open Street - HUB: $47,637

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>9,035,198</th>
<th>9,035,198</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Unappropriated Revenues: $30,000 - FY 2014/15 funds per Caltrans agreement for exchange of programmed projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unobligated Funds</th>
<th>1,244,815</th>
<th>1,244,815</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES:**

| 10,310,013 | 13,237,850 | 2,927,837 |
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### HIGHWAY 1 CONSTRUCTION
#### FY 2014-2015 BUDGET

### HWY 1 CONSTRUCTION: 722200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #683</th>
<th>FY14-15 APPROVED 10/02/14</th>
<th>FY14-15 APPROVED 06/04/15</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 STIP Construction</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CMIA Construction</td>
<td>1,099,087</td>
<td>1,099,087</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,249,087</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,249,087</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services and Supplies:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,174,087</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Other Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,249,087</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP EXCHANGE PROGRAM: 722000</td>
<td>FY14-15 APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ELEMENT #101</td>
<td>10/02/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 State RSTP Exchange Funds</td>
<td>2,927,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Interest</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 RSTP Exchange Funds Budgeted - Carryover</td>
<td>10,280,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>10,310,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 City of Capitola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 38th Avenue Rehabilitation</td>
<td>438,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Santa Cruz METRO Mainline Routes Runtime Recal</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Soquel Ave at Frederick St Intersection Modifications</td>
<td>188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Broadway-Brommer/Arana Gulch Bike/Pedestrian Path</td>
<td>390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Scotts Valley Dr Slurry Seal and Restriping</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Mt. Hermon Rd/Scotts Valley Dr/Whispering Pines Dr Intersection</td>
<td>346,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 City of Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Freedom Blvd Reconstruction (Broadis to Alta Vista Ave)</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Calabasas Road Bike/Pedestrian</td>
<td>9,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Apts Village Plan Improvements</td>
<td>690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Davenport Road Repairs</td>
<td>218,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Empire Grade 2&quot; Layer Seal: City of SC limits to 130' N of Heller</td>
<td>218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Empire Grade 2&quot; Layer Seal (130’ north of Heller Dr to 0.79 mi north)</td>
<td>187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Bear Creek Rd Surface Seal (PM 4.75-PM 7.0)</td>
<td>492,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Porter Street Overlay: Capitola Limits to 286’ N/O Soquel Dr</td>
<td>227,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Portola Drive Cape Seal: E. Cliff to 24th</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Summit Rd Chip Seal (Soquel-San Jose Rd-Old SC Hwy)</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 County of Santa Cruz Open Street - HUB</td>
<td>47,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Park and Ride Lot Program</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>60,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Highway 1 HOV Lanes PAVED</td>
<td>870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Commute Solutions Rideshare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 South County Youth Bike Safety Training (Eco Act)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Boilage/Active 4me - Ecology Action</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 TOTAL PROJECT EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>9,035,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Unappropriated Revenues:</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Unobligated Funds</td>
<td>1,244,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>10,310,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA: June 4, 2015

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: John Leopold, Chair
RE: Executive Director’s Employment Agreement

RECOMMENDATIONS

The ad-hoc Committee on the Executive Director’s performance recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the following changes in the RTC Executive Director’s contract:

1. Annual 2% COLA increase for three consecutive years, beginning April 1, 2015.
2. One time merit increase of 6%, effective April 1, 2015.
3. These changes to remain in effect through April 6, 2018.

BACKGROUND

RTC Executive Director, George Dondero has been employed by the RTC as an at-will employee under a contract executed on March 7, 2006 and amended June 26, 2013. On April 28, 2015 the ad-hoc performance evaluation committee appointed by the Chair met to discuss the Executive Director’s performance and to consider changes to his contract.

DISCUSSION

The ad-hoc performance evaluation committee, comprised of the Chair and Commissioners McPherson and Lane, collected evaluation forms from other commissioners, and discussed his performance with the Executive Director. The committee unanimously agreed to recommend the following changes to the Executive Director’s contract:

1. RTC agrees to pay an annual 2% COLA for three years consecutive, beginning April 1, 2015. Comparable to the RTC Association of Middle Management (RAMM) contract extension, approved by the RTC March 5, 2015.
2. RTC agrees to pay one time merit increase of 6%, effective April 1, 2015. Similar to the RAMM parity adjustment of 5.8% spread over a three year contract for the same time period, approved by the RTC March 5, 2015.
3. RTC will maintain the same level of benefits as outlined in the existing contract.
4. RTC agrees to pay same percentage of benefit premiums as outlined in the labor agreements based on premiums for each year.
5. These terms to remain in effect through April 6, 2018.
All other terms of the existing contract shall remain effective for the period of this extension.

The ad-hoc committee recommends that the RTC approve the above changes to the Executive Director’s compensation and authorize the RTC Chair to sign a contract amendment incorporating these changes. As with the existing contract there is no termination date.

SUMMARY

The RTC Chair appointed an ad-hoc committee to discuss changes in compensation for the Executive Director. The committee recommends that the RTC approve changes to the compensation package to include 2% COLA increases in 2015, 2016 and 2017, a merit increase of 6% effective April 1, 2015.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE

June 2015
Through
September 2015

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Day</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Meeting Time</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/4/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/15</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9/15</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Watsonville RTC Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/11/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/6/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Scotts Valley City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10/15</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11/15</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/15</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Safe on 17/Traffic Operations Systems</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
</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

"S:\RTC\TC2015\TC0615\2015-06-02-three-month-meeting-schedule.docx"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Letter &amp; 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>04/02/15</td>
<td>Email I CS 04/09/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soquel Drive/Porter Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/15</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>Appreciation for RTC Support of Santa Cruz METRO's Watsonville Transit Center Renovation Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/15</td>
<td>Email I KP 05/14/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Concern on Park Ave in Capitola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/24/15</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Congratulations to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission for the Recent Award of the FTA Section 5304, Sustainable Communities Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/15</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>Pushnik</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sumner Woods HOA Board of Directors</td>
<td>Degradation of Both HOA Pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/15</td>
<td>Email I CJ 4/28/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recycle Water Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/15</td>
<td>Email I CJ 4/28/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Energy Deals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/27/15</td>
<td>Email I LM 04/27/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td>Motorcars on Train Tracks in Aptos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Parag</td>
<td>Mehta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nolte Vertical Five</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Amendment #2 to Agreement with the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission for Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/30/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Vatican Global Warming Environmental Push</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>04/30/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Activism Politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>04/30/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Dalbey</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rail Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>05/14/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>Frey</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Passenger Rail Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/01/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Resurrection of Delta Smelt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Shewchuk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Exceptions to the Proposed Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/15</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McClendon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Invoice #10 Reimbursement for STIP Funds to State and SCCRTC master Agreement No:64A0158 and Program Supplement No: 05A0158-01 A5 for Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/15</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Garin</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Invoice #10 Reimbursement for Federal Funds to Administering Agency-State Agreement No. 05-6149R and Program Supplement No: 05-6149-007-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/02/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delta Smelt are Gone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>05/05/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Train Whistle on Westside Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/04/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Directors Sumner Woods HOA</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Erosion of the Slope Between the North Abutment of the Timber Railroad Bridge and the Sumner Woods HOA Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/04/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>McNulty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation for After School Tutoring Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/04/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>05/04/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Hazard on Wharf Road Roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McClendon</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FY2014-2015 Invoice #3 for the Rural Planning Assistance Funds (State Highway Account)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McClendon</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FY2014-2015 Invoice #2 for the Rural Planning Assistance Funds (State Highway Account)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McClendon</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRT</td>
<td>FY2014-2015 Invoice #1 for the Rural Planning Assistance Funds (State Highway Account)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 05/06/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Train Verse Trail Debate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/07/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Gubbins</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRT</td>
<td>2016 SHOPP - Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 05/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Berezin</td>
<td>Community Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 05/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Plomp</td>
<td>Golden Gate Rail Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 05/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>Laughead</td>
<td>Project Information Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>TS 05/22/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Cohn</td>
<td>Level 3 Charger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 05/12/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Former Supervisor Ellen Pirie View on Railline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Information about Transportation Expenditure Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Water Budget Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>USA Patriot Act Bulk Data Collection Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Organized Democratic Black Activism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>The Illusion of Treading Political Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/11/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>A Nuclear Bomb Attack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/13/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>Kniffin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stacy and Witbeck, Inc</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>Contract RT34039 Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Bridge Supports, Repairs, and Member Replacement Project Final Request for Equitable Adjustment 01 - Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Bender Rosenthal, Inc</td>
<td>Highway 1 Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Golden Gate Railroad Excursions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/14/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Smarter Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>What To Do With Billions of People?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Plomp</td>
<td>Pajaro Rail Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Denis</td>
<td>Hergenreter</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Railline and GGRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Len</td>
<td>Beyea</td>
<td>Rail and Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/20/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Support of Rail Corridor for Rail Including Excursions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Nolan</td>
<td>Golden Gate Railroad Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Type</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>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Hattrick</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/15/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Bond Obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>05/20/15</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No More Train Excursion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>05/20/15</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>McMinn</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Train Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/17/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>05/18/15</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Train Track Removal -- Replaced with Walkway and Bike Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/17/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>05/18/15</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obama's Middle East Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/18/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aileen K</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Year (FY) 2015/16 Work Program for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/18/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>05/20/15</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>SCCRTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response to Golden Gate Railroad Museum Use of Public Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/18/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/18/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dan Townsend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail Bike Path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/21/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>05/21/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica Lyons Hardcastle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hilltromper Story on Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/22/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>05/22/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Global Warming Business-As-Usual Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/23/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/23/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Wharf Roundabout-Safety Hazard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/24/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/24/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 Tax Measure-Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/25/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/25/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California Water Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/26/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>05/26/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why Misrepresent Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Correspondence Log

**June 4, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/26/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>☐ 05/27/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prosecuting Criminal Hackers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 30, 2015

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

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

Dear ATP Grant Selection Committee:

On behalf of the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee, I wish to extend support for the City of Santa Cruz’s ATP grant application for the Branciforte Creek Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge project. This project will fill a critical gap in the City’s bicycle network, most especially in the San Lorenzo River levee pathway which serves the downtown community, numerous commercial and residential nodes, as well as tourist attractions.

The Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee serves to assist in the development and maintenance of a complete, convenient and safe regional bicycle and pedestrian network. Such a network increases the opportunity and attractiveness of bicycle and pedestrian trips for transportation purposes and reduces the dependency on automobile travel. With that goal in mind, closure of this critical link in the San Lorenzo River levee system will ensure that bicyclists and pedestrians will be able to travel on a continuous, safe, and comfortable facility that is separated from motor vehicle travel and thus will serve users of all ages and abilities.

Additionally, the RTC has a long standing commitment to develop a 32-mile rail-with-trail system that will directly tie into the San Lorenzo River Levee pathway. The RTC recently adopted a Master Plan for the rail-with-trail project and allocated $4 million for a 2.4 mile project that is also being supplemented by the City of Santa Cruz with a $1 million local match. The City’s commitment to increasing trips made by foot or bicycle is evidenced in allocation of resources to pursuit of these projects.

The Committee thanks you for your consideration of this proposal. Please feel free to contact the RTC’s Bicycle Program Manager and staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org, for this and any other committee related matters.

Sincerely,

David Casterson
Bicycle Committee Chair

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
April 30, 2015

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

RE: City of Watsonville Active Transportation Program (ATP) Grant Application for Rail Trail Walker Street Project

Dear ATP Grant Selection Committee:

On behalf of the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee, I wish to extend support for the City of Watsonville’s ATP application for the Rail Trail Walker Street Project. This project will fill a critical gap in the City’s bicycle network by connecting a funded rail trail project with the heart of downtown Watsonville’s retail, commercial, school and residential destinations.

The Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee serves to assist in the development and maintenance of a complete, convenient and safe regional bicycle and pedestrian network. Such a network increases the opportunity and attractiveness of bicycle and pedestrian trips for transportation purposes and reduces the dependency on automobile travel. With that goal in mind, closure of this critical link will ensure that bicyclists and pedestrians will be able to travel on a continuous, safe, and comfortable facility that is separated from motor vehicle travel and thus will serve users of all ages and abilities.

This project ties in directly with the RTC’s long standing commitment to develop a 32-mile rail-with-trail system throughout the length of Santa Cruz County. The RTC recently adopted a Master Plan for the rail-with-trail project and allocated $1 million to a rail trail segment from Lee Road to 4,000 feet to the City’s Slough Trail connection. Additional funding needed for the funded segment are being provided by the City of Watsonville and the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County demonstrating the community’s commitment to increasing trips made by foot or bicycle. The ATP grant being solicited currently would enable the City to fill the missing link in the trail segment, thus leveraging a great deal of community investment.

The Committee thanks you for your consideration of this proposal. Please feel free to contact the RTC’s Bicycle Program Manager and staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org, for this and any other committee related matters.

Sincerely,

David Casterson
Bicycle Committee Chair

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee

S:\Bike\Committee\CORR\BC2015\City_of_Wats_ATP.docx
May 5, 2015

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

**RE: RTC Active Transportation Program (ATP) Grant Application for Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program**

Dear ATP Grant Selection Committee:

On behalf of the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee, I wish to extend great support for the RTC’s grant application for the Santa Cruz County-wide Bicycle Route Signage Program. This project will provide a critical way-finding tool for residents and tourists traveling by bike by direct them to safer routes, and alert motorists to expect greater bicycle travel on certain routes.

The Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee serves to assist in the development and maintenance of a complete, convenient and safe regional bicycle and pedestrian network. Such a network increases the opportunity and attractiveness of bicycle and pedestrian trips for transportation purposes and reduces the dependency on automobile travel. With that goal in mind, the RTC seeks to provide continuous, safe, and comfortable facilities that incentivize bicycle travel. The Bike Route Signage Program will define a network of preferred routes; provide development and installation of signs; and increase bicycle ridership by attracting new riders who may be intimidates by traffic and other safety considerations. This program, should it be implemented, has the potential to extend a much needed welcoming mat to new and experienced cyclists alike.

The Committee thanks you for your consideration of this grant proposal. Please feel free to contact the RTC’s Bicycle Program Manager and staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org, for this and any other committee related matters.

Sincerely,

David Casterson  
Bicycle Committee Chair  

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
Hello.

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

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

Stan Wilson

Capitola

From: Commute Solutions [mailto:info@commutesolutions.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 10:15 AM
To: 'alpine'
Subject: RE: Soquel Drive/Porter intersection.

Thank you for your comments. I’ve forwarded your email to the planners currently working on the RTC's Unified Corridors Plan, as well as to our administrative staff so they can include your email in our monthly board packet as a comment from the public.

Nathan Luedtke
Commute Solutions Help Desk
A service of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
831.429.POOL | info@commutesolutions.org
From: mary allen [mailto: ]
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2015 8:50 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Karena Pushnik

I am writing to you regarding a safety concern on Park Avenue, Capitola; near the 600 Park Ave Apts. There are no sidewalks on the entrance portions of Park Ave. for entry on foot to the 80 units of the complex.
The street is extremely busy. This is a dangerous situation, and the cost of providing safe pedestrian use would certainly not be substantial.
Seniors, children and the disabled would be more safe if they were installed. Those without motor vehicles have no other options.
The Manager here has told me the redwood tree on the property is the reason they were not allowed at one point. I find this incredulous, since the tree can be protected. It is not at the sidewalk area.
The complex has no other exit. There is no access to an adjacent park, nor the middle school grounds. This makes pedestrian travel challenging.
There is no sidewalk on either side of the street.
There is no crosswalk, and no stop sign, no mirror.
Most cars exceed the speed limit due to the hills on each side of the exit and there is poor visibility for the pedestrian attempting an exit.
Will you provide assistance to remedy this situation? Perhaps you can suggest ways that I move this request forward so that we can encourage and protect pedestrians in our community.
Thank you,
Mary Allen
marygallen@msr.com
831-601-5915
600 Park Ave. #14a
Capitola, CA 95010
Sent from Windows Mail

05/14/15

Hello Mary Allen -

Your email regarding pedestrian safety on Park Avenue in Capitola was received and will be made available to the Regional Transportation Commission.

The lead entity for a sidewalk project at this location, however, is the City of Capitola. By copy, this email has been sent to the Capitola Public Works Department. The City already identified sidewalks on Park Ave as a priority project in their Capital Improvement Program and the RTC supports this project. Follow up questions would best be answered by Capitola staff.

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: Jim MacKenzie [mailto:jimmo@cruzio.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 02, 2015 12:58 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: Jim MacKenzie; Renée Flower
Subject: Train whistle on westside Santa Cruz...

Hi SCCRTC -

It's 1pm on Saturday and we can hear a delightful train whistle from our home on King Street.

For the past few days, we've enjoyed hearing a train whistle coming from the tracks on the Westside of Santa Cruz, near our home. We have missed the train whistle that disappeared after the cement plant closed.

What train is using the tracks on the Westside of town this spring? We're curious!

Jim & Renée

Jim MacKenzie
831-427-2202
jimmo@cruzio.com

05/05/15

Hello Mr. McKenzie and Ms. Flower,

At the end of February, bridge reconstruction and rehabilitation work was completed at four bridges on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line making the entire rail line available for use. Therefore, the rail operator, Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway, has been running some trains on the rail line for testing, inspection and certification. Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway is working to increase freight service and is developing plans for passenger excursion trains.

Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3212 | 408.838.2392
From: Peoples, Brian C [mailto:brian.c.peoples@lmc0.com]
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2015 6:14 AM
To: info@scrcrtc.org
Cc: john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Zach Friend (BDS022@co.santa-cruz.ca.us); 'Patrick Mulhearn'; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bruce.mcperson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; dene@bustichi.com; dnorton@designs@msn.com; rji12@comcast.net; jimmy.dutra@cityofwatsonville.org; ebottoff167@yahoo.com; George Dondero; Luis Mendez; Karena Pushnik; Cory Caletti; micah posner (micahposner@cru佐.com); Brian Shulman (btshulman@gmail.com); gailpage@earthlink.net; Steve Pleich (spleich@gmail.com); brian_peoples@rocketmail.com; Piet Canin
Subject: former Supervisor Ellen Pirie view on Railline

RTC,

Please include this audio of Former Supervisor Ellen Pirie recent talk about Rail-Trail. In a nutshell she believes that train service isn’t practical and she favors removing the tracks and building a pedestrian and bicycle trail.

http://aptoscommunitynews.org/ellen-pirie-talks-aptos-village-rail-corridor/

Thanks,

Brian Peoples

05/12/15

Dear Mr. Peoples,

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

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

Thank you,

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

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

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: GARY PLOMP [mailto:plomp@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 2:00 PM
Subject: Fw: Pajaro rail station

To all:

This is great news! I do hope that the grant goes through. A lot of folks have put in great effort to see this happen! Not since the Southern Pacific's Del Monte passenger train was discontinued in 1971, has Watsonville (Pajaro) had intercity rail. Moreover, the new Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway will fit right into this as their trains or DMUs would travel down the Santa Cruz Branchline to connect with Amtrak and/or Cal-Train at Watsonville Junction.

Gary V. Plomp

Pajaro rail station in design phase
Construction could begin in 2017

An artist's rendering of what a rail station in Pajaro could look like.

By ERIK CHALHOUB OF THE REGISTER-PAJARONIAN

PAJARO A rail station that would connect Pajaro and Watsonville with the Silicon Valley is currently in the design phase, and if the project receives a grant, construction could begin in 2017.

Christina Watson, principal transportation planner with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, said the agency is currently waiting to hear back on its application for a grant. The agency should hear an update on the grant in June, according to Watson, and is currently preparing an application for a federal grant.

The station is proposed on Salinas Road near Lewis Road in Pajaro, where Union Pacific currently operates a rail yard. The 1949 rail depot building on the site was demolished in early 2012.

Environmental documents for the estimated $23 million project are complete, Watson said, and conceptual designs are about 60 percent complete. If the grant is received, the funds would go toward right of way acquisition, final designs and the start of construction, which could begin in 2017. "The schedule is ambitious, but we're optimistic we can proceed on schedule," Watson said.

The Watsonville City Council sent a letter in support of the project to the California State Transportation Agency in March.

The agency has already received funds for what it calls the "kick start" to the overall Capitola Corridor Extension, Watson said. This first phase includes a downsized Salinas station, which would include an improved car and bike parking facilities and a two-train layover facility.

Stops along the way include Gilroy, Morgan Hill and San Jose. Service is expected to begin in 2018, with two round trips offered. The hope is to eventually expand it to six round trips, according to Watson.

The total project, once completed, is expected to create more than 800 jobs, as well as $2.2 million saved annually in prevented highway accidents.

For information, visit tamcmonterey.org/programs/rail/salinas_rail.html.
Santa Cruz City Council and RTC,

On April 26th, a group of experienced bicycle riders rode through the new Santa Cruz Wharf Roundabout and Brenda Sheriff (tall one in middle of picture) crashed on railroad tracks / roundabout. The reason for the crash was Brenda’s tire getting caught in the tracks – that are now parallel to the roundabout path-flow. She broke her hip and had to be transported to Stanford for 8 hours surgery.

On the weekend of May 10, yet another accident on the Wharf roundabout occurred and person transported to Stanford. The new Santa Cruz Wharf roundabout has a design error in that it has the railroad tracks going parallel to the roundabout (photo below). It is a very difficult angle for bicyclist to maneuver causing Brenda’s accident. The white arrows painted on the road highlights the safety issue. Do we really expect these ARROWS to educate public to cross tracks perpendicular? These arrows are not effective enough to prevent future bike accidents. We are very concerned that more accidents will occur in this location.

Today, the Passenger Rail Feasibility Study was released and the results clearly show that such a train operation is not economically viable. Aptos Rail-Trail is asking RTC to remove railroad tracks from Wharf Roundabout to Harkins Slough and build Bike / Pedestrian Trail by 2016. The need to improve the Wharf Roundabout is a major addition to the justification to remove tracks and build bike / pedestrian trail. Removal of tracks will allow a re-design of bicycle traffic through the Beach Street and Wharf Roundabout.

The Unused Space could be used for bicycle traffic into the Roundabout. This would allow elimination of “Bike Direction Hazard” where bicyclist are riding in the wrong direction. The section with “Bike Direction Hazard” should only be for pedestrians. All bicycle traffic should flow within the Roundabout.

We are asking Santa Cruz City Council, Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), Roaring Camp Railroad and Santa Cruz Boardwalk to move train boarding location to underneath West Cliff Trestle. We think this will be a win-win for Roaring Camp - allowing them to increase promotions with a retail center. The greatest benefit will be to our community with the reduced SAFETY HAZARD on the main center of Santa Cruz.

There are multiple safety issues with the Wharf Roundabout and it is another justification to remove the railroad tracks asap. Let’s prevent others from getting seriously injured or killed.
Dear Mr. Peoples,

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

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

Thank you,

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.460.3205

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
The transportation tax survey showed a potential to get the funding approved. In the survey, it showed that voters want less Highway 1 traffic congestion, but have a low percentage asking for Highway widening. As Jimmy Dutra said, this is confusing and made no sense. I do want to challenge you and County leadership to realize that you are “designing a system” and need to appreciate public’s view, but do not rely on them for the system design. Designing the transportation infrastructure needs to be done with basic engineering principles and best Return-on-Investment (ROI) on reducing traffic congestion.

With the completion of the train Feasibility Study (FS), you have more data on providing a system design solution. The FS shows that a fixed rail system is very expensive and does not have a good ROI for improved mobility. One of the shortcomings of the FS is it does not do a Trade Study to compare other transportation improvements versus a fixed rail system. The rail corridor property is a very valuable asset to the County for improved mobility and the alternative uses make a compelling argument to remove old, unused railroad tracks:

- Bike / Pedestrian Trail from Harkins Slough to Santa Cruz for alternative commuting methods
- Improved Intersection at Murray Ave / Seabright Ave
- Improved surface-street in Aptos Village
- Provide access road during major traffic events or emergency response
- Potential Rapid Bus throughway along key sections
- Potential Groundwater Replenishment pipeline from Santa Cruz Water Treatment to South County
- Safety improvement to Santa Cruz Wharf Roundabout

Construction of rail-trail can be accommodated with private and Federal / State grants, as well as the other benefactors (Soquel Water District, Santa Cruz City, County), and the results will be one of the greatest bicycle infrastructures in the world.

For the 2016 Tax Measure, the public needs to believe that their tax dollars are going directly to the primary transportation system – Highway 1. More importantly, the investment needs to be the best ROI on improving mobility across the County, which is Highway 1 widening (HOV Lanes, On/Off Ramps) and other roadway improvements. The Tax Measure should not include Bicycle Facility improvements, but only target Highway 1 and roadway improvements (including solutions to Mission Blvd).

Thank you,

Brian Peoples
Aptos Rail-Trail

---

Dear Mr. Peoples,

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

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

Thank you,

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.460.3205

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
Highway 1 realignment getting under way

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

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

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

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

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

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/californiatransportationplan2040/index.shtml

First cable median barrier installation in District 5

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

(Continued on back)
Cable barrier continued

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

Workers’ Memorial Ceremony and Safety Fair

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

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

Caltrans ushers in change

Vision challenge: Find your role

Change is under way at Caltrans! We are committed to achieving real and significant changes to Caltrans' operations and culture, according to Director Malcolm Dougherty. We must choose to lead in order to remain a national leader in transportation policy in the future. Going beyond our new mission, vision and goals, we plan to measure our progress as well. We are developing specific data-based performance measures, which will be featured in the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan scheduled for release in early April 2015. Improving communication both internally and externally, and telling our organization’s story better are important priorities for Caltrans. Speaking at a recent town hall meeting broadcast online statewide, Dougherty encouraged employees to familiarize themselves with Caltrans’ new mission and vision statements, and know how they apply to their daily work. He also noted their individual roles and tasks are vital to fulfilling the future of transportation, improving the state’s economy and contributing to Californians’ quality of life.

Some key meeting highlights include:

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<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.</td>
<td>Hwy. 1 North County Pavement Preservation and Rumble Strips (05-1C8604)</td>
<td>Near Santa Cruz from Western Drive to San Mateo C/L (PM 20.2-37.4)</td>
<td>Pavement preservation and install rumble strips</td>
<td>May 13, 2015 – Fall 2015</td>
<td>$10.7 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>Granite Construction Company</td>
<td>Project was in winter suspension. Work resumed May 13, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Hwy. 9 Pollution Source Control (0Q5904)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County at and near Boulder Creek at various locations from 0.9 mile south of Glengarry Rd to 0.2 mile north of Mcgafligan Mill Rd (PM 3.7-18.7)</td>
<td>Construct retaining wall &amp; viaduct structure. Replace drainage pipes. Rehab maintenance turnaround.</td>
<td>Winter 2014-Summer 2015</td>
<td>$1.8 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Rock Company, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Full closure began February 10. The highway will be fully closed for approximately 6 months (February to July) at Location 1 (PM 3.7, between Santa Cruz and Felton) for construction of the retaining wall and viaduct due to limited access for staging and equipment. A signed detour route directing traffic to Mount Hermon Road and Highway 17 will be provided for autos. A signed detour route will also be provided for bikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hwy. 17 Laurel Curve NB Shoulder Widening (1C1804)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County near Scotts Valley from 0.3 Miles North of Glenwood Cutoff to 0.5 Miles South of Glenwood Drive (PM 9.4-10.1)</td>
<td>Shoulder Widening/Soil Nail Wall</td>
<td>August 4,2014— Summer 2015</td>
<td>$3 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Steve DiGrazia (BR)</td>
<td>Graniterock Company DBA Pavex Construction Division, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Work consists of daytime alternating lane closures. No night closures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Hwy. 152 Pavement Maintenance (05-1F8804)</td>
<td>Throughout Watsonville city limits (PM T0.3-R2.0)</td>
<td>Sealcoating and full dig outs at spot locations</td>
<td>May 4-July 2015</td>
<td>$1 Million</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Ken Romero (KB)</td>
<td>VSS International, West Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>This maintenance project will sealcoat SR 152 within the Watsonville city limits. The project includes full dig outs at spot locations (included in the plans).</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>5. <strong>Hwy. 129 Curve Realignment (05-0T540)</strong></td>
<td>East of Watsonville between 0.4 mile west of Old Chittendon Rd and 0.1 mile east of Chittendon underpass (PM 9.5–10.0)</td>
<td>Curve realignment</td>
<td>Fall, 2015</td>
<td>$8.1 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Bids open on July 1. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director

RE: Appreciation for Completed Murals on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Steven Allen, Allen Property Group and Arturo Thomae, Local Mural Artist, for completion of a mural on the western abutment wall of the railroad bridge over Soquel Drive at Spreckles Drive in Aptos; and

2. The City of Capitola for completion of a mural on the western abutment wall of the railroad bridge over Wharf Road in Capitola.

BACKGROUND

In October 2012, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) became the owner of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. One of the challenges that the RTC faces as owner of the rail line is maintaining the property free of graffiti. The RTC hires a painter and works with various entities and individuals in the community to clean up and help prevent the proliferation of graffiti. One measure to prevent graffiti is to paint artwork in public spaces that may be desirable for graffiti. In 2014, the RTC approved the painting of murals on a railroad bridge abutments in Aptos and Capitola.

DISCUSSION

Aptos Mural

Steven Allen enlisted the services of local mural artist Arturo Thomae. They worked with the Aptos Chamber of Commerce, the Aptos History Museum and the office of Supervisor Zach Friend to produce an acceptable design for the mural. The mural features four apple crates with labels for apples grown in Aptos. The apple crates are painted over a background of the Aptos apple orchards, packing houses and drying sheds. The featured apple labels are for Aptos, Valencia, Pleasant Valley and Day Valley apples.
Capitola Mural

The City of Capitola Art and Cultural Commission approved a mural design concept for the railroad bridge abutment wall at Wharf Road. The City of Capitola then hired local muralists John Ton and Mia Negre to finalize the design and paint the mural. The mural depicts beach goers traveling to the Capitola Village surrounded by begonia flowers and is an extension of an existing mural on Wharf Road that was previously painted by the same artist.

Staff will present photos of the finished murals at the meeting and recommends that the RTC appreciate Steve Allen, Arturo Thomae and the City of Capitola for the completed murals. The murals help to beautify the community and prevent graffiti.

SUMMARY

In 2014, the RTC approved the painting of two murals on bridge abutments of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. The murals have been completed. Staff recommends that the RTC appreciate the work of those responsible for these murals that help to beautify the community and reduce graffiti.

Attachments:
   1. Photos of the Aptos and Capitola Murals

S:\RTC\TC2015\TC0615\Murals\AptCapMrls0615.docx
ATTACHMENT 1: Photos of Murals

Mural in Aptos at Soquel Drive and Spreckels Drive

Mural in Capitola at Wharf Road
AGENDA: June 4, 2015

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission receive a presentation on the Draft Passenger Rail Feasibility Study, provide feedback, and attend the associated public open house at 6:30 p.m. on June 4, 2015 in the Live Oak Community Room at Simpkins Family Swim Center.

BACKGROUND

In order to expand mobility options along the most heavily traveled areas of the county, the Regional Transportation Commission acquired the 32-mile Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line -- a continuous transportation corridor from Davenport to Watsonville and Pajaro. Current, planned, and potential future uses of the rail corridor include freight and recreational passenger rail services, a new bicycle/pedestrian path next to the tracks, and new rail transit or intercity rail service connecting with local bus transit and planned regional and state rail service. The RTC used voter-approved bond funds designated for expanding passenger rail service to purchase the rail line from Union Pacific Railroad in October 2012.

With this transportation resource now in public ownership, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) received a transit planning grant from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to analyze the feasibility of rail transit on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Rail transit is regularly scheduled public transportation service, with established fares on fixed guide way railroad tracks. In May 2014, the RTC issued a contract with Fehr & Peers, a consulting firm specializing in transit planning, and their team of subconsultants to conduct the study. The consultant contract is $180,000.

In summer 2014, over 2,000 people provided input through an online survey, a community meeting and by email on community goals and objectives, service parameters, including station locations. Agencies with experience planning and implementing rail transit provided peer review of technical information, and community stakeholders also provided input at several points during development of the study. The study was prepared in partnership with Santa Cruz METRO, Iowa Pacific/Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway, and Caltrans who provided oversight as members of the Project Team.
In September 2014, the RTC approved service scenarios to undergo detailed analysis, as well as goals, objectives, and performance measures to evaluate those scenarios. The service scenarios include the length of service, number of stations, and frequency.

**DISCUSSION**

The Passenger Rail Feasibility Study – Draft Report (Attachment 1 – online) was posted on the RTC website (www.sccrtc.org/rail) for public review on May 21. The study is a high-level analysis of a range of rail transit options on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line between Santa Cruz and Watsonville/Pajaro based on goals and objectives identified by the community. **Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission receive a presentation on the draft Passenger Rail Feasibility Study from Steve Crosley of Fehr & Peers and provide feedback on the study.**

**Report contents**

The study includes the following sections:

1. **ES) Executive Summary**
   1) Introduction: Purpose of the study, rail corridor history, and coordination with the MBSST/Rail Trail, and summary of public outreach
   2) Comparable Systems and Technology Options: Description of rail systems and range of rail vehicles used in the United States.
   3) Study Goals and Objectives: Three core goals and corresponding objectives for rail transit used to evaluate each scenario.
   4) Passenger Rail Service Alternatives: Description of all service scenarios initially considered and process for selecting seven scenarios for detailed analysis, representing a range of station locations, service hours, vehicle types.
   5) Methods and Assumptions: General assumptions, operating details, and ridership forecasting methodology used for this study
   6) Technical Assessment of Service Scenarios: Description of findings from the technical analysis of seven service scenarios.
      - Capital Cost Estimates
      - Operations & Maintenance Cost Estimates
      - Ridership Forecasts
      - Funding Assessment – funding sources currently used by Metro for bus transit operations were not considered
   7) Evaluation of Service Scenarios: Summary of the level each scenario advances community goals and objectives.
   8) Preferred Service Alternative: Discussion of the two highest rated service options.
   9) Implementation: Describes next steps and timeline if the community decides to pursue implementation of passenger rail transit service in the near future; includes planning, design, environmental clearance activities and regulatory and governance considerations.
The Executive Summary is attached (Attachment 2). The Executive Summary, full plan and appendices are available for download on the RTC website – www.sccrtc.org/rail. Hard copies are also available for review at the RTC’s downtown Santa Cruz office and the Santa Cruz Central, Aptos and downtown Watsonville libraries.

Key Findings

- The technical analysis and evaluation of the seven service scenarios found that phased implementation of rail service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line is feasible.
- Differences between the scenarios include: type of train technology, speed of implementation, level of upfront investment, ongoing operating costs, and advancement of community goals.
- Ridership estimates range from 480,000 to 1,413,000 passengers per year (base year).
- Funding for construction would need to be secured from competitive grants.
- Some funding for operations would need to be secured from a local transportation ballot measure. Federal, state, and local funding sources currently used for operations by Metro for bus transit were not considered.
- Of seven scenarios analyzed, phased implementation could include:
  - Start up limited service (Scenario S) between Bay Street in Santa Cruz (connecting to buses to UCSC and Westside Santa Cruz) and Seacliff Village (with bus connections to Cabrillo College). Includes minimal upgrades to the rail line, fewer stations, and fewer trains in off-peak hours, using leased locomotive vehicles.
  - Local Service between Westside Santa Cruz and Aptos Village (Scenario E), serving 9 stations, with 30-minute headways, upgrades to the rail line and new Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) vehicles aimed at attracting strong ridership, and maximizing operational efficiencies.
  - Expanded Local Service to Watsonville (Scenario G). Since this scenario is twice as long as Scenario E it has higher ridership, however the level of funding necessary for upfront capital investments and ongoing operations and maintenance would be more challenging to secure, or the service could be added as funding becomes available.

Public outreach

Public input gathered at the beginning of the analysis helped shape this study. **Input on the draft report received by the July 8 deadline will be reflected in the Final Report.** As always, wide-spread public participation and engagement is encouraged. The community is encouraged to review the document and provide feedback through the RTC’s Rail eNews group (which has over 2,000 email subscribers), and neighborhood distribution lists.
In addition, information about the draft report is included in the RTC’s web newsfeed, Facebook and Twitter pages, as well as through newsletters, news media, local business, and community partners. Flyers and the Fact Sheet (Attachment 3) on the study and public open house were also distributed at multiple venues. Staff is also presenting information on the draft document to local technical stakeholders and community groups, RTC Advisory Committees, the METRO board, and other community groups and service clubs.

There are several ways for members of the community to learn more and provide input on the Draft Study:

- In addition to this RTC board meeting in Watsonville; the RTC is holding an open house to present the results of the study at 6:30pm on June 4 in mid-county at the Live Oak Community Room at Simpkins Family Swim Center on 17th Avenue. **Commissioners are encouraged to attend.**
- An online survey will be available June 4 to July 8 from [www.sccrtc.org/rail](http://www.sccrtc.org/rail)
- Written comments can be submitted to the RTC online (sccrtc.org/rail) by using the comment form or via email to: info@sccrtc.org with the subject: “Draft Rail Study Comments”, or by postal mail.

This is an important community discussion about the possibility of adding a new transportation option in Santa Cruz County.

**Next Steps**

Staff will review comments received through July 8, seek RTC guidance on issues identified by the public, and request that the consultant team conduct additional analysis if needed. Fehr & Peers will prepare the final report for presentation to the RTC in the fall, including next step recommendations for consideration.

**SUMMARY**

The RTC was awarded a transit planning grant to analyze passenger rail transit service along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. This high-level study focuses on public rail transit options within the most populated sections of the rail corridor. The study includes cost, ridership, and funding options for a range of transit service scenarios. The RTC board and members of the community are encouraged to review the draft report (posted online and at public locations) and attend the informational open house on June 4 in Live Oak. Subsequently, written comments on the draft report and use of an online survey (available online June 4) are encouraged through July 8, 2015 for consideration during development of the final report and recommendations.

**Attachments:**
2) [Executive Summary](
3) [Fact Sheet](
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0.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Is passenger rail transit service feasible in Santa Cruz County? What criteria should be used to define what is feasible? How can the community maximize use of the publicly-owned Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line? How much would it cost and how many people would ride trains? Could it help advance the community’s mobility, environmental, economic, and other goals? Is there a “starter” passenger rail service that could be implemented in the near term, and then augmented as demand and resources change? Could passenger rail service be part of an integrated transportation network? How will passenger rail service be coordinated with existing transit service, freight trains, and the planned Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network – especially the 32 mile rail-with-trail project? These are some of the questions that spurred policy makers, agency staff, and community members to investigate if rail transit could serve some of Santa Cruz County’s extensive transportation needs.

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) received a transit planning grant from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to evaluate the feasibility of passenger rail transit service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Rail transit provides regularly scheduled public transportation with established fares, using either locomotive-hauled or self-propelled railroad passenger cars on a fixed guideway (rail).\(^1\) In May 2014, the RTC hired a team of consultants, led by Fehr & Peers to conduct this high-level study, based on their extensive transit planning experience. The study includes technical analysis of several public transportation service scenarios (developed based on input from the public), ridership projections, capital and operating cost estimates, review of train technologies, and evaluation of funding options. Service scenarios were evaluated against multiple goals and objectives identified by the community, and compared to other rail transit systems in the nation. The report also discusses integration with other rail corridor uses; connectivity to other bus and rail services; and identifies feasible options for further analysis, environmental clearance, engineering, and construction, if the community decides to implement rail transit service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

\(^1\) While there are many different types of passenger service that could operate on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, this study focuses on public transportation options using the fixed guideway rail, characterized by passenger train service (using either locomotive hauled or self-propelled passenger cars) operated on a regular basis by or under contract with a public transit agency or Joint Powers Authority for the purpose of transporting passengers within urbanized areas, or between urbanized areas and outlying areas.
STUDY AREA

The Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line is a continuous transportation corridor offering a variety of mobility options for residents, businesses, and visitors. In October 2012 the RTC completed acquisition of the rail line, which has been a transportation corridor since the mid-1870s, bringing it into public ownership. Funding for acquisition was approved by the voters of both Santa Cruz County and the state of California. The rail corridor (see Figure ES-1) spans approximately 32 miles of Santa Cruz County’s coast from Davenport to Watsonville/Pajaro, runs parallel to the often congested Highway 1 corridor, and connects to regional and state rail lines. This underutilized transportation corridor is within one mile of more than 92 parks, 42 schools and approximately half of the county’s population. Based on public input, travel patterns, and analysis of existing and forecast future demographic conditions, this study focuses on the most populous and congested sections of Santa Cruz County – from the western edge of the city of Santa Cruz to downtown Watsonville; though service north west to Davenport is not precluded from future analysis.

Figure ES-1: Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line

Source: SCCRTC, 2015
Although Santa Cruz County is not considered a metropolitan area, the topography of the area concentrates development between the ocean and the mountains. The county’s population density is one of the highest in California, about 600 people per square mile overall, with areas along the rail line significantly higher (City of Santa Cruz and the Seacliff area are over 4,000 people/square mile; Live Oak almost 5300 people/square mile, Twin Lakes area and City of Watsonville over 7,000 people/square mile).²

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The RTC was awarded a federal transit planning grant by Caltrans to conduct a passenger rail study for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. The objective of this study is to analyze potential commuter rail service scenarios, along with potential station locations that could serve Santa Cruz County. If found to be feasible, this analysis is intended to lay the groundwork for decisions about pursuing more detailed definitions of operational characteristics and costs. Overall objectives of the study include:

- Analyze the feasibility of passenger rail service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.
- Identify, evaluate and compare a range of near- and long-term passenger rail service options.
- Understand how commuter and/or intercity passenger rail service can improve people’s access to jobs, schools, recreation, goods/services, and other activities.
- Provide data regarding ridership potential, capital and operating/maintenance costs, revenue projections, and connectivity with other transportation modes.
- Identify governance and financing options.
- Meet sustainable communities, greenhouse gas emission reduction and natural environment protection goals.
- If found to be feasible, provide the community with practical recommendations regarding implementation of passenger rail service, in accordance with forecasted ridership demand and funding.
- If the community decides to implement passenger rail service, recommendations on station locations and train passing sidings will assist local entities in ensuring coordination of land use, transit, trail, and freight plans along the corridor.
- Involve the community and the RTC board in the decision making process.

² http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06000.html
Why Consider Rail Transit for the Santa Cruz Branch Line?

When considering the current state of our strained infrastructure and the housing shortage in the County, as well as anticipated growth in population and jobs, we are faced with many questions. How will people get around? Where will they live? What kind of jobs will they find? What does this mean for quality of life? Will our highways support our growing transportation needs?

Essential for a stronger local economy and quality of life, improvements in the housing supply and the transportation network will be needed.

- **The need to ease traffic congestion.** Congestion is not just an inconvenience – it is costly. Unpredictable trip times, wasted fuel and lost time are costs paid by residents and businesses alike. Trips taken by rail could free up capacity and provide relief for those able to use an alternative to Highway 1.

- **Rising demand for complete communities.** Walkable neighborhoods with good quality transit service and a variety of essential services nearby are increasingly desirable.

- **Rail supports compact land use** that allows cities and counties to make the most of existing infrastructure and reduce the number of miles driven through more integrated transportation and land use planning.

- **Reduce emissions.** Rail transit could reduce the number of miles people drive and decrease associated greenhouse gas and other emissions.

- **Improve connectivity.** A commuter rail service would provide a new option for travel within the County, and could connect with rail services to adjoining counties, the San Francisco Bay Area and Southern California.

- **Scalable.** Once investment is made in basic infrastructure such as track, structures, signals and stations, capacity of trains can be increased by adding railcars as demand grows.

- **Funding landscape is changing.** The state’s new Cap and Trade program includes significant funding for conventional as well as high-speed rail investments and is expected to grow over time.

Passenger rail service could contribute to or support many existing policies and goals of the RTC, local government, environmental groups and local business organizations. Coordination and collaboration with these other entities would be essential to realize many goals and policies. As the backbone of a more diverse transportation system, rail service would need to be integrated with existing fixed route bus service. It is not realistic to represent passenger rail as the singular solution to many problems, yet it could provide a very strong supporting role in the future development of healthy sustainable communities in Santa Cruz County.
**Study Limitations**

The scope of this study is limited to a high-level analysis of rail transit options along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. This is not a detailed service or implementation plan. If the community decides to move forward with implementing service, environmental review and engineering level design work would be initiated to provide more detailed analysis of potential environmental impacts, station locations, parking needs, and integration with the planned Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST or “rail trail”). Train operating schedules would be evaluated and coordinated with METRO buses. Also, evaluation of multimodal transportation improvements along the heavily-traveled Santa Cruz to Aptos corridor is also in process as part of the Santa Cruz County Unified Corridors Plan. Starting with development of a multimodal county level travel demand model, the Unified Corridors Plan will analyze transportation investments on the parallel routes of Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line to identify the combination of investments that most effectively move people and provide transportation choices.

The RTC recognizes that there are also other options for the rail right-of-way that have been analyzed in the past or could be analyzed in the future. This includes other passenger rail service – such as recreational rail service or intercity rail service to the San Francisco Bay Area or Monterey County; or expanded freight service. Some members of the community have also expressed interest in using the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for bus rapid transit (BRT) or personal rapid transit (PRT). Expanding rail transit service up to Felton and other parts of San Lorenzo Valley, and operating train service from Santa Cruz to San Jose over the Santa Cruz Mountains have also been mentioned frequently. This study does not preclude future analysis of these and other options, but they are outside of the scope of this study.

**MEASURING FEASIBILITY: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

An initial step in development of this study, the RTC solicited input from the public on the goals, objectives and measures that should be used to evaluate the feasibility of rail service. Goals and objectives identified as priorities by the community are shown in Figure ES-2. These goals and objectives for rail transit in Santa Cruz County are consistent with regional, state and federal transportation planning goals and objectives related to access, mobility, maintenance, efficiency, economic vitality, safety, quality of life, and the environment.
### Transportation Alternatives/Choices

**GOAL 1: Provide a convenient, competitive and accessible, travel option**

- **More Options**
  - Provide additional and competitive travel options to address the current and future needs of the community (including employment, school, visitor, shopping, recreational, neighborhood and other daily trips)

- **Ridership**
  - Increase the number of people using transit

- **Faster Travel Times**
  - Reduce how long it takes to get places

- **Transit Connections**
  - Connect to the existing (METRO) bus transit system

- **Bike & Walk Connections**
  - Ensure connectivity to sidewalks, bike lanes and Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (or Rail-Trail)

- **Non-Drivers**
  - Expand options for seniors, children, people with disabilities, low-income, and those who cannot or do not drive

- **Visitors**
  - Expand options for visitors and tourists to reduce traffic congestion

- **Reliability**
  - Make it easier to predict how long it will take to get places (Improve reliability of transit travel times)

### Sustainability

**GOAL 2: Enhance communities & the environment, support economic vitality**

- **Reduce Traffic**
  - Reduce the number of cars on Highway 1 and local roads

- **Climate**
  - Reduce fuel consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, and air pollution

- **Other Car Impacts**
  - Reduce need for parking, road expansion and other land use effects of cars (preserve open space and reduce sprawl in other areas)

- **Serve Major Destinations**
  - Locate stations in areas with high concentrations of housing, jobs, services, visitors and activities

- **Economy**
  - Support access to jobs, shopping, tourist, and other economic activity centers/opportunities

- **Revitalization**
  - Stimulate sustainable development and revitalization of areas near stations

- **Minimize Impacts**
  - Minimize negative impacts of trains on neighborhoods, adjacent property owners, and the environment (including traffic, noise, parking, construction, etc.)

- **Safety**
  - Provide safety measures to avoid conflicts between trains & cars, bicyclists or pedestrians

- **Consistency**
  - Ensure consistency with local, regional, state, and federal plans and policies

### Cost Effectiveness

**GOAL 3: Develop a rail system that is cost effective and financially feasible**

- **Cost to Benefit (Cost Effectiveness)**
  - Develop a rail system that is cost effective

- **Cost per Rider**
  - Generate sufficient ridership to minimize per rider and system costs

- **Existing Resources**
  - Optimize use of existing infrastructure

- **Financially Feasible**
  - Develop a system that keeps operating and capital costs to a minimum

- **Funding Options**
  - Identify service options that are competitive for local, state, & federal funding sources

- **Efficiencies**
  - Maximize operational efficiencies, build partnerships with public and private agencies, groups and interests
STATIONS AND SCENARIOS ANALYZED

Based on existing and forecasted future travel patterns, as well as input from community members, technical stakeholders and rail peers, a series of station locations and service scenarios were analyzed for this study. The project team conducted a high-level, initial screening of ten service scenario concepts, with varying station locations, termini, and service hours. This included a qualitative assessment of ridership potential, capital costs, and connectivity to local, regional, state transit and intercity rail systems. Taking into consideration the initial screening, service scenarios (which represent a range of costs and near and longer term implementation potential, were selected for more detailed evaluation.

- Limited Service, Santa Cruz ↔ Capitola: Weekday and weekend service limited to primary stations\(^3\) and a few key visitor destinations (Scenario B)
- Peak Express Service, Santa Cruz ↔ Watsonville: Service hours limited to peak weekday commute hours (Scenario D)
- Local Service, Santa Cruz ↔ Aptos: Weekday and weekend service to primary and secondary stations, including service near Cabrillo College (Scenario E)
- Expanded Local Service, Santa Cruz ↔ Watsonville: Weekday and weekend service to primary and secondary stations expanded to Watsonville (Scenario G)
- Santa Cruz ↔ Watsonville Locomotive-Powered (can comingle with freight): Weekday and weekend service to primary and secondary stations (Scenario G1)
- Regional Rail Connector, Santa Cruz ↔ Pajaro: service connecting to future Capitol Corridor/Amtrak and Coast Daylight service at Pajaro to test potential for ridership demand with regional rail accessibility (Scenario J)
- Limited Starter Service, Santa Cruz ↔ Seacliff/State Park Drive: Very limited weekday and weekend service hours and station stops utilizing locomotives. (Scenario S)

While this represents a range of rail transit service options, the locations where trains start and stop (route/termini), the number and location of station stops, service days and times, vehicle types, passing sidings, station design and other factors could ultimately reflect a scalable hybrid of these scenarios and could change over time if and when the community decides to add rail transit service.

\(^3\) Potential station locations anticipated to have higher ridership potential were identified as “primary stations”. “Secondary stations” also have promising ridership potential, but not as high as primary stations. Other potential station locations were screened out for this analysis; however could ultimately be developed, in-step with growth in ridership potential (jobs, housing, infrastructure development or transit connections) or be utilized at special time periods (such as seasonal weekends or for special events).
TECHNICAL ANALYSIS: RIDERSHIP AND COSTS

Technical analysis of the scenarios described above included ridership forecasts, capital cost estimates, as well as operations and maintenance cost estimates.

**Ridership:** Fehr & Peers conducted a ridership modeling analysis to determine potential ridership demand at each station under each scenario. Based on existing travel and land use patterns, population and employment levels, as well as projected train travel times, the ridership models found that in the base year, up to 1.65 million passengers per year (5,500 daily weekday boardings) would ride trains between Santa Cruz and Watsonville in Scenario G, which serves the greatest number of stations with the most frequency. In 2035, ridership could increase for this same service to over two million annual boardings. For the base year, the scenario with trains limited to morning and evening peak commute hours, serving significantly fewer stations had the lowest ridership estimate of 1,100 per day (287,500 annual boardings in Scenario D).

**Capital Costs:** In order to assess the capital needs of each scenario, consultants RailPros conducted an assessment of existing infrastructure conditions and identified upfront and long-term cost estimates for the track, signal systems, crossings, stations, vehicles, and other components. In many instances, to minimize construction impacts once service is initiated and to reduce maintenance needs, full replacement and reconstruction of many rail elements is recommended and included in the cost estimates; though it is possible to initiate passenger service before making all of the upgrades identified. The initial infrastructure construction costs (capital outlay) range from a low of $23 million (Scenario B: Capitola to/from Santa Cruz) to a high of approximately $48 million (Scenario G1: Watsonville to/from Santa Cruz using locomotives). In addition to the base (or “raw”) construction estimates, the study assumes an additional 30 percent for support costs (e.g. preliminary design and environmental review, preparing construction documents, permitting, construction management) and a 30 percent contingency. Not surprisingly, the capital cost is closely related to the amount of line that is utilized for passenger service, number of stations, and number of rail vehicles. The cost estimates are conceptual, based on recent unit costs on other rail projects, as no engineering was performed for this feasibility-level study. Actual capital costs could range between 70 percent and 130 percent of these estimates, with more precise cost estimates only available following detailed surveying and engineering analysis.

**Operations and Maintenance:** LTK Engineering Services developed travel time forecasts, identified where new passing tracks (sidings) may be required to allow trains traveling in opposite directions to pass, as well as annual operating and maintenance costs. This analysis found that with the capital upgrades identified, including new passing sidings, it would take 36 or 41 minutes for trains to travel between Santa Cruz and

---

4 “Base year” is based on 2010 AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model information.
Watsonville, depending on the number of station stops (6 or 10, respectively). Service between the Westside of Santa Cruz to Capitola Village would take 16 minutes.

Estimated operating and maintenance costs included in this study vary depending on the number and distance of trains operating per day. Generally, the cost per revenue hour of $376 was assumed in this study, using an average cost from similar peer rail systems. This number includes fuel, operator salaries, general rail and station maintenance, and other ongoing expenses utilizing a Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) vehicle. Vehicle maintenance per DMU train set is assumed to be $173,000 per year. General Administration, which includes marketing, security, scheduling, and other administrative activities, is assumed to be an extra 38 percent. The operating costs for scenarios utilizing locomotives pulling coaches are higher due to the additional vehicles and fuel use.

Table ES-1 provides a summary of the ridership, travel time, and cost estimates for each scenario analyzed. Preliminary capital and operating costs for Scenario S were provided by Iowa Pacific, then adjusted for consistency regarding contingency and support costs, Positive Train Control, and labor rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track Miles</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way Travel Time</td>
<td>16 min</td>
<td>36 min</td>
<td>23 min</td>
<td>41 min</td>
<td>41 min</td>
<td>43 min</td>
<td>25 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trains per weekday (both directions)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicles (train sets)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (leased)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stations (weekday)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 + 1 seasonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating hours per year (rev train hours)</td>
<td>9800</td>
<td>4313</td>
<td>9800</td>
<td>13,591</td>
<td>13,591</td>
<td>5024</td>
<td>5513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual service miles (revenue train miles)</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>91,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Boardings Low Estimate (Base Year)</td>
<td>846,000</td>
<td>287,500</td>
<td>1,413,000</td>
<td>1,509,000</td>
<td>1,509,000</td>
<td>528,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Boardings High Estimate (2035)</td>
<td>1,287,000</td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>1,926,000</td>
<td>2,031,000</td>
<td>2,031,000</td>
<td>741,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE ES –1: SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily weekday boardings Low Estimate (Base Year)</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily weekday boardings High Estimate (2035)</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual O&amp;M cost (operations, vehicle maintenance, general admin, &amp; contingency)</td>
<td>$6.9M</td>
<td>$3.8M</td>
<td>$6.9M</td>
<td>$9.9M</td>
<td>$14M</td>
<td>$3.7M</td>
<td>$5.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Raw” Construction-only outlay cost (excluding vehicles, support and contingency)</td>
<td>$23M</td>
<td>$40M</td>
<td>$28M</td>
<td>$41M</td>
<td>$48M</td>
<td>$41M</td>
<td>$19.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upfront Capital Cost (Outlay) (tracks, stations, vehicles, +30% contingency &amp; 30% support)</td>
<td>$77M</td>
<td>$119M</td>
<td>$85M</td>
<td>$133M</td>
<td>$176M</td>
<td>$93M</td>
<td>$31.5M (vehicle lease under O&amp;M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay/mile</td>
<td>$12M</td>
<td>$6M</td>
<td>$9M</td>
<td>$6M</td>
<td>$9M</td>
<td>$4M</td>
<td>$4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehr & Peers, LTK, RailPros, 2015, Scenario S – Iowa Pacific, adjusted for consistency
Notes: SC = Santa Cruz, Cap = Capitola, W = Watsonville, FRA = Federal Railroad Administration; “Raw” items include capital construction costs such as tracks, stations, and sidings.

FUNDING ASSESSMENT

A core component of demonstrating feasibility for any transit project is the ability to secure adequate funding for project implementation (planning, environmental review, design, procurement and construction) and for ongoing system operations and maintenance. Initiation of new passenger rail service in Santa Cruz County will require a combination of federal and/or state capital funding, as well as new revenues for ongoing operations. This study includes an inventory of existing and potential new federal, state, regional, local, and private funding sources and identifies funding strategies or recommendations for sources or mechanisms that are most reasonable to pursue. The study also evaluated a range of passenger fare levels that could optimize revenues without significantly impacting ridership levels.
A base assumption used for this study was that funding sources used to fund the existing bus transit system would not be redirected to fund rail transit. The study found that a successful funding strategy for any scenario will need to include a new countywide sales tax with some portion dedicated to rail and some combination of the following sources – U.S. Department of Transportation TIGER grant program, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) §5309 Fixed Guideway Small Starts grant program, and/or California Cap and Trade program funds. Additional potential sources of revenue include regional shares of state and federal funds (e.g. State Transportation Improvement Program), federal Economic Development Administration public works grants, FTA §20005(b) Transit Oriented Development (TOD) grants, developer fees, smart cities, sustainable communities, healthy neighborhoods and other land use or planning type grants; as well as public-private partnerships (P3).

Taking into consideration the universe of sources that may be available for capital and ongoing operations, it appears unlikely that capital costs in excess of $100 million can be met with grant programs and other sources that currently exist or could be potentially available. As with capital needs, annual operating subsidies in excess of $10 million annually would be difficult to achieve in the current funding environment.

OTHER EVALUATION MEASURES/FEASIBILITY

In addition to the base metrics of ridership and cost described above, an evaluation framework was developed to evaluate rail transit service along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line in the context of the goals and objectives identified by the community for this study. Each of the seven scenarios was comparatively evaluated against several quantifiable metrics. These evaluation measures included criteria to measure transit operations and performance, connectivity and quality of access, livability and economic vitality, neighborhood and environmental impacts, impacts of construction on homes and businesses, capital and operating costs, and funding competitiveness. Comparing the seven service scenarios based on the evaluation measures and goals (Figure ES-3) each with equal weight, Scenario E (local service between Santa Cruz and Aptos Village), Scenario G (local service between Santa Cruz and Watsonville), and Scenario S scored the highest. Scenario D (Watsonville/Santa Cruz Peak Express), which only operates during peak commute hours, scored the lowest.
This study evaluates the feasibility of implementing rail transit service along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line based on how well the range of potential service scenarios advance goals and objectives identified by the community. The technical analysis and evaluation of the service scenarios found that phased implementation of rail service within Santa Cruz County is feasible.

Of the seven service scenarios, two potential strategies for implementing passenger rail transit service on the Santa Cruz Branch Line are recommended to move forward for further analysis. Both strategies are feasible options for introducing rail transit service on the corridor; the ultimate decision by the RTC Board to pursue and implement either option will be based on key decision factors.

- Option 1 (Higher investment) – Rail Transit | Scenario E, Santa Cruz to Aptos, Local Service.
• Option 2 (Lower investment) – Railroad | Scenario S, Santa Cruz to Seacliff, Limited Local Service.

Both service options are feasible from a constructability and operational standpoint. Both Scenario E and Scenario S would improve accessibility and mobility along a section of this passenger rail corridor that is currently underutilized.\(^5\) Available funding, ability to achieve community goals, and customer needs are the key factors to be considered by RTC when making a determination of which service alternative or hybrid of scenarios to pursue for implementation. Feasibility will rely heavily on securing a new sales tax with a portion of the funds dedicated for ongoing operation of rail transit service and which would provide an attractive match to federal and/or state grants for capital infrastructure.

**NEXT STEPS/ IMPLEMENTATION**

Implementation considerations include: regulatory requirements, freight integration, governance structure for operations, project development activities, and potential funding strategies. Based on the findings in this study, the following recommendations and action plan are organized into near-term (1-5 years) and mid-term (5-10 years) horizons with the objective of providing RTC with a program to follow for further planning, identification of funding sources, and potential implementation of service by the year 2025.

• Draft Environmental Studies and Conceptual Engineering – near-term.
• Final Design, Construction Documents, and Funding – near-term.
• Right-of-way (ROW) Acquisition for stations and sidings, if needed – near-term.
• Contractor Procurement – mid-term.
• Construction – mid-term.
• Vehicle Procurement – mid-term.
• Opening – mid-term.

Other considerations that need to be addressed when passenger rail service moves through subsequent planning and design activities towards implementation include:

• Integration/coordination with freight service
• Rail line governance

\(^5\) With the exception of excursion services and occasional freight service in the Watsonville area.
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public interest in this study is high, as demonstrated by extensive public input gathered at the project outset in 2014. Broad community participation helped shape this study. Information about the study is posted online at: www.sccrtc.org/rail, was distributed through an eNews email group with over 1,700 subscribers. In summer 2014, 2,000 members of the community participated in online questionnaires, or attended public workshops and meetings. The community provided input on study goals and objectives, evaluation measures, service scenarios, station locations, and operating hours. Through this Draft Study, the RTC requests that the community consider the results of ridership, revenue and cost estimates and engage in a thoughtful discussion about the feasibility of future rail transit service. To receive additional information about the passenger rail study and to participate in the discussion, sign up for eNews at: http://www.sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/. Comments on the draft study should be submitted to the RTC.
The RTC was awarded a transit planning grant by Caltrans to analyze passenger rail transit service along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Rail transit is regularly scheduled public transportation service, with established fares on fixed guideway railroad tracks. This high-level study focuses on the most populated sections of the rail corridor, between Santa Cruz and Watsonville.

The Draft Report is now available online: www.sccrtc.org/rail

Public input gathered at the beginning of the analysis helped shape this study. The study includes:

- **Introduction** including why consider rail transit
- **Goals and Objectives** used to evaluate the feasibility of each scenario
- **Service Scenarios** representing a range of station locations, service hours, vehicle types (over for map)
- **Technical Assessment** of Seven Service Scenarios
  - Capital Cost Estimates
  - Operations & Maintenance Cost Estimates
  - Ridership Forecasts - how many people would ride trains
  - Funding Assessment - how it could be funded
- **Evaluation** of how well each scenario advances community goals and objectives
- **Preferred Service Alternatives** – two highest rated options based on evaluation criteria
- **Implementation Options**

**Key Findings**

- The technical analysis and evaluation of the seven service scenarios found that phased implementation of rail service within Santa Cruz County is feasible.
- Of seven scenarios analyzed, two are recommended to be considered for implementation.
- Differences between the scenarios include: type of train technology, speed of implementation, level of upfront investment, ongoing operating costs, and level community goals advanced.
- Ridership estimates range from 480,000 to 1,413,000 annually (base year), with a $2.50 fare per ride.
- Funding for construction would need to be secured from competitive grants.
- Funding for operation would need to be secured from a local transportation ballot measure. Funding sources currently used for operations by Metro for bus transit were not considered.

**Get Involved - Your participation will help ensure that the Final Report reflects community input.**

**Step 1: Review the Draft Report**

- Online: www.sccrtc.org/rail
- In person: Review a print copy at the RTC’s Santa Cruz office, Central Library or Watsonville Library
- Attend a meeting:
  - **RTC Board Meeting 6/4/15** – The RTC board will receive a presentation on the draft report from the consultant during its regular monthly meeting at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main Street. The RTC meeting starts at 9:00 a.m. and will be rebroadcast on Community TV.
  - **Open House-Workshop 6/4/15, 6:30 pm** – View findings, hear overview presentation, and ask questions, Community Room at Simpkins Family Swim Center - 979 17th Avenue in Live Oak.

**Step 2: Submit Comments by July 8, 2015**

- **Comment Form**: Submit comments online - http://www.sccrtc.org/rail-study-comments/
- **Email**: Send your comments to info@sccrtc.org
- **Online Survey**: The Survey will be posted June 4 - July 8: www.sccrtc.org/rail

**Step 3: Stay Involved** - Sign up for eNews to receive information about the study and to participate in the discussion. http://www.sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/

For more information, please visit the RTC web site: www.sccrtc.org or call (831) 460-3200.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Rail Station Locations/Service Scenarios Analyzed

*Passing siding locations subject to change based on start/end times and service frequency.