AGENDA: May 1, 2014

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director

RE: Director’s Report

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Trail Master Plan Honored – Twice

The CA Department of Parks and Recreation honored the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at their Trails and Greenways Conference with an award for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan. RTC Project Manager Cory Caletti and Mike Sherrod from RRM Design Group accepted the award at the conference in Southern California. The purpose of the awards is to acknowledge and show appreciation for outstanding contributions that promote, enhance or expand public awareness and use of trails and greenways in California.

The Northern California Chapter of the American Planning Association also selected the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan for an Award of Excellence in the Transportation Planning category beating out the City and County of San Francisco’s WalkFirst initiative. Aside from the RTC, additional parties to be acknowledged on the plaque include Congressman Farr and the CA Coastal Conservancy which provided funding towards the development of the Master Plan. The RTC will be presented with the award at a ceremony in San Francisco on May 16th. This award will also allow the Master Plan to be considered for an award at the state level.

Watsonville Seeking Trail Grant

The City of Watsonville is applying for a $750,000 grant from the statewide Active Transportation Program to complete the funding of Segment 18 in the MBSST Master Plan. As you may recall, the RTC allocated $1M towards a partial section of that segment in December of last year. Friends of the Rail & Trail (FORT) is working to raise matching funds since the City is required to provide 11.47% in local match.
Iowa Pacific Holdings

The Surface Transportation Board is receiving comments until April 30 from interested parties regarding the sale of Iowa Pacific Holdings (IPH) to Chai/Equity Group Investments (EGI). The sale is expected to close in the next few weeks. IPH officials say the sale represents a major new equity investment providing IPH with resources to grow. They expect no change in the management at IPH. Chai-EGI states that the purpose of this transaction is to improve the revenue base of the railroads controlled by IPH through access to Chai-EGI's resources. Furthermore, Chai-EGI states that it plans to provide or secure access to sources of capital that will, in turn, promote growth among IPH's railroads. The STB notice was posted in the Federal Register on April 23.

Bike Week

Ecology Action’s Spring 2014 Bike Week is next week, from May 2nd to 9th. A week packed full of activities and events is scheduled with Bike to Work/School Day on Thursday May 8th. Visit Bike to Work’s website for a complete listing of events and the locations of the 15 Bike To Work sites and 45+ school sites. The RTC has supported Bike to Work over its entire 27 years.
BUILDING THE FOUNDATION FOR A PASSENGER RAIL RENAISSANCE:

How Global Experience Can Contribute to California’s Creation of a New Model for Rail

Anthony Perl, Professor of Urban Studies and Political Science
Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

MAY 15, 2014, 6:30 - 8:15PM
Simpkins Community Center, 979 17th Ave, Santa Cruz

California is at the forefront of efforts in North America to invent a new model for rail that can meet 21st century mobility needs.

What can California’s initiative learn from global experience with railroad redevelopment?

How might passenger rail in Santa Cruz County tie in?

This lecture will examine how half a century of experience with railroad reinvention can offer valuable lessons for California’s efforts to expand its railroad network.

Admission is FREE and open to the public. RSVP online at http://rtcperl.eventbrite.com

Early arrival is suggested as seating is limited. As always, you are encouraged to use public transit, bike, walk, or carpool. Santa Cruz Metro Route 66 serves this site and the facility is ADA accessible.

Anthony Perl is Professor of Urban Studies and Political Science at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, British Columbia. He has produced five books, most recently Transport Revolutions: Moving People and Freight Without Oil (2010). Anthony’s research crosses disciplinary and national boundaries to explore the policy decisions that affect transportation, cities and the environment.

Sponsored by

For questions call 831.460.3200 or email info@sccrtc.org
-----Original Message-----
From: Allison Brookes [mailto:brookesar@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2014 7:58 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Bike path recommendations

Hi SCCRTC
I support and recommend removing the tracks and putting in a 20 ft wide bike/ped path from Manresa to Wilder by 2016! It is what this Santa Cruz Co needs to bring our communities closer together; and it's something every "best place to live" should have.

Thank you for your consideration.
Allison Brookes,
Aptos
April 28, 2014

Ginger Dykaar  
Transportation Planner  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Ms. Dykaar:

Thank you for providing the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) with the opportunity to submit comments for the 2014 Draft Regional Transportation Plan in Santa Cruz County. The proposed transportation plan addresses challenges such as safety, environmental and public health, clean energy and economic vitality. These are some of the same principles shared by the Authority and would be supported by the implementation of California’s high-speed rail program.

The construction and operation of the high-speed rail system is a project within the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (SCCRTC) planning area and within the planning horizon of the proposed Regional Transportation Plan.

The Authority suggests that SCCRTC consider the adopted planning and environmental documents for the high-speed rail system while evaluating the impacts of the proposed transportation plan. The documents that may be used to describe the high-speed rail project include but are not limited to the following:

- Draft 2014 Business Plan (final version in May 2014);  

- Statewide Final Program EIR/EIS (adopted by the Board of Directors on November 2, 2005; Record of Decision received from Federal Railroad Administration on November 18, 2005).  
  [http://www.hsr.ca.gov/Programs/Environmental_Planning/EIR_EIS/index.html](http://www.hsr.ca.gov/Programs/Environmental_Planning/EIR_EIS/index.html)

SCCRTC is heavily involved in the region’s public transportation plans and activities, such as collaborating on long range and short range transit plans for Santa Cruz County. The Authority encourages SCCRTC to continue to prioritize transit connectivity and to work with local transit providers to improve transit connections to and from future high-speed rail stations in nearby Gilroy and San Jose, to meet the anticipated demand created by new and increased rail services.

The Authority is available to help refine the proposed transportation plan or develop alternatives for transit connectivity to reduce environmental impacts.
If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (408) 447-5631 or ben.tripousis@hsr.ca.gov or Ricci Graham, Information Officer at (408) 227-1086 or ricci.graham@hsr.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Ben Tripousis  
Northern California Regional Director  

cc: Mark McLoughlin, Director of Environmental Services  
    Barbara Gilliland, Director of Planning, Parsons Brinckerhoff  
    Caltrans District 5 Planning
FW: Item 21 RTC meeting comment

Comment on Item 21 (Transportation Plan):

It would be nice if a trolley system could operate on the Santa Cruz Railline, along with a bike/pedestrian trail. Unfortunately, the costs are prohibited. Based on current RTC projects, construction and operation of passenger train would need to be subsidized by Santa Cruz Taxpayers at a rate of $30 to $20 per rider. This does not include the additional $110M to construct trail parallel to tracks rather than removing tracks and constructing trail.

The current Transportation plan is placing too much emphasis on a railline — resulting in more effective approaches to reduce traffic which is widening Highway 1 with HOV lanes and metering lights — along with Express Buses.

Please shorten Passenger Train Study to a more responsible timeline, such as 6 months and postpone finalization of the RTP until the results of the Study.

Brian Peoples

21-150
From: Regional Transportation Commission
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 9:12 AM
Subject: FW: SCCRTC meeting Item 22 (Passenger Train Study)
Attachments: vehicle technology editorial - 2014.jpg
Importance: High
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI!

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

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news

From: Brian Peoples [mailto:brian_peoples@rocketmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2014 7:47 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: Zach Friend; Patrick Mulhearn
Subject: SCCRTC meeting Item 22 (Passenger Train Study)

RTC,

Please include the attached Santa Cruz Sentinel Editorial as a comment to Item 22 on the agenda along with this email.

Of the approximate 100 responses to RTP, 5% want a train, 50% want trail and 40% want removal of tracks with trail. The fact that the 5% train people are very much involved in guiding within RTC (Friends of Trains & Trolleys) is troubling. The interesting finding is that PeoplePower did not support the train.

Questions to Item 22:

- Why does it cost $250K and take 18 months to study the viability of a passenger train along the Santa Cruz Corridor when there have been multiple pass studies that could contribute to the report?
- Will the cost of constructing a bike/pedestrian trail parallel to tracks ($126M) verses removing tracks and constructing trail ($12M) be included in the Passenger Train Study?
Technology is speeding past trains

By Brian Peoples
Special to the Sentinel

Last Sunday’s oped from Ben Tripousis, northern regional director for the California High-Speed Rail Authority, provided no concrete evidence of why we should spend the billions on High Speed Rail.

Originally sold to California voters in 2008 for $33 billion, cost estimates have almost tripled, ridership projections have significantly been reduced and the estimated time of travel has doubled. The fact is the HSR is a bad idea for California.

HSR supporters are failing to understand how vehicle technology is making it impossible for rail systems to be competitive to the automobile. Train supporters like to highlight the fact that in 1990, 60 percent of voters supported Proposition 116 which was intended to expand passenger-rail systems. 1990 was also the year the World Wide Web was created and cellphones were bigger than a shoe box, very expensive and not reliable. Technology has advanced significantly from

25 years ago and what was practical then is not necessarily practical today.

The life cycles of products are changing at a very fast pace, including those technologies related to vehicle systems. A good analogy to how product life cycles change can be looked at computing systems (mainframes to smartphones). In today’s transportation environment, we can look at train technology as the mainframe and vehicles as smartphones.

Automobile manufacturers are integrating vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) systems, designed to allow automobiles to “talk” to each other for improved safety and efficiency on the roadways. V2V is becoming a reality and the technology has been successfully demonstrated in Europe in the form of road trains. Current models already have such technology, enabling the car to automatically stop before colliding with an object, other vehicle or a person. Safety systems are now available that will help prevent side-swiping by cars.

In 2012, researchers at Columbia University studied how effective vehicles equipped with V2V increase efficiency in the highway capacity due to the fact that vehicles can safely travel closer together. Their research showed that when traveling at 65 mph, if all vehicles had V2V, the capacity can be increased by almost 300 percent. In the future, Highway 1 capacity could go from 6,000 cars per hour to 24,000.

Most important to the automobile manufacturers, the baby boomers will not have to give up their independence and will continue to be able to drive their cars because of the automated safety systems.

As a resident of Santa Cruz traveling to Southern California, I would drive my electric car on I-5, merging into a road train, where I would sit back and read my iPad. Upon arriving in Southern California (likely faster than a HSR expedition) I would be able to drive my car around town.

Another example would be with left-turn light improvements. When the light turns green, the first car will automatically proceed, immediately followed by the group of cars in line to turn left, while at the same time the other cross-traffic will be prevented from entering the intersection. Rather than 20 seconds for the line of five cars to turn left, the time will take 10 seconds. Multiply that by the multiple intersections across the county and we will see significant improved traffic flow.

HSR will not be able to compete with the advance vehicle systems. I will choose to drive ride in my car to L.A.

Brian Peoples lives in Aptos.
May 1, 2014 RTC Meeting
Item #26 - Add-On Pages

24 April 2014

Garin Schneider
District Local Assistance Engineer
Caltrans, Office of Local Assistance
1120 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-5415

RE: EXHIBIT 23-B REQUEST FOR TIME EXTENSION (LOCAL STIP PROJECTS)

Date: April 24, 2014
PPNO: 2363
PROJECT #: RPSTPLE - 5304(009)
Adv ID or EA No.: 0512000221
Park Avenue Sidewalk
City of Capitola, Santa Cruz
Assembly District: 27
Senate District: 11

Dear Mr. Schneider:

We request that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) approve a request for a time extension for this project.

A. Project description:

New sidewalk construction that will provide primary pedestrian access from the Cliffwood Heights neighborhood to Capitola Village. Currently only 4 short segments of sidewalk exist. This project would complete the connection. The project will also include crosswalks at Cabrillo and Washburn improving access to transit stops on the south side of Park Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources (Specify fund source type - ex. RSTP, STIP, AB2766, Local, TDA, etc.)</th>
<th>Source Total</th>
<th>Envl (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>Right-of-Way (ROW)</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STIP funding</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 2: TDA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 3: Local</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 4</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 5</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 6</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 7</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$326,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26-13
B. Project element for which extension requested: (check appropriate box)

- [X] Allocation*
- [ ] Expenditure
- [ ] Award
- [ ] Completion (contract acceptance)

C. Phase (component) of project: (check appropriate box or boxes)

- [ ] Environmental Studies & Permits
- [ ] Plans, Specs. & Estimate
- [ ] Right of Way
- [X] Construction*

D. Allocation and deadline summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Date By Phase (if applicable)</th>
<th>Allocated Amount By Phase (if applicable)</th>
<th>Original Deadline</th>
<th>Number of Months of Extension Requested</th>
<th>Extended Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization for Construction</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/31/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Reason for project delay

The project has been delayed due to delays in the initial funding for PA & ED. The local funding source included City of Capitola Sales Tax revenue. The economic recession resulted in 25% reduction in this revenue in Capitola resulting in multiple program reductions and delays in capital improvements. In fiscal years 2010/11 – 2012/13 (three years) only $100,000 was allocated to all CIP projects in the City. Full local funding for this project was provided in fiscal year 2013/14. Initial designs were not begun until 10/13 but have progressed; the environmental certification has been delayed accordingly. A Negative Declaration is anticipated based on anticipated reviews mentioned above. The following timeline is proposed for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Original Date</th>
<th>Extended Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begin PA &amp; ED</td>
<td>7/12</td>
<td>10/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certify CEQA &amp; NEPA</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Design</td>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certify Right of Way</td>
<td>1/13</td>
<td>4/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Authorization to</td>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Per Section 66 of the CTC STIP Guidelines, “For each request to extend the deadline to allocate construction funds, the agency requesting the extension should submit, in conjunction with the request, a project construction STIP history. The request should also identify any cost increase related to the delay and how the increase would be funded. The STIP history should note the original inclusion of project construction in the STIP and each project construction STIP amendment, including, for each, the amendment date, the dollar amount programmed for construction, and the scheduled year of construction delivery. It is the CTC’s intent to review this history when considering a construction allocation extension request.”

F. Status of project milestones/revised project milestones
1) Completion of Environmental Document:
   CEQA – Notice of Exemption/Neg Dec. (original date: 11/12 – revised date: 12/14)
   NEPA - Exemption (same as above).

2) Right of Way Certification:
   Right of Way certification is 4/15 (original milestone 1/13).

3) Construction:
   Advertise for construction: 5/15 (original milestone 3/13).

G. Timely Use of Funds

We request that the CTC approve this request at the June 25 and 26 2014 meeting.

H. Local Agency Certification:

This Request for Time Extension has been prepared in accordance with the Procedures for Administering Local Grant Projects in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). I certify that the information provided in the document is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form will be returned and the request may be delayed. Please advise us as soon as the time extension has been approved. You may direct any questions to

Steven Jesberg at (831) 475-7300

Signature Title: Public Works Director Date: 4-24-14

Agency/Commission: City of Capitola

I. Regional Transportation Planning Agency/County Transportation Commission Concurrence:

Concurred

Signature Title: Date:

Agency/CTC

J. Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer Acceptance:

I have reviewed the information submitted on the Request for Time Extension and agree it is complete and has been prepared in accordance with the Procedures for Administering Local Grant Projects in the State Transportation Improvement Program.

Signature Title: Date:

Attachments: