

Summary of Comments Received on Draft Transportation Plan Goals, Targets and Policies and Responses

April–May 2012

A summary of comments received by May 13 on the draft transportation plan goals, targets and policies and their responses are below. The draft transportation plan goals, targets, and policies were first made available for comment as part of the April Regional Transportation Commission advisory committee agenda packets and the April 19th Transportation Policy Workshop agenda packet. Comments were received from members of the Regional Transportation Commission Advisory Committees (Bicycle, Elderly & Disabled Transportation, and Interagency Technical Advisory); commissioners during the Transportation Policy Workshop meeting; the public at the April 19th Public Workshop hosted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission; and the public through a web survey hosted by the Regional Transportation Commission.

*The asterisk indicates that a revision has been made to the goals, targets, policies and/or strategies based on the comment received.

Comments/Responses on Goals and Targets

1. *Comment:* Target 3C should look at how investments impact services, not the amount of funding.

**Response:* Target 3C is revised to read: “Increase the percentage of transportation disadvantaged individuals within a 30-minute walk, bike or transit trip to key destinations specific to the transportation disadvantaged”. Another target considered was, “Reduce the percent of income spent on transportation for transportation disadvantaged”, however, insufficient data is available to analyze this target.
2. *Comment:* How do you improve health if the target 1F is 0%?

**Response:* Target 1F has been revised to “Decrease single occupancy vehicle mode share compared to the baseline condition between 2 to 8 percent by 2035.” Research supports the goal that increasing bicycle, pedestrian and transit trips can increase regular physical activity- a direct benefit to health. A 2% reduction is based on reducing one-third of the short trips (less than 2 miles) from single occupancy vehicle to bicycle or walk trips. An 8% reduction in single occupancy vehicles can be translated into increases of the following: over 100% in transit ridership and 30% in bicycle trips. These potential changes could increase the number of calories burned by an individual by approximately 350-700 per week.
3. *Comment:* Clarify that Goal 2 is for all modes.

**Response:* Goal 2 has been revised as shown: Reduce transportation related fatalities and injuries for all transportation modes.
4. *Comment:* Goals should include bicyclists and motorists education.

**Response:* Education activities that can demonstrate safety benefits and advance Goal 2 are addressed by a revised Policy 2.1, Safety: “Prioritize funding for safety projects and programs

improvements that will reduce fatal and injury collisions.” The revised policy clarifies the intention to address projects and programs.

5. *Comment:* Goal 2 should include “to maintain roads so that they are not hazardous to travel.”
**Response:* A strategy has been added under Goal 2. Strategy 2.1.4, Maintain and operate the existing transportation infrastructure to minimize hazards when traveling for all modes.
6. *Comment:* Goals should focus on number of users
Response: The number of users is a primary consideration when evaluating the cost-effectiveness of projects and is addressed in Policy 3.1, Cost-Effectiveness and System Maintenance, which includes Strategy 3.1.4, Facility Demand: Prioritize projects based on number of users of a facility and system management plans.
7. *Comment:* Reduce cost of public transportation and household transportation related expenses.
Response: Goal 3 addresses the benefit of transportation investments for all users and includes Policy 3.4, Demonstrate that planned investments will reduce disparities in safety and access for transportation disadvantaged populations. The cost of transportation has been identified as a barrier to access for transportation disadvantaged populations such as seniors and children, therefore proposed projects that reduce the cost of transportation for transportation disadvantaged will be evaluated during the development of the project list, also known as the Action Element of the transportation plan based on their ability to improve access for transportation disadvantaged to key destinations.
8. *Comment:* Maintenance targets should also address the condition of bicycle lanes and sidewalks.
Response: Targets 3A and 3B address both the condition of the vehicle lane and the bicycle facilities. Sidewalk maintenance is the responsibility of adjacent property owners and thus is not included in the pavement condition index. A project sponsored by RTC is currently underway to provide information to property owners about their responsibility for sidewalk maintenance. However, there are many pedestrian facilities needed to close the gaps and improve access to activity centers, school sites, transit and other locations.
9. *Comment:* How is distributing benefits equally among modes addressed by the draft goals?
Response: The draft goals and targets are focused on sustainable outcomes, not mode specific investments. In many strategies, investments that encourage a greater number of trips to be made by bicycle, walking and transit achieve targets. In other cases, investments that support more efficient use of vehicle trips achieve targets. Still, in other cases, investments that support fewer trips achieve targets.
10. *Comment:* Limit goals to improving non-motorized transportation only.
Response: Goals and policies are designed to be outcome oriented and not mode specific. Proposed projects will be evaluated based on their consistency with goals and policies and their ability to achieve specific outcomes and advance targets. Not everyone can use non-motorized transportations, but small shifts can result in substantial benefits.
11. *Comment:* Limit goals to improving vehicle traffic only.
Response: Goals and policies are designed to be outcome oriented and not mode specific. Proposed projects will be evaluated based on their consistency with goals and policies and their ability to achieve specific outcomes and advance targets.
12. *Comment:* Goals should place greater emphasis on road maintenance.

Response: Maintaining roads is a critical strategy to achieve several sustainable goals and can demonstrate significant benefits to achieve cost-effectiveness goals. Yet, a combination of approaches is needed to develop a sustainable transportation system consistent with the Triple Bottom Line definition of sustainability.

13. *Comment:* More emphasis should be given to reducing congestion and improving speed and efficiency for vehicles.

Response: Reducing vehicle congestion is primarily addressed by the draft policy element using the speed consistency, travel time reliability, and vehicles miles traveled measures. Policies that support these measures as ways of reducing congestion include: Policy 1.1 Transportation Demand Management; Policy 1.2 Transportation System Management; and, Policy 1.2 Transportation Infrastructure.

14. *Comment:* Goals should be prioritized with safety the number one goal.

Response: Safety is of critical component of transportation planning and is a key component in achieving a sustainable transportation system, as it addresses the people, and prosperity component of the Triple Bottom Line definition of sustainability. Yet, a combination of approaches is needed to develop a sustainable transportation system which comprehensively addresses all of the Triple Bottom Line components: people, prosperity and planet.

Transportation system investments should optimize all three goals in order to be sustainable.

15. *Comment:* Improving health should not be a goal for the transportation system.

Response: Because transportation infrastructure investments have long-lasting implications not only on the transportation system, but also on the larger environmental, economic, and social systems with which transportation interacts, the draft policy element proposes to consider the impacts of transportation investments using the Triple Bottom Line definition of sustainability, including people, planet and prosperity. Research demonstrates that increasing active modes of transportation, such as walking and bicycling, can play a role in improving health and reducing obesity. In addition, some forms of transportation produce more health-affecting pollution than others, therefore transportation choices have direct and indirect impacts to health.

16. *Comment:* Improving equity should not be a goal for the transportation system.

Response: Because transportation infrastructure investments have long-lasting implications not only on the transportation system, but also on the larger environmental, economic, and social systems with which transportation interacts, the draft policy element proposes to include a fairness component when considering the impacts of transportation investments using the Triple Bottom Line definition of sustainability, including people, planet and prosperity. Transportation investments can disproportionately impact or benefit the ability of some segments of the population to access essential goods and services.

17. *Comment:* Target 1D: Speed consistency as a target is too automobile centric, and not multimodal enough.

Response: Some targets may be more specific to one component of the transportation system but it is the intent of the RTC that in its entirety, all of the goals, targets, and policies adequately address all components of the entire transportation system. The speed consistency target aims to reduce the amount of stop-and-go traffic and thus reduce fuel consumption and GHG emissions. The speed consistency target was combined with Target 1B.

18. *Comment:* Goals are too vague.

Response: Goals are intended to identify a vision for a sustainable transportation system for Santa Cruz County. Developing a transportation system that is sustainable and addressing the transportation needs of Santa Cruz County travelers requires a variety of approaches and considerations. The specific concepts encompassed in the three goals deliberately address sustainable outcomes as defined by the Sustainable Transportation Analysis Rating System and comprehensively address the Triple Bottom Line definition of sustainability.

19. *Comment:* Provide transportation choices.

Response: The draft goals and policies support a multimodal transportation system. It is the intent of the RTC to include goals, targets, and policies that adequately address all components of the entire transportation system.

20. *Comment:* Improve access to business areas.

Response: The draft policies address transportation improvements that can result in economic benefits. Improving economic benefit through improved access is primarily addressed by the draft policy element through policies focused on Transportation Demand Management, Transportation System Management, Transportation Infrastructure and Land use. These policies supporting actions that improve travel time reliability, reduce fuel related expenses and thus increase reinvestment in the local economy, and increase the percent of people within a 30 minute trip to employment centers.

21. *Comment:* Greater emphasis should be on visitor/tourist related travel.

Response: The unique transportation needs of visitors are supported primarily by Goal 1, which address access to key destinations using a combination of Transportation Demand Management, Transportation System Management, Transportation Infrastructure Improvements, and Land Use Strategies.

22. *Comment:* Focus on less vehicle travel and the need to own a car.

Response: Two of the primary measures encompassed in the draft transportation targets are reduced vehicle miles traveled and reduce single occupancy vehicle trips. These measures can be advanced by shifting trips from vehicles to bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and carshare modes. Many of the targets and policies associated with Goal 1 support less vehicle travel, and safe and convenient access to key destinations.

23. *Comment:* Reduce commute times and focus on local employment.

Response: Access to employment directly advances economic benefit and access outcomes, which are encompassed in Goal 1. Improved access to employment centers, travel time reliability, and vehicle miles traveled measures will be used to evaluate transportation investments ability to improve access to employment.

24. *Comment:* Target 1B is not challenging enough.

25. *Response:* Target 1B, "Reduce per capita fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions by 5 percent by 2035 due to a reduction in vehicle miles traveled and improved speed consistency" is consistent with the greenhouse gas emission reduction target established by the California Air Resources Board for the tri-county Monterey Bay Area. Achieving this target equates to reversing the historical trend of significantly increasing vehicle miles traveled per person. Establishing a target does not prevent the region from exceeding the target. The target is intended to reflect an aggressive, but achievable target based on available resources, and influence of transportation planning agencies. Other policies and advances such as fuel

efficiency requirements and developments in vehicle and fuel technologies are expected to further reduce greenhouse gas emission per capita.

26. *Comment:* Why not more aggressive targets?

Response: Establishing targets involves setting desirable future objectives first then determining the degree to which investments will meet objectives, rather than relying on demand-based forecasts to direct the planning and investments. Proposed targets consider aggressive, but reasonably obtainable targets based on existing and potential future conditions and state and federal requirements.

27. *Comment:* Provide a context for Targets 2A and 2B.

Response: Proposed targets consider aggressive, but obtainable targets based on existing and potential future conditions and similar efforts. Methodologies for targets will be discussed in greater detail when various transportation investment packages are evaluated. The best available data will be used as baseline data. In 2009, injury and fatal collisions in Santa Cruz County were as follows: bicycle, 189; pedestrian, 37; motorized, 1,386.

28. *Comment:* Goals should more explicitly address greenhouse gas emission reductions and AB32 requirements.

Response: Goal 1 addresses reducing pollution. This includes greenhouse gases and other air pollutants. The targets that intend to advance Goal 1 are more specific. Target 1B specifically addresses greenhouse gas emission reduction targets. AB32 sets specific greenhouse gas emission targets for California for all sectors using a combination of strategies, many outside the purview of a regional transportation agency. SB375 implements AB32 by establishing targets for regions to reduce greenhouse emissions by reducing vehicle miles traveled and fuel efficiency associated with vehicle speed. Target 1B is consistent with SB375 vehicle miles traveled reduction goals.

29. *Comment:* Greater emphasis on bicycle infrastructure.

Response: Goals and policies are designed to be outcome oriented and not mode specific. Proposed projects will be evaluated based on their consistency with goals and policies and their ability to achieve specific outcomes and advance targets.

30. *Comment:* A sustainable transportation system should not focus on improving access.

Response: The RTC has adopted the Triple Bottom Line definition of sustainability, which supports a system that addresses the needs of people, planet and prosperity, and approved eight sustainable outcomes as the basis for evaluating a transportation plan, including access. According to this framework, improving access can advance all three areas of the triple bottom line and advance several sustainable outcomes simultaneously, including, economic benefit, climate and energy, by improving the convenience and quality of trips for all modes.

31. *Comment:* Goals should focus on improved mobility only.

Response: Mobility is one factor that affects individual's ability to access goals and services. Mobility can be provided by walking, bicycling, transit, or automobiles. Mobility is based on travel distance and speed. Reducing travel distance and speed are addressed by Goal 1 and policies 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 & 1.5. A focus on only mobility would most likely not result in a sustainable transportation system supported by Triple Bottom Line definition of sustainability as one that addresses people, prosperity and planet.

32. *Comment:* Goal should be included to encourage alternative fuel vehicles.

Response: Policy 1.3.4 promotes electric vehicle use through development of infrastructure related to electric vehicles such as charging stations. Electric vehicles have demonstrated potential to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions when compared with other alternative fuel vehicles. In addition, reductions in greenhouse gas emissions due to alternative fuel vehicles, specifically technological improvements, are mainly being addressed at the Federal and State level and within the private sector. The RTC is primarily addressing reductions in greenhouse gas emissions due to reductions in vehicle miles traveled and improvements in speed consistency.

33. *Comment:* Add “plan for future energy demands and availability”.

Response: The draft transportation plan goals, targets and policies incorporate sustainable outcomes which in turn support a sustainable transportation system. A sustainable transportation system strives to reduce future energy demands by improving access through the ability to meet most of your needs without having to drive and thus increasing the use of bike, walk and transit modes while also reducing fuel emissions by improving speed consistency. Reductions in fuel use through vehicle efficiency requirements are being addressed at the Federal and State level.

34. *Comment:* Goal 1 should be only goal.

Response: Because transportation infrastructure investments have long-lasting implications not only on the transportation system, but also on the larger environmental, economic, and social systems with which transportation interacts, the draft policy element proposes to consider the impacts of transportation investments using the Triple Bottom Line definition of sustainability, including people, planet and prosperity. While Goal 1 addresses several components of a sustainable transportation system, Goals 2 and 3 address safety and equity measures, also required to achieve a sustainable system by way of addressing people and prosperity outcomes.

35. *Comment:* Improve driver experience.

Response: An “improved driver experience” is highly subjective and could mean different things to different people. However, Goal 1 and Target 1C is intended to improve driver experience by improving travel time reliability for motor vehicles and improving multimodal level of service for walk and bike trips.

36. *Comment:* Reduce traffic during commute periods and reduce commute times.

37. *Response:* Goal 1 addresses improved access to jobs and supports actions to reduce travel times including, reducing demand on transportation system during peak periods by improving people’s ability to meet their needs without having to drive alone, creating incentives to travel outside of peak periods, and improving system operations.

38. *Comment:* Monitor use of the transportation system to assess ways to increase alternative transportation strategies

Response: Establishing targets will provide a tool for evaluating progress towards goals. Targets 1A, 1B and 1D establish measurable goals for increasing trips made by walking, bicycling, transit and carpool/vanpooling. Also, strategy 3.2.2 under Goal 3 discusses need for data collection to assess transportation needs.

39. *Comment:* Focus on managing student travel

Response: Goal 1 addresses improving people’s ability (including students) to meet most of their daily needs without having to drive by increasing the percentage of people within a 30-

minute walk, bike or transit trip to key destinations. Strategy 1.1.1 includes individualized marketing to schools to achieve these goals.

40. *Comment:* Manage peak period travel with congestion pricing
Response: Policy 1.2 and Strategy 1.2.7 considers congestion pricing as a means for increasing the efficiency of the existing transportation system.
41. *Comment:* Reduce the amount of time spent on transportation
Response: Goal 1 and Target 1A support decreasing the amount of time people spend on transportation by improving people's ability to meet most of their daily needs without having to drive and increasing the percentage of people within a 30-minute walk, bike or transit trip to key destinations.
42. *Comment:* Give incentives to people who commute by bike
Response: Policy 1.1 and Strategy 1.1.1 discuss the use of incentive programs that encourage people to reduce trips made driving alone including shifting to other modes such as bicycling.
43. *Comment:* Cars can reduce pollution when there are less backups and they get better mileage.
Response: Goal 1, Target 1B addresses reducing pollution through improved speed consistency.
44. *Comment:* Consider density and diversity in land use.
Response: Policy 1.5 addresses the support of land use decisions that locate new facilities close to existing services.
45. *Comment:* Need more revenue in order to achieve goals- cannot limit ourselves to available revenue.
Response: Policy 3.3 addresses the support of new or increased taxes and fees that reflect the cost to operate and maintain the transportation system.
46. *Comment:* Add "events" to goal 1 as people must have access to events too.
Response: Goal 1 includes "other regular needs" which would encompass events.
47. *Comment:* Goals should say "provide" not "improve"
Response: Goals are designed to direct changes from the current baseline condition
48. *Comment:* Reduce solo commuting, work with employer to reduce solo commuting
Response: Policy 1.1 and Strategy 1.1.1 discuss individualized marketing to employers to reduce trips made driving alone.
49. *Comment:* Increase public awareness for transit use
Response: Policy 1.1, Strategies 1.1.1, 1.1.3 and 1.1.5 all include aspects of public education about the transit system.
50. *Comment:* Improve access to transit
Response: Goal 1, Target 1A, Target 1C, Policies 1.3 and 1.4 and Strategies 1.3.1 and Strategies 1.3.2 support improving access to transit.
51. *Comment:* Discuss role of fossil fuel in support of OPEC and causing pollution
Response: Goal 1 and Target 1B support reducing fuel consumption and thus decrease transportation related pollution.
52. *Comment:* Make transit free
Response: Goal 1 and Policies 1.1 and 1.3 and Strategies 1.3.2 support making transit more accessible and affordable.
53. *Comment:* Goals should not involve building more roads for carbon based transportation
Response: The draft goals and targets are focused on sustainable outcomes, not mode specific investments. In many strategies, investments that encourage a greater number of trips to be

made by bicycle, walking and transit achieve targets. In other cases, investments that support more efficient use of vehicle trips achieve targets. Still, in other cases, investments that support fewer trips achieve targets.

54. *Comment:* Repword Goal 3: "Improve people's access to their daily transportation needs in a safe, fair, environmentally sustainable and economical manner."
Response: There are many ways that Goal 3 can be written to describe a similar intent. Goal 3 as currently written also includes the need to solicit broad public input in stating "...responsive to the needs of all users of the transportation system... "
55. *Comment:* More emphasis on reducing distance between jobs and homes
Response: Goal 1, Target 1A, Policy 1.5 and Strategy 1.5.2 are focused on providing improved access to jobs, schools, health care and other regular needs, and increasing the percentage of people within a 30-minute bike, walk or transit trip to key destinations.
56. *Comment:* Reinstate previous bus routes
Response: Goal 1 and Policies 1.1 and 1.3 and Strategies 1.3.2 support making transit more accessible and affordable.
57. *Comment:* Need to know baseline data for targets
Response: Targets were chosen based on availability of data to estimate the baseline conditions.
58. *Comment:* Decrease the size of the buses
Response: Alternatives to existing transit vehicles could be considered under Policy 1.3 and Policy 3.1, however a large portion of providing transit is the operator and maintenance, which is a cost regardless of the vehicle size.
59. *Comment:* More emphasis on travel safety and connectivity.
Response: Goal 2 is dedicated to increasing safety on the transportation system. Policy 1.4 (Transportation Infrastructure) promotes network connectivity by closing gaps in the bicycle, pedestrian and transit networks.
60. *Comment:* Goals restrict mobility and infringe on people's rights
Response: The goals, policies and targets aim to expand, not restrict the range of transportation options.
61. *Comment:* Decrease single occupant vehicle trips goal is not reasonable
Response: The target for the reduction in SOV mode share is between 2% and 8%. A reduction in vehicle miles traveled of 5% would require approximately an 8% reduction in SOV mode share and this is the upper limit of the SOV reduction target. The lower limit reduction target was determined from an assumption that if one third of the short trips (average of 1.5 miles in length) could be shifted from SOV to walk, bike or transit, this target could be achieved.
62. *Comment:* Improve mass transit service, performance, reliability and cost effectiveness
Response: Goal 1, Target 1A, Target 1C, Policies 1.3 and 1.4, Policy 3.1, Strategy 1.3.1 and Strategy 1.3.2 all support improved transit service.
63. *Comment:* Set different goals for urban and rural residents
Response: The Policy Element of the Regional Transportation Plan defines countywide goals, targets and polices. In some instances, more significant advancement towards goals will occur in urban areas or on more highly traveled routes where the number of individuals served is greater.
64. *Comment:* Focus on efficiently moving people

Response: Goal 1, Target 1A and 1C and Policies 1.1 to 1.5 all address improving the transportation system so that it is more efficient and access is improved.

65. *Comment:* Make it harder to drive

Response: The draft goals and targets are focused on sustainable outcomes, not mode specific investments. In many strategies, investments that encourage a greater number of trips to be made by bicycle, walking and transit achieve targets. In other cases, investments that support more efficient use of vehicle trips achieve targets. Still, in other cases, investments that support fewer trips achieve targets.

66. *Comment:* Improve walking, biking, and transit corridors

Response: Goals 1 and 2, Targets 1A to 1D, Targets 2A and 2B, Policies 1.3 and 1.4 and Policies 2.1 and 2.3 address improving walk, bike and transit access.

67. *Comment:* Change targets that have zero in them

Response: Target 1F has been revised to decrease single occupancy vehicle mode share compared to the baseline condition between 2 and 8 percent by 2035. A 2 percent reduction is based on reducing one-third of the short trips (less than 2 miles) from single occupancy vehicle to bicycle or walk trips. Target 1D has been revised by incorporating it into Target 1B and explaining more clearly the role that improved speed consistency plays along with reductions in vehicle miles traveled in reducing fuel consumption.

68. *Comment:* Goals should focus on serving all community.

Response: Goal 3 addresses the need to deliver improvements in a way which is responsive to the needs of all users of the transportation system. Also, the draft transportation policies take into account the transportation needs of a wide range of the county's population by providing transportation choices through support of a multimodal transportation system and addressing the specific needs of transportation disadvantaged populations.

69. *Comment:* Target 3D should be measurable.

Response: Outreach efforts for RTC planning and project implementation activities are generally documented including the number of outreach materials distributed, what mechanisms were utilized to distribute outreach materials, and number of participants. RTC will continue to investigate what a reasonable goal for public input based on similar efforts.

70. *Comment:* Focus on improving rural roads.

Response: Target 3A and 3B address system maintenance. The draft transportation policies provide guidance about how to identify cost-effective improvements including optimum maintenance and replacement levels and number of users.

71. *Comment:* Separate out Goal 3 into four separate goals.

Response: Goal 3 combines the manner in which access and safety goals referenced in Goal 1 and Goal 2 are delivered, including cost-effectiveness, distribution of benefits amongst population groups, and impact on ecological function.

72. *Comment:* What are the metrics used to measure transportation disadvantaged people?

Response: Transportation disadvantaged individuals are defined as: elderly (70+), disabled, low-income (<\$15,000 annual income per year for an individual), limited English proficiency; and, youth (0-17 years). These groups tend to be overrepresented in households without access to a vehicle. In addition, barriers to transit and pedestrian facilities may also prevent these groups from experiencing the full benefit of the transportation system. These definitions mirror those used in other transportation planning and local social service agencies.

73. *Comment:* Target 3D- go to where people are so they don't have to come to you
Response: Policy 3.6 focuses on soliciting broad public input and is supported by Strategy, 3.6.2, supports using a broad range of outreach methods and media solutions to provide the communication access to information about the RTC's programs, projects and services on a regular basis. This supports public outreach activities that "go to where people are" to seek input on transportation plans, programs and projects. That said, this process is extremely labor intensive and costly. The RTC tries to balance all effective outreach/input strategies including attending meetings, holding hearings, and use of electronic means.
74. *Comments:* Monitoring progress towards "reducing disparities" may require data that is not available.
Response: Data limitations could make it difficult to precisely measure progress towards this sustainable outcome. For this reason, the measure for evaluating how well disparities will be reduced is recommended to be "Increase the percentage of transportation disadvantaged people with a 30-minute walk, bike or transit trip to key destinations" and the sustainable outcome will be revised to "~~Reduce transportation disparities~~ Enhance healthy, safe access to key destinations for transportation-disadvantaged populations."
75. *Comment:* Improving physical activity by encouraging active transportation could increase safety risks.
Response: Goals and policies are intended to assist in identifying actions that simultaneously advance multiple targets, including improving health and safety. The proposed framework will assist in identifying those actions with multiple benefits and understanding the trade offs in the event that actions advance one target while limiting advances towards another target.
76. *Comment:* Separate targets for injuries and fatalities .
Response: Separate targets for injuries and fatalities for each mode are being considered although given the low number of fatalities in Santa Cruz County for each mode per year it may be more difficult to assess improvements over time.
77. *Comment:* Instead of reducing the # of high collision locations, it would be more meaningful to try to reduce the # of collisions at the high collision locations.
Response: The target to reduce the number of high collision locations aims to improve safety at particular locations that are known for high numbers of collisions. By reducing the number of high collision locations, the number of collisions at these locations will decrease. A high collision location is defined as a certain number of collisions per intersection per year.
78. *Comment:* We should aim for ZERO accidents.
Response: While a target of zero accident rates may be desirable, a target of a 50% reduction is an aggressive first step. Over time, the targets will be re-assessed to determine whether they are achievable given current resources.
79. *Comment:* Provide better collision reporting
Response: Information gathered on collision reports is determined and collected by the California Highway Patrol through the SWITRS database. This data is limited to collisions that are reported to police. The RTC and other transportation safety groups use the SWITRS data to determine the total numbers of collisions per mode, the high collision locations and to understand trends over time. In the absence of other reliable data, the SWITRS database will be used to determine the baseline data for the safety targets.
80. *Comment:* Emphasize feasibility of achieving targets for Goal 2

Response: The targets for Goal 2 were selected based on setting an aggressive but attainable target. Over time, the targets will be re-assessed to determine whether they are achievable given current resources.

Comments/Responses on Policies and Strategies

81. *Comment:* Revise Policy 2.3, Traffic Calming. Traffic calming typically refers to infrastructure improvements and programs to slow vehicle traffic down on residential streets.
**Response:* Policy 2.3 has been re-titled “Complete Streets” and combined with Policy 2.4. The intent of Policy 2.3 and 2.4 is to encourage system design considerations that improve multimodal safety while addressing transportation demands specific to that area or location.
82. *Comment:* Consider ecodriving as a strategy for reducing fuel emissions.
**Response:* Policy 1.2 now includes Strategy 1.2.7, ecodriving. Sufficient research is available to document the benefits of eco/efficient driving towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
83. *Comment:* Consider carsharing as a strategy for reducing vehicle miles traveled.
**Response:* Policy 1.1 now includes Strategy 1.1.7, Carsharing. Sufficient research is available to document the benefit of carsharing on reducing vehicle miles driven to support inclusion of this strategy.
84. *Comment:* Strategy 1.1.1 should also allow for flexible work schedules.
**Response:* Strategy 1.1.1 now includes flexible work schedules. Flexible work schedules that reduce time spent in congestion and reduce the number of trips also achieve goals.
85. *Comment:* More explicitly address coordination between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development.
**Response:* Included as Strategy 3.2.3, Plan Consistency.
86. *Comment:* Include policies which directly support improved travel times for bicycle trips.
**Response:* Several policies support strategies that improve travel times for bicycles including: Policy 1.2, which encompasses strategies to address transportation system operations impacting bicycles and, Policy 1.3 & 1.4, which encompasses strategies addressing availability of bicycle facilities and connectivity of bicycle facilities. Also, Target IC has been revised to include, “improve multimodal level of service for walk and bicycle trips within and between key destinations” in order to better capture and measure the convenience and quality of bicycle trips since limited data about travel times for bicycle trips is available.
87. *Comment:* Increase enforcement for bicyclists and motorists
**Response:* Additional enforcement activities that can demonstrate safety benefits would be addressed by Policy 2.1, Safety: “Prioritize funding for safety projects and programs ~~improvements~~ that will reduce fatal and injury collisions,” which has been revised to clarify that the policy intends to address projects and programs.
88. *Comments:* Increasing tree canopy may not be beneficial in all locations.
**Response:* Revise Policy 3.5.3 as follows, “Promote native and drought-tolerant plants in the right-of-way and increase tree canopy coverage, where appropriate.”
89. *Comment:* Timely manner must be proportional to the size of the project
**Response:* Policy 3.1.1 has been revised as follows, Support projects that can be delivered in a timely manner, relative to their scope.
90. *Comment:* Need more policies that support expanded transit service.

Response: Policy 1.3, Transportation Infrastructure, includes Strategy 1.3.1 which focuses on improved transit service by decreasing individuals travel times. This may include, but is not limited to, providing more frequent service, and providing additional service.

91. *Comment:* Add policy that requires developments which serve transportation disadvantaged individuals to coordinate with transit service.

Response: The proposed draft goals focus on providing improved access and safety for transportation disadvantaged individuals to key destinations. Facilities located within these areas will benefit from transportation investments, including transit service, that serve these locations.

92. *Comment:* Strategy 1.5.2 should also include “served by transit”

Response: Strategy 1.5.2 supports multimodal transportation investments, including transit.

93. *Comment:* Include more policies that address the attractiveness of trips

Response: Several policies including, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, & 2.3, address the attractiveness of trips including a consideration of facilities, design, safety and convenience.

94. *Comment:* Include policy that encourages separated facilities for vehicles and bicyclists and pedestrians.

Response: Separated facilities would be considered under Policy 2.3, System Design as they reduce the potential for conflict between bicyclists, pedestrians and vehicles.

95. *Comment:* Bicycle and pedestrian modes are not emphasized enough in policies.

Response: Two of the primary measures encompassed in the draft transportation targets are reduced vehicle miles traveled and reduce single occupancy vehicle trips. These measures can be advanced by shifting trips from vehicles to bicycle and pedestrian modes. Support for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, system management improvements that addresses bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and safety efforts that emphasize bicycle and pedestrian safety are included as draft policies 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.3.

96. *Comment:* Policies should more directly support economic development.

Response: The draft policies address transportation improvements that can result in economic benefits, not economic development specifically. Economic benefit is addressed through three primary measures: reinvestment in the local economy through reducing vehicle expenses, including fuel expenses; travel time reliability, which support a competitive business environment as business and individuals can better manage delivery and time spent in travel; improving access to employment and other key destinations, which include education and commercial centers.

97. *Comment:* Greater emphasis should be placed on complete streets.

Response: Complete streets are supported by several policies including, but not limited to, policies 1.4 and 2.3.

98. *Comment:* Are potential impacts of increases in fuel prices considered?

Response: The draft policies are designed to provide travelers with a variety of transportation choices, which would support transportation system users in making choices consistent with the economic opportunities and constraints an individual may be facing. Although the number of vehicle miles traveled is sensitive to fuel prices, transportation planning agencies have little influence over fuel prices. Policy 3.3 supports the role of fuel taxes and user fees to provide funding for needed transportation improvements and achieve sustainability goals.

99. *Comment:* Support affordable investments in public transportation.

Response: Proposed projects must be consistent with adopted draft goals and policies and will be evaluated based on sustainable measures, including cost-effectiveness.

100. *Comment:* Sustainable funding sources are needed.

Response: Policy 3.3, System Financing: Support new or increased taxes and fees that reflect the cost to operate and maintain the transportation system, intends to address the need for a reliable source of transportation funding.

101. *Comment:* There are many mechanisms that will influence behavior.

Response: The draft transportation plan goals, targets, and policies consider the ability of transportation agencies to support a variety of transportation choices with the intent of addressing trends and future projections.

102. *Comment:* Improving road quality seems to facilitate motorists driving too fast, and thereby putting undue strain on road surfaces.

Response: Several factors play a role in determining road quality, including, but not limited to: traffic volumes, vehicle fleets, and geographic conditions. Policy 2.1, Safety, includes Strategy 2.1.2, Speed Suitability, which encourages projects to demonstrate that streets are designed and speeds are set to maximize multimodal safety and are consistent with surrounding land use.

103. *Comment:* More pay-to-use programs should be implemented and less subsidizing of car use.

Response: Policy 3.3, System Financing includes Strategy, 3.3.3 which supports evaluation of user fees, where appropriate, such as, but not limited to, congestion pricing and vehicle registration fees going toward street and road improvements.

104. *Comment:* Permeable asphalt, paving, and water catchment systems should be used.

Response: Policy 3.5, Ecological Function supports transportation investments that can be delivered in a way that, among other things, increases water quality and enhances sensitive areas by using strategies such as, but not limited to, low impact design (Strategy 3.5.2).

105. *Comment:* Generate revenues from bicycle registration and require bicycle operating licenses

Response: Policy 3.3, System Financing, supports new or increased taxes and fees that reflect the cost to operate and maintain the transportation system and includes Strategy, 3.3.3 which supports evaluation of user fees, where appropriate, which could include bicycle registration fees.

106. *Comment:* More support for new vehicle infrastructure projects

Response: New vehicle infrastructure may advance sustainable outcomes and will be considered when evaluating a project's ability to achieve draft transportation goals and targets. The draft policy element emphasizes improvements to existing facilities, given the feasibility of implementing improvements to the existing transportation network when compared with the new facilities for vehicles.

107. *Comment:* Reduce speed limits

Response: Policy 2.1 includes Strategy 2.1.2 which encourages projects to demonstrate that streets are designed and speeds are set to maximize multimodal safety and are consistent with surrounding land use.

108. *Comment:* What is cause of injury and fatal collisions- operator or facility?

Response: Policy 2.1 and 2.3 primarily address facility improvements. However, operator education programs could be considered under Strategy 2.1.1 if the actions support reductions to collisions at high collision locations.

109. *Comment:* Increase enforcement of safe driving practices using various different methods to improve safety.
Response: Policy 2.1 and Strategy 2.1.1 would allow for increased enforcement if particular enforcement strategy has been found to improve safety sufficiently.
110. *Comment:* Provide better access for emergency vehicles.
Response: Policy 2.2 supports projects that provide better access for emergency vehicles.
111. *Comment:* Improve visibility for cross walks
Response: Strategy 2.3.1 covers design elements for pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements, including sidewalks.
112. *Comment:* Synchronize lights
Response: Policy 1.2 and Strategy 1.2.1 prioritize funding for signal synchronization.
113. *Comment:* Where is the investment in median islands, safer intersections, more frequent protected crossings, installation of missing sidewalks, pedestrian/bike bridges over the highway etc.?
Response: Strategy 2.3.1 includes design elements to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.
114. *Comment:* Reduce volume of auto traffic
Response: Many of the goals/targets/policies/strategies focus on reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in order to reduce GHGs, pollution, and fuel costs and to improve safety. A reduction in VMT will reduce the volume of auto traffic.
115. *Comment:* Provide driver training programs to improve safety
Response: Policy 1.2 includes programs that would significantly reduce the number of injury and fatal collisions.
116. *Comment:* Remove parking on streets
117. *Response:* Strategy 2.3.4 covers context sensitive approaches to relate adjacent land use and associated transportation uses. For some areas, removing parking increases safety, in other areas removing parking is unrealistic or decreases safety by increasing speeds.
118. *Comment:* Provide more signage for safe driving
Response: Strategy 2.3.3 includes safety features that have been proven to affect safe driving and could include signage.
119. *Comment:* Reduce city speed limits
Response: Policy 2.3 includes system design elements such as a reduction in speed limits that have been shown to significantly improve safety and that are enforceable.

Clarification-Additional Information

120. *Comment:* How will progress towards targets be monitored?
Response: Adopting targets as part of the transportation plan helps to facilitate performance monitoring. The intent of monitoring the transportation plan's performance is to measure and communicate progress towards adopted transportation plan targets to decision makers and the public. The evaluation tool is currently designed to evaluate progress in 2020 and 2035 based on relative progress made towards targets when compared to projections. The extent to which progress towards goals will be monitored will largely depend on available data; for instance, the extents that traffic counts are available for all modes. Some data is currently available to measure progress towards targets in absolute terms and for other targets additional data is

needed. Before and after data will be required to better understand the impacts specific to individual projects.

121. *Comment:* Language included in goals and targets contains too much jargon and is difficult to understand.

Response: Every effort was made to easily communicate the intent of the draft goals, targets, and policies; however, some language still contains references to specific transportation planning concepts, measures and requirements that may be new to members of the public. Staff will continue to work on improving the ease with which the concepts contained in the policy element are communicated to the public and decision makers.

122. *Comment:* Many project specific references were received including, but not limited to, rail trail, light rail, and highway 1 improvements.

Response: Goals and policies are not intended to reference specific projects. Proposed projects will be evaluated based on their consistency with goals and policies and their ability to achieve specific outcomes and advance targets. Project selection and prioritization will occur during development of the project list, also known as the Action Element of the transportation plan.

123. *Comment:* Why 2035?

Response: The horizon year 2035 has been selected primarily because this is the timeframe for which the Regional Travel Demand Model is currently designed to make projections. Also by state law, long range transportation plans are required to cover at a minimum of twenty years.

124. *Comment:* Solicit volunteers for making transportation improvements

Response: The RTC currently solicits volunteers for projects, where appropriate, such as conducting bicycle and pedestrian counts. The RTC will consider funding and other requirements to assess new opportunities and restrictions for working with volunteers.

125. *Comment:* Appreciate the good outreach and opportunities for participation and website

Response: Thank you. RTC staff, Commissioners and partners made every effort to reach the community. Given that there is always room for improvement, other ideas for outreach avenues are welcome.

126. *Comment:* Is adequate funding available to achieve the repairs and improvements?

Response: There are limited transportation funds available for needed transportation improvements. The 2010 RTP identified over 4 billion dollars in transportation needs in Santa Cruz County through 2035 and estimated that only \$2.5 billion would be available; leaving a shortfall or \$1.7 billion for needed transportation improvements. The most recent needs assessment indicated that there is a \$300 million backlog of road maintenance in the region. In recognition of these short falls, the draft transportation policies support projects that simultaneously achieve multiple goals and include Policy 3.3, System Financing, which supports new or increased taxes and fees that reflect the cost to operate and maintain the transportation system.

127. *Comment:* What additional level of funding is planned?

Response: The Financial Element of the Regional Transportation Plan estimates the amount of funding that is reasonably expected to be available. Approximately \$2.5 billion was estimated to be available from federal, state and local sources for the 25-year period outlined in the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan. The estimate is based on historical averages and known trends. Much of this funding is dedicated for specific uses. In recognition of these funding shortfalls, the draft transportation policies support projects that simultaneously achieve multiple goals

and include Policy 3.3, System Financing, which supports new or increased taxes and fees that reflect the cost to operate and maintain the transportation system.

128. *Comment: What does “within available revenues”*

Response: The Financial Element of the Regional Transportation Plan estimates the amount of funding that is reasonably expected to be available. Approximately \$2.5 billion was estimated to be available from federal, state and local sources for the 25-year period outlined in the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan. The estimate is based on historical averages and known trends. Much of this funding is dedicated for specific uses. The Regional Transportation Plan also identifies two sets of projects: one that can be pursued given the amount of revenue estimated to be available, and another that will require new funds.

129. *Comment: What does 70 mean?*

Response: Local roadway conditions are rated on a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) scale of zero (failed) to 100 (excellent). A pavement condition index of 70 is considered good condition. While some roadways in Santa Cruz County are in good condition, on average all of the roadways in Santa Cruz County had a PCI of 48 in 2010 since many are severely deteriorated and will require complete rehabilitation .

130. *Comment: There are too many uncontrollable factors to reach these goals.*

Response: The presence of uncontrollable factors that influence these goals is noted and acknowledged. Setting goals and targets is a way to define what to strive for and how to measure progress towards the goals. It is acknowledged that the data available for quantifying targets is limited and the cost of collecting data is a challenge. Over time data collection efforts will need to be increased.

*The asterisk indicates that a revision has been made to the goals, targets, policies and/or strategies based on the comment received.