Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s
BICYCLE COMMITTEE

AGENDA
Monday, October 21, 2013
6:00 pm to 8:30 pm
Note Special Date and Earlier Start Time

RTC Office
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Announcements – RTC staff
4. Oral communications – members and public
   
   The Committee will receive oral communications during this time on items not on today’s agenda. Presentations must be
   within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and may be limited in time at the discretion of the Chair. Committee members
   will not take action or respond immediately to any Oral Communications presented, but may choose to follow up at a
   later time, either individually, or on a subsequent Committee agenda.

5. 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 Committee or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members
   of the Committee 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 committee member objects to the change.

6. Approve draft minutes of the September 23, 2013 Bicycle Committee meeting (pages 3-5)
7. Accept Bicycle Committee roster (page 6)
8. Accept summary of Bicycle Hazard Reports (page 7)
9. Accept follow-up email from Caltrans regarding bicycle improvement needs on Caltrans right-of-way that were addressed at the Sept 23rd, 2013 meeting (pages 8-9)
REGULAR AGENDA

10. Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) Regional Bike Model Web Tool – Presentation from Cody Meyer, AMBAG Planner (pages 10-11)

11. Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Final Master Plan – Presentation from Cory Caletti, RTC Senior Transportation Planner/MBSST Project Manager (pages 12-33)

12. Member updates related to Committee functions

13. Adjourn

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 18th, 2013 from the special time of 6:00pm to 8:30pm at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Ave, 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
email: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org

AGENDAS ONLINE:
To receive email notification when the Bicycle Committee meeting agenda packets are posted on our website, please call (831) 460-3201 or email caletti@sccrtc.org to subscribe.

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

SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/TRANSLATION SERVICES
Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de antípico 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.
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1. Call to Order

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
- Kem Akol, District 1
- David Casterson, District 2, Chair
- Amelia Conlen, District 4
- Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz
- Andy Ward, City of Capitola, Vice-Chair
- Lex Rau, City of Scotts Valley
- Rob Straka, Ecology Action/Bike to Work
- Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)
- Leo Jed, CTSC
- Will Mencine, District 3 (Alt.)

**Staff:**
- Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
- Luis Mendez, Deputy Director

**Vacancies:**
- District 4 – Alternate
- District 5 – Alternate
- City of Watsonville – Alternate

**Unexcused Absences:**
- Peter Scott, District 3

**Excused Absences:**
- Eric Horton, District 2 (Alt.)
- Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
- Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)
- Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work (Alt)
- Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola (Alt.)
- Carlos Garza, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
- Myrna Sherman, City of Watsonville
- Rick Hyman, District 5

**Guests:**
- Steve All, Executor and Beneficiary of the Public Trust
- Doug Hessing, Caltrans Project Manager
- Paul McClintic, Caltrans Traffic
- Scott Morris, Caltrans Traffic
- Matt Fowler, Caltrans Environmental
- Jim Espinosa, Caltrans Design
- Jean Brocklebank, resident
- Michael Lewis, resident

3. Announcements – Cory Caletti made the following announcements:

- Open Streets event will be happening on West Cliff Drive on Sunday, October 13th; volunteers are still needed; there will be an RTC booth. The RTC will be providing funding for two similar events next year to be held in the Cities of Watsonville and Capitola.
• The RTC issued a “call for projects” for up to $5.5 million in projected FY17/18 and FY18/19 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, $2.5 million in projected FY13/14 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds and approximately $5.3 million in federal earmarks and STIP funds to the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network projects.
• The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report will be released in October; adoption and certification will be considered by the RTC in November. The Bike Committee will receive a presentation on the Master Plan at the October 21st meeting.
• Governor Jerry Brown signed the “Three Feet for Safety Act” into law mandating that drivers provide cyclists with a three-foot berth when passing. The law will take effect in Sept, 2014.

4. Oral communications – Chair Casterson reminded members of their duty to come prepared to meetings and to read materials supplied in each Bike Committee packet. Steve All, Executor and Beneficiary of the Public Trust, asked for a show of hands of members familiar with the CycleNet bicycle route numbering project. Jean Brocklebank, Live Oak resident, expressed concerns regarding the design for the Arana Gulch Creek multi-use trail exit on to the 7th Avenue and Brommer Street intersection. A motion was made (Akol/Ward) to agendize the item for discussion at an upcoming meeting. The motion was approved with one vote against the motion.

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – Item #9 was pulled from the agenda per a request from Leo Jed and was placed as Item #10a. Cory Caletti distributed a replacement page to item #10.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion (Ward /Fieberling) to approve the consent agenda as amended passed unanimously.

6. Approved draft minutes of the August 19, 2013 Bicycle Committee meeting

7. Accepted Bicycle Committee roster

8. Accepted summary of Bicycle Hazard Reports

9. Pulled - Accept response letter from Caltrans regarding the Bicycle Committee's request for Highway 1 shoulder and Wilder Ranch multi-use path pavement improvements and safety measures

REGULAR AGENDA

10. Centerline and outside shoulder rumble strip project in Santa Cruz County on Route 1 from Shafter Road to Swanton Road past Davenport – Cory Caletti summarized the staff report and provided background information on the project. Doug Hessing, Caltrans District 5 Project Manager, presented an alternative treatment that would be less impactful to cyclists. The alternative treatment is narrower in width, striped over the white edge line rather than into the shoulder and is shallower. Locally, the alternative treatment has been used on Highway 68 and has received favorable responses from cyclists. The alternative treatment will be applied to the entire length of the project area in the centerline and for the first four miles in the shoulder. Following discussion about the current project and the possibility of adding gaps in the treatment, a motion was made (Menchine/Akol) to recommend that the RTC approve the application of the alternative treatment proposed and to request that Caltrans collect bicycle count data to supplement average daily vehicle count data. The motion passed unanimously.
10a. Item #9 from Consent Agenda: In response to issues related to approaches to the narrow bridges at Waddell and Scott Creeks on Highway 1, Leo Jed requested that Caltrans install Bikes May Use Full Lane signs to inform motorists and bicyclists on how to traverse the crossings safely. Paul McClintic from Caltrans volunteered to conduct a site inspection and install the signs if the situations warrant it. Andy Ward requested the Caltrans investigate how to improve the maintenance mechanism used for the Wilder Ranch multi-use path that is causing deterioration of the asphalt surface. An issue of debris in the shoulder from the steep slope at the northern intersection of Coast Road on Highway 1 was discussed. Paul McClintic will conduct a site inspection and report back.

11. Member updates related to Committee functions:
   - David Casterson updated members on their request to have the RTC add a 0.25 Full Time Equivalent transportation planner position to provide more staff support to the Bicycle Committee so that it can meet every month. The request was brought to the Budget and Administration (B&A) Committee who did not recommending that change. David Casterson reported that the B&A Committee suggested that members work on ways to add value to staff time by identifying projects they are interested in working on. He reiterated again the need for members to read packets ahead of time and come prepared for efficient meetings.
   - Steve All provided a CD and summary of the CycleNet route numbering project he has developed. He indicated that the CD contains a 15 minute video presentation on the project.
   - Amelia Conlen informed members that she participated in a Highway 9 field tour with various staff members from Caltrans and County Public Works, Commissioner McPherson and his staff, as well as community members to identify bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements. While many constrains exist on the narrow corridor, a few low cost measures were examined for quick implementation.
   - Will Menchine mentioned that Shaffer Road improvements in the City of Santa Cruz are nearly complete and many of the Bike Committee’s recommendations were incorporated.
   - Lex Rau informed members that Scotts Valley Drive has been resurfaced and improvements have been made to the bicycle lane width.
   - Kem Akol requested an update on the Murray Street bridge seismic retrofit project and possible connections to the Harbor that could be incorporated.

12. Adjourned: 8:50 PM

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 21, 2013, from 6:00pm to 8:30pm at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
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**Representing** | **Member Name/Contact Info** | **Appointment Dates**
---|---|---
**District 1**<br>Voting<br>Soquel, Live Oak, part of Capitola | Kem Akol<br>kemakol@msn.com<br>247-2944 | First Appointed: 1993<br>Term Expires: 3/16
Alternate | Holly M. Tyler<br>holly.m.tyler@comcast.net<br>818-2117 | First Appointed: 2010<br>Term Expires: 3/16

**District 2**<br>Voting<br>Aptos, Corralitos, part of Capitola, Nisene Marks, Freedom, PajDunes | David Casterson, Chair<br>dbcasterson@gmail.com<br>588-2068 | First Appointed: 2005<br>Term Expires: 3/15
Alternate | Eric Horton<br>erichortondesign@gmail.com<br>419-7296 | First Appointed: 3/09<br>Term Expires: 3/15

**District 3**<br>Voting<br>Big Basin, Davenport, Bonny Doon, City of Santa Cruz | Peter Scott<br>drip@ucsc.edu<br>423-0796 | First Appointed: 2007<br>Term Expires: 3/16
Alternate | William Menchine (Will)<br>menchine@cruzio.com<br>426-3528 | First Appointed: 4/02<br>Term Expires: 3/16

**District 4**<br>Voting<br>Watsonville, part of Corralitos | Amelia Conlen<br>director@peoplepowersc.org<br>425-0665 | First Appointed: 5/13<br>Term Expires: 3/15
Alternate | Vacant | Term Expires: 3/15

**District 5**<br>Voting<br>SL Valley, Summit, Scotts Valley, part of Santa Cruz | Rick Hyman<br>bikerick@att.net | First Appointed: 1989<br>Term Expires: 3/16
Alternate | Vacant | Term Expires: 3/16

**City of Capitola**<br>Voting | Andy Ward, Vice Chair<br>Andrew.ward@plantronics.com<br>462-6653 | First Appointed: 2005<br>Term Expires: 3/14
Alternate | Daniel Kostelec<br>dnlkostelec@yahoo.com<br>325-9623 | First Appointed: 3/09<br>Term Expires: 3/14

**City of Santa Cruz**<br>Voting | Wilson Fieberling<br>anbfieb@yahoo.com | First Appointed: 2/97<br>Term Expires: 3/15
Alternate | Carlos Garza<br>carlos@cruzio.com | First Appointed: 4/02<br>Term Expires: 3/15

**City of Scotts Valley**<br>Voting | Lex Rau<br>lexrau@sbcglobal.net<br>419-1817 | First Appointed: 2007<br>Term Expires: 3/14
Alternate | Gary Milburn<br>g.milburn@sbcglobal.net/438-2888 ext 210 wk<br>427-3839 hm | First Appointed: 1997<br>Term Expires: 3/14

**City of Watsonville**<br>Voting | Myrna Sherman<br>calgary1947@gmail.com | Term Expires: 3/16
Alternate | Vacant | Term Expires: 3/16

**Bike To Work**<br>Voting | Rob Straka<br>rob@ecoact.org<br>909-967-0204 | First Appointed: 5/13<br>Term Expires: 3/16
Alternate | Piet Canin<br>pcanin@ecoact.org<br>426-5925 ext. 127 | First Appointed: 4/02<br>Term Expires: 3/16

**Community Traffic Safety Coalition**<br>Voting | Leo Jed<br>leojed@gmail.com<br>425-2650 | First Appointed: 3/09<br>Term Expires: 3/15
Alternate | Jim Langley<br>jim@jimlangley.net<br>423-7248 | First Appointed: 4/02<br>Term Expires: 3/15

All phone numbers have the (831) area code unless otherwise noted.
HI Cory,

First I’d like to thank David for running the meeting and keeping it very civil and organized. David’s action was much appreciated and led to structured active dialog with the members and I believe led to a productive outcome for both Caltrans and the Committee.

I would like to follow up on a few items generated at the Meeting. The following day Doug, Scott and I drive up to past Davenport on Hwy 1 and field reviewed, the Scott / Waddell creek bridge locations, stopped at several spots to review the Wilder Bike path, reviewed the speed feedback signs entering Davenport and looked at the two drainage grates within the narrow (approx 2 foot) shoulder/ drainage channel in the shoulder.

All these locations have their challenges. I give some discussion to each.

The Wilder bike path: It is in the Caltrans Right of Way and our records indicate we do not have a agreement with another agency for maintenance of that facility. This is not the traditional agreement we have with local agencies for facilities such as the Wilder path. We typically expect and require the local agency/jurisdiction who is applying for encroachment/constructing a facility into our Right of way to accept maintenance responsibilities for that facility to a level they deem necessary. When this is the case more local control exists for the hows, when and how often facilities are treated. However in this case Caltrans is that maintainer. As I stated in the meeting our ability to maintain the existing highway is very constrained. The local crews in the Santa Cruz region are in constant flux from various “complaint driven” issues (Removing spray painted graffiti, removing illegal homeless camps, and litter pickup) to physical item replacement (Repairing damaged guardrail, sweeping shoulders of rock/debris, replacing damaged warning signs and filling potholes). The crews time to perform one of the above activities is shared from the time necessary to performing all the others. The crews do a balancing act everyday to determine the appropriate level of care to address the daily needs. I observed the scraping of the asphalt on the trail edges the committee mentioned. The scraping is from the bottom of the tractor mower used to mow the path. This method of mowing the trail is the best practice available to the Department. We are limited in the available equipment and time to perform the weed abatement required. We will typically mow this section twice a year. Although the edge of the trail asphalt has been scraped, the intended function of the path has not been compromised. The Department has been required to severely reduce the Chemical spraying of weeds so this method is also not available for our crews. Although the current practice may not be appear to be the perfect method to maintain this path, we are limited in the equipment and time available for this activity and must use the most efficient methods possible. I would welcome and be willing to entertain the organization of County maintenance force/ or the Coalition forming a group to help maintain the path with smaller tractor / hand operated weed whackers and such via a encroachment permit/ “adopt a pathway” type program.

Scott and Waddel creek bridge shoulder width issue will be looked into. The shoulders across these bridges are narrow and from the field review appear to be a good candidate for additional warning signs. I will have my special investigator review the CA MUTCD for appropriate warning devices and place accordingly.

The two Drainage inlet grates along the southbound shoulder within the narrow shoulders will be looked at on the pavement overlay project. The project manager will have the design team follow up and look at some options at the three locations mentioned at the meeting. The Design engineers will need to address the hydraulic capacity necessary and compare to what types of inlets are available. IE we need to make sure the quantity of water needed to be caught and removed from the roadway is able to be done so with a different or modified type of inlet system. Initially it looks
like something can be done here to address the grates in the narrow shoulder and the channel along the side of the shoulder.

The speed feedback sign for Davenport was in place and functioning properly. Motorists we observed were modifying their speed when the sigh flashed their speed. The Committee could consider asking the County to apply for an encroachment permit to install a second speed feedback sign directly in town. Caltrans would not pay for/maintain a second sign however if the County would consider this application necessary we could allow a added/ additional speed emphasis sign requested at this location.

Finally the rocks and along the shoulder at “the gap” location. The day we drove thru the shoulder was free of debris. However I can appreciate the complaint. We have looked at this location for many years on a fix to keep the debris contained and the maintenance crews form not spending time to clear the shoulders. A proposed project was scoped to cut the slope back some 60 feet high to make a rock/debris catch bench. The cost of this project kept growing and escalating along with the environmental issues associated with a permanent fix to control the debris. So a permanent fix for this location is sitting without a funding source to proceed. We have also looked at a rock net catch treatment. This too is on that difficult to get started path. Although less costly, this treatment would not eliminate the smaller rocks from falling to the shoulder thus a less desirable permanent fix. So we are left with the existing slope trickling rocks down to the shoulder. Our local maintenance crews are aware of the ongoing issue and to the extent possible to keep the debris removed.

I hope this will help with the committee questions on these issues.

Thanks again for the productive meeting.

Paul McClintic  PE  TE
District 5 Traffic Engineer
805 549-3473
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Contact Info</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
<th>Forwarded To</th>
<th>Forwarded Date</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Images</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/10/13</td>
<td>Elaina</td>
<td>Ramer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elaina.ramer@gmail.com">elaina.ramer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Soquel Dr</td>
<td>Park Ave</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>debris on shoulder or bikeway</td>
<td>rider states bikenascal program and Cabrillo College in both directions there are construction signs in bike lane. In spots where bike lane is narrow, bikes are forced to merge into car lane with cars traveling about 40 mph.</td>
<td>General Dept of Co of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>10/11/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/13</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pj@rattlebrain.com">pj@rattlebrain.com</a></td>
<td>Soquel Dr</td>
<td>Spreckles</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>bikeway not clearly marked, signs absent, poor signage westbound</td>
<td>rider states sign to alert drivers going west on Soquel Dr that cyclists may use full lane. There isn’t one for eastbound. Need new sharrow where not bike lane</td>
<td>General Dept of Co of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>10/10/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/13</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pj@rattlebrain.com">pj@rattlebrain.com</a></td>
<td>Soquel Dr</td>
<td>Aptos Rd</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>bikeway not clearly marked</td>
<td>rider states bike lane ends and signage is inadequate to alert drivers. No sharrow in area. Recent paving and striping and contractor painted a white stripe that looks like a bike lane where one doesn’t exist.</td>
<td>General Dept of Co of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>10/10/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/13</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pj@rattlebrain.com">pj@rattlebrain.com</a></td>
<td>San Andreas Rd</td>
<td>Benito Dr</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>bikeway not clearly marked, signage</td>
<td>rider states cars aking san andreas won’t yield to cyclist making left turn onto benito. Alert drivers for all cyclists, need a left turn pocket.</td>
<td>General Dept of Co of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>10/10/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/13</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pj@rattlebrain.com">pj@rattlebrain.com</a></td>
<td>Park Ave</td>
<td>Soquel Dr</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>bikeway not clearly marked, signage</td>
<td>rider states no sign to inform touring cyclists that new brighton state beach is on park ave. It is a state park with $5 bike camping and often have to direct cyclists to the park.</td>
<td>General Dept of Co of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>10/10/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07/13</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pj@rattlebrain.com">pj@rattlebrain.com</a></td>
<td>Soquel Dr</td>
<td>Dominican Way</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>damaged bikeway</td>
<td>rider states that there is a 6-8” divot in bike lane at eastern gate of equipment rental business</td>
<td>General Dept of Co of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>10/10/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/27/13</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Patton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frankm0n@hotmail.com">frankm0n@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Ocean St</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>rough pavement or potholes; pavement cracks; bikeway not clearly marked</td>
<td>rider states that Ocean Street between Broadway and East Cliff Drive northbound is narrow, very rough road, and non-existent bike markings. Bike traffic coming off of East Cliff heading north on Ocean risk getting squeezed out by cars.</td>
<td>Cheryl Schmit</td>
<td>09/30/13</td>
<td>From Cheryl: We are likely to re-pave and re-stripe Ocean Street with next year’s funding. - 9/30/13; attempted to forward to Mr. Patton on 9/30/13, but email bounced back as “mailbox unavailable.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/23/13</td>
<td>Piet</td>
<td>Canin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pccarino@gmail.com">pccarino@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>1976 Branciforte Dr</td>
<td>Mystery Spot Rd</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>debris on shoulder or bikeway</td>
<td>rider states that gravel on shoulder of Branciforte from Mystery Spot Rd is directly in the travel path of cyclists therefore causing them to veer into automobile traffic</td>
<td>General Dept of Co of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>09/24/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TO: Bicycle Committee
FROM: Cody Meyer, Planner, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
RE: Regional Bicycle Model Web Tool

RECOMMENDATION
Receive a presentation from the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) on the regional bicycle model web tool.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Funded by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District’s (MBUAPCD) AB2766 Emission Reduction Grant Program, the Regional Bicycle Travel Demand Model Phase II will assist the Air District and local planners in conducting benefit-cost analyses of bicycle projects while assisting AMBAG with meeting SB 375 mandated regional greenhouse gas (GHG) targets.

Development of Phase I of the Regional Bicycle Travel Demand Model was funded through an AB2766 grant from the MBUAPCD, and was completed in April of 2013. As AMBAG staff has worked with stakeholders across the region, bike modeling experts around the country and the consultant team, a number of potential enhancements to the tool and the overall project have surfaced. These enhancements include data collection through the form of a refined route mapping application, refinement of the modeling tool for consistency with the Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM), and increasing the functionality of the modeling tool.

A consultant is developing the modeling tool within the context of AMBAG’s overarching model improvement plan while also meeting the needs of the Air District.

The CycleTracks Monterey web site builds upon the Cycle Tracks smartphone app that was rolled out in 2011 to collect data on local bike trips throughout the region. The CycleTracks web site will enable cyclists to map out their bike routes on an interactive map, rather than requiring the user to use a smartphone while riding a bike. To contribute to the effort, cyclists can either log their bike trips online at CycleTracksMonterey.org or download the CycleTracks smartphone application for iPhone or Android to log their bicycle trips.

The purpose of the CycleTracks application is to inform the Bicycle Travel Demand Model with local knowledge. As such, staff will present the CycleTracks applications throughout the region, engaging the community and stakeholders to participate in the process and build awareness of active transportation.

AMBAG Staff is coordinating with project stakeholders and MBUAPCD staff to develop and beta test the website.

Attachment: Cycle Tracks Monterey Summary
Monterey Bay Area Bicycle Regional Travel Demand Modeling Project - Cycle Tracks Monterey

Monterey Bay Area Bicycle Regional Travel Demand Modeling project analyzes bike counts, route data, inventories of existing bike facilities, and a statewide survey of travel behavior to improve planning for bicyclists. The completed tool will assist the Air District and local planners in conducting cost-benefit analyses of bicycle projects. Funding for the project is provided by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) through the AB 2766 Emission Reduction Grant Program. The final modeling tool will be completed in March 2015.

The project consists of two phases. The first phase completed in March of 2013, collected information on cyclist’s routes preferences through the Cycle Tracks smart phone application. The second phase of the project adds a web application to collect bicycle route preferences. The web application allows participants to map and view their trips on an interactive map. It also allows users to respond to a series of demographic and trip-attribute questions. Data gathering through the Cycle Tracks Applications will continue through June 2014.

Contact Cody Meyer at cmeyer@ambag.org for more information. For information on the bicycle route mapping visit cycletracksmonterey.org or for bicycle travel demand modeling information visit www.ambag.org/programs-services/modeling/bicycle-travel-demand-modeling-project.
TO: RTC Advisory Committees

FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/MBSST Network Project Manager

RE: Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Final Master Plan

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that RTC’s Advisory Committees receive presentations on the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Final Master Plan, provide comments and recommend that the RTC adopt the final plan.

BACKGROUND

The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (Trail Network) is envisioned to be a multi-use transportation, recreational, and interpretive facility for bicyclists and pedestrians that will span the coast of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary from the San Mateo/Santa Cruz County line in Santa Cruz County to Lovers Point in Pacific Grove, Monterey County. Federal funds to establish a continuous trail spanning Monterey and Santa Cruz counties were secured by Congressman Sam Farr with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) taking the lead for the Monterey County portion of the trail and the RTC taking the lead in Santa Cruz County. Local funds have also been programmed to the project by the RTC.

The Trail Network will be separated from motor vehicle traffic, as possible, and utilize the on-street network to provide greater community connectivity. The Trail Network will serve transportation, recreation, health, eco-tourism, coastal access, economic vitality, and educational and interpretive purposes. The “spine” of the Trail Network will be built parallel to the operational 32 mile Santa Cruz Branch rail line, within the rail right of way, so that freight service can continue and future passenger rail service may be provided. Spur trails will connect the primary alignment to major activity centers and coastal access points to highlight the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. Approximately 50% of the county’s population, 88 parks and 45 schools are in census tracts within 1 mile of the rail line. The Trail Network will also serve as the California Coastal Trail in Santa Cruz County.

With the assistance of RRM Design Group, a consulting firm specializing in trail planning, the RTC has been developing a Trail Network Master plan and environmental review document to guide future implementation and streamline environmental permitting. The RTC received a presentation in August, 2011 on the document’s scope, schedule and timeline. Following that presentation, RRM Design Group conducted corridor tours; identified and mapped opportunities and constraints; met with stakeholder groups representing over 50 agencies, community representatives and businesses; held 3 route identification public workshops throughout the county which were attended by over 200 community members; released a Draft Master Plan; held 4 trail alignment public workshops with nearly 300 people in attendance to provide an overview of the Plan and solicit public input; and released a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and two public meetings to receive comments on the Draft EIR.
DISCUSSION

The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network will serve bicycle, pedestrian, wheelchair, and other non-motorized travel on a paved right-of-way separated from vehicular traffic and adjacent to the operational rail line. Equestrian use will be accommodated in limited locations. The on-street roadway network will provide connectivity from the trail to other destination points. Natural surface paths will provide access to coastal viewing points. The Master Plan defines a set of design standards, prioritization criteria, estimated costs, operation, maintenance, and implementation mechanisms for approximately 50 miles of trails that is divided into 20 segments to be constructed as funding opportunities arise.

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) released the Final Master Plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (Trail Network) project on Tuesday, October 10, 2013. The Executive Summary is provided in Attachment 1. The Master Plan defines the “rail trail”, a proposed bicycle and pedestrian trail adjacent to the Santa Cruz Branch rail line right-of-way, as the spine of a broader network of trails that will provide connections to activity centers, coastal access points and other key destinations. The Final Master Plan addresses comments received on the Draft Master Plan; identifies missed features or crossings; provides updated bridge and construction cost estimates; corrects errors; includes construction management costs; provides project priority segment scores by geographic reach; and makes other refinements.

MBST Final Master Plan Contents

The Final Master Plan is organized into chapters as follows:

1. Executive Summary – Provides an overview of the project area and the sections summarized below.
   1) Introduction – The project’s history, evolution, major milestones completed, project scope and the Plan's relationship to other planning efforts for non-motorized mobility are described. The “braided trail network” concept is introduced and the goal of providing a comprehensive system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities with proximity to the coast and separated from motor vehicle traffic to the greatest extent possible is addressed. How the Master Plan is organized and what public outreach has been conducted to date for its development is outlined.
   2) Goals, Objectives, and Policies – Within the planning and policy context, this chapter provides the goals of generally desired outcomes, measurable and specific objectives, as well as policies related to implementation of the project’s goals and objectives.
   3) Master Plan Setting – The planning area is divided into three major areas or “reaches”, each containing a set of characteristics that will require coordinated treatment types. The northern, central and southern reaches are identified and opportunities and constraints for each area are discussed. Additionally, activity centers are summarized since access to desirable destinations is integral to vibrant trail systems.
   4) Trail Alignments – The entire Trail Network is divided into twenty (20) segments as described. Segment proposals identify trail treatment types through cross-section graphics, show spur trails as well as improvements needed to existing facilities. Cost estimates are provided for the number of miles, amenities, at-grade crossings and new bridge structures. Consideration is given to right-of-way width, proximity to activity centers, and network connectivity that the segment would provide.
5) Trail Design Standards – A trail functions best when it is seamless to the users and is constructed to uniform standards as it traverses through different jurisdictions and geographic areas. This chapter addresses standards for each facility type, treatments for crossings and intersections and universal design guidelines to provide accessibility to the highest number of users. Amenities, shared use conflict reduction measures, dog and equestrian uses and other trail functionality considerations are also addressed.

6) Project Prioritization and Costs – Categories by which to prioritize segment implementation and a weighted scoring system are recommended. A scoring system is identifies by which to rank segments within each reach of the county.

7) Operation and Maintenance – Aside from regular maintenance, the trail management will also involve carefully considered interface guidelines with current and future agricultural and rail operations. Responsibilities and a variety of different mechanisms by which trail segment projects may be developed, constructed and maintained are offered.

Next Steps

The RTC is scheduled to consider adoption of the Final Master Plan and certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) at the November 7th, 2013 meeting, to be held at the Board of Supervisors Chambers. The Draft Final EIR is expected to be released by Friday, October 25th, 2013.

Following RTC action, staff will input any final changes, reprint, and distribute the adopted Final Master Plan as needed. The final document will also be posted on the RTC website.

With the Master Plan project nearing completion, the RTC issued a “call for projects” to local jurisdictions for constructing segments of the trail. $5.3 million is available, which includes federal earmark funds secured by Congressman Sam Farr. The RTC is scheduled to select projects to receive funds at the December 5th, 2013 RTC meeting.

Staff recommends that RTC’s Advisory Committees receive presentations on the Final Master Plan, provide feedback and recommend that the RTC adopts the plan.

SUMMARY

The RTC has released the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Final Master Plan. Staff recommends that the RTC’s Advisory Committees review the Final Master Plan, provide feedback and recommend that the RTC adopts the plan.

Attachments:
1. Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Final Master Plan – Executive Summary
2. Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Final Master Plan – full document *

*Note on Attachment: In an effort to reduce paper use, the full Final Master Plan is not attached but rather made available on the RTC’s website, at the RTC’s Santa Cruz and Watsonville offices and at various libraries.
Welcome to the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan!

Completion of this Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (Trail Network) Master Plan brings us all one step closer to realizing our long-standing dream of providing greater access and use of transportation corridors to connect Santa Cruz County with the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary and other regional attractions. With the rail corridor as a tremendous new public resource, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is in a unique position to provide a continuous and separated bicycle and pedestrian path as the spine of a braided Trail Network. The primary corridor will link coastal access to schools, retail centers, residences and other destinations in our vibrant community. The rail right-of-way will also serve freight and passenger rail service thereby expanding travel options and providing unprecedented integration of bicycle, pedestrian and transit options.

I challenge you to join me in working to bring all segments of this continuous Trail Network to fruition. And thank you for helping to make Santa Cruz County a great place to live, work, thrive and to get around.

Regards,

Sam Farr
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. OVERVIEW

The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST Network) is a two-county pedestrian and bicycle pathway project that was initially conceived by the Santa Cruz County Sanctuary Interagency Task Force and championed by Congressman Sam Farr to foster appreciation for the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary and provide a non-motorized coastal path for walkers, joggers, cyclists, people with mobility impairments, families, locals, and visitors.

The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan (Master Plan) is the result of a directed effort by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) to develop a braided bicycle/pedestrian MBSST Network along Santa Cruz County’s coast. The Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line corridor, which includes the proposed Coastal Rail Trail, will serve the MBSST Network’s continuous multi-use trail “spine” to provide alternative transportation and coastal access. The spine, or primary alignment, of the MBSST Network will be built parallel to (not in place of) the operational rail line, within the rail right-of-way, to the extent possible so freight service can continue and future passenger rail service may be provided.

The Coastal Rail Trail promises to be a highly valuable asset to the Santa Cruz County community for transportation, recreation, education, health, eco-tourism, coastal access, economic vitality, and other visitor-serving purposes. Implementation of this key 32-mile-long transportation corridor will allow greater transportation options to 88 parks, 42 schools, and over half of the county’s population who live within one mile of the corridor (per 2010 Census tract information). The full MBSST Network will also serve as the California Coastal Trail, although additional facilities may be added.

I.II MASTER PLAN PURPOSE

The purpose of this Master Plan is to establish the continuous alignment and set of design standards for the Coastal Rail Trail and its associated spur trails within the context of existing physical constraints of the railroad, coastal access requirements, highway, and public street rights-of-way. The Master Plan identifies planning issues associated with the Coastal Rail Trail’s construction and presents feasible solutions for its design and long-term operation and maintenance.

The focus of this Master Plan is on the proposed alignment of the 32-mile-long Coastal Rail Trail as the spine of the broader MBSST Network with additional spur trails and natural surface paths providing connectivity to the coast and to activity centers.

These trails and other existing on-road bicycle and pedestrian facilities form the braided network of trails that is the MBSST Network project. The continuous MBSST Network also proposes gap closures within the project area and access to other desirable destinations, as well as to the coast. These trails, on-street facilities, and natural surface paths will form the approximately 50-mile bike/pedestrian MBSST Network.
The Coastal Rail Trail, serving as the system’s spine, is a result of a 20-year-long effort to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, which was first established in 1876. In the early 1990s, the RTC began efforts to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way. Originally owned by Southern Pacific, the property was sold to Union Pacific in 1996. In 2001, the RTC officially began negotiating with then-owner Union Pacific. Over the next decade, negotiations and due diligence work were conducted. On May 6, 2010, the RTC decided to purchase 31 miles of the 32-mile Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line from Union Pacific for $14.2 million, with $11 million coming from the California voter-approved Proposition 116. On January 19, 2011, the RTC secured approval and funding from the California Transportation Commission for the purchase of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. On October 12, 2012, the RTC successfully closed escrow, placing title of the branch line into public ownership with the commitment of facilitating passenger and freight service, as well as creating a multi-use bicycle and pedestrian trail.

Iowa Pacific runs the line as the Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway. The Chicago-based railroad company is responsible for maintenance, though not for the work that needs to be done to upgrade the line. Iowa Pacific owns a 20-foot-wide easement along the length of the rail line for rail operations and maintenance.
I.IV  PROJECT GOALS

Through a collaborative planning process, the following goals were developed to guide the development of the Master Plan. They are designed to enhance non-motorized mobility and improve safety, access, traffic congestion, air quality, and the quality of life for Santa Cruz County residents, workers, and visitors. The goals are meant to function as the common framework that integrates the countywide rail trail to new and existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

GOAL 1: TRAIL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT
Define a continuous trail alignment that maximizes opportunities for a multi-use bicycle and pedestrian trail separate from roadway vehicle traffic.

GOAL 2: ENHANCE APPRECIATION OF THE COASTAL ENVIRONMENT
Develop public trail access along the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary to enhance appreciation, understanding, and protection of this special resource.

GOAL 3: EDUCATION AND AWARENESS
Promote awareness of the trail, trail opportunities, and trail user responsibilities.

GOAL 4: IMPLEMENTATION
Develop a long- and short-term program to achieve the policies set forth by this Master Plan through a combination of public and private funding, regulatory methods, and other strategies.

GOAL 5: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
Develop the necessary organizational staffing and funding mechanisms to ensure that all trail segments, trailheads, and accessory features are safe, well-maintained, and well-managed.
I.V. PUBLIC INPUT

The planning effort for the Master Plan has been conducted within the framework of an extensive public outreach program designed to involve all those interested and affected by the proposed trail. It does not consider use of private property, does not presume eminent domain actions, and does not prohibit continued agricultural and rail operations.

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

The majority of the interviews were conducted over a three-day period (October 25, 26, and 27, 2011) at the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s office. Following the initial meeting series, two additional stakeholder groups were interviewed—one on November 16, 2011 at RRM Design Group’s office and the other on December 1, 2011 via telephone.

A total of 68 people representing 52 stakeholder groups were interviewed. The interviews began with a summary of the project by RTC staff. Following this introduction, the consulting planning team discussed with each stakeholder group their interest in the project, specific technical issues, perceived opportunities and constraints, and, finally, their key desired outcomes. The stakeholder’s comments were noted on interview forms by planning team members.

WORKSHOP SERIES #1

This workshop series occurred on three consecutive evenings in north, mid and south county locations from December 13, 2011 to December 15, 2011; approximately 200 members of the public attended. The goal of the workshop series was to bring the community into the MBSST Network development early in the process, with the focus on soliciting ideas for new alignment opportunities, connection points, and design elements.

Workshops began with an overview by RTC staff of the Master Plan’s evolution and goals, followed by an update from the consultant on the field work, corridor analysis and initial trail alignment effort completed so far. Following this introduction, the MBSST Network was defined to help illustrate the concept of a “braided” trail system with a well-defined, off-street, paved, multi-use trail following the rail corridor, and serving as the spine for the MBSST Network. With the MBSST Network defined, the consultant team then presented constraints, opportunities, and the emerging trail alignment(s) within the Master Plan area.

WORKSHOP SERIES #2

This workshop series occurred on four consecutive evenings in north, mid and south county locations from November 26, 2012 to November 29, 2012. The workshops were attended by approximately 300 members of the public. The workshop series’ goal was to provide an overview of the Draft Master Plan, demonstrate how community input provided at the first workshop influenced the trail alignments, and solicit the community’s preferences for trail segment implementation prioritization.

Workshops began with an overview by RTC Staff of the Master Plan’s evolution and goals, followed by a summary from the consultant of the field work, corridor analysis, trail alignment development, design standards establishment, and cost analysis efforts completed for the Draft Master Plan. Following this introduction, the organizational structure of the Draft Master Plan was presented along with a synopsis of each section contained within the document. With the Draft Master Plan’s contents presented, the consultant team then described the “look and feel” of the MBSST Network’s various components through renderings and photographs to help workshop participants visualize the project’s build-out.

Following the presentation, workshop participants were provided segment priority preference surveys and asked to list their first and second segment priorities for implementation. To facilitate this exercise, RTC and consultant team members staffed Trail Reach Stations set up around the perimeter of each workshop room. Community members were invited to visit their geographical area (or reach) of interest to ask questions and gather additional information about trail segments before listing their prioritization preferences.

As a result of this interactive process, Table 6.9 in Section 6 was developed to represent community preferences. Table 6.10 includes the cumulative sum of each participating community member’s top two preferences. Community input was one of nine prioritization criteria utilized to determine the top segments per trail reach.
The Master Plan organizes the proposed trail alignment into two categories: reaches and segments.

A reach is defined as a geographic area identified by regional similarities, such as the urbanized areas of Santa Cruz, Capitola, and Aptos. The Master Plan area is divided into the Northern, Central, and Watsonville Reaches, which are further explained in Sections 3.3 through 3.5.

Segments are defined as potential trail projects with logical beginning and end points. The Master Plan trail alignment is divided into 20 segments with the intent that each segment will be funded, designed, and constructed in part or as a whole.

**NORTHERN REACH DESCRIPTION**

The defined Northern Reach of the MBSST Network begins where Highway 1 crosses the San Mateo/Santa Cruz County line, just north of the Waddell Bluffs, and continues south to the northern Santa Cruz city limit near Schaffer Road. The Northern Reach consists primarily of narrow, steep coastal bluffs from Waddell Creek to Yellow Bank Beach at Coast Dairies, and transitions to rural agricultural land and natural coastal mesas south to Schaffer Road. There are numerous small coves and beach strands with mostly informal footpaths down to the beach shore. Large sections of the coastal edge are owned by California State Parks, with several scenic rest stops along Highway 1 that include passive recreation access to beaches, coastal bluffs, and inland parkland trails. Much of the land between Highway 1 and the coastal bluffs is managed under agricultural leases with intermittent public coastal access adjacent to the agricultural land. These intermittent access points vary from paved parking lots with restrooms, potable water, and scenic overlooks to unpaved informal roadway pullouts with difficult access to steep coastal bluff tops and beaches.

An existing multi-use paved path runs parallel between the railroad corridor and Highway 1, heading north just over one mile from Schaffer Road to Wilder Ranch trailhead parking off Highway 1. Many of the other public access points along the Northern Reach have limited signage and provide limited trail access along the coast. The railroad corridor parallels the coastal side of Highway 1 from Schaffer Road to Davenport, where the tracks cross Highway 1 to the inland side before ending one mile north of Davenport. Except for the crossing in Davenport, the railroad’s offset from Highway 1 varies from 100 feet to 1/4 mile from Schaffer Road to Scaroni Road, then parallels Highway 1 at a distance of 50 to 100 feet as the coastal bluffs steepen and narrow toward Davenport. The rail tracks cross several small drainages with both wood trestles and box culverts in the Northern Reach. Much of the land south of Coast Dairies is flat, with intermittent rolling hills giving way to steep coastal cliffs further north. Sensitive biological areas exist along perennial creeks and drainages, and near coastal bluffs and sand dunes. The Northern Reach is comprised of Segments 1-5.
CENTRAL REACH DESCRIPTION

Beginning at Santa Cruz's northern city limit near Schaffer Road and extending southeast to Seascape Park just south of Aptos, this reach of the rail corridor traverses through densely populated coastal urban areas. The combination of intense urban development and the steep coastal edge in the Central Reach creates many physical challenges. However, the central reach has the highest potential to improve bicycle and pedestrian access to key destinations and reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and associated greenhouse gas emissions.

Within the Santa Cruz city limits, the rail corridor parallels many existing segments of the core route of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) alignment. Much of the original alignment in the Central Reach is made up of on-road facilities, sidewalks, bike lanes or coastal edge pedestrian boardwalks with beach access and interpretive signs. Some sections are strictly in the street as Class III bike routes with no sidewalks. The rail corridor parallels the entire length of the existing MBSST alignment and could serve as an alternate off-street, multi-use route connecting communities north and south to the regional network.

Other challenges along the Central Reach are the many existing large rail bridge and trestle structure crossings. These structures are old, narrow in width, and span steep drainages and roadways. In one scenario the structure spans across a historic district in Capitola. The southern portion of the Central Reach parallels the coast meandering atop the steep coastal bluffs and multiple residential and resort areas. Equestrian use may be provided in Segment 6 of the reach. The Central Reach connects over six state beaches, numerous coastal access points, parks, schools, and provides future connection opportunities for countless communities along the corridor. The Central Reach is comprised of Segments 6-14.

WATSONVILLE REACH DESCRIPTION

The Watsonville Reach of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail begins at railroad mile marker 10 near Seascape Park, and ends over the Santa Cruz and Monterey County border at the Pajaro River and at Railroad Avenue in Monterey County. This reach only parallels the coastal edge for about one mile before it begins following the San Andreas Road alignment inland as it heads south and east. The landscape is primarily open space, with some residential areas near Manresa and tapers off to rural farm and agricultural lands further to the south. The rail alignment eventually drifts away from San Andreas Road just south of railroad mile marker 7 and follows the inland side of a steep sloping mesa.

The Watsonville Reach stretch of the corridor travels through native woodlands, flanked on the west by agricultural land on top of the mesa and to the east, rural land sloping away to the Gallighan Slough below. The Harkins Slough is an impressive wetland crossing with wide open fields flooded throughout the year. The rail crossing at the Harkins Slough is on a stretch of raised earthen dike. The rail line then crosses Watsonville Slough and passes through the center of the agricultural fields, just west of the city of Watsonville, eventually connecting to city park land and the downtown street network at Walker Street. The rail line crosses the Pajaro River to the south and ends at Railroad Avenue in the town of Pajaro. The Watsonville Reach is comprised of Segments 15-20.
PROJECT COSTS AND FUNDING

Through Congressman Sam Farr’s leadership and effort, the project was solidified as a two-county system in order to establish a trail around the full arc of the Monterey Bay. Congressman Farr secured $9 million through federal appropriations and earmarks towards the project to be split equally between the two counties. Through the RTC’s discretionary funding sources, an additional $2.2 million was designated for the project. Finally, the California Coastal Conservancy granted the RTC $250,000 toward the preparation of the Master Plan so the trail will span the length of the Santa Cruz County coast from the San Mateo County line to the Monterey County line. Federal transportation dollars mandate the Trail Network serve the mobility needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. Additional funding will need to be identified to bring the project into full implementation. Figure A includes a cost breakdown summary associated with completing the MBSST Network.

NORTHERN REACH PROJECTS AND COSTS

The Northern Reach includes Segments 1-5. Table A prioritizes the segments by the number of points they received through nine project prioritization criteria (proximity to activity center, coastal access connectivity, trail segment cost, trail segment length, minimal or no bridge crossings, limited right-of-way constraints, gap closures, public input, and population density). The segments that received the most number of points are considered the most feasible for implementing within a short time frame. This includes Segments 5, 1, and 2 (in that order) as the top three segments within this reach.

These segments provide gap closures to existing MBSST Network segments, provide access to numerous activity centers, connect to the coastal edge and beaches, and provide connectivity to other existing local and regional bikeway and pedestrian facilities. Segments 3 and 4 may require a bit more lead time to resolve physical design constraints, right-of-way conflicts, complex coastal connections, and other budgetary challenges. However, these segments serve to close the gap in the overall MBSST Network, which will help elevate their importance for funding. Segment 5 is particularly in a good position for implementation as it falls within the railroad right-of-way corridor with minimal private land interference or significant environmental impacts. Also, equestrian use is appropriate for the Northern Reach, particularly in Segments 5 and 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Document Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 33     | Subsegment 5.1 proposed improvements include:                           | 2.75 miles | - 1.49 miles (7,890 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the coastal-side rail right-of-way  
- 1.26 miles (6,680 LF) native soil coastal bluff trails and coastal access between Davenport Beach and Yellow Bank Beach (this distance is comprised of Segments 5A, 5B, and 5C)  
- One (1) rail crossing at spur trail connecting Davenport parking lot to rail trail, parking lot improvements to existing dirt lot, coastal side of Highway 1 in Davenport near the Davenport Overlook  
- One (1) new signalized at-grade road crossing of Highway 1 in Davenport  
- One (1) rail crossing at the Highway 1 crossing  
- One (1) private road crossing  
- Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $3,365,904 | 4-25 to 4-34 |
| 33     | Subsegment 5.2 proposed improvements include:                           | 4.18 miles | - 2.58 miles (13,630 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the coastal side rail right-of-way  
- 1.60 miles (8,430 LF) native soil coastal bluff trails (this distance is comprised of Segments 5D and 5E)  
- One (1) rail crossing at upper Scaroni Rd.  
- One (1) road crossing of upper Scaroni Rd. and two (2) additional private crossings  
- Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $4,997,232 | 4-25 to 4-34 |
| 33     | Subsegment 5.3 proposed improvements include:                           | 3.62 miles | - 3.51 miles (18,520 LF) multi-use path (Class I) along the coastal side rail right-of-way  
- 0.11 miles (570 LF) native soil coastal bluff trails (Segment 5F)  
- One (1) rail crossing at lower Scaroni Rd.  
- One (1) road crossing of lower Scaroni Rd. and eleven (11) additional private crossings  
- Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $6,643,648 | 4-25 to 4-34 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 - Waddell Bluffs</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>• 0.87 miles (4,600 LF) Class III on-street/road shoulder bike route</td>
<td>$107,120</td>
<td>4-5 to 4-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 0.19 miles (1,000 LF) unpaved native soil trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unpaved roadway shoulder on coastal side of Highway 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 - Greyhound Rock/Cal Poly Bluffs</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>• 4.77 miles of primarily existing road shoulder improvements due to limited available space and adjacent public land on the coastal side of State Highway 1</td>
<td>$308,032</td>
<td>4-9 to 4-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Routine road edge clearing, signs, and shoulder pavement striping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4 - Davenport Landing/End of Railroad Tracks</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>• 1.38 miles (7,300 LF) multi-use rail trail (Class I)</td>
<td>$2,685,424</td>
<td>4-21 to 4-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1.41 miles (7,470 LF) bluff trail (Segment 4A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 0.85 miles (4,510 LF) on-street bike lanes (Segment 4B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One (1) Highway 1 crossing at Davenport Landing Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One (1) rail crossing in front of cement plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Three (3) road crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3 - Upper Coast Dairies at Scott Creek</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>• 1.11 miles (5,870 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I)</td>
<td>$2,550,096</td>
<td>4-15 to 4-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One (1) preengineered bike/pedestrian bridge, 150-foot span</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.13 miles</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,657,456</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CENTRAL REACH PROJECTS AND COSTS

The Central Reach includes Segments 6-14. Table B prioritizes the segments by the number of points they received. The segments that received the most number of points are considered the most feasible for implementing within a short time frame. This includes Segments 7, 9, and 8 (in that order) as the top three segments.

These segments provide gap closures to existing MBSST Network segments, provide access to numerous activity centers, connect to the coastal edge and beaches, and provide connectivity to other existing local and regional bikeway and pedestrian facilities. These segments are located in some of the most densely populated areas of the MBSST Network and provide ideal start/end points from residential neighborhoods. Some of the segments that received a lower number of points did so due to influences such as: high cost of construction, difficult or numerous rail crossings, narrow right-of-way, minimal access to greater population, and other limiting factors. However, these segments serve to close gaps in the overall MBSST Network, which will help elevate their importance for funding.

**TABLE B - Central Reach Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Document Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 36     | 7 - Coastal Santa Cruz   | 3.10   miles | • 2.17 miles (11,450 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along rail right-of-way  
• 0.08 miles (410 LF) on-street bike route  
• 0.85 miles (4,480 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the coastal side of the rail right-of-way (Segment 7A)  
• Fourteen (14) street crossings  
• Three (3) rail crossings and one (1) additional private crossing  
• One (1) preengineered bike bridge (Moore Creek crossing)  
• Existing staging area at Depot Park  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $11,218,016 | 4-39 to 4-44 |
| 35     | 9 - Twin Lakes           | 1.73   miles | • 1.53 miles (8,100 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I)  
• 0.20 miles (1,040 LF) on-street facilities (Segments 9A and 9B)  
• One (1) new preengineered bike/pedestrian bridge crossings over the harbor  
• One (1) new preengineered bike/pedestrian bridge crossing Upper Schwan Lagoon  
• One (1) new preengineered bike/pedestrian bridge crossing (rail culvert crossing) near El Dorado Ave.  
• Four (4) road crossings (Mott Ave., Seabright Ave., 7th Ave.)  
• Two (2) rail crossings (trail spur at El Dorado Ave., 7th Ave.)  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $11,914,384 | 4-51 to 4-56 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Document Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 33     | 8 - Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk | 0.77   | • 0.77 miles (4,070 LF) existing Class II bike lanes  
• One (1) new preengineered bike and pedestrian bridge, 400-foot span  
• Improvements of striping to existing cycle track with future roadway roundabout at Pacific Ave. and Beach St. (2000 LF)  
• Upgrade existing rail trail to the minimum 8-foot standard from Depot Park to the intersection of Pacific Ave. and Beach St.  
• One (1) rail crossing with upgrades to Beach St. and Pacific Ave. intersection  
• Two (2) street crossings with upgrades to Beach St. and Pacific Ave. intersection  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented                                                                 | $10,314,240     | 4-45 to 4-50              |
| 30     | 11 - Capitola-Seacliff        | 3.20   | • 3.20 miles (16,880 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the rail right-of-way  
• Bike and pedestrian facilities to be included in any design plans for new rail bridge replacement of the Soquel Creek rail crossing  
• Two (2) preengineered bike/pedestrian bridges (one [1] at New Brighton State Beach parking lot and one [1] at Borregas Creek)  
• Five (5) at-grade street crossings (47th St., Monterey Ave., New Brighton Rd., Estates Dr., Mar Vista Dr.)  
• One (1) private at-grade street crossing (Grove Ln.), one (1) private at-grade crossing at 48th St., and one (1) additional private crossing  
• One (1) rail crossing at 47th St.  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented                                                                 | $8,868,336      | 4-61 to 4-66              |
| 26     | 6 - Wilder Ranch Trailhead/Shaffer Road | 1.49   | • 1.36 miles (7,160 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the coastal side of the rail right-of-way  
• 0.13 miles (670 LF) native soil coastal bluff trails (Segment 6A)  
• One (1) road crossing of Schaffer Rd.  
• Two (2) culvert crossings up the coast from Wilder Ranch trailhead and three (3) additional private crossings  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented                                                                 | $3,114,224      | 4-35 to 4-38              |
### TABLE B - Central Reach Projects Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Document Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25     | 10 - Live Oak/Jade St Park | 1.50 miles | • 1.50 miles (7,940 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the rail right-of-way  
• Relocation of approximately 1.0 mile (5,280 LF) of rail track and signal arm assemblies  
• One (1) preengineered bike/pedestrian bridge crossing at Rodeo Gulch Creek 200-foot span  
• Four (4) non-signalized street crossings (17th Ave., 30th Ave., 38th Ave., 41st Ave.)  
• One (1) at-grade rail crossing  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $9,707,440    | 4-57 to 4-60 |
| 22     | 14 - Seascape             | 1.17 miles | • 1.17 miles (6,160 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the inland rail right-of-way  
• Two (2) at-grade road crossings (Clubhouse Dr., Seascape Blvd.)  
• One (1) trail undercrossing of the existing rail bridge at Hidden Beach  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $2,079,872    | 4-79 to 4-82 |
| 17     | 13 - Rio Del Mar-Hidden Beach | 0.85 miles | • 0.85 miles (4,510 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the coastal side rail right-of-way  
• One (1) undercrossing connection to Rio Del Mar Blvd.  
• One (1) preengineered bike/pedestrian bridge, 200-foot span  
• One (1) existing staging area at Hidden Beach  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $3,306,112    | 4-73 to 4-78 |
| 17     | 12 - Aptos Village        | 1.14 miles | • 1.14 miles (6,030 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the rail right-of-way  
• Three (3) preengineered bike/pedestrian bridges (bridge spans vary)  
• One (1) retrofit of northern Highway 1 concrete bridge for bike and pedestrian facility  
• Three (3) at-grade street crossings (State Park Dr., Aptos Creek Rd., Trout Gulch Rd.)  
• One (1) rail crossing at Trout Gulch Rd.  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $10,831,696   | 4-67 to 4-72 |
| TOTALS |                          | 14.95 miles |                                                                                                                                          | $71,354,320   |                         |
WATSONVILLE REACH PROJECTS AND COSTS

The Watsonville Reach includes Segments 15-20. Table C prioritizes the segments by the number of points they received. The segments that received the most number of points are considered the most feasible for implementing within a short time frame. This includes Segments 18, 19, and 20 (in that order) as the top three segments.

These segments provide gap closures to existing MBSST Network segments, provide access to numerous activity centers, and provide connectivity to other existing local and regional bikeway and pedestrian facilities. These segments are located in some of the most densely populated areas of the Watsonville Reach and provide ideal start/end points from residential neighborhoods and the city of Watsonville. Segments 16 and 15 may require a bit more lead time to resolve physical design constraints, right-of-way conflicts, bridge design and construction issues, and other budgetary challenges. However, these segments serve to close gaps in the overall MBSST Network, which will help elevate their importance for funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Document Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 26     | 18 - Watsonville Slough Open Space Trails | 4.01 miles | • 1.20 miles (6,350 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the inland rail right-of-way  
• 2.81 miles (14,820 LF) Class II bike lanes (Segments 18A and 18B)  
• One (1) rail culvert crossing  
• Two (2) road crossings (one [1] at Lee Rd. and one [1] at Ohlone Pkwy.)  
• This segment also includes fencing for agricultural operations and safety; additional fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $3,010,720 | 4-99 to 4-104 |
| 23     | 19 - Walker Street, City of Watsonville | 0.47 miles | • 0.29 miles (1,510 LF) existing Class II bike lane along Walker St. right-of-way  
• 0.18 miles (950 LF) proposed Class II bike lane along Walker St. right-of-way (Segment 19A)  
• New sidewalks on the inland side of Walker St. from the intersection of W. Riverside Dr. to the end of Walker St., connecting to the Pajaro River  
• One (1) at-grade street crossing at Riverside Dr.  
• Additional fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $381,280 | 4-105 to 4-108 |
| 20     | 20 - Pajaro River | 0.74 miles | • 0.74 miles (3,930 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the inland rail right-of-way  
• One (1) new preengineered bike/pedestrian bridge at the Pajaro River crossing, 200-foot span  
• 3,930 feet of fencing for agricultural operations and safety; additional fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $3,009,136 | 4-109 to 4-112 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Document Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20     | 16 - Ellicott Slough | 2.66 miles | • 1.78 miles (9,400 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the rail right-of-way  
• 0.40 miles (2,100 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) coastal trail (Segment 16A)  
• 0.48 miles (2,530 LF) Class II bike lanes (Segment 16B)  
• Two (2) at-grade road crossings (Spring Valley Rd., Peaceful Valley Rd.)  
• One (1) at-grade rail crossing (Spring Valley Rd.)  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $3,613,600 | 4-89 to 4-92 |
| 20     | 15 - Manresa State Beach | 1.37 miles | • 1.37 miles (7,240 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the inland rail right-of-way  
• Two (2) at-grade road crossings (Sumner Ave., Camino Al Mar) and two (2) additional private crossings  
• Two (2) preengineered rail bridge crossings (one [1] 300-foot span at La Selva, and one [1] 225-foot span at San Andreas Rd.)  
• One (1) rail at-grade crossing (Camino Al Mar)  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $4,735,680 | 4-83 to 4-88 |
| 14     | 17 - Harkins Slough | 4.0 miles | • 4.0 miles (21,140 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the inland rail right-of-way  
• Seven (7) rail bridge/culvert crossings of varying lengths  
• One (1) private farm road crossing (1/2 mile west of Lee Rd.)  
• One (1) private road crossing at Buena Vista Dr. and one (1) additional private crossing  
• This segment also includes fencing for agricultural operations and safety; additional fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $19,961,888 | 4-93 to 4-98 |
|        | **TOTALS**        | **13.25 miles** |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | **$34,712,304** |                         |
Figure A Summary of cost by trail facility type
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

In regard to MBSST Network improvements, the main role of the RTC is to provide ongoing coordination services and funding for implementation of the MBSST Network. The RTC will take the lead in preparing memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between itself and implementing entities to clarify roles, responsibilities for design, development, construction, monitoring, and maintenance of the MBSST Network. The RTC may itself act as the implementing entity and construction manager.

The following describes the RTC’s implementation responsibilities in greater detail:

- **Phasing** - Taking many considerations into account, including the prioritization provided in Section 6.3, the RTC will coordinate with implementing entities to identify segments that are to be implemented.
- **Funding** - Upon identification of a segment, the RTC will organize a funding strategy to design, construct, and maintain the segment. RTC staff will assist implementing entities in developing fundable projects, matching projects with funding sources, and helping to complete competitive funding applications. In some cases, RTC may act as the project sponsor or co-sponsor.
- **Progress** - Through board presentations, website notifications, and other venues, the RTC will provide regular updates to the public regarding the status of the MBSST Network development.
- **Oversight** - The RTC will work closely with implementing entities, Planning, Parks, and Public Works staff to implement MBSST Network segments.
- **Coordination** - Finally, should the RTC incur additional operating expenses to coordinate implementation, maintenance, operation, and liability of the MBSST Network through agreements with implementing entities, funding will need to be identified.

The following describes implementing entities’ responsibilities in greater detail:

- Once the segment as been identified and funded, the RTC and/or implementing entities may employ in-house staff or retain a qualified bicycle and pedestrian trail planning consultant to design the MBSST Network construction documents. After review by the RTC’s advisory committees and implementing entities, boards, and committees, the RTC will review and approve of all MBSST Network designs submitted by the implementing entities.
- In conjunction with implementing entities and/or a trail planning consultant, a series of workshops should be conducted to introduce the project to the public and to identify any new information not included in this Master Plan.
- Implementing entities will be responsible for overseeing any necessary environmental clearance. The implementing entities will obtain the necessary planning, environmental, and development permits.
- The RTC may oversee project construction in consultation with the implementing entity and/or trail planning consultant.
- The RTC will also coordinate, or provide coordination assistance, between rail and agricultural operations to ensure minimal service disruptions.

NEXT STEPS

This Master Plan is a planning-level study of the location and configuration of the MBSST Network. Implementation of actual MBSST Network projects will require additional site-specific study, planning, and design. Each project will require thorough environmental study and documentation, review, and permitting consistent with the complexity of the improvements, sensitive resources, and regulatory and easement requirements. A primary objective of the Master Plan is to identify and, if possible, avoid significant constraints, and address the anticipated implementation criteria and requirements.