Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s

BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

NOTE SPECIAL MEETING DATE:
Monday, November 13, 2017

6:00 pm to 8:30 pm

RTC Office
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grace Voss</td>
<td>Janneke Strause</td>
<td>District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Casterson, Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Jim Cook</td>
<td>District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Scott</td>
<td>Will Menchine</td>
<td>District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kem Akol</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>District 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Hyman</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Conlen, Chair</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Fontes</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kira Ticus</td>
<td>Piet Canin</td>
<td>Ecology Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the Committee constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business

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 18, 2017 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting (pages 4-7)

7. Accept Bicycle Advisory Committee roster (page 8)

8. Accept summary of Hazard Reports (pages 9-11)

9. Accept letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee in support of the “Santa Cruz County Complete Streets to School Planning Grant” (page 12)

10. Accept letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee in support of the “Watsonville Complete Streets to School Planning Grant” (page 13)

11. Accept comment from a member of the public regarding Glen Canyon as a bicycle route (page 14-16)

12. Accept comment submitted to the Regional Transportation Commission regarding the Unified Corridor Study by Committee member Rick Hyman (pages 17-19)

13. Accept the 2017 Bicycle Friendly State ranking by the League of American Bicyclists (page 20)

14. Accept announcement from the Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency regarding award of a California Office of Traffic Safety to implement community education programs with the goal of improving safety on area roads (page 21)

**REGULAR AGENDA**

15. 2018 State Rail Plan – Presentation from George Dondero, RTC Executive Director (pages 22-47)

16. Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood Program – Presentation from Grace Blakeslee, RTC Senior Transportation Planner (pages 48-49)

17. 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program: Preliminary Staff Recommendations – Presentation from Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner (pages 50-61)

18. Updates related to Committee functions

19. Adjourn
NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for December 11, 2017 from 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 ccaletti@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 anticipado al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis. Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance by calling (831) 460-3200.

TITLE VI NOTICE
The RTC operates its programs and services without regard to race, color and national origin in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Any person believing to have been aggrieved by the RTC under Title VI may file a complaint with RTC by contacting the RTC at (831) 460-3212 or 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA, 95060 or online at www.sccrtc.org. A complaint may also be filed directly with the Federal Transit Administration to the Office of Civil Rights, Attention: Title VI Program Coordinator, East Building, 5th Floor-TCR, 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE, Washington, DC 20590.
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Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Draft Minutes

Special Meeting
Monday, September 18, 2017
6:00 pm to 8:30 pm

RTC Office
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

1. Call to Order: Chair Conlen called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm.

2. Introductions

   Members Present:
   Janneke Strause, District 1 (Alt)
   Jim Cook, District 2 (Alt.)
   Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
   Kem Akol, District 4
   Rick Hyman, District 5
   Amelia Conlen, City of Santa Cruz, Chair
   Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville
   Leo Jed, CTSC
   Kira Ticus, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work

   Staff:
   Cory Caletti, Sr Transportation Planner
   Gingery Dykaar, Sr Transportation Planner
   Anais Schenk, Transportation Planner

   Guests:
   Scott Hamby, City of Scotts Valley
   Theresia Rogerson, County Health Services Agency

   Unexcused Absences:

   Excused Absences:
   Grace Voss, District 1
   David Casterson, District 2, Vice-Chair
   Peter Scott, District 3
   Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)
   Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike to Work (Alt)

   Vacancies:
   District 4 - Alternate
   District 5 - Alternate
   City of Santa Cruz - Alternate
   City of Scotts Valley - Voting and Alternate
   City of Capitola - Voting and Alternate
   City of Watsonville - Alternate

3. Announcements – Cory Caletti, staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, provided a number of announcements. Anais Schenk, the RTC’s new transportation planner, was introduced and welcomed. A special November Bicycle Advisory Committee will be required due to grant funding applications that committees will be asked to provide recommendations on before the RTC’s final allocation decisions. The October meeting will be cancelled. A Notice of Preparation for the North Coast Rail Trail was released on September 13th and two scoping meetings will be held on
September 27th and 28th, 2017 in order to accept public input into alternatives to be considered as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Comments will be due by October 16th, 2017 at 4pm. Rick Hyman asked to have the DEIR presented to the Bicycle Advisory Committee when it will be available for review and comment. The Mar Vista Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing ad-hoc committee is invited to a stakeholder meeting. Members will include Janneke Strause, Kira Ticus, David Casterson and RTC staff Cory Caletti. Kim Shultz, RTC’s highway programs manager, will contact members to schedule a meeting in the near future.

4. Oral communications – Amelia Conlen announced that the City of Santa Cruz will be launching a Bike Share program in March of next year and will seek community input into station locations in the coming months. She indicated that the Branciforte bicycle and pedestrian bridge ribbon cutting will be held on September 28th, 2017 at noon. The City of Santa Cruz launched a “Street Smarts” traffic safety education campaign. Finally, an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the City of Santa Cruz’s rail trail project (from Natural Bridges to Bay/California) was issued in August and the comment period closed on September 14, 2017. The City’s Planning Commission will consider adoption of the MND on the tentatively scheduled date of October 5th, 2017. Kira Ticus announced that October 5th is also Bike to Work Day and Janneke Strause invited members to the Open Streets event scheduled for Sunday, October 8th, 2017 on West Cliff Drive in the City of Santa Cruz. Murray Fontes announced that the City of Watsonville’s first Measure D funded project, the Bike Smart! bicycle education training program, will be launched in the near future.

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – Item #14 was pulled and moved to the regular agenda

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion (Hyman/Fontes) was made to approve the consent agenda through item 13. Rick Hyman abstained from items #6 and #11. Janneke Strause abstained from item #6. The motion passed with members Strause, Cook, Menchine, Akol, Hyman, Conlen, Fontes, Jed and Ticus voting in favor except for the abstentions noted above.

6. Approved draft minutes of the June 5, 2017 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accepted Bicycle Advisory Committee roster

8. Accepted Highlights of September 7th, 2017 RTC, including 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Call for Projects

9. Accepted summary of Hazard Reports

10. Accepted letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee to the City of Santa Cruz in support of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Segment 7 (Phase I) of the Rail Trail project

11. Accepted letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee to the County of Santa Cruz regarding recommendations for hiring considerations for a new Traffic Engineer

12. Accepted the City of Santa Cruz’s Street Smart Campaign Kickoff and Safety Tips

13. Approved the City of Santa Cruz’s Article 8 FY 17/18 Transportation Development Act allocation claims for $32,000 for Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements, and $2,000 for Bike Parking
14. Moved to the regular agenda - Approve the City of Scotts Valley Transportation Development Act Claim in the amount of $93,963 for the Mt. Hermon/Scotts Valley Rd/Whispering Pines Intersection Improvement Project

**REGULAR AGENDA**

Moved item #14: Approve City of Scotts Valley Transportation Development Act Claim in the amount of $93,963 for the Mt. Hermon/Scotts Valley Rd/Whispering Pines Intersection Improvement Project - Scott Hamby, City of Scotts Valley Public Works Director, was asked to provide a summary of the request. He noted that the intersection improvement project was reviewed by the Committee on multiple occasions, committee suggestions were incorporated as feasible, a notice for construction bidding was released and that a contract was awarded to Granite Construction. He anticipates work to start in October and go through the end of this calendar year. He also noted that video detection was added to the project at intersections versus traffic loops, a detail not reflected in the TDA application, which was in response to committee recommendations about ways to enhance design and functionality features. A motion was made (Hyman/Murray) to approve the recommendation that the RTC approve the TDA claim with members Strause, Cook, Menchine, Akol, Hyman, Conlen, Fontes, Jed and Ticus voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

15. Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS): Step 1 Draft Scenario Analysis Results – Ginger Dykaar, Senior Transportation Planner, summarized the UCS scenario analysis results and reminded members of the goals of the study. She indicated that public workshops will be held on October 2nd and 3rd in Watsonville and Live Oak, respectively, and that a community input survey will be released shortly. The following comments or requests were made: use a number system for rating projects and be consistent in comparing projects, highlight environmental and safety benefits, place high value to buffered/protected bicycle lanes and specify priority locations, give greater weight to projects that close gaps in the network and provide high utility benefits, include greater mention of pedestrian facilities and amenities, add video detection at signalized intersections, prioritize safety improvements at intersections, consider bus transit on a dedicated lane on Highway 1, remove language specifying safety benefits to bicyclists if riding in a shared bike/bus lane as there is no evidence of that assertion, and general discussion of the bike and pedestrian trail in the rail right-of-way as the committee’s highest priority project.

16. Vision Zero and “The Impact of Traffic Violence on Santa Cruz County” Report – Theresia Rogerson from the County Health Services Agency (HSA) presented the Vision Zero concept and “The Impact of Traffic Violence on Santa Cruz County” report. The report emphasizes the need to prevent transportation-related deaths and injuries. It includes statistics about collisions, identifies high-injury corridors, and analyzes trends in different areas of the county. Traveling at unsafe speeds and distracted driving are major causes of incidents; 54% of severe/fatal crashes were on 6% of roadways in the county; and pedestrian deaths and serious injuries made up 46% of incidents in Watsonville in the twelve month period from May 2016 to May 2017, as compared to 2% countywide. HSA and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) are working on a toolkit for agencies that includes vision zero policies and plans that prioritize the prevention of traffic deaths and injuries and provides technical support and data that can be used to secure funding for projects that will prevent transportation related fatalities and injuries. HSA/CTSC is also reaching out to the broader community with information to reduce crashes. The report and additional information is online at: www.sctrafficsafety.org/VisionZero

17. Visualization Sustainable Transportation: Progress Report – Anais Schenk, Transportation Planner, presented the Visualizing Sustainable Transportation Project which is funded by a Caltrans grant. The project focuses on engaging the community through the use of virtual reality technology
displayed through “Owl” viewers. The viewers will be installed in four different locations in Santa Cruz County as a means to engage and survey the public about sustainable transportation concepts. The Owls will be up for 6 weeks and will be operational 24/7 and will include short term and long term visuals.

18. Updates related to Committee functions – Leo Jed requested that an item to discuss returning to a monthly meeting frequency be agendized for the future. Cory Caletti reminded members that the meeting frequency is specified in the Rules and Regulations.

19. Adjourned - 8:25 PM

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for the special date of November 13, 2017 and the October 16, 2017 is cancelled. The meeting will be held 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
### Representing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 1 - Voting</th>
<th>Member Name/Contact Info</th>
<th>Appointment Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soquel, Live Oak, part of Capitola</td>
<td>Grace Voss <a href="mailto:gracevoss@sbcglobal.net">gracevoss@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>462-4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Janneke Strause <a href="mailto:director@bikesantacruzcounty.org">director@bikesantacruzcounty.org</a></td>
<td>425-0665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2 - Voting</td>
<td>David Casterson, Vice-Chair <a href="mailto:dbcasterson@gmail.com">dbcasterson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>588-2068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptos, Corralitos, part of Capitola, Nisene Marks, Freedom, PajDunes</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Jim Cook <a href="mailto:wookiv@comcast.net">wookiv@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3 - Voting</td>
<td>Peter Scott <a href="mailto:drip@ucsc.edu">drip@ucsc.edu</a></td>
<td>423-0796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Basin, Davenport, Bonny Doon, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>William Menchine (Will) <a href="mailto:menchine@cruzio.com">menchine@cruzio.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4 - Voting</td>
<td>Kem Akol <a href="mailto:kemakol@msn.com">kemakol@msn.com</a></td>
<td>247-2944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville, part of Corralitos</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5 - Voting</td>
<td>Rick Hyman <a href="mailto:bikerick@att.net">bikerick@att.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL Valley, Summit, Scotts Valley, part of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola - Voting</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz - Voting</td>
<td>Amelia Conlen <a href="mailto:conlen.ameliawren@gmail.com">conlen.ameliawren@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley - Voting</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville - Voting</td>
<td>Murray Fontes <a href="mailto:murray.fontes@cityofwatsonville.org">murray.fontes@cityofwatsonville.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike To Work - Voting</td>
<td>Kira Ticus <a href="mailto:kticus@ecoact.org">kticus@ecoact.org</a></td>
<td>426-5925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Piet Canin <a href="mailto:pcanin@ecoact.org">pcanin@ecoact.org</a></td>
<td>426-5925 ext. 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Coalition - Voting</td>
<td>Leo Jed <a href="mailto:leojed@gmail.com">leojed@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>425-2650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Jim Langley mobil: 713-7702 <a href="mailto:jim@jimlangley.net">jim@jimlangley.net</a></td>
<td>423-7248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All phone numbers have the (831) area code unless otherwise noted.
<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>Reported Hazards</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
<th>Forwarded To</th>
<th>Forwarded Date</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/01/17</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Schmack</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tom.schmack@gmail.com">tom.schmack@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>399-407</td>
<td>Fairmount</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Problem</td>
<td>No marking on pavement for sensor (W/bnd on Fairmount @ Morrissey X). Sensor no longer works.</td>
<td>Amelia Conlen</td>
<td>11/02/17</td>
<td>11/2: Amelia “Thank you for this report. It has been forwarded to our Maintenance team for action – I’ll let you know when I hear back.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/17</td>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>Gauger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeremygauger@gmail.com">jeremygauger@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>530 High St</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Bikeway not clearly marked</td>
<td>Not much visibility for cars ascending hill around turn, cars tend to cut across inside of bike lane, posing a very dangerous hazard for cyclists in the bike lane already on/around the corner. Primary bicycle route from downtown to the USCS campus.</td>
<td>Amelia Conlen</td>
<td>10/13/17</td>
<td>10/17: Amelia “Thank you for this report. We have completed plans to stripe a buffer on the uphill bike lane on High Street around the curves between Laurent and Storey, and a buffer on the downhill bike lane on the curve between Moore and Kalkar. Our next step is to go out to bid and secure a contractor to do the work. We have been seeing long lead times due to contractor workloads, but I would anticipate this project being completed in the next few months.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/17</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hnewburn@ucsc.edu">hnewburn@ucsc.edu</a></td>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Bikeway not clearly marked/enforced. I am a regular bike commuter to the UCSC campus via High Street. Concerned as to the safety of the High Street route. Drivers consistently cut through the bike lane on both of the two major curves leading up to campus and I have had three close calls just since I've been here.</td>
<td>Amelia Conlen 10/12/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/17</td>
<td>Anais</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aschenk@sccrtc.org">aschenk@sccrtc.org</a></td>
<td>Morrissey</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Rough pavement or potholes, Other Bump in bike lane. If not paying attention can catch one off guard and cause a possible crash.</td>
<td>Amelia Conlen 10/11/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/09/17</td>
<td>Piet</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pcanin@ecoact.org">pcanin@ecoact.org</a></td>
<td>Walnut Street</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Debris on shoulder or bikeway. J: Glass in bike lane on E/bound side of Walnut right after Mission &amp; before California as you are biking towards SC HighSchool.</td>
<td>Amelia Conlen 10/09/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/28/17</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>sarah@<a href="mailto:vhharmon@yahoo.com">vhharmon@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Fairmont</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Traffic signal problem. Loop detector stopped detecting bikes around 9/19 (was working previously). Occurs when trying to cross Morrissey w/b on Fairmount.</td>
<td>Amelia Conlen 09/28/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10/17: Amelia “Thank you for this report. We have completed plans to stripe a buffer on the uphill bike lane on High Street around the curves between Laurent and Storey, and a buffer on the downhill bike lane on the curve between Moore and Kalkar. Our next step is to go out to bid and secure a contractor to do the work. We have been seeing long lead times due to contractor workloads, but I would anticipate this project being completed in the next few months.”

10/11 Amelia “Thank you for this report. It has been forwarded to our maintenance crews for action – I’ll let you know what I hear back.”

10/09 Amelia “Thank you for this report. It has been forwarded to our maintenance crews for action.”

9/29/17: Amelia “Thank you for this report. It has been passed on to our maintenance crews for inspection and action.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/25/17</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td><a href="mailto:billwilson.04@sbcglobal.net">billwilson.04@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Trout Gulch Bridge Valencia School Road Aptos</td>
<td>Bikeway not clearly marked, Construction hazard Area needs signage. Lane/Sharrow Marking Driver's are not warned there is not sufficient room for bike &amp; car on bridge</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>09/25/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/17/17</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bikerick@att.net">bikerick@att.net</a></td>
<td>Capitola Rd Extension Harbor View Ct. Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Plant overgrowth or interference Trees overhanging the bike lane</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>09/20/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9/20 Christine Berge of SCCounty "Thank you for taking the time to report this. I have forwarded your email onto the Maintenance Yard where a service request will be generated for the area."
October 2, 2017

Giang Nguyen
Health Services Agency Director
Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency
1080 Emeline Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Ms. Nguyen:

I’m writing on behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Bicycle Committee in support of Santa Cruz County’s “Santa Cruz County Complete Streets to School Planning Grant” proposal to lay the groundwork for increasing the frequency and safety of bicycling and walking among school students at 19 county schools. Although we have many bike and pedestrian amenities and school-based efforts in our county, this planning effort will lay the groundwork for increasing safe multi-modal usage by school students and will involve coordinated approach to integrated land use and transportation in planning and implementation.

The RTC’s Bicycle Committee serves to assist in the development and maintenance of a complete, convenient and safe regional bicycle and pedestrian network. Such a network increases the opportunity and attractiveness of bicycle and pedestrian trips for transportation purposes. This grant proposal complements the Bicycle Committee’s goals to increase the number of safe bicycle trips through safety awareness and education, including plans to distribute information to motorists about driving safely around more vulnerable road users.

We strongly support the County’s proposal that will provide a thorough and well thought out plan to increase safe and equitable multi-modal access to our school communities, as well as contribute towards the additional benefits of reduced congestion around schools and helping to reach state targets for improved air quality and greenhouse gas reduction. Thank you for your continued support of efforts to build a more livable community with all residents in mind. Please feel free to contact the RTC’s Bicycle Program Manager and staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org, for this and any other committee related matters.

Sincerely,

Amelia Conlen
Bicycle Advisory Committee Chair

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
October 2, 2017

Charles A. Montoya
City Manager
275 Main St., Suite 400
Watsonville, CA  95076

Dear Mr. Montoya:

I’m writing on behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Bicycle Advisory Committee in support of the City of Watsonville’s proposal entitled “Watsonville Complete Streets to School Planning Grant” to Caltrans. This proposal would impact 15 schools and lay the groundwork for increasing the frequency and safety of bicycling and walking among city school students. If funded, the grant would enhance safety through coordinated efforts among public works, public health, community-based programs, the schools, and law enforcement.

The RTC’s Bicycle Advisory Committee serves to assist in the development and maintenance of a complete, convenient and safe regional bicycle and pedestrian network. This grant proposal complements the Bicycle Advisory Committee’s goals to increase the number of safe bicycle trips through safety awareness and education, including plans to distribute information to motorists about driving safely around more vulnerable road users. The project will involve a coordinated approach to integrated land use and transportation in planning and implementation, furthering the regions’ land-use planning.

The increasing use of private vehicles to transport students to school is of vital concern to us as we continue to search for methods to boost safety and reduce congestion for increased multi-modal access to local city schools. With population projections for the region rising, we have fundamental work to do to prepare for mode shift within the current landscape. This city-wide school improvement plan will have many long-term benefits for students and the community, as well as providing a vehicle for leveraging traffic safety funding for school projects in the future. Please feel free to contact the RTC’s Bicycle Program Manager and staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org, for this and any other committee related matters.

Sincerely,

Amelia Conlen
Bicycle Advisory Committee Chair

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

I’d be very interested to know more about this. I try to follow the stuff, but despite the fact this program was “finalized” two years ago, I’d not heard of it before. For reasons I cannot fathom, the SCCRTC Bicycle Committee decided that Glen Canyon would be an excellent place to encourage bike riding, despite the fact that other routes between Santa Cruz and Scotts Valley have much, *MUCH* better sight lines. Be clear: I ride a bicycle. I enjoy it. I have been doing so for 60 years. Glen Canyon is a suicide run and nevertheless parents with little children riding their bicycles take that route *BECAUSE IT IS ON THE BICYCLE MAP*. So, the planned signed routes need to take some sanity into account and I do not believe that the Bicycle Committee is being run by folks using much of their grey matter. :(

Please apply some caution in considering their recommendations for routes.

Thank you! Regards, - Bruce
I finally wound my way down to the the map showing signage. Yep. You have Glen Canyon. If you include it, please, for God's sake, mark the thing as *HIGHLY* dangerous. Please *DISCOURAGE* little children and neophytes who might unknowingly take their lives in their hands. I've seen too many accidents on that road. Way too frequent. Please consider alternate routes:

https://goo.gl/maps/5jg9gdr4e1o

Thank you! Regards, - Bruce
Dear RTC: Please refine the discussion of improvements for bicycles in the Unified Corridor Investment Study Step 1 Draft Scenario Analysis particularly for the Soquel/Freedom corridor along the lines of the input that you received at the September 19, 2017 Bicycle Committee meeting. In summary, the base case that needs to happen (what exists and needs to remain plus what is already planned and needs to occur) in any and all scenarios consists of:

- Keeping bike lanes in locations where they now exist and adding standard bike lanes where they are missing;
- Widening existing bike lanes that are of substandard width;
- Maintaining bike lanes in good physical condition.

Future projects to be a component of all scenarios are: intersection improvements for bicycles and widened/possibly buffered bike lanes up to five feet wide plus up to a two foot wide buffer.

First, bike lanes exist along most of Soquel Avenue, Soquel Drive, and Freedom Boulevard. These should be acknowledged as the base case that would remain in all scenarios. Existing bike lanes would never be reduced in width or eliminated in any locations. There are a few places where the current bike lanes are substandard; i.e., less than four feet wide (or five feet where adjacent to on-street parking). These need to be widened to minimum standards for safety and liability purposes as soon as possible regardless of what other improvements may happen.

Also, both Santa Cruz City and Santa Cruz County have on-going projects to maintain their bike lanes, including periodic sweeping and restriping. Such maintenance would continue.

One possible project in one scenario is “Dedicated Lanes for Bus Rapid Transit and Biking.” “The dedicated lanes would occupy the existing right hand general purpose lane in segments where there are a minimum of 2 lanes in each direction.” This statement does not say that the existing bike lane would be eliminated, but since having a bike lane next to a bike/bus lane appears redundant, there is an implication that the existing bike lane would be eliminated. This should not occur – the existing bike lanes should be maintained. The UCIS states, “Shared bus-bike lanes provide basic bicycle access on transit-focused streets when no space is available for dedicated bikeways.” Since there is space, as the dedicated bike lanes already exist, there is no reason to established shared bus-bike lanes. The report goes on to say, “Biking in a lane shared with BRT would create a safer biking facility and increase bicycle ridership as they generally travel at similar speeds and thus “leap frogging” is less likely.” This statement should be sourced or eliminated, since it is not apparent that substituting the current configuration for a combined bus-bike lane is either safer or more conducive to cycling. This combined bike and bus lane idea should be dropped.

Two other possible projects -- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lite and Intersection Improvements for Automobiles – may interfere with current bike lanes. By including the clarifications suggested herein, these projects would have to incorporate bike lanes. The existing bike lane configuration might have to change close to intersections, but the lane would not be eliminated nor narrowed.
Second, there are segments of these streets with no bike lanes, including westbound Soquel Avenue between Pacific Avenue and Front Street, westbound Soquel Avenue between Ocean Street and Branciforte Avenue, eastbound Soquel Drive between South Main Street and Center Street, Freedom Boulevard between Richardson Road and Broadis Street, and westbound Freedom Boulevard between Broadis and East High Streets. Current local bicycle plans and the Regional Transportation Plan already contain projects to close most of these gaps. These projects should be acknowledged as already committed to by responsible jurisdictions and would occur under any scenario.

Third, “Bike and Pedestrian Intersection Improvements” are offered as a new project in only three of the six scenarios. They are not part of the two scenarios including “auto intersection improvements.” Although some of the specific elements of bike and pedestrian improvements may not be compatible with those of auto improvements at intersections, these two projects are not totally incompatible. Just the opposite -- if intersection designs are going to be modified and turn lanes added to better accommodate autos, then, for safety purposes, it is incumbent in the redesign to also incorporate bicycle (and pedestrian) improvements. For examples, adding a right turn lane may add another conflict point between bikes and autos that can at least partially be ameliorated by adding a green bike lane. Adding a left turn lane may increase the difficulty cyclists face in riding into the turn lane that can at least partially be ameliorated by adding a bike box. Intersections are where the majority of bicycle/motor vehicle crashes occur. Thus, some level of intersection improvements for bicycles (and pedestrians) should be part of all scenarios and be of high priority.

Fourth, “Buffered/protected bike lanes” are offered as a new project in only two of the six scenarios. Missing from this study are improvements to bike lanes under all scenarios. The UCIS states, “Where feasible, this project would widen the bicycle lanes to 5 feet and provide a 1-2 feet buffer zone next to the lanes with either striping or a physical barrier to clearly mark the area for bicycle travel.” Along the corridor most, but not all of the bike lane, meets the current minimum standard of 4 feet or (if next to parking) 5 feet. Any widening and/or adding buffer width would be generally be welcome by cyclists. For example, where there is currently only a four foot or less bike lane and only room to add less than a foot that should be done, even if there is no additional room for a buffer. In other words, the 6 to 7 width (5 + 1 or 5 +2) should be a goal, but not an absolute. The current wording implies that if 6 to 7 feet cannot be achieved, then no project happens. You requested clarification of this bike project description, which should be: up to five feet wide plus if possible up to a two foot wide buffer.

The USIS indicates that this project may require on-street parking removal. Currently, there are segments of the corridor with fairly narrow bike lanes adjacent to on-street parking. These pose dangers to cyclists from dooring, parked vehicles extending into the bike lanes, and motor vehicle maneuvering to park or return to the traffic lanes. If on-street parking is removed, these dangers disappear. If on-street parking is retained, then widening the bike lane or buffering it from the parking strip becomes important; indeed some buffered bike lanes have the buffer strip between the bike lane and the parking.
As noted, the USIS indicates that this project may include physical barriers as buffers. Physical barriers introduce maintenance complications and can reduce cyclist maneuverability (e.g., if the cyclist has to move to avoid being doored or to make a left turn).

Buffering is generally recommended on higher speed streets. Lowering motor vehicle speeds correlates with reduced crashes and crash severities and thus is another option to consider.

All these points and other considerations suggest that improved bike lanes along the corridor may take various forms; thus, the USIS project description should include flexibility. But, these points also suggest that some level and type of improvement can be made along most if not all of the corridor; thus, this USIS project (with flexibility) belongs in all scenarios.

In conclusion, what should universally occur, regardless of scenario, is a detailed examination along the entire corridor of what improvements for cyclists can be made at intersections and to the existing bike lanes -- running the gamut from eliminating gaps, intrusions and impediments; to some widening; all the way to widening with buffering to a total seven foot width.

Rick Hyman
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>2017 Rank</th>
<th># of Bicycle Friendly Actions*</th>
<th>Infrastructure &amp; Funding</th>
<th>Education &amp; Encouragement</th>
<th>Legislation &amp; Enforcement</th>
<th>Policies &amp; Programs</th>
<th>Evaluation &amp; Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>🆆���</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>🆆���</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>🆆��</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>🆆��</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>🆆�</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>🆆�</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>🆆��</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>🆆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Bicycle Friendly Actions include a Complete Streets policy, a safe passing law, a statewide bike plan, spending 2% or more of federal transportation money on biking and walking, and a bicycle safety emphasis area.

Key: Category rank among all 50 states

Learn more at bikeleague.org/states
PRESS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: Contact: Lynn Lauridsen, MPH
November 9, 2017 Senior Health Educator
(831) 454-5477
Lynn.lauridsen@santacruzcounty.us

Health Services Agency Funded for Traffic Safety Education Programs

SANTA CRUZ, CA – The Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency (HSA) was recently awarded California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) grants totaling $214,500 to implement programs that emphasize collaboration and community education to improve safety on area roads.

Local traffic data directed HSA to focus bike and pedestrian safety along with child passenger safety. The most currently available OTS rankings (2014) showed Santa Cruz County was the worst in California for bicyclists being injured/killed. Santa Cruz County also ranked in the top 10 in all pedestrian categories: 4th for pedestrian injuries/fatalities under 15 years of age, 8th for overall pedestrian injuries/fatalities; and 8th for pedestrian injuries/fatalities aged 65 and over. Local survey data also show that only 46% of elementary school children observed are safely restrained in their vehicle.

The Health Services Agency is targeting the most vulnerable road users - bicyclists, pedestrians, and youth in vehicles. Grant activities for the upcoming year include:

- Hands-on bicycle and pedestrian safety skills training for elementary aged youth.
- Distribution and proper fitting of bicycle helmets.
- Safety events at UCSC.
- School crossing guard needs assessment.
- Child safety seat checkup events.
- Distribution of no-cost car seats to low income families.

Grant funds also support the Community Traffic Safety Coalition’s Vision Zero campaign, joining communities across the nation and around the world with a goal to prevent all serious injuries and fatalities on our roadways. Vision Zero considers any loss of life from traffic crashes unacceptable and preventable. The project is currently providing technical assistance to the City of Watsonville as they consider a Vision Zero policy.

Grant funds are being provided by the California Office of Traffic Safety through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

###
TO: Bicycle Advisory Committee

FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director

RE: California State Rail Plan

THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND

On October 11 Caltrans released the new 2018 California State Rail Plan. This plan represents one aspect of significant changes in the state’s approach to meeting future transportation needs. Consistent with state policies on climate change and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, this strategic plan provides a framework to plan and implement California’s rail network for the next 20 years and beyond. The plan provides operating and capital investment strategies leading to a coordinated, statewide travel system. Caltrans says that “by 2040, Californians will have access to an integrated, state-of-the-art rail system that will revolutionize personal mobility and enhance quality of life.” A Fact Sheet is provided as Attachment 1, and the Executive Summary as Attachment 2. The link to the full report is provided above.

DISCUSSION

There are some notable differences between this draft strategic plan and prior state rail plans. First, this plan takes an integrated approach to rail service statewide. Service will be developed on a hub system, similar to the way airlines schedule service. Coordinated schedules will be timed to make transfer times brief and predictable. Express bus and urban rail components are included as essential links in the network.

Second, the plan is consistent with state goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Third, with the passage of SB 1 new funding for rail investment is now available. Programs include: State Rail Assistance, Transit and Intercity Rail Capital program, Congested Corridor program, and State Transit Assistance.

Fourth, the plan is bold. By 2040 the plan projects that trips by rail will grow from a current 110,000 daily trips to 1.3 million daily trips in 2040.
SUMMARY

Caltrans has issued a draft 2018 California State Rail Plan. A presentation and discussion will be provided.

Attachments:
1. Fact Sheet
2. Executive summary
The Rail Plan establishes a long-term vision for prioritizing state investment in an efficient, effective passenger and freight rail system, which supports the goals and policies of the California Transportation Plan 2040. The Rail Plan identifies service goals, capital costs, and a phased strategy for achieving the Vision. This ambitious plan identifies a coordinated, statewide passenger rail network that will get Californians where they want to go, when they want to go, and enhance the movement of goods by rail to support California’s industries and the economy.

**WHAT IS THE 2018 CALIFORNIA STATE RAIL PLAN?**

The Rail Plan investments will open the door for travelers to glide past traffic on reliable trains and buses in dedicated lanes; transfer quickly and easily with timed transfers; and to plan an entire, door-to-door trip, even on different trains, using a single ticket.

**PASSENGER RAIL:**

**FREIGHT RAIL:** The Rail Plan establishes state priorities for freight: improving trade corridors, yards and terminals, and access for businesses; and enhancing the competitiveness of California’s ports and intermodal transfer facilities.

**IMPLEMENTATION HIGHLIGHTS**

**The Short-Term Plan (2022)**

- Caltrain electrification
- Committed rail improvements/extensions
- More bus connections to fill gaps
- Elimination of existing rail freight bottlenecks
- Statewide service planning – connect train routes

**The Ten Year Plan (2027)**

- High Speed Rail – Central Valley to Silicon Valley
- More frequencies using available capacity
- Timed connections between services
- Fully operational integrated ticketing
- Rail freight – shared passenger lines, trade corridors

**The Vision (2040)**

- High Speed Rail – Anaheim to San Francisco by 2029
- High Speed Rail connections – Sacramento, Inland Empire, San Diego
- New regional rail system connections
- Regular frequencies & fast services

**contact us**

For more information, or to view the Rail Plan and submit comments, please visit our website at www.CaliforniaStateRailPlan.com/comments.html or email RailPlan@dot.ca.gov.
California has a premier, customer-focused, integrated rail system that successfully moves people and products while enhancing economic growth and quality of life.
Building California’s Future

California is the world’s sixth-largest economy, and home to nearly 40 million people. California supports world-class cities, universities, research centers, and the world’s most valuable, innovative, and technologically advanced companies. The State’s landscapes include productive agricultural areas and spectacular natural beauty—from the shoreline to the mountains to the deserts. This natural beauty, alongside thriving communities, draws visitors and residents alike to support the State’s innovative economy, spur its entrepreneurial spirit, and sustain its creative culture.

To continue to compete and thrive on the cutting edge of global technology, to lead the State’s efforts to curb climate change, and to grow sustainably and resiliently in a fast-changing world, Californians must invest in and build a high-performance statewide rail system befitting their needs and ambitions.
Recent events have added significant new momentum that will lead to a renaissance of rail transportation throughout the State. At the local level, many counties have passed sales tax measures that add tremendous resources to the development of passenger rail—most notably in Los Angeles, Santa Clara, and Alameda Counties. At the State level, the passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) (the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017) provides the long-term resources to invest in the State’s rail system. We have the opportunity to grow service in congested corridors, launch new rail services and extensions, develop customer-friendly connections, provide statewide integrated ticketing and trip planning, reduce delays and travel times, and attract new riders to the statewide rail network. This is an opportunity to transform how we travel throughout the state.

By 2040, Californians will have access to an integrated, state-of-the-art rail system that will revolutionize personal mobility and enhance quality of life. Passenger rail will be the option of choice for a large share of regional and long-distance travel in the state. It will help Californians achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) and air quality goals while boosting economic growth and helping to create more livable communities. Passenger rail trips are expected to increase more than ten-fold to over 1.3 million per day, while mode shift to rail increases six-fold over the current share.

California’s rail system will expand its ability to move freight cleanly and efficiently, benefiting Californians and California’s businesses, as well as supporting national competitiveness. Freight rail capacity will significantly increase to handle a more than doubling of demand, almost entirely within existing rail corridor rights-of-way. Federal, State, and local agencies will partner with privately owned freight railroads to support this growth.
California State Rail Plan Overview

The 2018 California State Rail Plan (Rail Plan) is a strategic plan with operating and capital investment strategies that will lead to a coordinated, statewide travel system. The Rail Plan is an important element in the comprehensive planning and analysis of statewide transportation investment strategies detailed in the California Transportation Plan 2040 (CTP 2040). In concert with CTP 2040 and other plans, it will help clear the air, invigorate our cities, and provide the mobility Californians need in the future. Regional plans will build on the Rail Plan as they make use of new regional rail capacity, develop transit networks, and set land use recommendations that benefit from enhanced connectivity. Federal and State grant awards and funding decisions will consider project alignment with the 2040 Vision and strategies reflected in the Rail Plan.

This Rail Plan is more ambitious than previous rail plans. In compliance with Federal and State laws, it proposes a unified statewide rail network that better integrates passenger and freight service, connects passenger rail to other transportation modes, and supports smart mobility. The Rail Plan acknowledges the need for expanded freight capacity to support future economic needs.

The Rail Plan aims to capture an increasing percentage of travel demand by rail. California’s population will be 48 million by 2040, a 30 percent increase from 2010. Jobs are expected to grow at similar rates, with a 31 percent increase by 2040.

California has already built the best statewide rail and bus system in the country—the result of concentrated efforts starting in the 1990s. Intercity and regional ridership is booming, as services that didn’t even exist 25 years ago play a vital role throughout the state. In total, current intercity and regional ridership exceeds 110,000 per day and provide connections to the wide local transit network1.

The rail system can still provide more service within potential latent capacity, and more efficient performance. With longer trains, more frequent services, better connectivity, and ease of access, the number of riders will grow, reducing average costs per passenger. More trains, more often, with faster travel times will be auto- and air competitive, and motivate travelers to use rail and transit for more daily trips. The user-friendly, high-performance statewide system described in the 2040 Vision will carry more than 1.3 million daily trips by 2040. It will do so at a lower cost, allowing fares that encourage additional ridership and reduced public subsidies.

1 For full ridership numbers, see Section 2.1.1 in the 2018 California State Rail Plan.
A great deal of implementation planning by State and local agencies, in partnership with each other, will be guided by the vision and strategies in the Rail Plan. Although clear investment priorities are indicated between now and 2040, the exact nature of the specific capital investments needed, as well as the phasing of network improvements, requires further input from local communities, current and future rail system users, and businesses to ensure that impacts of network development are acceptable, costs are justifiable, and benefits are widespread.

The Rail Plan was developed by Caltrans with extensive input from stakeholders and public outreach. The final plan is approved by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), and will be reviewed and accepted by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). Caltrans also receives advice from the California Transportation Commission (CTC), and will submit the final approved Rail Plan to the Legislature, the Governor, the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), and the CTC.
California’s Vision for an Integrated Statewide Rail Network

The integrated passenger rail system described in the 2040 Vision is comprised of high-speed, intercity and regional train services connecting at hubs to enable smooth transfers between trains, express buses, local transit, and even ferry boats. To facilitate efficient service and market-driven growth, the rail system can continue to expand capacity, largely on existing rights-of-way, while being sensitive to existing communities. This Vision will extend the significant benefits of high-speed rail and multimodal connectivity to residents across the state.

The 2040 Vision will allow people to:

Travel seamlessly across urban, suburban, and rural areas of the state with more trains, more often: Departures at least every hour – and every 30 minutes or better in most markets;

Save time with significantly faster trips;

Enjoy the journey on modern, safe, clean, and comfortable trains;

Glide past traffic congestion on reliable trains and express buses in dedicated lanes;

Transfer quickly and easily between high-speed, intercity, and regional trains, express buses, and transit at hub stations with coordinated arrivals and departures with significantly reduced wait times;

And plan entire door-to-door trips, and purchase a single ticket using a streamlined trip-planning portal.

---

2 Some low-density areas of the state may have bi-hourly or every-4-hour service until the market matures.
Additionally, shippers will benefit from more reliable and environmentally-friendly shipping options as freight rail capacity grows and freight train operations benefit from many fewer delays from passenger train movements. Coordinated planning and investments among public agencies and private railroads will ensure that freight rail operators will benefit from the strategies in this plan.

Coordinated and ongoing planning allows State and regional agencies responsible for rail services to have a conversation with communities about how best to meet diverse needs. Investing in rail will increase the mode share of freight and passenger rail, support a growing economy while lowering statewide transportation costs, integrating rail travel network with existing state highways and airports, improving safety, lowering greenhouse gas emissions, and enhancing livability. Highways and local roads will benefit from having their capacity used for high-value trips that cannot be made by rail, and airports will benefit from having their capacity available for higher-profit long-distance flights. Locally, California cities and towns will benefit from the private investment that follows station-area development.

“California has a premier, customer-focused, integrated rail system that successfully moves people and products while enhancing growth and quality of life.”
The 2040 Vision for passenger rail introduces new services and expands the State's rail network into new areas of California and across State borders, including the congested international border into Mexico.

The passenger component of the California rail vision includes several key elements:

**Statewide System** – Passenger rail service will tie together urban, suburban, and rural areas of the state.

**Integrated Services** – Multimodal hubs will connect all levels of service with a common fare system, which allows trips to be made on a single ticket.

**Coordinated Schedules** – Services will be coordinated in a ‘Pulsed’ schedule across the network to reduce wait times and allow direct transfers.

**Frequent Service** – Service frequency will make rail a timely option for travelers, meeting trip demands throughout the day.

**Customer Focus** – Enhanced ticketing, scheduling, and passenger information will be supported by coordinated services.
Moving Goods and Enhancing the Economy

California is the sixth-largest economy in the world, with an annual gross domestic product of over $2.4 trillion. California businesses export roughly $162 billion worth of goods to more than 225 foreign countries annually. The State’s extensive rail network supports California’s economy, while minimizing impacts on air quality compared to other modes. Rail is an efficient, safe, and cost-effective way to move goods, because energy consumption and GHG emissions per ton carried are far lower than diesel trucks.

The ability of the State’s freight railroads to deliver these benefits depends on fluid traffic conditions on the railroads’ main lines. By 2040, the State’s freight railroad loads will increase 38 percent, compared to 2013. Investments to address bottlenecks, improve operations, and increase capacity throughout the network will reduce congestion and delays. In turn, an improved freight rail network will help shift goods movement away from congested roadways, which have a limited ability to expand.

Improvements in California’s rail system are investments that will pay off with greater economic activity: new construction, more jobs, and growing tax revenues. The goods movement industry creates valuable jobs at California’s ports and intermodal transfer facilities, warehouses, and distribution centers. Investment in the rail system supports diverse industries by making California’s businesses more efficient and competitive.
The Rail Plan freight investment strategy envisions an evolving partnership between the State, regions and the freight railroads to:

Eliminate bottlenecks and use existing corridors more intensively, enhancing the capabilities of both freight and passenger trains in the short term;

Utilize significant new federal and state funding programs, such as FASTLANE and TCEA, to implement corridor investment programs for freight improvements;

Make shared investments that improve the performance and utility of freight and passenger operations through strategic identification of infrastructure projects that provide benefits to all operators, and

Implement quiet zones and grade separations, as well as foster the use of cleaner and quieter locomotives that will make railroads better neighbors.

The Rail Plan identifies $40.8 billion of direct expenditures planned by private railroads and regional agencies, resulting in total economic output of nearly $77.5 billion by 2040—a payout of nearly two dollars for every dollar invested. The expenditures will result in nearly 463,000 full-time jobs, and labor income surpassing $28 billion across industries. By 2040, State and local tax revenues anticipated from the expenditures will be close to $2 billion, and Federal tax revenues will be $5.4 billion. New Federal and State trade corridor funding will accelerate many of these investments, bringing the economic benefits sooner. In addition to these planned expenditures, many of the projects that bring about passenger rail expansion will deliver significant capacity and operational benefits for freight rail as well.
Ensuring Economic Competitiveness

The 2040 projections show significant intermodal growth from 2013—more than double the goods moving through the transcontinental routes. **Ensuring the State’s economic competitiveness has been the guiding principle behind California’s Trade Corridor Investment Fund program.** Strategic investments, such as the Colton Crossing grade separation, eliminated bottlenecks for Union Pacific Railroad and BNSF Railway traffic at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. The new Trade Corridor Enhancement Account (TCEA), created through SB 1, will provide new opportunities to address strategic investments in highway and rail trade corridors, with additional funding of almost $300 million annually for the coming decade and beyond.

### Projected Intermodal Growth

**2013**

- **North:** 0.8
- **Midwest and Northwest:** 29.4
- **Southwest:** 17.1

Unit: Millions of Tons
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The freight component of the Rail Plan includes several key elements:

First, a premier system requires improved trade corridors, yards and terminals, upgraded track conditions for short lines; and innovative service concepts that have efficiency and safety benefits for all users.

Second, a customer-focused system will lead to improved access to the rail network (Class I and short lines), with competitive cost and service (improved speeds and service options), enhancing options for the State’s shippers.

Third, an integrated system requires improved intermodal terminal and transload connections to smooth transfers between modes.

Fourth, the Rail Plan is focused on supporting development of a rail network that moves both people and products, and on addressing strategies and improvements for coordinating passenger and freight service and preserving freight capacity as passenger services grow.

Fifth, economic growth will be achieved through trade corridor improvements and the availability of competitive modal options for California’s industries.

Finally, the Rail Plan supports improvements in California’s quality of life through modal energy/ emissions benefits associated with movement of freight by rail and mode-shift to rail where feasible. The Rail Plan also addresses grade crossing impacts.
Shifting from Highway to Railway

The 2040 Vision improvements make it possible for people to drive less. Reducing automobile passenger trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduces roadway congestion, GHG, and vehicle emissions, and supports the State’s Assembly Bill 32 Scoping Plan target of 80 percent reduction of GHG emissions from 1990 levels by 2050.

The 2040 Vision projects 88 million daily passenger miles diverted to rail from highways and an increase of 92 million daily passenger miles on rail as a result of the investments outlined in the Rail Plan.

A reduction of that volume would:

- **Eliminate over 13 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalence annually,** comparable to planting more than 166 million urban trees every year.
- **Decrease highway congestion,** resulting in fewer hours lost commuting, less damage to roads, and providing more efficient travel of goods and people.

Compared to air travel, the projected 1.3 million rail riders per day is 3 times the number of passengers boarding flights at California’s 7 largest airports (LAX, SFO, SAN, OAK, SNA, SJC, and SMF). It would take nearly 3,000 Boeing 747 Jumbo Jets to carry the same number of daily passengers.

**Rail Mode Share**

Current: 0.34%

2040 No Build: 0.52%

2040 Vision: 6.8%

- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Mitigate roadway congestion
- Reduce vehicle emissions

---

3 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Greenhouse Gases Equivalencies Calculator.
4 U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Table 1-44, Passengers Boarded at the Top 50 U.S. Airports.
Advancing Sustainability and Livability

The Rail Plan advances the State’s commitment to reduce GHG and other pollutants by providing a competitive alternative to private vehicle travel and diesel-truck transport. California high-speed rail (HSR) will be fully electrified, and powered by 100 percent renewable energy. Many intercity, regional, and urban transit passenger services will benefit from electrification or other zero emission technology, often through sharing infrastructure with the growing HSR network.

By 2040, more than half of passenger trips and the majority of passenger miles of travel will take place on electrified trains in California. Diesel-electric and other alternative clean technology passenger and freight locomotives will reduce GHG emissions, making rail a greener mode of transportation.

- Offer a convenient and reliable alternative to private vehicle travel
- Increase electric and zero emission trains
- Provide alternative to truck transport of containerized cargo

### CO₂ per Passenger Mile (in grams)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>2040 Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Improving Safety

Emerging technologies offer opportunities to increase the safety and capacity of passenger and freight rail. Positive Train Control is capable of preventing train-to-train collisions, monitoring train speed, and stopping a train in an emergency. New technology can improve train operations in environmentally sensitive or dense urban areas to further reduce potential accidents.

Passenger rail is considered a far safer mode of travel and risk of personal injuries and deaths are currently 17 times lower than traveling in auto and even safer on high speed trains. An anticipated reduction of 74 million daily VMT away from highways can potentially eliminate 250 fatalities and 19,000 transportation related injuries in California by 2040, supporting the State’s goal of adopting a “Toward Zero Deaths” practice, in coordination with local Vision Zero programs.

The most dangerous element of the rail network is grade crossings. Combined with new funding sources, such as the Federal FAST Act and State TCEA, Federal railroad crossing safety programs and Caltrans-administered State programs, including the Section 130 Railroad/Highway At-Grade Crossing Improvement and the Section 190 Grade Separation programs, will continue to upgrade safety devices or eliminate rail/highway grade crossings throughout the state.
Funding Opportunities: Sources and Programs

Rail funding in California is a unique partnership among Federal, State, regional, and private sources. Newly passed SB 1 provides a significant enhancement of the funding available to State and regional agencies responsible for many of the rail services. Future improvements in intercity and regional services, as well as HSR, will allow operating revenues to provide significant resources to invest in rail corridor improvements.

Key rail funding sources and programs:

- Local Transportation Fund
- Local Sales Tax
- State Transit Assistance
- Intercity Rail Program Funding
- State Transportation Improvement Program
- California Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund
- Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program
- HSR Funding:
  - Proposition 1A bonds
  - Additional funding and program enhancements guided by SB1
    - State Transit Assistance
    - State Rail Assistance
    - Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program
    - Congested Corridor Program
    - Trade Corridor Enhancement Account
- Federal Discretionary Programs
  - TIGER
  - FASTLANE/INFRA
  - FTA's Capital Investment Grants
  - FRA's FAST Act grants
- Federal Formula Programs

2040 Vision
Overall Capital Program (in Billions) Time Horizon

$85
$47
$4.8

2022
2027
2040

5 Estimated costs in 2018 dollars. These costs are planning-level estimates and require further study in implementation.
Implementation Goals: A Phased Approach

To achieve the 2040 Vision, the Rail Plan identifies phased investments to reach frequency and connectivity goals. Strategic implementation plans, most developed between now and 2022, will guide investments and implementation planning, to avoid redundancy and deliver enhancements sooner.

Statewide Service Highlights

2022

The statewide plan for 2022 or earlier identifies service improvements that will lay the foundation for improving and integrating the passenger rail network. Advancing projects allow expansion of service, including Caltrain electrification, expansion of rail service to Redlands Salinas and Larkspur, and increased frequencies on segments of intercity and regional rail corridors. These efforts include programmed funding, or funding expected to be awarded in 2018, and identified capacity within host railroad agreements.

Additional efforts include:

- Assisting communities statewide in better connecting transit systems to rail, and enhancing station area functions;
- Land use planning and development to cluster jobs and housing at station hubs;
- Strategic planning for fleet management, replacement, and expansion; and
- Conducting targeted investments in integrated ticketing and travel planning.
2027

The 2027 or earlier service goals focus on initial high speed rail services; targeted improvements for integrating intercity and regional rail with HSR; and maximizing service in existing rail corridors. Key components of the 2027 plan include expansion of service to the San Francisco Transbay Terminal, Merced, Coachella Valley, and Las Vegas; with significant growth in intercity and regional rail frequencies on all existing corridors, including the Central Coast.

Additional efforts include:

- Initiation of statewide pulse-hub operations;
- Full use of programmed passenger corridor capacity statewide;
- Full use of negotiated passenger service capacity on existing freight corridors;
- Targeted investments at hubs to connect to HSR
- Fully developed and operational integrated ticketing; and
- Implementation of a new fleet strategy.

2040

The 2040 or earlier Vision represents the full build-out of the long-term planning goals for the integrated statewide rail network.

The 2040 Vision highlights include:

- HSR expanded and integrated service to Sacramento, the Inland Empire, and San Diego;
- Completion of a new Transbay tube, allowing fast service between Sacramento, San Francisco, and throughout the Bay Area;
- Completion of many complementary corridor investments in the Los Angeles Basin;
- Significant new regional services in the Central Valley, on the Central Coast, and in the North Bay;
- Expansion of network capacity in full realization of the integrated service goals; and
- Intensification of services implemented during the 2022 and 2027 horizon years.
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TO: Bicycle Advisory Committee
FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner
RE: Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood – Program Activities and Results

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Advisory Committee receive information about the Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood Program activities and results.

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood Program (previously the User Oriented Transit Planning Project) was a program focused on reducing the number of drive alone trips and increasing the number of trips made by bus, biking, walking and carpooling in Santa Cruz County. The Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood Program was designed to test the effectiveness of individualized marketing techniques on changing travel choices and reduce vehicle miles traveled. This involved providing interested individuals with a comprehensive set of customized travel resources and tools to motivate and convince them to switch from drive alone car trips to trips made by bus, biking, walking, and carpooling. The RTC, in partnership with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz Metro), secured a Caltrans Transit Planning for Sustainable Communities Grant to conduct this pilot project. The Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood Program was carried out in Santa Cruz County between March 2017 and September 2017.

DISCUSSION

Previously entitled the “User Oriented Transit Planning Project”, the individual marketing of travel choices pilot program identified neighborhoods as the unique community segment to be the focus of the program and was rebranded “Cruz 511 In Your Neighborhood”. After a review of neighborhoods countywide, neighborhoods defined as Central Watsonville and Eastside Santa Cruz were selected to be the program’s target audience. Between April and July 2017, households in these neighborhoods were invited to participate in the program using several outreach strategies though: direct mail, contact with travel advisors who canvas neighborhoods and speak with individuals at their household about the program, neighborhood events and notifications on Nextdoor, a neighborhood social media site. Participants were asked to complete a before program survey about their travel habits and preferences and invited to order customized travel resources specific to each neighborhood. Customized travel resources included bus, biking and walking map guides, information about region-wide transportation services
and how to conveniently and safely use the bus, biking, walking and carpooling. Almost all materials were available in both English or Spanish.

The Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood Program’s effectiveness is measured by the changes in: the frequency of drive alone, riding the bus, bike, walk and carpool trips, and awareness and attitudes towards transportation options before and after the program intervention. Program effectiveness also considers the number of program participants and materials distributed and the public’s perception of the Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood Project.

**RTC staff will provide a presentation to the Bicycle Committee about the Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood program activities and results.**

**SUMMARY**

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood Program (previously the User Oriented Transit Planning Project) was a program focused on reducing the number of drive alone trips and increasing the number of trips made by bus, biking, walking and carpooling in Santa Cruz County. The program was carried out in Santa Cruz County between March 2017 and September 2017.
AGENDA: November 2017

TO: RTC Advisory Committees

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Preliminary Staff Recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee, Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC), and Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) review and provide input on preliminary staff recommendations for the 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) (Attachment 1) and make Committee recommendations to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC).

BACKGROUND

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Santa Cruz County, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for selecting projects to receive certain state and federal funds.

In September 2017, the RTC issued a consolidated call for projects for the region’s anticipated shares of funds including:

- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP): $17.5 million target through FY22/23 (which includes $9 million in past balances), though the California Transportation Commission (CTC) is only required to program $4.7 million of those funds.
- Surface Transportation Block Grant Program/Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (STBG/RSTPX): $3.5 million.
- SB 1-Local Partnership Program (LPP): Preliminary estimates are that $250,000 per year for FY17/18 and FY18/19 will be available. CTC will release updated estimates in mid-November.
- Senate Bill 1 Supplemental State Transit Assistance (STA) population-formula funds for FY17/18: Approximately $975,500. Includes funds from the State of Good Repair program.

In total, approximately $22 million is expected to be available. Applications were due on October 23, 2017. Projects the RTC selects for STIP and LPP funds are subject to concurrence from the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and the RTC’s project lists are due to the CTC on December 15, 2017, with CTC action scheduled for March 2018.
DISCUSSION

Project sponsors submitted 36 applications requesting over $38 million. Attachment 1 summarizes the projects and preliminary staff recommendations for anticipated funds. Project applications are posted on the RTC website http://www.sccrtc.org/funding-planning/project-funding/.

Project Evaluation

The RTC selects projects to receive funds on a competitive basis. The RTC considers how well projects address Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) goals, policies, and targets and federal and state criteria and guidelines when evaluating projects. Since available funding is limited compared to the cost to operate, maintain, and improve the local transportation system, it is important to ensure that funds are directed to projects that maximize improvements to the region’s multimodal transportation network. In September 2017, the RTC approved several factors to be considered when evaluating projects. The RTC directed staff to give the highest priority to projects that address one or more of the first four criteria.

1. **Number of people served by project**
2. **Safety**
3. **Preservation of existing infrastructure**
4. **Reduce vehicle miles traveled, air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and/or fuel consumption**
5. Improve access for all modes, especially to and within key destinations
6. Change in travel times and travel time reliability and efficiency of the transportation system, including transit
7. Change in passenger, freight and goods movement efficiency
8. Change in disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age, income, disability or minority status
9. Inclusion of projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) “constrained” project list, which implements the SB375-mandated Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)
10. Consistency with the Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook
11. Public engagement, in identification of the project as a priority and planned during project implementation
12. Funding, including if all other funding is secured and amount of match
13. Deliverability of the project, if there are possible barriers to project schedules.

**Recommendations**

**Staff recommends that RTC advisory committees provide input on preliminary staff recommendations and make recommendations to the RTC on which projects to fund with anticipated state and federal funds (Attachment 1).** For some projects, it is possible for agencies to reduce the project scope and still implement the project, even if full funding is not awarded.

Consistent with the evaluation criteria noted above, the staff recommendations focus the anticipated funds to projects that serve the greatest number of users, have
demonstrated safety needs, preserve existing transportation infrastructure and programs, and/or would do the most to reduce the number of miles driven and associated air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. For roadway system preservation projects, staff generally prioritized the most cost-effective treatments, such as chip seals over full roadway rehabilitation.

At its September 2017 meeting, the RTC indicated its intent to program STIP funds for three years of state and federally-mandated regional planning, programming and monitoring activities (PPM) and to program $2 million in STIP previously reserved for the Highway 1 Soquel-41st Avenue Auxiliary Lanes to that project. The staff recommendations are consistent with this action.

The RTC also discussed taking the new Senate Bill 1 (SB1) $975,000 transit funds (from the State Transit Assistance (STA) State of Good Repair and STA-base funds) out of this competitive process and established an ad-hoc committee to develop a recommendation on STA funds. The ad-hoc committee recommends providing 100% of all STA funds to Santa Cruz METRO for the 2017/18 fiscal year, as well as the next fiscal year, with some reduction in future years to make some funds available to other eligible recipients. The ad-hoc committee’s recommendation will be presented to the RTC for their consideration. In light of the ad-hoc committee’s discussions and since Santa Cruz METRO is the only agency that submitted applications for eligible projects under STA, the staff recommendation includes 100% of the supplemental FY17/18 SB1 funds for bus replacements, as requested by Santa Cruz METRO.

While staff has identified projects to receive most of the anticipated funds, the RTC may decide to keep some of the region’s shares in reserve to address future funding needs. Additionally, though the RTC is responsible for selecting projects to receive the region’s share of STIP funds, the CTC makes the final decision on whether projects are included in the STIP and in what year. It is not uncommon for the CTC to program only some projects and to shift projects to later years than requested. While the region’s target for the 2018 STIP is $17 million, the CTC is only required to make $4.7 million in STIP funds available for programming in this cycle (the county minimum).

The CTC has stated that it will prioritize STIP funds to regions for state-mandated planning, programming and monitoring costs (PPM), cost increases on previously programmed projects and projects or project components deleted in the 2016 STIP due to statewide funding shortfalls. After those priorities, the CTC will consider new projects – with focus on RTIP proposals that meet state highway improvement and intercity rail needs. The CTC is also considering how well projects advance a wide range of performance measures, address climate preparedness and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Next Steps

RTC advisory committees are concurrently reviewing proposals for funds at their November 2017 meetings. Staff will consider input from committees when developing final staff recommendations. Committee recommendations and final staff recommendations will be presented at the December 7, 2017 RTC board meeting.
RTC is scheduled to select projects to receive funds following a public hearing at that meeting.

SUMMARY

The RTC is responsible for selecting projects to receive certain state and federal funds, including State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG), and certain new Senate Bill 1 funds. If the California Transportation Commission (CTC) agrees to program 100% of the region’s targeted share of STIP funds through FY22/23, approximately $22 million total (in STIP, STBG, and SB1) is available for programming to projects in Santa Cruz County. Under the worst case scenario, only $9.7 million would available. Staff is seeking input from advisory committees on projects proposed to receive these limited funds. A public hearing is scheduled for the December 7, 2017 RTC meeting, where the RTC will select projects to receive the funds.

Attachment:
1. 2018 RTIP Application Summary and Preliminary Staff Recommendations
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## Attachment 1

### 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

**Application Summary and Preliminary Staff Recommendations**

Available funds: Up to $17.5M STIP (through FY22/23), $3.5M STBG (through FY18/19), and est. $500k SB1 LPP and $975,590 SB1 Transit funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Summary of Benefits</th>
<th>Estimated Daily Use</th>
<th>Sponsor Priority #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Santa Cruz County (County HSA sponsor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open Streets Events – Watsonville and Santa Cruz</td>
<td>2 events/year over two years that temporarily transform roadways into parks for people to bike, walk, skate, and play in a safe and festive environment by temporarily blocking automobile traffic. Watsonville: Brennan/Union St (Freedom-Peck St), SC: West Cliff Dr. (Lighthouse Field-Swanton Blvd). Request: $12.5k/event</td>
<td>Increase active transportation use. Promote physical activity and health, promote a culture of bicycling and walking, and increase safety and access to the roadway for users of all ages, abilities and modes. Help communities achieve key sustainable transportation goals; reduce single-occupant vehicle trips, mitigate traffic congestion, reduce carbon emissions, and increase access and safety. Create culture of biking, walking, riding bus, and carpooling; firsthand experience of modes; outreach event for agencies promoting alts to SOV</td>
<td>4 one day events: 1k-2k (Watsonville); 10k-12k (Santa Cruz)</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology Action (RTC oversight)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Every Day is Bike to Work Day</td>
<td>Pilot bike commuter initiative to increase bike commuting at 6 large employers in Santa Cruz, Live Oak, and Watsonville areas; includes bike commute and safety workshops, online tracking apps/systems, support/encouragement</td>
<td>Increase number of people bike community and safety practices of those biking through targeted education and support. Reduce VMT - est. 450 trips per day.</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>METRO Refurbish Buses</td>
<td>Refurbish 16 fixed route buses to add 4 - 8 years to their useful life (avg. 6 yrs). Includes rebuild or replacement of engine/transmission assembly, cooling system, doors, windows, floors, seat cushions, paint, and wheelchair securement system.</td>
<td>System preservation: Maintains buses in state of good repair to retain service. Refurbishing adds up to 8 years to the useful life of a bus at 40% of the cost for a new replacement bus; new motor reduces greenhouse gas emissions; reduces maintenance costs; passenger amenities help sustain rider experience/ridersh</td>
<td>avg: 2978 = 16buses; 186/bus</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>METRO ITS Equipment</td>
<td>Install Automatic Vehicle Locators (AVL), automatic passenger counters, and automatic vehicle announcing system on up to 100 buses to provide real-time schedules, next bus info at bus stops, and data collection for system operations, security, planning and maintenance.</td>
<td>Provide real-time bus arrival information to ease trip planning, reduce uncertainty, and improve access for bus riders, which may foster increased ridership; reduce operating costs and delays by automating passenger counting equipment; provide stop-level data to enable more effective route planning and deployment of benches, shelters, signage.</td>
<td>15280</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>METRO Revenue Vehicle Replacements</td>
<td>Purchase 1 CNG bus, 5 battery-electric buses, and 4 paratransit vans to replace 1998 diesel buses and 14-year old paratransit vans which have exceeded their useful life.</td>
<td>System preservation: Maintain bus service, improve service reliability, reduce maintenance costs, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, modern buses may attract new riders.</td>
<td>1267 total; 7 per paratransit van; 200 per bus.</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Planning, programming, and monitoring (PPM)</td>
<td>State and federally-mandated planning and programming activities associated with state and fed. funding programs, assisting project sponsors, and coordination with Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission.</td>
<td>Secure and maintain state and federal transportation funds for projects in Santa Cruz County. Keep projects on schedule, meet state and federal planning, programming and monitoring mandates.</td>
<td>Serves entire county</td>
<td>1 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cruz511</td>
<td>Cruz511 provides traveler information and transportation demand management services including traffic map, traffic congestion, traffic incidents, outreach, education, and incentives with the mission of reducing single-occupant vehicle (SOV) trips, vehicle miles traveled and roadway congestion. The program also acts as a traveler information hub for commuters and visitors looking for information on road conditions or sustainable transportation modes.</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion, trips, VMT, greenhouse gases and improve health and air quality. Make more efficient use of the existing transportation system by shifting SOV trips to carpool, vanpool, transit, bike and walk. Provide real-time traveler information (traffic), and info on transit, carpool, bicycle and walkways.</td>
<td>Varies: 1000-15,000/day (website visits)</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC/Caltrans</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41st/Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Overcrossing</td>
<td>Construct auxiliary lanes on Highway 1 between 41st Ave and Soquel Dr. interchanges, and construct 12-14’ pedestrian/bike overcrossing at Chanticleer Ave.</td>
<td>Improve traffic flow, increase safety, improve travel times and reliability and improve pedestrian/bike access across highway. Heavily traveled - over 100,000 vehicles per day. Daily congestion results in by-pass traffic on local arterials.</td>
<td>120,000 (avg. veh=1.2persons)</td>
<td>2 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Summary of Benefits</td>
<td>Estimated Daily Use</td>
<td>Sponsor Priority #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC/Caltrans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>State Park/Bay Porter Auxiliary Lanes Project</td>
<td>Prelim. design and project level environmental review of auxiliary lanes on Highway 1 between the State Park to Park Ave to Bay/Pt interchanges (approx. 2.5 miles). Includes retaining walls, drainage, reconstruction of Capitol Ave crossing to include wider sidewalk and bridge lighting.</td>
<td>Improve traffic flow, access and reduce collisions by improving merging. Improve pedestrian access across highway. Heavily traveled - over 90,000 vehicles per day. Daily congestion results in by-pass traffic on local arterials.</td>
<td>90-100k vehicles/day</td>
<td>5 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC/Caltrans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Highway 1 Corridor Tiered Environmental Document</td>
<td>Environmental analysis of HOV lanes (Tier 1/program-level) and Soquel-41st Ave Aux Lanes (Tier 2/project level), including interchange reconstruction, ramp metering, 3 bike/ped crossings, and intelligent vehicle management systems. Additional funds to finalize the environmental document.</td>
<td>Analysis of options, impacts and benefits of modifying Highway 1 corridor. Reduce delay and congestion; improve travel times - especially for transit, carpool; improve pedestrian/bike access across highway. Heavily traveled - over 100,000 vehicles per day. Daily congestion results in by-pass traffic on local arterials.</td>
<td>Over 120k</td>
<td>3 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brommer Street Complete Street Improvements (250’ west of 38th Ave to 41st Ave)</td>
<td>Construct complete street roadway improvements on Brommer St. to improve access for vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians. Pavement reconstruction, install ADA driveways and sidewalks, and reconfigure eastbound approach to 41st Ave. for vehicle access.</td>
<td>System preservation, fills gap in existing transportation system, improve accessibility and safety for all users, especially bikes and pedestrians. Route used by trucks, autos, and bike commuters travelling between Capitola and Live Oak to residents and businesses. Currently the roadway pavement is in poor condition PCI 13. lacks a continuous sidewalk on the north side between 38th and 41st Ave. restripe the Class II bike lane, and reconfigure the eastbound intersection approach to 41st Avenue.</td>
<td>6400 vehicles; 265 bus riders; 106 bikes; 110 peds</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pacific Ave. Sidewalk</td>
<td>Construct 200’ of new sidewalk on Pacific Avenue between Front Street and 55 Front St, including installation of a new accessible crosswalk at Front and Pacific; 150’ bike lane.</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian safety and walking levels through construction of new sidewalk and an improved crossing in a highly traveled corridor. Solve conflict between pedestrians and bikes, autos, and transit vehicles and creates a safer environment for all roadway users.</td>
<td>720 (8300 autos)</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bay/High Roundabout</td>
<td>Replace 4-way signal light with new roundabout at Bay/High intersection</td>
<td>Expected to improve overall function of intersection; reduce collisions associated with unprotected left-tums; reduce emissions associated with congestion/idling at stop lights; reduce delay; reduce auto speeds/severity of collisions with bikes and peds.</td>
<td>21,000+8800bus riders+ 3800 bike, +3300 ped</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>River Street Pavement Rehabilitation (Water St to Potrero Street)</td>
<td>Pavement rehabilitation of River Street between Water Street and Potrero Street. (0.4 mi)</td>
<td>Preserves existing infrastructure and improves accessibility for a multimodal arterial for all users: auto, trucks, transit, bikes and pedestrians. The method of paving may include cold-in-place recycling which is a more sustainable paving practice.</td>
<td>10,535 ADT; METRO buses</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>State Route 1/9 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Adds lanes to the Highway 1 and 9 intersection to improve operations and safety. The intersection will be upgraded to include standard lane widths, transitions, shoulders, bike lanes, lighting, sidewalks and access ramps.</td>
<td>Regionally significant intersection. Improve access and safety, reduce congestion and bottlenecks, energy use and emissions. Heavily traveled, provides access for the university, Santa Cruz west side, Harvey West Area and Downtown.</td>
<td>85000</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>UCSC Great Meadow Bike Path Preservation and Safety Improvement Project (Phase 2)</td>
<td>Reconstruct and widen Class I main bike path to meet current Caltrans standards within current alignment for safety and system preservation needs (approx. 1 mile).</td>
<td>System preservation, safety, bicycle and pedestrian access. Bring 43-year-old path up to current Caltrans standards, reduce potential bike conflicts with other bikes and pedestrians, allow cyclists more recovery room when traveling at high downhill speeds.</td>
<td>660-1320</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bean Creek Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Pavement rehabilitation of Bean Creek Rd (Bluebonnet Lane to city limits), improve signage and road markings for bikes (0.6mi)</td>
<td>System preservation (current PCI: 42), improve drainage. May use road recycling method and green bike lane treatments.</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Glenwood Drive Rehabilitation and Bicycle Improvement Project</td>
<td>Pavement rehabilitation of Glenwood Dr. (K Street Way to city limits), drainage repair, and widen to add bike lanes. (0.58mi)</td>
<td>System preservation (current PCI: 44) and enhance bicycle network. Increase active transportation and safety, reduce greenhouse gas emissions by shifting approx. 200 trip to bike or walk. Extend service life of roadways and ensure safe, drivable surface for motorists and bicyclists.</td>
<td>2167</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Glen Canyon Road/Green Hills Road/S. Navarra Drive Bike Corridor and Roadway Preservation</td>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation on Green Hills Rd. (Glen Canyon to end at S. Navarra) and Glen Canyon Rd. (Flora Lane to Green Hills); add bicycle lanes on Green Hills Rd., and green lanes, markings on 3 roads.</td>
<td>System preservation (current PCI: 22) and fill gap in bicycle network. Increase active transportation and safety, reduce greenhouse gas emissions by shifting approx. 200 trip to bike or walk. Extend service life of roadways and ensure safe, drivable surface for motorists and bicyclists.</td>
<td>8900</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Summary of Benefits</td>
<td>Estimated Daily Use</td>
<td>Sponsor Priority #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kings Village Road/Bluebonnet Lane Sidewalk</td>
<td>Construct new, fill gaps, and improve accessibility of sidewalks on both sides of King's Village Rd. (Mt. Hermon to Bluebonnet) and south side of Bluebonnet Ln (KV to Bean Creek), Approx.0.3mi. Curb ramp upgrades at Mt. Hermon.</td>
<td>Fill gaps in pedestrian network to increase safety and improve access to schools, shopping, transit center, parks, and housing.</td>
<td>222.1</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Airport Blvd Reconstruction: Westgate/Larkin Valley Rd to Hanger Way</td>
<td>Reconstruct roadway &amp; bike lanes (1300 ft), install new sidewalk (1070 ft), upgrade curb ramps and driveway crossings, install median islands, modify traffic signals to include additional ped crossings and install rectangular rapid flashing beacon.</td>
<td>System preservation, fill gaps in sidewalks and adds high visibility crosswalk @Holm Rd to improve safety for pedestrians, improve access to bus stops, ADA upgrades.</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bicycle Safety Improvements</td>
<td>New bicycle lane striping, markings, green lanes, and signage, esp. at intersections, on 7.47 miles. Beach St (Lee Rd to Rodriguez St); Bridge St (Beck St to E. Lake Ave), Green Valley Rd (Harkins Slough Rd to Corralitos Ck Bridge), Harkins Slough/Walker St (GV-Riverside Dr), Rodriguez St (Riverside-Man St)</td>
<td>Improve existing bicycle facilities to improve visibility and reduce crashes on roadways with severe injury and fatal incidents in past 10 year; increase cycling with improved safety and route/wayfinding signage.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Freedom Blvd Reconstruction from Alta Vista Ave to Green Valley Rd</td>
<td>Reconstruct existing roadway (0.6mi), replace non-ADA compliant curb ramps and driveways, ped scale lighting and illumination at crosswalks, install traffic signal at Sydney Ave, replace bus shelter, traffic calming.</td>
<td>System preservation (PCI 58) on major arterial (ADT 24,000), ADA upgrades, sharrows/signage to improve bike safety, crossing feature to improve pedestrian safety.</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Green Valley Road Reconstruction (Struve Slough to Freedom Boulevard)</td>
<td>Reconstruct existing roadway and bike lanes, install curb, gutter, sidewalk, ADA upgrades at curb ramps and driveways (0.3mi)</td>
<td>Extend service life of arterial roadway (PCI 62) and ensure safe, drivable surface for motorists and bicyclists. Replacement of existing striping and signage to enhance safety of motorists and bicyclists. Replacement of existing paved path with concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk and replacement of non-ADA compliant curb ramps and driveways improve existing pedestrian facilities and extend service life.</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Apts Creek Road Traffic Signal, Soquel Dr. Sidewalks &amp; Bike Lanes.</td>
<td>Installation of a traffic signal at Apts Creek Rd and Soquel Dr including railroad crossing arms. Controlled pedestrian at grade railroad crossing along Apts Creek Road and crosswalks across Apts Creek Road and Soquel Drive. Sidewalks, curb, gutter on south side of Soquel Dr. and bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>Fill gaps in sidewalk network, improve bicycle facilities, improve access in village and to Forest of Nisene Marks State Park. Bring intersection up to current standards, improve safety and convenience for people in vehicles, on bikes, or walking.</td>
<td>8910</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Branciforte Drive Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation: Digouts, Rubber Chip Seal, and restriping of a portion of Branciforte Drive (Granite Creek Rd to SC city limits - 1.91mi)</td>
<td>System preservation. Serves as primary route conveying vehicular traffic from Scotts Valley &amp; Happy Valley to Santa Cruz and Hwy 17. Current PCI 54-75.</td>
<td>4657</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Branciforte Drive Road Recycle &amp; Overlay Project</td>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation: Pavement Recycling, Asphalt Overlay, and restriping of a portion of Branciforte Drive (PM 2.4 to Granite Creek Rd - 0.62 miles)</td>
<td>System preservation. Service. A priority route conveying vehicular traffic from Scotts Valley to Hwy 17. Current PCI 35.</td>
<td>&lt;4657</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Empire Grade Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation: Digouts, Chip Seal, and restriping of Empire Grade: PM 13.86 to 14.38; near Alba (0.52mi)</td>
<td>System preservation. RTC approved $174,000 for chip seal in 2016, but the 2017 winter storms exacerbated damage; additional funds to upgrade proposed treatment to full depth recycle and overlay. Current PCI 35.</td>
<td>2329</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Empire Grade Road Recycle And Overlay Project</td>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation: Pavement Recycling/Asphalt Overlay of Empire Grade Rd - PM 1.32 to end of county maintained road (1.32 mi)</td>
<td>System preservation. ADT: 1094; PCI 25-39; Connects Bonny Doon and SLV; serves Lockheed Facility.</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Glenwood Drive Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation: Digouts, Rubber Chip Seal, and restriping Glenwood Dr. from Bean Creek Rd. to Mt. Charlie Rd. (0.98mi)</td>
<td>System preservation. ADT: 5825; PCI 38-40: used as bypass for Hwy 17; connects County residents to Scotts Valley.</td>
<td>5825</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Summary of Benefits</td>
<td>Estimated Daily Use</td>
<td>Sponsor Priority #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Granite Creek Rd Road Recycle &amp; Overlay Project</td>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation: Pavement Recycling/Asphalt Overlay on Granite Creek Rd from Scotts Valley limits to 0.56 miles south (0.56 mi)</td>
<td>System preservation. ADT 4249. Serves as alternate route between northern Scotts Valley and Branciforte Dr./Happy Valley.</td>
<td>4249</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Highway 17 To Soquel Corridor Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation: Digouts, Chip Seal, and restriping of Vine Hill Rd (Hwy 17 to B40), Branciforte Dr (Vine Hill to PM 0.7), Mt. View Rd (B40-N. Rodeo Gulch), N. Rodeo Gulch Rd (Mt. View-PM 1.97), Laurel Rd (N. Rodeo-Soquel San Jose Rd), and Soquel-San Jose Rd. (Laurel to Dawn Lon) - 9.90 mi.</td>
<td>System preservation. ADT varies - Soquel-SJ Rd (8400) to lows on Laurel Glen &amp; Mt View (840); PCI also varies 10-79 on varying sections of 9.9mi of roads. Several routes had increased use due to closures of other roadways after winter 2017 storms.</td>
<td>Varies - B40, Soquel SJ+ over 4K, N. Rodeo - 2956; others less than 1K.</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hwy 152/Holohan - College Intersection</td>
<td>Add sidewalks and bicycle lanes on Holohan Rd, an additional left-turn lane from Holohan to EB Hwy 17, sidewalk on north side of Hwy 152 from Holohan to Corrallos Creek bridge, adds crosswalks and speed feedback signs.</td>
<td>Fill gaps in bike and walk facilities, access to schools; reduce traffic congestion; ADA upgrades; reduce speeding in school zone. Anticipated use: 25K/day - 1% bike, 1% ped, 0.5% bus. ADT: 15,800</td>
<td>25k</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Scotts Valley Area Routes Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation: Digouts, Chip Seal, and restriping Mt. Hermon Rd (PM 1.31 to SV city limits), Lockwood Ln (GH-SV city limits), and Graham Hill Rd (Sims to Lockwood) - 2.76mi</td>
<td>System preservation. ADT (PCI) Mt. Hermon; 19,330 (41-62); Lockwood: 3900 (24); Graham Hill: 17,500 (38). Provide access from SLV to Hwy 17 and Scotts Valley.</td>
<td>19k-4000</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Seaciff Village Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>Construct sidewalks, bike lanes, bus stops, central plaza, parking, landscaping, drainage infrastructure, and roadway rehabilitation; includes St. Park Dr, Center Ave, Broadway, and Santa Cruz Ave.</td>
<td>Provide gateway to Seaciff Village and the Seaciff State Beach, improve multi-modal access to and through the Village, increase landscaping, formalize parking, and create a public plaza. Roadway rehab (PCI in 50's now); 12,000</td>
<td>11k</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Zayante Road Corridor Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation: Digouts, Chip Seal, and restriping East Zayante &amp; Upper E. Zayante from Quail Hallow to SR 35 (9.07mi)</td>
<td>System preservation. ADT=7800; PCI 0-62</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>RTC Staff Comments/Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open Streets Events – Watsonville and Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$97,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Fund events in Watsonville which has high collision rates, lower bike/walk use. $50k RSTPX approved by RTC 2/7/13 for events in Watsonville and Capitola. In 2016, RTC approved $10K for Watsonville event. Provides venue to raise awareness of other programs (e.g. METRO, Cruz511, etc.) One-day event reaches large audience, however unclear if more effective compared to other TDM and infrastructure/focused education programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Every Day is Bike to Work Day</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Low cost program to test effectiveness of new methods to encourage bicycle commuting which could be applied at other employers in the future. Require records include info about frequency that participates bike before/after program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>METRO Refurbish Buses</td>
<td>$4,080,000</td>
<td>$3,612,024</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>Avg. cost is $255k/bus to extend life 6 years. Fund approx. 4 buses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>METRO ITS Equipment</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,770,600</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) = $1M; passenger counters=$500k; auto vehicle announcement system=$500k. Staff recommends funding at least AVL portion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>METRO Revenue Vehicle Replacements</td>
<td>$5,915,000</td>
<td>$5,236,550</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Funding for CNG buses and paratransit vans. $975k from FY17/18 supplemental SB1 PUC 99313 formula funds (SB1 STA and SB1 SGR); balance from STIP. Cost is $1M/electric bus; $615k/CNG bus; $75k/paratransit van.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Planning, programming, and monitoring (PPM)</td>
<td>$250k/year</td>
<td>$409,000</td>
<td>$409,000</td>
<td>While cost of state/fed mandated activities is approx. $250k/year, legislation restricts STIP available for this work to $409k for FY20/21-22/23. Only program STIP formula available for PPM; staff does not recommend using STBG/RSTPX.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cruz511</td>
<td>$313k/year</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Request is for 2 years of funds. Recent program evaluation has resulted in updated program goals and work program focused on serving low income residents, Vision Zero safety messaging, and improved user experience. Measure D Hwy Corridor funds would cover balance of program cost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>41st/Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Overcrossing</td>
<td>$34,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>RTC has reserved $2M STIP for this project since 2014. This is a regionally significant multi-modal project serving over 100,000 vehicles per day. Approx. 28% of project cost attributed to bike/ped crossing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>RTC Staff Comments/Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>State Park/Bay Porter Auxiliary Lanes Project</td>
<td>$73,000,000</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$1,830,000</td>
<td>Heavily used transportation facility. Initiate work to make project more competitive for grants. Application was for 50% of PA/ED (environmental review) cost; lower CTs overhead rate if STIP-funded. RTC could also request Advance Project Development (APDE) STIP funds (from future county shares). Balance of PA/ED would be funded by Measure D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Highway 1 Corridor Tiered Environmental Document</td>
<td>Enviro: $14.5M; $600M total project cost</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Most heavily used transportation facility in Santa Cruz County. Provides long term vision for the corridor, upgrades design standards and adds new bicycle and pedestrian facilities. RTC needs to complete environmental document, including responses to comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brommer Street Complete Street Improvements (250' west of 38th Ave to 41st Ave)</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>Fills gap in pedestrian network. Only request from Capitola.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pacific Ave. Sidewalk</td>
<td>$439,870</td>
<td>$339,870</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>City's 4th priority. Serves fewer people, sidewalk available on one side of road - unclear would increase walking rates. Low collision rate. Consider for TDA in future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bay/High Roundabout</td>
<td>$2,150,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>City priority 3 of 4. 14 collisions in past 10 years. Encourage city to seek AB2766 grant and other funds for construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>River Street Pavement Rehabilitation and Safety Improvement Project (Water St to Potrero Street)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$815,000</td>
<td>2nd priority for city. Medium use, mixed-use, multimodal roadway; however cost/mile of roadway preservation is high. Consider partial funding if city can scale project or commit other funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>State Route 1/9 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$8,361,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
<td>City's highest priority. Very high use, multimodal, regionally significant project. Some of bike/ped components of project were constructed earlier as the Highway 1 undercrossing. RTC has previously awarded $1,329,000 STIP to project and $1M shifted to MBSST.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UCSC Great Meadow Bike Path Preservation and Safety Improvement Project (Phase 2)</td>
<td>$1,134,000</td>
<td>$1,004,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>Demonstrated need. There is a history of collisions on the path. Consider funding contingent on UCSC securing ATP grant for balance of funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bean Creek Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$717,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>4th priority of city. Higher cost/mile. Relatively low use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Glenwood Drive Rehabilitation and Bicycle Improvement Project</td>
<td>$865,000</td>
<td>$763,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>Priority 3 of 4 applications. Located near school. Consider partial funding if city can scale project or commit other funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Glen Canyon Road/Green Hills Road/S. Navarra Drive Bike Corridor and Roadway Preservation</td>
<td>$993,000</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>Supplements $711k approve by RTC in 2016. Moderate traffic volumes, complete streets project. Identified as priority through community meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>RTC Staff Comments/Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kings Village Road/ Bluebonnet Lane Sidewalk</td>
<td>$306,000</td>
<td>$271,000</td>
<td>$271,000</td>
<td>Fills gap in sidewalk network in urbanized area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Airport Blvd Reconstruction: Westgate/Larkin Valley Rd to Hanger Way</td>
<td>$1,645,000</td>
<td>$177,000</td>
<td>$177,000</td>
<td>RTC programmed $1,196,000 STIP in 2013. Supplemental funds requested due to cost increase/change in scope from full-depth rehab to &quot;remove and replace existing hot mix asphalt&quot; and escalating construction costs statewide. Scope change required due to PG&amp;E gas line location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bicycle Safety Improvements</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>32 collisions in past 10 years. Safety project will increase visibility of bicyclists. Project can be scaled to focus on highest crash locations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Freedom Blvd Reconstruction from Alta Vista Ave to Green Valley Rd</td>
<td>$3,125,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
<td>High use, major arterial, multi-modal safety improvements. Consider partial funding if city can scale project or commit other funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Green Valley Road Reconstruction (Struve Slough to Freedom Boulevard)</td>
<td>$1,598,000</td>
<td>$354,000</td>
<td>$354,000</td>
<td>Address funding shortfall. RTC programmed $1,047,000 STBG in 2016. Used by over 21k/day, major arterial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Aptos Creek Road Traffic Signal, Soquel Dr. Sidewalks &amp; Bike Lanes.</td>
<td>$3,201,671</td>
<td>$2,651,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>High use, major arterial (Soquel Dr), multi-modal project. Includes improved safety and access for bikes, pedestrians, and transit riders; system preservation. RTC has previously awarded $1.4M to Aptos Village project components. Priority for county.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Branciforte Drive Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>$433,000</td>
<td>$384,000</td>
<td>$384,000</td>
<td>Complete Branciforte repairs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Branciforte Drive Road Recycle &amp; Overlay Project</td>
<td>$431,000</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
<td>Addresses funding shortfall. Would bring total RTC funding for project to $382,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Empire Grade Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>$286,000</td>
<td>$253,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Empire Grade Road Recycle And Overlay Project</td>
<td>$808,000</td>
<td>$715,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Very low use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Glenwood Drive Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Relatively low use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>RTC Staff Comments/Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Granite Creek Rd Road Recycle &amp; Overlay Project</td>
<td>$1,103,000</td>
<td>$476,000</td>
<td>$476,000</td>
<td>Addresses funding shortfall. In 2016, RTC approved $500k for project. County providing $127k.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Highway 17 To Soquel Corridor Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>$1,881,000</td>
<td>$1,665,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Alternate route to Hwy 17. Chip seal is cost effective. County will need to scale project or commit additional funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hwy 152/Holohan - College Intersection</td>
<td>$3,153,205</td>
<td>$767,000</td>
<td>$767,000</td>
<td>Fills gap in sidewalk and bike lane network, reduce traffic congestion at intersection; bypass to downtown Watsonville; Still needs extra $1.7M. CTC will not approve STIP for partially funded project. Funding contingent on County securing other funds by Sept. 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Scotts Valley Area Routes Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>$940,000</td>
<td>$832,000</td>
<td>$832,000</td>
<td>High use, primary routes between SLV and Scotts Valley. Chip seal is cost effective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Seacliff Village Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>$3,436,332</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>RTC has approved RSTPX &amp; TDA funds for project since 2007 ($587k RSTPX and $263k TDA). Still needs extra $1.69M, consider in future cycles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Zayante Road Corridor Chip Seal Project</td>
<td>$1,725,000</td>
<td>$1,527,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>Chip seal is cost effective. Ensure small aggregate used to improve safety for bicycles, widen shoulders where feasible. Road used by transit also. Consider partial funding if county can scale project or commit other funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **$38,236,044** | **$22,420,000**