



*Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's*  
**Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)**

---

**AGENDA**

**Thursday, October 18, 2012  
1:30 p.m.**

***SCCRTC Conference Room  
1523 Pacific Ave.  
Santa Cruz, CA***

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Oral communications

*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.*

4. 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.*

5. Approve Minutes of the September 20, 2012 ITAC meeting - Page 3
6. Caltrans District 5 SHOPP Updates - Page 7
  - a. Candidate SHOPP Projects: Projects being considered to compete for statewide funding
  - b. Programmed/Funded SHOPPP Projects: July 2012 Semi-Annual List

**REGULAR AGENDA**

7. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents - Verbal updates from project sponsors
8. MAP-21 Implementation Update and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Recommendation - Page 11
  - a. Staff report

9. Central Coast Commercial Flows Study and Model Improvement Program
  - a. Presentation by Anais Schenk, AMBAG
10. On-Board Transit Ridership Study (Ginger Dykaar, RTC and Erich Friedrich, SCMTD) - *Page 17*  
*Item carried over from the September ITAC meeting*
  - a. Copy of September 6, 2012 staff report to RTC
11. SC3 Partnership and the Healthy Lands & Healthy Communities Initiative - *Page 21*
  - a. Presentation by Karen Christensen Resource Conservation District of SC County, Jim Robins of Alnus Ecological, and Jen Harrison-Cox of Earth Economics
  - b. Presentation Outline
  - c. Survey (*please **complete before meeting**, either hard copy or online at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/3L6HWVL>*)
12. 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) updates
  - a. Verbal update from RTC staff

**NEXT MEETING:** The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **November 15, 2012** at **1:30 PM** in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, 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](mailto:info@sccrtc.org) / website: [www.sccrtc.org](http://www.sccrtc.org)*

#### **AGENDAS ONLINE**

*To receive email notification when the Committee meeting agenda packets are posted on our website, please call (831) 460-3200 or email [rmoriconi@sccrtc.org](mailto:rmoriconi@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 anticipo al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis. Please make advance arrangements at least three days in advance by calling (831) 460-3200).*

\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2012\Oct2012\Oct12ITACagenda.docx



**Santa Cruz County  
Regional Transportation Commission  
Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)**

---

**DRAFT MINUTES**

Thursday, September 20, 2012  
1:30 p.m.

SCCRTC Conference Room  
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

**ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT**

Teresa Buika, UCSC  
Piet Canin, Ecology Action  
Russell Chen, County Planning Proxy  
Mark Dettle, City of Santa Cruz Planning Proxy  
Erich Friedrich, Santa Cruz METRO  
David Koch, City of Watsonville Public Works  
Maria Esther Rodriguez, City of Watsonville Community Development Proxy  
Anais Schenk, AMBAG  
Chris Schneider, City of Santa Cruz Public Works  
Steve Wiesner, County Public Works

**STAFF PRESENT**

George Dondero  
Ginger Dykaar  
Rachel Moriconi  
Karena Pushnik

**OTHER PRESENT**

None

- 
1. Call to Order – Chair Chris Schneider called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.
  2. Introductions – Self introductions were made.
  3. Oral communications – Anais Schenk requested agencies review changes made to the regional model webportal for road network information. She noted that at the October ITAC meeting, AMBAG will present information on the regional travel demand model update and Central Coast Commercial Flow Study.
  4. Changes consent and regular agendas – none

**CONSENT AGENDA (Wiesner/Buika) approved unanimously**

5. Approved Minutes of the June 21, 2012 ITAC meeting with one modification to list of attendees
6. Received Notice of Preparation for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) environmental document.
7. Received Bike to Work Day notice

8. Received information on upcoming transportation funding opportunities

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

9. *Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents - Verbal updates from project sponsors*

Ecology Action - Piet Canin reported that Ecology Action will be working on a Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) planning grant with Santa Cruz City Schools and implementing a walking school bus SRTS-funded project for Westlake Elementary School. Ecology Action will also be working on a Plug-In Electric Vehicle (EV) Access and Public Education Program and has been working on an EV Charging Station program for the Monterey Bay Area.

SC Metro – Erich Friedrich reported that Metro received eight bids for the Proposition 1B SLPP/PTMISEA-funded operations facility, with construction expected to start in November 2012. Metro is also out to bid for the next round of bus stop improvements, including improvements to sidewalks, shelters, and transit centers.

Watsonville - Maria Rodriguez reported that the City received an AB2766 grant for the Pennsylvania/Clifford Roundabout Project and an HSIP grant for pedestrian safety improvements. The City is also working on Safe Routes to Schools-funded projects, including improving pedestrian crossings. Design work for the STIP-funded Airport Boulevard at Freedom Boulevard project and planning work with Caltrans for the Freedom/Main Street Roundabout continues.

UCSC – Teresa Buika reported that the University is working on installing several electric charging stations; installing a slow-fill CNG station; and New Freedom grant-funded transit stop improvements.

County of Santa Cruz – Steve Wiesner and Russell Chen reported that the County is finishing work on the upper Porter Street sidewalk, East Cliff Parkway, Soquel Drive and Soquel-San Jose Road rehabilitations, Old Big Trees Road repair, and several storm damage repair projects. Resurfacing, chip seal, cape seal, overlay projects are underway on several roadways. The County is also working on Lockwood/Graham Hill Road signalization; with construction of the STIP TE-funded Calabasas Road bike lane/sidewalks and a project on Empire Grade starting this fall. The County is still looking at options to fund March 2011 storm damage repairs.

AMBAG – Anais Schenk reported that the regional travel model update continues. AMBAG received AB2766 grants for phase two of the Bicycle Model, continuation of the agricultural worker vanpool program, and a new AMBAG fleet vehicle. She also encouraged participation in Rideshare Month (October).

SCCRTC – George Dondero reported that escrow for the Rail Line purchase is expected to close soon; the RTC approved service plans for Iowa Pacific train service; and the Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project construction is expected to be completed by May 2013. He noted that alternative transportation programs for schools are being implemented as part of the Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project and appreciated the City of Santa Cruz for their assistance on the project. Steve Wiesner and Chris Schneiter commended RTC staff and the Resident Engineer for coordination and communication on the highway project.

City of Santa Cruz – Chris Schneiter reported that projects on River Street, Soquel at Cathcart, and Soquel Avenue are moving forward. The City also received a Bicycle Transportation Account grant for the spur connection to the Arana Gulch path. Construction of the Chestnut Street Extension slope

stabilization project will be completed in October. A solar project at the City Hall parking lot will begin this fall.

10. Update on the Federal Transportation Act/MAP-21 Implementation including Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding

Rachel Moriconi provided a summary of the new federal transportation act, MAP-21, and proposals being discussed at the state-level for implementation of MAP-21. These include proposals to designate funds for the Safe Routes to Schools program out of the Surface Transportation Program, keep funding for the statewide competitive HSIP program at current levels, use FY13 Transportation Alternatives funds for projects previously programmed to receive STIP TE funds in FY13, and increase funds for the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP). She clarified that funding the Safe Routes to Schools program through STP, rather than HSIP, would allow for funds to be used on educational programs and that the program would still be run as a statewide competitive program. Russell Chen requested additional information on ensuring toll credits can be used for bridge projects, which staff confirmed is under discussion.

Given uncertainty with funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects programmed beyond FY13 for STIP funds, staff recommended holding off on issuing a call for projects for RSTP funds. The committee will discuss options for the RSTP at the next ITAC meeting.

Erich Friedrich provided updates on federal transit programs, highlighting that changes from competitive to formula for some programs would make it challenging to fund some projects and could result in a reduction in funds to Santa Cruz County because Metro has been very successful at securing competitive grants.

11. Debrief on Deferred Transportation Funding Ballot Measure

Rachel Moriconi (RTC) provided information and requested input on the vehicle registration fee proposal that had been under consideration for a ballot measure. She also requested that the ITAC discuss future options for addressing transportation funding shortfalls.

Piet Canin noted the importance of having someone take the lead on a campaign early on. Mark Dettle suggested ideas for communicating to the public why additional funding is needed, such as an annual state of local roads report that highlights some of the worst roads and why there is insufficient funds now to maintain all roads. George Dondero emphasized the challenge of achieving the 2/3rds voter threshold and provided information on efforts to lower the threshold to 55% for transportation funding initiatives. He noted that staff is also meeting with board members to debrief on the vehicle registration fee effort. Karena Pushnik noted the importance of showing the public that agencies are spending existing funds wisely now and why more funding is needed to repair roads. Chris Schreiber noted it can be a challenge to get a countywide initiative passed when there are varied priorities throughout the county. Steve Wiesner noted that given the large funding shortfall, it is important to emphasize that even with a small amount of additional funds, 10% more repairs could be done each year. He also noted that it may also be worth asking for more funding to address even more of the backlog and to emphasize it as a maintenance program, rather than a large capital program. David Koch suggested looking at lower cost campaign options. Web surveys encouraging the community to help identify the worst roads, educational pieces, updating and reporting Pavement Condition Index numbers annually at council/board meetings were among ideas shared. It was noted that all agencies have limited staff available for public education materials/programs. RTC staff agreed to have a meeting with public works departments in January to discuss options and timing in more detail.

12. 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Financial Element

Rachel Moriconi reported that staff is preparing the draft financial element for the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update in coordination with Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) and regional agencies in San Benito and Monterey Counties. She requested that project sponsors provide information on local funding sources, such as local taxes, fees, general funds, and other non-state/federal revenues that local agencies use to help fund transportation projects by November 1, 2012. Ms. Moriconi also requested feedback on possible new revenues that might be available over the next twenty-five years, including revenues being investigated by the statewide Needs Assessment workgroup.

The committee discussed whether gas tax revenue estimates for the RTP should be significantly reduced to reflect the fact that with increased fuel economy, revenues have declined dramatically in the past and will decrease even more into the future. It was noted that with a smaller constrained project list it would be more difficult to achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets. There was general agreement that new revenues will have to be generated to backfill gas tax loses, whether that is an increase in the gas tax, new user fees (such a fees per vehicle miles traveled, vehicle registration fees, etc), or other options. There was general consensus to assume that funds for state and federal programs would remain steady, but not to assume that they would increase in the RTP.

13. Regional Transportation Plan Map Review

Ginger Dykaar reminded members that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) includes a variety of goals and policies, as well as targets for achieving safety and access goals. She noted that the RTP should include projects that could reduce injury and fatal collisions and projects that improve access for transportation disadvantaged populations (which include areas serving people over 70, youth, people of limited income, etc). She provided preliminary draft maps of some areas where projects could score higher if they address safety or access. The committee discussed that several factors are considered when identifying priority safety projects, including the cause of past incidents, new developments or changes to traffic patterns, and the importance of projects on alternate routes. Ms. Dykaar requested that the ITAC provide information on key destinations for transportation disadvantaged populations.

14. On-Board Transit Ridership Survey – DEFERRED to October ITAC meeting

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m. The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **October 18, 2012 at 1:30 PM** in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

*Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi*

*||RTCSERV2\Shared\ITAC\2012\Sept2012\Sept12ITACmin.doc*



## Santa Cruz County Candidate SHOPP Projects

<b>EA</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>Route</b>	<b>Post Mile</b>	<b>Project Location</b>	<b>Project Manager</b>
1C650k	Reduce roadway departure collisions- shoulder widening, guardrail upgrade/replacement rumble strips	9	22.1/23.8	In Castle Rock State Park from 5.0 miles to 3.3 miles south of State Route 35	Doug Hessing (805) 549-3386
1C380K	Bridge Preventive Maintenance- Scour Mitigation	9	9.3	In Santa Cruz Co, near Ben Lomond at San Lorenzo River (Br # 36-48)	Doug Hessing (805) 549-3386
1C850K	Pavement Preservation- CAPM	1	10.2/17.5	In Santa Cruz County near Aptos from North Aptos UP to Jct Route 09/01	Luis Duazo (805) 542-4678
1C860K	Pavement Preservation- CAPM	1	20.2/37.5	Near Santa Cruz from 0.2 miles south of Mission Street to Santa Cruz/San Mateo County Line	Doug Hessing (805) 549-3386
1E020K	Upgrade Pedestrian Infrastructure for ADA compliance	152	1.3/2.5	Near Watsonville, from the eastern city limit to 0.5 miles east of Holohan Road	Steve DiGrazia (805) 549-3437
1C310K	Collision Reduction-Install centerline and shoulder rumble strips	1	20.4/30.6	From Shaffer Road to Swanton Road (Davenport Landing Rd)	Doug Hessing (805) 549-3386
1C670K	Collision Reduction-shoulder widening and soil nail wall	17	0.15/0.4	In Santa Cruz from 0.5 to 0.3 miles South of Pasatiempo Overcrossing	Luis Duazo (805) 542-4678
1A870K	Collision Reduction- restripe and widen shoulders	1	17.0/17.2	In Santa Cruz from the NB on-ramp from SB Route 17 to the NB off-ramp at Ocean Street	Luis Duazo (805) 542-4678
1F030K	Collision Reduction- overlay and upgrade guardrail	SCR/SBt 129	4.7/ 9.99 & 0.0/0.4	In Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties on Route 129	Rochelle Vierra (805) 549-3003

Note: For project-specific questions, contact the corresponding project manager. For general PID program & planning questions contact Claudia Espino at (805)549-3640.



# Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission



## PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS/July 2012 Semi-Annual List

Route	Post Miles	EA	PPNO	Project Description	Project Name	Current Project Phase	Ready To List (Target)	Project Manager Phone # Email	Cost (\$1,000) CON/RW
<b>Programmed in 08/09 FY</b>									
17	7.0/7.3	0P810 0500000271	8100	Near Scotts Valley near West Vinehill Road. Correct super elevation, improve drainage facilities, and replace Open Grade Asphalt Concrete.	Vinehill Wet Weather Improvements	CON	12/2/2008(A)*	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$1,788 Award/\$11
<b>Programmed in 09/10 FY</b>									
17	6.0/12.6	0L70U 0500000151	7007	Near Scotts Valley at various locations from Santa's Village Road to the Santa Clara County line. Construct new guardrail and retaining walls and upgrade guard rail, crash cushions, end treatments. (Combines 05-0L700 & 05-0L760)	SCR 17 Guard Rail Upgrades	CON	7/28/2009(A)*	Steve Digrazia 805-549-3437 steve_digrazia@dot.ca.gov	\$6,160 Award/\$17
<b>Programmed in 10/11 FY</b>									
17	6.1/6.6	0G400 0500000059	4001	Near Scotts Valley north of Santa's Village Road to south of Crescent Drive. Construct concrete guard rail.	Santa Village Road Guard Rail	CON	3/25/2010(A)*	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$1,568 Award/\$113
1	R0.0/R10.2	0M750 0500020234	0075	Near the city of Santa Cruz, from Pajaro River Bridge to North Aptos Underpass. Rehabilitate pavement.	Watsonville CAPM	CON	6/15/11(A)*	Luis Duazo 805-542-4678 luis_duazo@dot.ca.gov	\$14,414 Award/\$15
17	11	1A520 0500020364	2323	Near Lexington Hills, 1.5 miles south of from the Santa Clara County line. Stabilize roadway and repair drainage system.	Summit Slide Repair - Emergency Force Account	CON	N/A	Lance Gorman (805) 549-3315 lance_gorman@dot.ca.gov	\$350 ER Deleg Award/\$20
<b>Programmed in 11/12 FY</b>									
9	8.4/8.6	0K230 0500000108	1937	Near Ben Lomond, from 0.2 mile north of Glen Arbor Rd to Highland Country Park. Guardrail upgrade and stabilize shoulder. <b>(Project include \$900k of OTS funds.)</b>	Holiday Lane Viaduct	PS&E/RW	12/21/11(A)*	Steve Digrazia 805-549-3437 steve_digrazia@dot.ca.gov	\$217 Award/\$4
1	17.4/26.0	0M970 0500000203	1963	Near the city of Santa Cruz from the San Lorenzo River Bridge to Laguna Road. Install guardrail and crash cushions.	Santa Cruz 1 Guardrail Upgrade	PS&E/RW	2/24/2012(A)*	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$1,785 Vote/\$14

NOTE: For general informaton about the SHOPP program contact Cindy Simeroth at (805) 549-3050 or by email at cindy\_simeroth@dot.ca.gov  
\*List is provided in January and July of each year.





# Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission



## PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS/July 2012 Semi-Annual List

Route	Post Miles	EA	PPNO	Project Description	Project Name	Current Project Phase	Ready To List (Target)	Project Manager Phone # Email	Cost (\$1,000) CON/RW
1	17.5/18.2	0S310 0500000420	2246	In the city of Santa Cruz, from north of Rte 9 to north of High Street Pedestrian Overcrossing. Install concrete median barrier.	Santa Cruz Highway 1 Median Barrier, 9 to Mission	CON	8/31/11(A)*	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$1,388 Award/\$3
129	3.5	0H430 05000020287	N/A	In Santa Cruz Co at PM 3.54, near Watsonville, 1.5 km east of Coward Creek Bridge. Culvert replacement	Coward Creek Bridge Culvert Replacement	CON	12/15/2011(A)*	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$646 Award/\$13

### Programmed in 12/13 FY

1	26.8/36.3	0M980 0500000204	1964	Near the city of Santa Cruz from Laguna Road to Waddell Creek Bridge. Upgrade guardrail and drainage facilities.	Laguna Road Guardrail Upgrade	PS&E/RW	10/1/2012	Steve Digrazia 805-549-3437 steve_digrazia@dot.ca.gov	\$1,543/\$14
1	R0.0/R17.0	0P250 0500000245	2278	Near the city of Santa Cruz, from the Monterey County line to Rte 17; also in Monterey County from Carmel River Bridge to the Santa Cruz County line. Upgrade guardrail and crash cushions. <b>(Project includes \$2.5m of OTS funds.)</b>	SCR 1 Guardrail Upgrades	CON	4/28/2011	Luis Duazo 805-542-4678 luis_duazo @dot.ca.gov	\$1 Award/\$15
1	9.0/17.6	0R910 0500000387	2271	Near Aptos, from South Aptos Underpass to Roaring Camp RR crossing. Upgrade guardrail, guardrail end treatments, and drainage features.	Santa Cruz 1, ENV, RR, Guardrails	PS&E/RW	1/2/2013	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$2,469/\$75
17	11.04	1A710 0512000010	2332	Near Scotts Valley, north of Glenwood Drive. Construct retaining wall.	Summit Slide Repair	PS&E/RW	3/1/2012	Steve Digrazia 805-549-3437 steve_digrazia@dot.ca.gov	\$4,000 Vote/\$25

### Programmed in 13/14 FY

1	8.0/17.5	0C901 0500000029	9000	Near Santa Cruz, from 0.4 mile south of Freedom Blvd to 0.4 mile north of Ocean Street. Install CCTV and signs.	SCR Traffic Surveillance Station-CC TV	PS&E/RW	4/15/2013	Luis Duazo 805-542-4678 luis_duazo @dot.ca.gov	\$2,956/\$13
9	1.7/23.9	0Q590 0500000317	1988	Near Boulder Creek, from 0.3 mile south of Rincon Creek Bridge to the San Mateo County line at various locations. Storm water mitigation.	SCR 9 San Lorenzo River Source Control	PS&E/RW	12/1/2013	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$2,543/\$46
129	9.5/10.0	0T540 0500000857	2285	In Santa Cruz County, west of Chittenden Road. Improve roadway alignment.	Hwy 129 Curve Realignment	PA&ED	6/1/2014	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$12,527/\$101

NOTE: For general informaton about the SHOPP program  
contact Cindy Simeroth at (805) 549-3050 or by email at cindy\_simeroth@dot.ca.gov  
\*List is provided in January and July of each year.



# Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission



## PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS/July 2012 Semi-Annual List

Route	Post Miles	EA	PPNO	Project Description	Project Name	Current Project Phase	Ready To List (Target)	Project Manager Phone # Email	Cost (\$1,000) CON/RW
<b>Programmed in 14/15 FY</b>									
VAR	VAR	0R510 0500000363	2235	In Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties at various locations on Routes 1, 9, 17, 68, 129, 218, and 236. Upgrade pedestrian curb ramps. <b>(Project in Santa Cruz; some work in MON)</b>	Santa Cruz / Monterey ADA	PS&E/RW	3/16/2014	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$3,859/\$833
17	8.2/10.1	0T980 0500020244	2311	Near Glenwood, from 0.9 mile north of Vinehill Road and 0.5 mile south of Glenwood Drive. Shoulder widening and concrete guardrail.	Santa Cruz 17 Shoulder Widening and Concrete Guardrail	PS&E/RW	1/21/2015	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$6,968/\$75
<b>Programmed in 15/16 FY</b>									
1	31.6/36.3	0F990 0500000053	9900	In Santa Cruz County near Davenport, at Scott Creek Bridge #36-0031 and Waddell Creek Bridge #36-0065. Bridge replacement. <b>(Note: Former Long Lead project)</b>	Scott Creek and Waddell Creek Bridge Replacement	PA&ED	10/1/2015	Steve Digrazia 805-549-3437 steve_digrazia@dot.ca.gov	\$20,369/\$340
17	0.7/2.2	0Q600 0500020290	1989	In Santa Cruz County, from 0.7 mile north of Route 1/17 Separation to north of Simms Road. Storm water mitigation.	Hwy 17 Sediment Source Control	PA&ED	4/1/2016	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$9,905/\$1,107
1	7.5/17.4	1C100 0512000074	2358	In and near the city of Santa Cruz, on Routes 1 and 17 at various locations. Construct roadside paving, access gates, weed barriers and relocate facilities.	Santa Cruz 1 & 17 Roadside Safety Improvements	PA&ED	12/1/2015	Luis Duazo 805-542-4678 luis_duazo @dot.ca.gov	\$1,222/\$5

(A)\* = Actual date RTL was achieved.

### Minor A Projects

Note: Construction Award or Vote costs are actuals; otherwise Construction costs are estimates.

NOTE: For general informaton about the SHOPP program  
contact Cindy Simeroth at (805) 549-3050 or by email at cindy\_simeroth@dot.ca.gov  
\*List is provided in January and July of each year.

**AGENDA:** October 18, 2012

**TO:** Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)

**FROM:** Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

**RE:** Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) Implementation Update and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Recommendation

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC):

1. Receive updates on implementation of the federal transportation act, MAP-21; and
  2. Recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) issue a call for projects for \$5 million in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds.
- 

## **BACKGROUND**

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), as the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Santa Cruz County, is responsible for selecting projects to receive a variety of state and federal transportation funds. This includes Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds from the "highway" portion of the federal transportation act (MAP-21).

Last fall, given significant uncertainty surrounding the new federal transportation act and the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) reluctance to release State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds to projects on local streets and roads in the past, the RTC decided to wait to program Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds.

Following enactment of the two-year federal transportation act in July 2012, Caltrans established a MAP-21 working group to address near-term funding policy direction and any legislation that may be needed to implement MAP-21 in California. In late September, the CTC approved a funding plan for fiscal year 2013 (FY13) federal highway funds. This included appropriation of RSTP funds and a commitment to fund projects previously designated in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to receive funds from the now eliminated federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) program with new Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds in FY13. The state is not anticipated to finalize the formulas and process for distributing FY14 RSTP, TAP, and other federal funds until spring 2013.

With elimination of the TE program and uncertainty on how TAP funds will be distributed beyond FY13, over \$11 million in Santa Cruz County bicycle and pedestrian projects, currently programmed in the STIP to receive TE funds between FY14 and FY16, could be at risk of losing funds unless the CTC makes a commitment to continue to fund these projects with other sources in the STIP.

## DISCUSSION

While there is uncertainty regarding FY14 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding levels and funding availability for some previously programmed STIP projects, there is over \$5 million in FY12 and FY13 RSTP funds currently available for programming. Given the large backlog of transportation needs in Santa Cruz County and low bid prices being realized by many agencies, **staff recommends that the RTC issue a call for projects for \$5 million in RSTP next month and recommends that the ITAC concur with this recommendation.** Staff will also provide updates on statewide proposals for MAP-21 implementation at this meeting.

### Proposed Process

Staff proposes that the RTC issue a call for projects at its November 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, with **applications due December 15**, review by RTC Advisory Committees in January 2013, and adoption of the final project list following a public hearing at the RTC's February or March 2013 meeting.

### Eligible Projects and Priorities

RSTP funds can be used on a variety of projects, as outlined in the Surface Transportation Program. These include: highway, local street and road, transit, paratransit, bicycle, pedestrian, carpool, safety, and bridge projects.

Given the large backlog of multi-modal transportation needs in the region and the extremely limited amount of funding available for transportation projects, it is important to ensure that funds are used cost effectively to improve the region's transportation system. Therefore, several factors will be considered when evaluating projects. The RTC, through the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) development process has indicated its intent to prioritize projects that address the goals, policies, and targets already approved by the RTC (Attachment 1). This includes evaluation of how projects:

1. Improve access for all modes, especially to and within key destinations
2. Improve transportation safety, reduce fatalities and injuries
3. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fuel consumption through a reduction in vehicle miles traveled and/or speed consistency
4. Improve travel time reliability and increase efficiency of the transportation system
5. Preserve existing infrastructure or service cost-effectively

Project sponsors are encouraged to propose at least some projects that could be implemented as early as summer 2013.

### TE Project Uncertainties

While there is some uncertainty regarding funding availability for projects previously programmed for STIP TE funds in fiscal years 2013/14 through 2015/16, several CTC Commissioners and staff have indicated their intent to continue to fund previously approved projects. If this situation changes, the RTC could consider using future RSTP funds to replace STIP funds with RSTP.

## **SUMMARY**

\$5 million Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds are available for programming. Staff recommends that the ITAC recommend that the RTC issue a call for projects to program those funds.

Attachment:

1. RTP Draft Goals, Targets, and Policies

\\Rtcserv2\internal\RTIP\STP-CMAQ\RSTP2012\RSTPCall4ProjectsRecITAC.doc

## Revised Draft Transportation Plan Goals, Targets and Policies

*Underline/strikeout reflects proposed changes since RTC approval*

- **GOAL 1. Improve people's access to jobs, schools, health care and other regular needs in ways that improve health, reduce pollution and retain money in the local economy.**

There is a strong relationship between achieving access, health, economic benefit, and climate and energy goals and meeting targets. In many cases actions to achieve one goal will lead toward achieving the other goals. For example, providing more carpool, transit and bicycle trips reduces fuel consumption, retains money in the local Santa Cruz County economy and reduces congestion.

### **TARGETS:**

Improve people's ability to meet most of their daily needs without having to drive. Improve access and proximity to employment centers.

**1A.** Increase the percentage of people within a 30-minute walk, bike or transit trip to key destinations. *(Specific target numbers will be developed in conjunction with Sustainable Communities Strategy.)*

Re-invest in the local economy by reducing transportation expenses from vehicle ownership, operation and fuel consumption. Reduce smog-forming pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions.

**1B.** Reduce per capita fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions by 5 percent by 2035 through a reduction in vehicle miles traveled and improved speed consistency. [Note: Of the 5 percent reduction in fuel consumption/greenhouse gas emissions, improving speed consistency could account for up to 1% with the remaining due to reductions in vehicle miles traveled.]

**1C.** Re-invest in the local economy by \$xx million/year (2012 dollars) by 2035 compared to business-as-usual forecasts through a reduction in fuel consumption due to a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

Improve the convenience and quality of trips, especially for walk, bicycle, transit and car/vanpool trips.

**~~4E~~1D.** Improve travel time reliability for vehicle trips and multimodal level of service for walk and bicycle trips to and within key destinations. *(Specific target numbers still to be developed.)*

Improve health by increasing physical activity in using the transportation system.

**~~1D~~E.** Decrease single occupancy vehicle mode share compared to the baseline condition between 2 to 8 percent by 2035.

### **POLICIES:**

- 1.1. *Transportation Demand Management (TDM):* Expand demand management programs that decrease the number of vehicle miles traveled and result in mode shift.

- 1.2. *Transportation System Management*: Implement Transportation System Management programs and projects on major roadways across Santa Cruz County that increases the efficiency of the existing transportation system.
- 1.3. *Transportation Infrastructure*: Improve multimodal access to and within key destinations.
- 1.4. *Transportation Infrastructure*: Ensure network connectivity by closing gaps in the bicycle, pedestrian and transit networks
- 1.5. *Land Use*: Support land use decisions that locate new facilities close to existing services, particularly those that service transportation disadvantaged populations.

➤ **GOAL 2. Reduce transportation related fatalities and injuries for all transportation modes**

Safety is a fundamental outcome from transportation system investments and operations. Across the United States, pedestrians and bicyclists (vulnerable users) are killed and injured at a significantly higher rate than the percentage of trips they take.

**TARGETS:**

Improve transportation safety, especially for the most vulnerable users.

**2A.** Reduce injury and fatal collisions by mode by 50 percent by 2035

**2B.** Reduce total number of high collision locations by 75 percent by 2035

**POLICIES:**

- 2.1 *Safety*: Prioritize funding for safety projects and programs that will reduce fatal or injury collisions.
- 2.2 *Emergency Services*: Support projects that provide access to emergency services.
- 2.3 *System Design*: Reduce the potential for conflict between bicyclists, pedestrians and vehicles.

➤ **GOAL 3. Deliver access and safety improvements cost effectively, within available revenues, equitably and responsive to the needs of all users of the transportation system, and beneficially for the natural environment.**

The manner in which access and safety outcomes referenced in Goal 1 and Goal 2 are delivered can impact cost-effectiveness, distribution of benefits amongst population groups, and ecological function.

## TARGETS:

Maintain the existing system.

**3A.** ~~Increase~~ Improve the condition of transportation facilities. This includes bringing the average local road pavement condition index to 70 by 2035.

**3B.** Reduce the number of transportation facilities in "distressed" condition. This includes r~~educing~~ the lane miles in "distressed" condition by 5 percent per year.

Enhance healthy, safe access to key destinations for transportation-disadvantaged populations.

**3C.** Increase the percentage of people that are within a 30-minute walk, bike or transit trip to key destinations who are transportation disadvantaged ~~people due to age, income, disability or limited English proficiency. within a 30-minute walk, bike or transit trip to key destinations.~~

Solicit broad public input.

**3D.** Maximize participation from diverse members of the public in RTC planning and project implementation activities.

## POLICIES:

- 3.1 *Cost Effectiveness & System Maintenance:* Maintain and operate the existing transportation system cost-effectively and in a manner that adapts the current transportation system to maximize existing investments.
- 3.2 *Coordination:* Improve coordination between agencies in a manner that improves efficiencies, reduces, and duplication (e.g. paratransit and transit; road repairs; signal synchronization; TDM programs).
- 3.3 *System Financing:* Support new or increased taxes and fees that reflect the cost to operate and maintain the transportation system.
- 3.4 *Equity:* Demonstrate that planned investments will reduce disparities in safety and access for transportation disadvantaged populations.
- 3.5 *Ecological Function:* Deliver transportation investments in a way that increases tree canopy, where appropriate, improves habitat and water quality, enhances sensitive areas.
- 3.6 *Public Engagement:* Solicit broad public input on all aspects of regional and local transportation plans, projects and funding actions.

S:\RTP\2014\STARS\RTPSustainabilityGoalDev\Goals&Policies\_FinalDraft\AddedEconomic BenefitTarget\RTPGoalsPolicyNarrative072512\_FinalDraft with Econb.docx



**AGENDA:** September 6, 2012

**TO:** Regional Transportation Commission

**FROM:** Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner

**RE:** 2012 Santa Cruz County On-board Transit Ridership Study

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) accept the 2012 Santa Cruz County On-board Transit Ridership Survey Final Report.

---

## **BACKGROUND**

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) received a Rural or Small Urban Transit Planning Studies grant from the California Department of Transportation to conduct an on-board transit ridership study. RTC and Santa Cruz METRO are also coordinating with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) on this project. AMBAG is the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MPO) for Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties.

## **DISCUSSION**

The on-board transit ridership study was performed by Moore & Associates and consisted of an on-board survey, an assessment of on-time performance and boarding/alighting counts for the fixed route bus service in Santa Cruz County. The primary purpose of the project was to collect data needed to support the transit component of the regional travel demand model (RTDM) managed by AMBAG. In addition, the study will support future transit planning efforts and will enable Santa Cruz METRO to quantify the population of its service area that speaks a primary language other than English in order to ensure Title VI compliance.

Up-to-date transit ridership data is essential to support planning efforts that achieve statewide and regional goals to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and achieve greenhouse gas (GhG) reduction targets. Santa Cruz County, like many regions, will refer to the RTDM and associated transportation modeling efforts for evaluating the impacts of new transportation investments on meeting regional goals. Transit ridership can be an important strategy for reducing VMT and GhG emissions. The transit data included in the RTDM will now better reflect current transit usage in Santa Cruz County and enable a more accurate transit ridership forecast.

## **Key Findings**

The on-board survey revealed the characteristics of typical Santa Cruz County transit customers to be people who use the bus 5 or more times per week, to have an income of less than \$15,000 per year and to be 16-24 years old. The majority of respondents traveled between home, school and work and walked to and from the bus stop. The majority of respondents (82%) indicated that they did not have a personal vehicle available to make the trip. The three most requested service improvements were "increase service frequency", "real-time bus information", and "shorter travel time". The primary methods for getting service information are from the METRO website and the printed bus schedule.

The 2012 Santa Cruz County On-Board Transit Ridership Survey Report can be found online at <http://www.sccrtc.org/projects/bus>. The Executive Summary is included as Attachment 1. **Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission accept the 2012 Santa Cruz County On-Board Transit Ridership Survey Final Report.**

## **SUMMARY**

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) received a Rural or Small Urban Transit Planning Studies grant from the California Department of Transportation to conduct an on-board transit ridership study. The study was performed by Moore & Associates and the results are presented in the Santa Cruz County On-Board Transit Ridership Survey Report. RTC staff recommends acceptance of this report.

## Attachment

- 1: Executive Summary of Santa Cruz County On-Board Transit Ridership Study

S:\RTC\TC2012\0912\Onboard Transit Study\SR-Onboard0912.doc

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) received a Rural or Small Urban Transit Planning Studies Grant from the California Department of Transportation to conduct an on-board transit ridership study.

The three main goals of this project were to:

1. Collect current ridership data for input into the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) regional travel demand model to more accurately reflect current transit use as well as forecast future transit ridership.
2. Assess the limited English proficiency population in order to comply with Title VI requirements.
3. Collect transit service and performance data to assist in future service planning.

Moore & Associates was selected to complete the Transit Ridership Study which consisted of an onboard fixed-route customer survey and on-time performance and boarding/alighting. Data collection efforts were completed on April 17-19, 2012 and April 24-26, 2012 (Tuesdays/Wednesdays/Thursdays). A total of 1,972 valid surveys were collected; 1,016 of which were 100 percent complete (all questions had 100 percent responses except for demographic questions), a statistically-valid sampling.

### Key Findings

Respondent trip origin-destination and boarding-alighting location data are presented in Appendix A. These exhibits present the general flow of travel throughout the service area and identify significant “magnets” for trip generation. The origin-destination map shows travel with a minimum of at least one leg of travel being transit within the Santa Cruz/Capitola area, between Santa Cruz and UCSC, Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and Santa Cruz/Capitola and Scotts Valley.

The onboard survey revealed the profile of Santa Cruz customers to be people who use the bus 5 or more times per week, to have an income of less than \$15,000 per year and to be 16-24 years old. Home, school, and work were the three most common purposes. The majority of respondents were coming from home (44.9 percent), school (24.7 percent), and work (11.5 percent); and going to school (32.7 percent), home (30.7 percent), and work (14.3 percent). The trip purpose varied based on education level, income, and age. The majority of respondents walk to and from the bus stop (75.8 percent walking to and 79.3 percent walking from) with 48.6 percent walking less than five minutes to their stop and 49.7 percent walking less than five minutes from their stop to their destination. The majority of respondents cited using METRO five or more times a week (67.7 percent). Ninety-four percent of respondents cited using METRO fixed-route services at least once weekly.

Total travel time cited varied from one minute to 400 minutes with an average trip duration of 35 minutes. Approximately 47 percent of respondents indicated a trip duration of 25 minutes or less. The majority (81.9 percent) indicated not having a personal vehicle available to make the trip. Therefore, the majority of respondents are “captive riders” rather than “choice riders”.

When asked what the most prevalent barrier is to using METRO, the most common response was “nothing” (34.7 percent). Other common barriers were “does not travel when I need it” and “costs too much/lack of financial resources” (20.2 and 10.9 percent, respectively). The three most requested service improvements were “increase service frequency” (25.7 percent), “real-time bus arrival information” (14 percent), and “shorter travel time” (13.3 percent).

The primary method of obtaining information regarding METRO service varied by respondent demographic (i.e., age, income, and education level). However, the most-frequently cited forms of obtaining information (in hierarchical order) were:

- METRO’s website (46.8 percent),
- Paper bus schedule (36.4 percent),
- Google Transit (11.4 percent),
- Other (3.2 percent), and
- Call METRO customer service (2.2 percent).

#### Limited-English Proficiency Assessment

Several data cross-tabulations were produced so as to extract information with respect to Spanish-speaking respondents. A total of 108 surveys were collected in which the respondent chose to complete the survey in Spanish. A number of interesting patterns and trends became evident. More than 25 percent of Spanish-speaking respondents indicated there were no barriers to their use of METRO. The most-frequently cited barrier was “does not travel when I need it” (nearly 20 percent). The most common trip purposes were “home” and “work,” which contrasts with English-language respondents who indicated “home” and “school.” Spanish-speaking METRO customers heavily favor the printed bus schedule (Headways) (more than 70 percent).

#### On-Time Performance and Boarding/Alighting Information

Route-by-route on-time performance and boarding/alighting information was collected along with the transit rider survey. Total trips reported as either late or missed amount to 24 percent of all surveyed trips. Routes 4, 12, 20, and 91X to Watsonville (outbound) in particular experienced many early departures. Routes 8, 54, 69W (outbound), and Route 74 reported 100 percent on-time performance during the ride check. Detailed boarding and alighting exhibits for each route/direction are presented in the Appendix C. These exhibits identify the activity on a stop-by-stop basis. As seen in the charts, local stops serving UCSC typically experience the greatest boarding and alighting activity.



# HEALTHY LANDS HEALTHY COMMUNITIES



## DEMONSTRATING THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF NATURAL AREAS AND WORKING LANDSCAPES

Presentation Outline: October 18, 2012

- 1) **Introductions (collect paper copies of surveys )**
- 2) **About the SC3 Partnership and the Healthy Lands & Healthy Communities Initiative-** Karen Christensen Resource Conservation District of SC County and Jim Robins of *Alnus* Ecological
- 3) **A healthy 21<sup>st</sup> century economy: introduction to ecosystem services-** Jen Harrison-Cox of Earth Economics
- 4) **Towards new planning tools and reliable funding mechanisms: Valuation applications and case studies-** Jen Harrison-Cox of Earth Economics
- 5) **How can this effort help inform you and your agencies mandates and future projects (i.e. sustainability/STARS, new funding sources and partners, green infrastructure, cost-avoidance, triple bottom line and life cycle analysis, etc)?** Group discussion
- 6) **Next steps and wrap up**



# HEALTHY LANDS HEALTHY COMMUNITIES



## DEMONSTRATING THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF NATURAL AREAS AND WORKING LANDSCAPES

### Ecosystem Services Survey

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey, designed to measure knowledge of and attitudes about ecosystem services and related concepts. The results of this survey, combined with a similar survey at the end of the project, will help the project team evaluate the impact of this project and the associated deliverables our local, state, and federal partners. The primary goals of this effort are to demonstrate the economic value of the benefits that natural systems provides to society, often referred to as "ecosystem services" and provide a set of tools for decision-makers to incorporate these values into a wide array of future actions.

The survey should take you less than 10 minutes. Only the survey team will have access to personal information collected in this survey, which will be kept confidential. When sharing the results of the survey, both with the project team and in any publications, we will not include any information that will identify you personally. And finally, your participation is completely voluntary.

If you choose to complete the survey in hard copy, please bring it to the upcoming kick-off meeting and return it to the project team. If you would rather conduct the survey on-line, please click on the following link: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/3L6HWVL>

Thanks again,  
Stephen Posner and Christy Getz, SC3 Survey Team



1. Please tell us how much you agree with the following statements (*circle one number for each*):

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
An ecosystem services approach is relevant to my company's/ organization's work.	1	2	3	4	5
My company/organization actively considers ecosystem services in making decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
The economic value of ecosystem services is relevant to my own work.	1	2	3	4	5
Conservation work is central to my company's/organization's core mission.	1	2	3	4	5
Regional or multi-county projects are high priority for my company/organization.	1	2	3	4	5
Barriers outside of my organization impede multi-jurisdictional collaboration.	1	2	3	4	5
My organization is involved in projects with other agencies/ organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
My organization should be involved in more projects with other agencies/ organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
Capacity to monitor impacts to ecosystem services exists in my county/region.	1	2	3	4	5
Capacity to implement policies or plans about ecosystem services exists in my county/region.	1	2	3	4	5
Ecosystem service knowledge is legitimate – gathered in a way that is complete, correct, and unbiased.	1	2	3	4	5
The economic value of ecosystem services can be quantified in scientifically credible ways.	1	2	3	4	5
I have a solid understanding of what the term <i>ecosystem services</i> means.	1	2	3	4	5
I have been familiar with <i>ecosystem services</i> language for more than a year.	1	2	3	4	5

2. Some people do not think the term *ecosystem services* is effective in non-scientific settings. Which of the following terms do you prefer as an alternative? (check one)

☐ *The value of nature*

☐ *The economic value of conservation*

☐ *Conservation's benefits*

☐ *Nature's assets*

☐ *Natural capital*

☐ *Nature's benefits*

☐ None of the above, I like the term *ecosystem services*

☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

3. Approximately what percentage of your time would you estimate is spent on work and/or projects that interface with ecosystem services?

(Place a mark at the closest point on the following line *or* check the box "I don't know")

0-----20-----30-----40-----50-----60-----70-----80-----90-----100 %

☐ *I don't know*

4. What percentage of your time do you work in the following places?  
Next to each option, please estimate (by marking an X) the percentage of your overall work in that county/region.

Santa Cruz                      0-----20-----30-----40-----50-----60-----70-----80-----90-----100 %

Santa Clara                    0-----20-----30-----40-----50-----60-----70-----80-----90-----100 %

Sonoma                         0-----20-----30-----40-----50-----60-----70-----80-----90-----100 %

Regional level                0-----20-----30-----40-----50-----60-----70-----80-----90-----100 %

State level                     0-----20-----30-----40-----50-----60-----70-----80-----90-----100 %



5. How would you characterize your relationship to conservation work? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Providing scientific or technical input
- ☐ Advocating for conservation
- ☐ Mediating relationships
- ☐ Implementing projects
- ☐ Strategic planning
- ☐ Making decisions about funding priorities
- ☐ Developing regulations or crafting policy
- ☐ Enforcing regulations
- ☐ Assessing or mitigating impacts
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

6. Approximately what percentage of your time would you estimate is spent on conservation?

(Place a mark at the closest point on the following line.)

0-----20-----30-----40-----50-----60-----70-----80-----90-----100 %

7. Approximately what percentage of your time would you estimate is spent on management of natural resources?

(Place a mark at the closest point on the following line.)

0-----20-----30-----40-----50-----60-----70-----80-----90-----100 %

8. **How important** CURRENTLY are the following ecosystems services in your organization's work? Please **circle one number for each statement**, indicating how important each is to your organization, with 1 being "not important at all", and 5 being "highly important" (*circle one number for each*):

<i>Ecosystem Services:</i>	Not important at all	Somewhat un- important	Neither important or unimportant	Somewhat important	Highly important
Regulation of greenhouse gases (forests store carbon)	1	2	3	4	5
Protection from natural disasters (coastal ecosystems mitigate hazards from storms or severe weather)	1	2	3	4	5
Flood control	1	2	3	4	5
Water quality protection	1	2	3	4	5
Soil retention	1	2	3	4	5
Soil formation	1	2	3	4	5
Nutrient cycling (promotes healthy and productive soils)	1	2	3	4	5
Pollination	1	2	3	4	5
Biological control (pest and disease control)	1	2	3	4	5
Habitat and biodiversity	1	2	3	4	5
Food & Agriculture	1	2	3	4	5
Timber/forest products	1	2	3	4	5
Aesthetic quality (enjoyment of scenery)	1	2	3	4	5
Recreation & Tourism	1	2	3	4	5
Public Health	1	2	3	4	5
Cultural and historic value	1	2	3	4	5
Spiritual value	1	2	3	4	5
Science and education	1	2	3	4	5

9. **How important** do you think the following ecosystems services **SHOULD BE** in your organization's work? Please **circle one number for each statement**, indicating how important you think each service should be to your organization, with 1 being "not important at all", and 5 being "highly important" (*circle one number for each*):

<i>Ecosystem Services:</i>	Not important at all	Somewhat un- important	Neither important or unimportant	Somewhat important	Highly important
Regulation of greenhouse gases (forests store carbon)	1	2	3	4	5
Protection from natural disasters (coastal ecosystems mitigate hazards from storms or severe weather)	1	2	3	4	5
Flood control	1	2	3	4	5
Water quality protection	1	2	3	4	5
Soil retention	1	2	3	4	5
Soil formation	1	2	3	4	5
Nutrient cycling (promotes healthy and productive soils)	1	2	3	4	5
Pollination	1	2	3	4	5
Biological control (pest and disease control)	1	2	3	4	5
Habitat and biodiversity	1	2	3	4	5
Food & Agriculture	1	2	3	4	5
Timber/forest products	1	2	3	4	5
Aesthetic quality (enjoyment of scenery)	1	2	3	4	5
Recreation & Tourism	1	2	3	4	5
Public Health	1	2	3	4	5
Cultural and historic value	1	2	3	4	5
Spiritual value	1	2	3	4	5
Science and education	1	2	3	4	5

10. What are three ecosystem services related to your work, in order of importance?

1) \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_

10b. Please describe briefly how you would go about estimating the economic value of #1 (ecosystem service) that you have listed above?

11. What is your job title?

\_\_\_\_\_

12. What type of organization do you work for? (please check one box below)

☐ *Resource Conservation District*

☐ *Parks and Recreation Department*

☐ *Open Space Authority*

☐ *Special District*

☐ *State Regulatory Agency*

☐ *Consulting Company*

☐ *Water Agency/District*

☐ *Private Non-Profit/NGO*

☐ *Funding organization*

☐ *Private Business*

☐ *OTHER* \_\_\_\_\_

12. How old are you (please check one)

- |                                |                                |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 21-30 | <input type="checkbox"/> 61-70 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 31-40 | <input type="checkbox"/> 71-80 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 41-50 | <input type="checkbox"/> 81+   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 51-60 |                                |

13. Are you ... ? (please check one)

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

14. What is your highest level of education?

- |                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some school  | <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's degree or equivalent  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> High School  | <input type="checkbox"/> Master's Degree                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some College | <input type="checkbox"/> Ph.D., M.D., J.D., or equivalent |

15. What is your name?\*

---

\* Please also note an email address or a phone number if you'd like to talk with us more in-depth about these issues.

Thank you so much for taking the time to complete this survey. We appreciate you including your name so that we can track changes in knowledge and opinion over the duration of the SC3 project. As a reminder, individual responses will be kept confidential. If you have any questions, please note our contact info below and feel free to get in touch.

Thanks again,

Stephen Posner  
Gund Institute for Ecological Economics Graduate Fellow  
University of Vermont  
[sposner@uvm.edu](mailto:sposner@uvm.edu)

Christy Getz  
Associate Cooperative Extension Specialist  
UC Berkeley  
[cgetz@berkeley.edu](mailto:cgetz@berkeley.edu)