AGENDA
Thursday, October 17, 2013
1:30 p.m.
RTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Avenue, 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 August 22, 2013 ITAC meeting - Page 3

REGULAR AGENDA

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

7. Receive presentation on Santa Cruz METRO Short Range Transit Plan - Page 7
   a. Staff report and presentation from Erich Friedrich, Santa Cruz METRO
   b. Attachment

8. Receive presentation on AMBAG LiveMaps Tool - Page 19
   a. Staff report and presentation from Cody Meyer, AMBAG

9. Receive presentation on AMBAG Regional Bike Model Web Tool - Page 21
   a. Staff report and presentation from Cody Meyer, AMBAG
   b. Attachment
10. Receive presentation on Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Final Master Plan - Page 23
   a. Staff report
   b. Attachment

11. State Legislative Update and Active Transportation Program - Page 44
   a. Staff report

12. Adjourn. The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for 1:30pm on November 21, 2013 in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.
1. Call to Order – Chair Chris Schneiter called the meeting to order at 1:35 pm.

2. Introductions – Self introductions were made.

3. Oral communications – None

4. Additions to consent and regular agendas – Handout distributed for item 6

**CONSENT AGENDA (Fontes/ Schneiter) approved**

5. Approved minutes of the June 20, 2013 ITAC meeting

**REGULAR AGENDA**

6. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents – Verbal updates from project sponsors

   Santa Cruz: Chris Schneiter reported that the city would be opening bids for the Broadway/Brommer-Arana Gulch multiuse path on August 27, with construction scheduled to begin in October and take 14-16 months. The City plans to go out to bid for the Soquel-Park Way traffic signal project nearing completion of the Highway 1...
auxiliary lanes construction. Cape seals on roadways on the lower west side of the city are underway, with work on Branciforte scheduled to start in September. Work on the Mission Street extension project is underway, with K-rail removed; striping and bollards are being installed.

Watsonville: Murray Fontes reported that the City of Watsonville is resurfacing Airport Boulevard on both sides of the highway and several slurry seal projects will begin soon. The City’s Safe Routes to Schools pedestrian signal project will start this fall. Highway 152 relinquishment is still being evaluated. The City continues to work with Caltrans on Highway 1/Harkins Slough Road and Main Street/Green Valley Road area planning.

Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO): Erich Friedrich reported that construction of the operations facility continues, with a Spring 2015 completion schedule. The existing conditions section of the Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) is finishing up, with the consultant to work on the service planning section next. METRO and the City of Santa Cruz have initiated design work on the Pacific Station project and will be soliciting input from the public on design options. METRO also has four new buses with Q-pod ADA areas, however these will be the last new buses for a while without changes to state and federal funding.

RTC: Rachel Moriconi reported that the La Fonda Bridge opening will take place on Saturday August 24. The RTC authorized award of a contract to rehabilitate several rail bridge structures on August 15. The RTC also approved the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project list on August 15. The RTC received a Caltrans Planning Grant to conduct a passenger rail study.

Caltrans: Mark McCumsey referenced the District 5 monthly construction report that was distributed at the meeting and noted that the bids have been received for the Highway 1 Guardrail Upgrade (project #7), with construction scheduled for this fall.

7. Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidelines

Grace Blakeslee reported that Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidelines have been updated to reflect comments received. She appreciated Chair Schneiter for his review of the draft document on behalf of the ITAC. She highlighted changes made to the document, including text about challenges and constraints for complete streets, opportunities to add complete streets components within roadway rehabilitation projects, and economic benefits of complete streets. She noted that while examples of complete street designs are not applicable in all areas, the document is intended to identify opportunities for complete streets components. The document is scheduled for completion in September. She noted that some funding is available for training local agencies on complete streets. She highlighted the project checklist, which is meant to serve as a guide for agencies to use when developing and evaluating projects. Local jurisdictions will be asked to adopt the guidelines.

In response to questions from ITAC members, Ms. Blakeslee noted that complete
streets analysis was part of the project list development for the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The goal of complete streets is to support reduction in vehicle miles traveled. The Guidelines may be included as an appendix to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

Ms. Blakeslee noted that while many jurisdictions include some complete streets components within their projects, the document provides guidance for agencies to consider adjacent land uses and appropriate complete streets components when defining project scope. Anais Schenk added that the guidelines provide tools to consider and recognize complete street benefits within projects.

Taylor Bateman noted that California Fire Codes combined with right-of-way limits can pose a challenge for implementing complete streets and suggested addressing legal challenges within the guidelines. Chris Schneiter noted “green street” trainings that include complete street components might be useful to local agencies. He recommended not establishing a certification process for complete street projects.

The ITAC approved a motion (Fontes/ Friedrich) recommending that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt the Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook (Bateman abstained).

8. Update on 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)

Rachel Moriconi reported that the RTC approved the draft project list for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on August 15, 2013, identifying projects that could reasonably be funded through 2035 using projected revenues (constrained) and projects which are not currently financially feasible given revenue shortfalls (unconstrained). She noted that the RTC-approved project list will be incorporated into the tri-county Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and preferred scenario for the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Anais Schenk reported that the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) evaluated two hybrid scenarios for land use and transportation projects and is modeling the proposed preferred scenario now. The preferred scenario includes mixed use, economic/job growth aimed at improving job-to-housing balance in low income residential areas, and growth in “opportunity areas” within ½ mile of transit stops along high quality transit corridors that have headways of 15 minutes or less. AMBAG is scheduled to adopt the preferred scenario in September, and then will start environmental analysis of the MTP and RTPs for each of the counties in the Monterey Bay region.

9. Local Assistance Updates

Garin Schneider and Donn Miyahara joined the meeting by phone and provided updates
on behalf of Caltrans Local Assistance. Mr. Schneider noted that Caltrans is surveying agencies regarding expectations for Local Assistance oversight on federal-aide projects. He noted that District 5 currently has two vacancies that he does not currently have the budget to backfill, which could impact how long it takes to process local project oversight. Ms. Moriconi noted the survey is partly in response to regional agency concerns that an increased amount of funds are being taken off the top of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) apportionments to fund Caltrans’ Local Assistance. She requested that agencies complete and submit the survey via rmoriconi@sccrtc.org and she would forward to state representatives. Chris Schneiter commented that District 5 Local Assistance does a great job, but expressed concern about Local Capital Outlay review time for projects on the state highway system.

Garin Schneider also noted that Caltrans has developed a summary sheet of common issues identified during FHWA and other audits that have resulted in some local agencies in the state losing federal funds. He urged agencies to especially note changes to Chapter 10 of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) related to contracts and subconsultant contract language, especially if there are contract change orders.

Mr. Schneider also noted that Buy American provisions for non-federally-funded right-of-way will not apply until December 31, 2013. Changes to Buy American requirements are expected in the future, however for most local projects the impact of the MAP-21 requirements are less significant than originally anticipated.

10. Next meeting: The next meeting of the ITAC is scheduled for September 19, 2013 at 1:30 PM at the RTC Conference Room in Santa Cruz. The meeting adjourned at 2:50pm.

Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi
AGENDA: October 17, 2013

TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)

FROM: Erich Friedrich, Senior Transportation Planner, Santa Cruz METRO

RE: Short Range Transit Plan

RECOMMENDATION

Receive a presentation and provide input on the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District’s (METRO) Short Range Transit Plan.

HIGHLIGHTS

• Santa Cruz METRO awarded a contract with Nelson\Nygaard on April 26, 2013 to draft the 2013 Short Range Transit Plan.

• The 2013 Short Range Transit Plan is a document that will guide Santa Cruz METRO in service and capital improvements over a five year horizon.

• Public Outreach and Data collection for the Short Range Transit Plan was conducted from late spring through the summer of this year. The Short Range Transit Plan also leverages data collection efforts from previous studies and plans.

• Existing conditions are reported from a thorough review of the various data collection efforts and have three basic elements:
  • Demographics
  • System Performance
  • Passenger Survey Results

• Initial findings and a Draft Service Plan were created based on the Existing Conditions. A presentation on the existing conditions and Initial Findings with draft Service Plans is attached to this staff report.

• Additional outreach to stakeholders and stakeholder groups will be coming in early October. Remaining elements of the Short Range Transit Plan are currently being drafted and will be presented in draft form in mid November.

DISCUSSION

Santa Cruz METRO’s last Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) expired at the end of 2012 and based on state law must have a current up to date SRTP in order to purchase buses starting in 2014. In order to draft a new SRTP, Santa Cruz METRO
awarded a contract with the planning firm Nelson\Nygaard on April 26, 2013 to draft the 2013 SRTP.

The 2013 Short Range Transit Plan is a planning document focused on transit service and capital improvements over a five year horizon. This document will guide Santa Cruz METRO in regards to service changes, capital projects, fleet management, public outreach and communication, as well as other elements like financial and legislative forecasting, and policy revisions and recommendations.

Once the contract with Nelson\Nygaard was awarded, Santa Cruz METRO staff and Nelson\Nygaard staff began working on collecting data and performing public outreach to guide the elements of the SRTP. Public involvement and data collection included:

- Onboard rider surveys
- Ridecheck data collection along mainline routes
- Stakeholder interviews – including interviews with several board members
- Public workshops throughout the county
- "Drop in’ interviews with Santa Cruz METRO Bus Operators and Transit Supervisors
- Planning Meetings with members of Santa Cruz METRO’s Service Planning and Review Committee

The team from Nelson\Nygaard has also leveraged other planning documents such as the Watsonville Transit Planning Study (2011) and the Regional Transportation Commission’s On Board Transit Study (2012) as data sources for the SRTP. Finally the team has reviewed other planning documents such as the new general plans from the Cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville, the County’s ongoing Transit Corridors Study, and the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan.

Existing Conditions based on the extensive data collection effort and public participation were reported to Santa Cruz METRO staff in mid August. Details of the Existing Conditions are summarized by Santa Cruz METRO staff in three parts: Demographics of ridership, system performance with global figures and individual route statistics, and results of the passenger survey. Attachment A is a detailed presentation of this information.

Initial Findings based on the Existing Conditions and data collection lead the team at Nelson\Nygaard to submit a draft Service Plan with recommendations for new and revised service policies and recommendations for specific service changes. The highlights include:

**Policies and Practices:**

- Establishing a Transit-Emphasis Corridors Policy
- Establish a Performance Standers and Service Review Policy
• Establish Route Deviation Standard
• Revise Bus Stop Spacing Standards
• Study headways based scheduling for School Term UCSC Service
• Address the need for better and more abundant transit data

Draft Service Plans:

• Realignments of Local Santa Cruz service
• Reschedule UCSC School Term service
• Reallocate Mid-County service to establish better weekend service
• Realign Cabrillo/South County service to better utilize Soquel

Attachment A is a detailed presentation of the Draft Service Plan.

While the SRTP project is well underway, there are many elements still being developed. Additional outreach to stakeholders and stakeholder groups focusing on the Draft Service Plan as well as the Capital Improvement Plan and the Marketing Plan is underway in October. After edits and incorporating comments, the entire SRTP will be presented in draft form by mid November. The SRTP is on schedule to be recommended for adoption by mid December.

Attachment: Presentation
DEMOGRAPHICS
Who are we serving?
The Basics

### Age

- Under 16: 2%
- 18-24: 42%
- 25-34: 17%
- 35-44: 10%
- 45-54: 12%
- 55-65: 11%
- 65 or older: 6%

(n = 625)

### Income

- Under $10,000: 38%
- $10,000-$19,999: 21%
- $20,000-$29,999: 11%
- $30,000-$39,999: 8%
- $40,000-$49,999: 7%
- $50,000-$59,999: 4%
- Over $60,000: 8%

(n = 553)

### Employment

- Student: 31%
- Employed part-time: 25%
- Employed full-time: 25%
- Unemployed: 9%
- Retired: 7%
- Other: 2%
- Visiting the area: 1%

(n = 714)

---

**Accessing Transit**

### Trip Planning

- METRO website: 25%
- Headways: 35%
- Information on bus stops: 20%
- Google transit: 15%
- Other: 5%

(n = 624)

### Trip Purpose

- Work: 45%
- College University: 10%
- Personal Business: 5%
- Shopping: 10%
- School K-12: 10%
- Recreation or sports: 5%
- Medical: 5%
- Other: 10%
- Airport: 5%

(n = 649)
Accessing Transit

To Bus Stop

From Bus Stop

SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

How well are we doing?
ON-TIME PERFORMANCE

System Wide:
- 70% on time
- 8% early
- 14% late (>5-10min)
- 8% missed (>10min)

Mainline Routes:
- Route 66: 91% on time
- Route 68: 70% on time
- Route 69A/W: 62% on time
- Route 71: 50% on time
- Route 91X: 67% on time
The recession and service fluctuations have greatly impacted overall performance.

Since 2010:

- Passengers per hour: -9.6%
- Farebox Recovery: -11.5%
- System Ridership: -4.2%

The recession and service fluctuations have greatly impacted overall performance.

RIDER SURVEY RESULTS

What do our riders need?
Perception of Service

- Safety
- Bus arrives on time
- Frequency of service
- Service runs early enough
- Rider information
- Service runs late enough

Priorities for Improvements

- More frequent service
- More routes
- Later evening service
- Reduced travel times
- More direct service
- Earlier morning service
- Route closer to my home
- Route closer to my job
- Better service information
- Improved transfer connections

Other

N = 343
INITIAL FINDINGS
Draft Recommendations and Service Plans

DATA
Santa Cruz METRO has limited Data:

• Lack of GPS system - cannot monitor on-time performance
• Using farebox data for ridership isn’t always accurate
• No boarding / alighting data per stop
• Lack of regularly performed ridership surveys

The SRTP will address strategies to address these needs in the Capital Element of the plan
SERVICE POLICIES

Santa Cruz METRO has a need to adopt a set of service planning policies to guide the agency.

Four Elements:

• Transit-Emphasis Corridors
• Performance Standards and Review
• Route Deviation Standards
• Bus Stop Spacing Standards

DRAFT SERVICE PLAN

UCSC:

• Standardize and operate Routes 15 and 16 every fifteen minutes
• Increase the number of “short” Route 15 and 16
• Pursue alternative scheduling practices - Headways based schedules
• Exchange Route 12 for Route 68

Local Santa Cruz:

• Conduct a performance review on Route 3
• Realign Routes 4 and 8

Mid-County:

• Reallocated the Route 54 to establish weekend service of Route 55
• Reallocate the Route 54 to add additional trip of Route 56
DRAFT SERVICE PLAN

Cabrillo / South County:

• Realign Route 71 to incorporate the Transit-Emphasis Corridors (Soquel Ave, Main St.)
• South of State Park Dr. - realign Route 71 and Route 69W
• Reallocate Route 91X to restore the Route 70

Highway 17 & SLV:

• Realign The Highway 17 Express to use Soquel and Ocean St. to access Hwy 17
• Realign Route 35/35A to use Soquel and Ocean St. to access Hwy 17
• Establishes Ocean Street as a Transit-Emphasis Corridor

NEXT STEPS

Remaining Elements of the SRTP:

• Financial Plan
• Capital/Fleet Plan
• Marketing Study
• Implementation Plan

Next round of Stakeholder Interviews and Committee Presentations in early/mid October.

First presentation of the Full Draft SRTP is scheduled for mid November.
RECOMMENDATION

Receive a presentation on the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) LiveMaps tool.

BACKGROUND

As part of the development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy, AMBAG with the assistance of RBF Consulting developed an online GIS tool called LiveMaps. AMBAG staff will provide a demonstration of this interactive mapping tool at the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting. The Live Maps tool is available online at www.movingforwardmb.org.

DISCUSSION

This new online tool allows jurisdictions and the public to view geospatial data in a live interactive format. The goal of the tool was to consolidate the spatial data holdings in a standardized and accessible format, while allowing a dynamic interface and easy to use site.

The LiveMaps tool can be used to view regional data sets such as land use, natural features, and transportation data. As you select data layers and zoom in/out, geospatial data layers become active and auto labeling occurs. The Moving Forward Monterey Bay Mapping Tool has key features such as: zoom to city (drop down list), zoom in/out, home page, pan (hand symbol), info, and printing of the map for use in reports. In addition, there is a slider tool that enables the user to adjust the transparency of the data layers that show over the background map. Users of the tool can also specify the background map, which includes a robust and seamless view of aerial imagery, street maps, and National Geographic Map.

The online mapping tool does not require the user to have proprietary ESRI mapping software, but does require the user to have an internet connection and Microsoft Silverlight. The Moving Forward Monterey Bay Mapping Tool was developed in ESRI 10.1 software using ArcServer and Microsoft Silverlight. If you are using Macintosh OS, you will need to download Silverlight and use a compatible
browser (Firefox 3, Safari 3 or 4) for displaying Silverlight based pages. Future updates to this online mapping tool will roll out as the AMBAG data sets are standardized and compiled as regional layers.

The development of the LiveMaps tool was coordinated with local jurisdictions within the region, the Fort Ord Reuse Authority, the California State University Monterey Bay, and the University of California, Santa Cruz.
TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
FROM: Cody Meyer, Planner, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
RE: Regional Bicycle Model Web Tool

RECOMMENDATION

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

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

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

MBSSST Final Master Plan Contents

The Final Master Plan is organized into chapters as follows:

i. Executive Summary – Provides an overview of the project area and the sections summarized below.

1) Introduction – The project’s history, evolution, major milestones completed, project scope and the Plan’s relationship to other planning efforts for non-motorized mobility are described. The “braided trail network” concept is introduced and the goal of providing a comprehensive system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities with proximity to the coast and separated from motor vehicle traffic to the greatest extent possible is addressed. How the Master Plan is organized and what public outreach has been conducted to date for its development is outlined.

2) Goals, Objectives, and Policies – Within the planning and policy context, this chapter provides the goals of generally desired outcomes, measurable and specific objectives, as well as policies related to implementation of the project’s goals and objectives.

3) Master Plan Setting – The planning area is divided into three major areas or “reaches”, each containing a set of characteristics that will require coordinated treatment types. The northern, central and southern reaches are identified and opportunities and constraints for each area are discussed. Additionally, activity centers are summarized since access to desirable destinations is integral to vibrant trail systems.

4) Trail Alignments – The entire Trail Network is divided into twenty (20) segments as described. Segment proposals indentify trail treatment types through cross-section graphics, show spur trails as well as improvements needed to existing facilities. Cost estimates are provided for the number of miles, amenities, at-grade crossings and new bridge structures. Consideration is given to right-of-way width, proximity to activity centers, and network connectivity that the segment would provide.
5) Trail Design Standards – A trail functions best when it is seamless to the users and is constructed to uniform standards as it traverses through different jurisdictions and geographic areas. This chapter addresses standards for each facility type, treatments for crossings and intersections and universal design guidelines to provide accessibility to the highest number of users. Amenities, shared use conflict reduction measures, dog and equestrian uses and other trail functionality considerations are also addressed.

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

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

Next Steps

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

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

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

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

SUMMARY

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

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

*Note on Attachment: In an effort to reduce paper use, the full Final Master Plan is not attached but rather made available on the RTC’s website (http://sccrtc.org/projects/multi-modal/monterey-bay-sanctuary-scenic-trail/mbsst-master-plan/), at the RTC’s Santa Cruz and Watsonville offices and at various libraries.
Welcome to the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan!

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

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

Regards,

Sam Farr
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I.I OVERVIEW

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

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

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

I.II MASTER PLAN PURPOSE

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

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

These trails and other existing on-road bicycle and pedestrian facilities form the braided network of trails that is the MBSST Network project. The continuous MBSST Network also proposes gap closures within the project area and access to other desirable destinations, as well as to the coast. These trails, on-street facilities, and natural surface paths will form the approximately 50-mile bike/pedestrian MBSST Network.
PROJECT HISTORY

The Coastal Rail Trail, serving as the system’s spine, is a result of a 20-year-long effort to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, which was first established in 1876. In the early 1990s, the RTC began efforts to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way. Originally owned by Southern Pacific, the property was sold to Union Pacific in 1996. In 2001, the RTC officially began negotiating with then-owner Union Pacific. Over the next decade, negotiations and due diligence work were conducted. On May 6, 2010, the RTC decided to purchase 31 miles of the 32-mile Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line from Union Pacific for $14.2 million, with $11 million coming from the California voter-approved Proposition 116. On January 19, 2011, the RTC secured approval and funding from the California Transportation Commission for the purchase of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. On October 12, 2012, the RTC successfully closed escrow, placing title of the branch line into public ownership with the commitment of facilitating passenger and freight service, as well as creating a multi-use bicycle and pedestrian trail.

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

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

GOAL 1:  TRAIL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

Define a continuous trail alignment that maximizes opportunities for a multi-use bicycle and pedestrian trail separate from roadway vehicle traffic.

GOAL 2:  ENHANCE APPRECIATION OF THE COASTAL ENVIRONMENT

Develop public trail access along the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary to enhance appreciation, understanding, and protection of this special resource.

GOAL 3:  EDUCATION AND AWARENESS

Promote awareness of the trail, trail opportunities, and trail user responsibilities.

GOAL 4:  IMPLEMENTATION

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

GOAL 5:  OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Develop the necessary organizational staffing and funding mechanisms to ensure that all trail segments, trailheads, and accessory features are safe, well-maintained, and well-managed.
PUBLIC INPUT

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

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

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

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

WORKSHOP SERIES #1

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

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

WORKSHOP SERIES #2

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

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

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

As a result of this interactive process, Table 6.9 in Section 6 was developed to represent community preferences. Table 6.10 includes the cumulative sum of each participating community member’s top two preferences. Community input was one of nine prioritization criteria utilized to determine the top segments per trail reach.
The Master Plan organizes the proposed trail alignment into two categories: reaches and segments. A reach is defined as a geographic area identified by regional similarities, such as the urbanized areas of Santa Cruz, Capitola, and Aptos. The Master Plan area is divided into the Northern, Central, and Watsonville Reaches, which are further explained in Sections 3.3 through 3.5.

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

**NORTHERN REACH DESCRIPTION**

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

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

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

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

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

**WATSONVILLE REACH DESCRIPTION**

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

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

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

NORTHERN REACH PROJECTS AND COSTS

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

These segments provide gap closures to existing MBSST Network segments, provide access to numerous activity centers, connect to the coastal edge and beaches, and provide connectivity to other existing local and regional bikeway and pedestrian facilities. Segments 3 and 4 may require a bit more lead time to resolve physical design constraints, right-of-way conflicts, complex coastal connections, and other budgetary challenges. However, these segments serve to close the gap in the overall MBSST Network, which will help elevate their importance for funding. Segment 5 is particularly in a good position for implementation as it falls within the railroad right-of-way corridor with minimal private land interference or significant environmental impacts. Also, equestrian use is appropriate for the Northern Reach, particularly in Segments 5 and 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Document Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1    | Davenport and Wilder Ranch    | 2.75    | Subsegment 5.1 proposed improvements include:  
• 1.49 miles (7,890 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the coastal-side rail right-of-way  
• 1.26 miles (6,680 LF) native soil coastal bluff trails and coastal access between Davenport Beach and Yellow Bank Beach (this distance is comprised of Segments 5A, 5B, and 5C)  
• One (1) rail crossing at spur trail connecting Davenport parking lot to rail trail, parking lot improvements to existing dirt lot, coastal side of Highway 1 in Davenport near the Davenport Overlook  
• One (1) new signalized at-grade road crossing of Highway 1 in Davenport  
• One (1) rail crossing at the Highway 1 crossing  
• One (1) private road crossing  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $3,365,904      | 4-25 to 4-34 |
| 5.2    | Davenport and Wilder Ranch    | 4.18    | Subsegment 5.2 proposed improvements include:  
• 2.58 miles (13,630 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the coastal side rail right-of-way  
• 1.60 miles (8,430 LF) native soil coastal bluff trails (this distance is comprised of Segments 5D and 5E)  
• One (1) rail crossing at upper Scaroni Rd.  
• One (1) road crossing of upper Scaroni Rd. and two (2) additional private crossings  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $4,997,232      | 4-25 to 4-34 |
| 5.3    | Davenport and Wilder Ranch    | 3.62    | Subsegment 5.3 proposed improvements include:  
• 3.51 miles (18,520 LF) multi-use path (Class I) along the coastal side rail right-of-way  
• 0.11 miles (570 LF) native soil coastal bluff trails (Segment 5F)  
• One (1) rail crossing at lower Scaroni Rd.  
• One (1) road crossing of lower Scaroni Rd. and eleven (11) additional private crossings  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $6,643,648      | 4-25 to 4-34 |
### TABLE A - Northern Reach Projects Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Document Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24     | 1 - Waddell Bluffs               | 1.06 miles | • 0.87 miles (4,600 LF) Class III on-street/road shoulder bike route  
• 0.19 miles (1,000 LF) unpaved native soil trail  
• Unpaved roadway shoulder on coastal side of Highway 1  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $107,120      | 4-5 to 4-8               |
| 24     | 2 - Greyhound Rock/Cal Poly Bluffs | 4.77 miles | • 4.77 miles of primarily existing road shoulder improvements due to limited available space and adjacent public land on the coastal side of State Highway 1  
• Routine road edge clearing, signs, and shoulder pavement striping  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $308,032      | 4-9 to 4-14              |
| 21     | 4 - Davenport Landing/End of Railroad Tracks | 3.64 miles | • 1.38 miles (7,300 LF) multi-use rail trail (Class I)  
• 1.41 miles (7,470 LF) bluff trail (Segment 4A)  
• 0.85 miles (4,510 LF) on-street bike lanes (Segment 4B)  
• One (1) Highway 1 crossing at Davenport Landing Rd.  
• One (1) rail crossing in front of cement plant  
• Three (3) road crossings  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $2,685,424    | 4-21 to 4-24             |
| 16     | 3 - Upper Coast Dairies at Scott Creek | 1.11 miles | • 1.11 miles (5,870 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I)  
• One (1) preengineered bike/pedestrian bridge, 150-foot span  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $2,550,096    | 4-15 to 4-20             |
| **TOTALS** |                                  | **21.13 miles** |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | **$20,657,456** |                         |
CENTRAL REACH PROJECTS AND COSTS

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

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

### TABLE B - Central Reach Projects

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Document Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 26     | 18 - Watsonville Slough Open Space Trails | 4.01 miles | • 1.20 miles (6,350 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the inland rail right-of-way  
• 2.81 miles (14,820 LF) Class II bike lanes (Segments 18A and 18B)  
• One (1) rail culvert crossing  
• Two (2) road crossings (one [1] at Lee Rd. and one [1] at Ohlone Pkwy.)  
• This segment also includes fencing for agricultural operations and safety; additional fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $3,010,720 | 4-99 to 4-104 |
| 23     | 19 - Walker Street, City of Watsonville | 0.47 miles | • 0.29 miles (1,510 LF) existing Class II bike lane along Walker St. right-of-way  
• 0.18 miles (950 LF) proposed Class II bike lane along Walker St. right-of-way (Segment 19A)  
• New sidewalks on the inland side of Walker St. from the intersection of W. Riverside Dr. to the end of Walker St., connecting to the Pajaro River  
• One (1) at-grade street crossing at Riverside Dr.  
• Additional fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $381,280 | 4-105 to 4-108 |
| 20     | 20 - Pajaro River | 0.74 miles | • 0.74 miles (3,930 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the inland rail right-of-way  
• One (1) new preengineered bike/pedestrian bridge at the Pajaro River crossing, 200-foot span  
• 3,930 feet of fencing for agricultural operations and safety; additional fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $3,009,136 | 4-109 to 4-112 |
### TABLE C - Watsonville Reach Projects Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Improvements</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Document Reference Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20     | 16 - Ellicott Slough | 2.66 miles | • 1.78 miles (9,400 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the rail right-of-way  
• 0.40 miles (2,100 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) coastal trail (Segment 16A)  
• 0.48 miles (2,530 LF) Class II bike lanes (Segment 16B)  
• Two (2) at-grade road crossings (Spring Valley Rd., Peaceful Valley Rd.)  
• One (1) at-grade rail crossing (Spring Valley Rd.)  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $3,613,600 | 4-89 to 4-92 |
| 20     | 15 - Manresa State Beach | 1.37 miles | • 1.37 miles (7,240 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the inland rail right-of-way  
• Two (2) at-grade road crossings (Sumner Ave., Camino Al Mar) and two (2) additional private crossings  
• Two (2) preengineered rail bridge crossings (one [1] 300-foot span at La Selva, and one [1] 225-foot span at San Andreas Rd.)  
• One (1) rail at-grade crossing (Camino Al Mar)  
• Fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $4,735,680 | 4-83 to 4-88 |
| 14     | 17 - Harkins Slough | 4.0 miles | • 4.0 miles (21,140 LF) multi-use paved path (Class I) along the inland rail right-of-way  
• Seven (7) rail bridge/culvert crossings of varying lengths  
• One (1) private farm road crossing (1/2 mile west of Lee Rd.)  
• One (1) private road crossing at Buena Vista Dr. and one (1) additional private crossing  
• This segment also includes fencing for agricultural operations and safety; additional fencing may be considered when project is implemented | $19,961,888 | 4-93 to 4-98 |
| **TOTALS** |                     | **13.25 miles** |                                                                                                                                  | **$34,712,304** |                       |
Figure A  Summary of cost by trail facility type
I.VIII PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

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

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

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

The following describes implementing entities’ responsibilities in greater detail:

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

I.IX NEXT STEPS

This Master Plan is a planning-level study of the location and configuration of the MBSST Network. Implementation of actual MBSST Network projects will require additional site-specific study, planning, and design. Each project will require thorough environmental study and documentation, review, and permitting consistent with the complexity of the improvements, sensitive resources, and regulatory and easement requirements. A primary objective of the Master Plan is to identify and, if possible, avoid significant constraints, and address the anticipated implementation criteria and requirements.
TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: State Legislative Update and Active Transportation Program

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) receive legislative updates and provide input on the state Active Transportation Program.

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) monitors and provides input on federal and state actions that could impact transportation planning, programming and project implementation in Santa Cruz County.

DISCUSSION

State Legislative Activities

Last month, the state legislature completed the first year of a two-year session. A list of several state transportation bills that could impact the RTC or project sponsors is attached (Attachment 1). The Governor has until October 13 to sign or veto bills. About 45% of the bills introduced this session failed to pass this year. Bills that were not approved by the legislature by September 13 may be carried over as “Two-Year” bills when the Legislature reconvenes on January 6, 2014. The full text of bills and analysis of most bills is available online at http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/bilinfo.html.

Active Transportation Program

With Senate Bill 99 (SB99), the legislature approved creation of a new Active Transportation Program. The bill consolidates funds from the new federal Transportation Alternatives program (TAP), state and federal Safe Routes to Schools programs, and Bicycle Transportation Program into one program, but also provides the popular Safe Routes to Schools Program with its historic amount of funding for the first two years. Whereas the RTC traditionally received a formula share of federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds, MAP-21 replaced the TE program with TAP and eliminated direct allocations of TAP funds to regions without an urban population over 200,000. Regions with urbanized areas over 200,000 will receive direct allocations of 40% of the ATP. Bicycle and pedestrian projects in Santa Cruz County will compete in a statewide competitive program. The bill left many details of the program up to the California Transportation Commission. The CTC is holding several meetings this month to gather input on ATP guidelines and
implementation. **Staff will seek input from ITAC members on ATP development at this meeting.** CTC staff has indicated its intent to establish guidelines for the program in early 2014 and issue a call for project in Spring 2014.

**55% Voter Threshold**
Legislators introduced several constitutional amendments proposing to modify the voter threshold for local revenue measures to 55%. However, none of these bills made it through the legislature in 2013. Staff will continue to work with partners throughout the state, including the “Aspiring Counties” group, to advance this effort in 2014.

**Cap and Trade Revenues for Transportation**
The investment plan for cap and trade revenues is still under development. All of this year’s revenues were designated as a loan to the general fund in the state budget and the administration delayed its "final" investment plan when it became clear that there was going to be a loan. The draft plan designated some of the funds to sustainable planning, livable communities (SB 375), SHOPP, and High Speed Rail (HSR). According to sources in the administration, the scoping plan update will inform the development of the revised investment plan. However the final determination on how cap and trade revenues are distributed will be subject to Department of Finance recommendations for the state budget and the Governor’s January budget proposal.

**Delay of Federal Transit Administration Funding Due to PEPRA**
The legislature also approved AB 1222 (Bloom), which exempts transit agencies from the state’s pension reform bill enacted last year, Public Employees Pension Reform Act (PEPRA), in order to end the freeze on Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds as a result of union complaints to the U.S. Department of Labor. In 2013 the total funds being held amounted to approximately $1 billion with a project total of funds at risk of $1.6 billion. Included in the federal funds being held is $5.5 million in Santa Cruz METRO operating funds.

**SUMMARY**
This report provides an overview of state legislative activities that could impact transportation planning, programming and projects in Santa Cruz County.

Attachment:
  1. State Legislative Tracking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Last Amend</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACA 6 (Gatto)</td>
<td>Constitutional Amendments</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 8 (Blumenfield)</td>
<td>Local Government Financing: Voter Approval</td>
<td>4/4/13</td>
<td>Senate Governance &amp; Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 4 (Liu)</td>
<td>Local Government Transportation Projects</td>
<td>8/28/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 8 (Corbett)</td>
<td>Local Government Transportation Projects</td>
<td>5/21/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 9 (Corbett)</td>
<td>Local Government: Economic Development Special Taxes</td>
<td>5/21/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 11 (Hancock)</td>
<td>Local Government: Special Taxes</td>
<td>5/21/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bills that may directly impact RTC or of special interest to RTC*
### Assembly Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Last Amend</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 8 (Perea)</td>
<td>Alternative Fuel and Vehicle Technologies: Funding Programs</td>
<td>Extends the authorization and various funding sources for the following four alternative fuel and vehicle technology programs until January 1, 2024: (1) the Carl Moyer Program administered by local air districts; (2) the Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB); (3) the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program administered by the California Energy Commission; and (4) the Air Quality Improvement Program administered by CARB.</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 14 (B. Lowenthal)</td>
<td>State Freight Plan</td>
<td>Requires the Transportation Agency to prepare a state freight plan to govern the immediate and long-range planning activities and capital investments of the state with respect to the movement of freight.</td>
<td>5/6/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 53 (J. Perez)</td>
<td>Biennial California Economic Development Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Requires the Governor’s Office of Business &amp; Economic Development to lead the preparation of a California Economic Development Strategic Plan. Includes: (1) recommendations regarding an economic development strategy for the state; (2) governmental and non-governmental impediments to economic development, and a list of legislative, regulatory and administrative reforms necessary to ease those impediments, and improve the business climate and economy of the state; (3) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the state’s economic development programs; (4) a list of key industries where the state should focus its economic development efforts; (5) strategies to foster job growth and economic development covering all state agencies, offices, boards, and commissions that have economic development responsibilities; (6) an evaluation of proposals, policies and goals developed at the regional level; (7) strengths and weaknesses of the California economy and the state’s prospects for future economic prosperity; (8) existing, emerging and declining industries in California and elsewhere; (9) effectiveness of California’s economic development programs in creating and retaining jobs and attracting industries; (10) adequacy of state and local physical and economic infrastructure; (11) opportunities to leverage federal resources for state priorities; and (12) tactics for attracting private capital to the state and investment in state priority areas.</td>
<td>9/3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 164 (Wieckowski)</td>
<td>Infrastructure Projects: Performance and Payment Bonds</td>
<td>Requires a lease agreement between a governmental entity undertaking an infrastructure project and a private entity to include: (1) performance bonds as security to ensure the completion of the construction of the facility; and (2) payment bonds to secure the payment of claims of laborers, mechanics and material suppliers employed on the work under contract.</td>
<td>6/5/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 179 (Bocanegra)</td>
<td>Electronic Transit Fare Collection Systems</td>
<td>Prohibits a transportation agency from selling or providing personally identifiable information of a person obtained pursuant to the person’s subscribing to an electronic transit fare collection system, subject to specified exceptions. Requires a transportation agency that employs an electronic transit fare collection system to establish a privacy policy regarding the collection and use of personally identifiable information.</td>
<td>9/4/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 185 (R. Hernandez)</td>
<td>Open and Public Meetings</td>
<td>Provides that an audio or video recording of an open and public meeting made at the direction of a local agency may be erased or destroyed two years after the recording, but not sooner.</td>
<td>4/23/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* AB 204 (Wilk)</td>
<td>Green Vehicles: Reg Fees</td>
<td>Declares the intent of the Legislature to enact a bill to impose a fee in conjunction with registration on green vehicles to address the costs of those vehicles using public roads and highways.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 206 (Dickinson)</td>
<td>Sacramento Regional Transit: Three-Position Bike Racks</td>
<td>Allows the Sacramento Regional Transit District (RTD) to install folding devices attached to the front of its buses that are designed and used exclusively for transporting bicycles if: (1) the device does not extend more than 40 inches from the front of the bus when fully deployed; and (2) the handlebars of the bicycles being transported do not extend more than 46 inches from the front of the bus. Requires RTD to establish a route review committee prior to the installation of the initial folding device on a bus that is 45 feet in length.</td>
<td>4/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* AB 210 (Wieckowski)</td>
<td>Alameda and Contra Costa Counties: Taxes</td>
<td>Until December 31, 2020, allows the Counties of Alameda and Contra Costa to impose a transactions and use tax for the support of countywide transportation programs at a rate of not more than 0.5 percent that would, in combination with all other such taxes imposed in the county, exceed the state’s limit of 2 percent.</td>
<td>4/23/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Last Amend</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 220 (Ting) Low-Emission Vehicles</td>
<td>Until January 1, 2018, provides either a partial exemption or a partial exclusion from existing sales and use taxes with respect to the sale of specified low-emission vehicles.</td>
<td>4/30/13</td>
<td>Assembly Rev &amp; Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 225 (Nestande) Medium-Speed Electric Vehicles</td>
<td>Authorizes the operation of a medium-speed electric vehicle at speeds of no more than 45 miles per hour on a roadway with a speed limit that does not exceed 45 miles per hour.</td>
<td>5/9/13</td>
<td>Senate T&amp;H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* AB 229 (J. Perez) Infrastructure and Revitalization Financing Districts</td>
<td>Authorizes cities to form an infrastructure and revitalization financing district to finance the following types of facilities and projects of communitywide significance: (1) highways, interchanges, ramps, bridges, arterial streets, parking facilities, and transit facilities; (2) sewage treatment and water reclamation plants and interceptor pipes; (3) facilities and watershed lands used for the collection and treatment of water for urban uses; (4) flood management, including levees, bypasses, dams, retention basins, and drainage channels; (5) child care facilities; (6) libraries; (7) parks, recreational facilities, open space, and habitat restoration; (8) facilities for the transfer and disposal of solid waste; (9) brownfields restoration and other environmental mitigation; (10) purchase of land and property for development purposes and related site improvements; (11) acquisition, construction or repair of housing for rental or purchase, including multipurpose facilities; (12) acquisition, construction or repair of commercial or industrial structures for private use; (13) projects on a former military base; and (14) projects that implement a sustainable communities strategy prepared pursuant to SB 375. Prohibits an infrastructure and revitalization financing district from being used to finance routine maintenance, repair work, or the costs of ongoing operations or providing services of any kind. Allows an infrastructure and revitalization financing district to fund projects in any portion of a redevelopment project area, former redevelopment project area or former military base. Authorizes the creation of an infrastructure and revitalization financing district, adoption of a financing plan, and the issuance of bonds for implementing a financing plan with a two-thirds vote of landowners within the proposed district.</td>
<td>8/12/13</td>
<td>Assm Floor: Concurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 243 (Dickinson) Infrastructure and Revit. Financing Dist</td>
<td>Same as AB 229, but only requires 55 percent vote of landowners within the proposed district (as compared to 2/3).</td>
<td>8/19/13</td>
<td>Assm Floor: Concurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 266 (Blumenfield) HOV Lanes: White Sticker Program</td>
<td>Unless pre-empted by federal law, extends the authorization for battery electric, hydrogen fuel cell and compressed natural gas vehicles to use high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes regardless of the number of occupants to January 1, 2019. Shall become operative only if SB 286 (Yee) is also enacted.</td>
<td>8/19/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: 9/28/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 278 (Gatto) Low-Carbon Fuel Standard: Food Supply Sustainability</td>
<td>When promulgating regulations or other policies on the carbon intensity of fuels, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to consider all of the following sustainability factors: (1) the full life-cycle carbon emissions from the production of a fuel; (2) the positive or negative effect of a fuel source on the domestic food supply, including crop displacement, food prices, food shipping, and market conditions; and (3) the direct and indirect land-use changes resulting from fuel production. Requires CARB to consider the state of the fuel market and technologies. By December 1, 2014, requires CARB to: (1) include mechanisms and policies that favor low-carbon fuels with the highest possible sustainability based on the aforementioned factors; and (2) encourage incentives for sustainable fuels produced without food stock or displacement of food crops.</td>
<td>9/3/13</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 284 (Quirk) Road to 2050 Board</td>
<td>Requires CARB to convene a “Road to 2050 Board” and submit a report to the Governor and Legislature regarding the impacts to California of global warming, as well as mitigation and adaption plans to combat these impacts. Includes impacts to the state’s water supply, public health, agriculture, coastline, and forestry. Requires the report to be used, on an advisory basis, to guide key infrastructure decision-making processes and policies at the local and statewide levels.</td>
<td>5/8/13</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Last Amend</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * AB 294 (Holden)   | ERAF Revenues

Creates the Local-State Joint Investment Partnership Program. Allows certain local government entities, including an infrastructure financing district or any special district, until January 1, 2020, to utilize the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) portion of incremental property tax revenues to finance certain kinds of public works projects that further state policy. Includes (1) city streets, county highways and state highways; (2) sewage collection and treatment; (3) water treatment and distribution; (4) facilities for the collection and treatment of water for urban uses; (5) drainage, water supply and flood control; (6) educational facilities; (7) parks and recreational facilities; (8) solid waste collection and disposal; (9) public transit; (10) power and communications; (11) brownfield clean-up that promotes infill housing, and other related infill development consistent with regional and local plans; (12) economic development facilities; and (13) development of affordable housing. Authorizes the bank to approve up to a maximum of 15 applications or a total of $50 million in allocations for all approved projects, whichever comes first. The local entity may issue bonds against ERAF funds. | 5/6/13     | Assembly Appropriations Committee |
| AB 313 (Frazier)    | Electronic Wireless Communications Devices

Prohibits a person from driving a motor vehicle while using an electronic wireless communications device to write, send or read a text-based communications, even if the device is specifically designed and configured to allow voice-operated and hands-free operation.                                                                                                                                                        | As Introduced | Assembly Appropriations Committee |
| AB 401 (Daly)      | Design-Build Contracting: State Highway Projects

Until January 1, 2024, allows Caltrans to use design-build contracting for 10 projects on the state highway system, and regional transportation agencies, as defined, to use design-build contracting for an unlimited number of projects on local expressways or the state highway system based on either best value or lowest responsible bidder. Requires Caltrans to perform construction inspection services for any project on or interfacing with the state highway system where a regional transportation agency uses design-build contracting as authorized by this bill. | 9/6/13     | Signed into Law: 10/5/13         |
| * AB 416 (Gordon)  | Local Emission Reduction Program

Requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to create the Local Emission Reduction Program to provide grants and other financial assistance on a competitive basis to local entities to develop and implement greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects, subject to appropriations from the General Fund by the Legislature. Projects must maximize the ability to achieve one or more of the following: (1) decrease air or water pollution; (2) reduce the consumption of natural resources or energy; (3) provide opportunities to achieve greenhouse gas emissions reductions in ways that increase localized energy resources; (4) promote public-private partnerships to implement energy efficiency and clean energy projects with financing incentives for residential and commercial facilities; (5) increase the reliability of local water supplies; (6) increase solid waste diversion from landfills; (7) increase electric vehicle infrastructure; (8) achieve greenhouse gas emissions reductions in ways that reduce vehicle miles traveled; or (9) prevent conversion of agricultural, forest and open space lands to uses that result in higher greenhouse gas emissions. Requires CARB to give priority to projects that demonstrate one or more of the following characteristics: (1) regional implementation; (2) the ability to leverage additional public and private funding; (3) the potential for co-benefits or multi-benefit attributes; (4) the potential for the project or program to be replicated; or (5) consideration of geographic and socioeconomic issues. | 4/4/13     | Assembly Appropriations Committee |
| AB 417 (Frazier)    | CEQA: Bicycle Transportation Plans

Exempts from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) through January 1, 2018 (unless extended) a bicycle transportation plan prepared for an urbanized area for restriping of streets and highways; bicycle parking and storage; signal timing to improve street and highway intersection operations; and related signage for bicycles, pedestrians and vehicles.                                                                                                                                                                      | 6/13/13    | Signed into Law: 10/7/13         |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Last Amend</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AB 528 (Lowenthal)**  
State Rail Plan | Requires the State Rail Plan to contain: (1) a statement of compliance with the requirements set forth in the federal Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008; (2) plans for a comprehensive and integrated statewide passenger rail system; (3) a review of all high-speed rail routes; the freight rail system; conventional intercity and commuter rail systems; and urban rail system connections to high-speed, conventional intercity and commuter rail systems; (4) an identification of the improvements that have utility to both freight and passenger rail services in the state; (5) an inventory of the existing rail transportation system, services and facilities in the state, and an analysis of the role of rail transportation within the state’s overall transportation system; and (6) a freight rail element that discusses environmental impacts, financing issues, intermodal connections, current system deficiencies, service objectives, and new technologies. High-Speed Rail Business Plan to include an estimate and description of the total anticipated federal, state, local, and other funds for construction and operation; reasonably foreseeable risks project may encounter related to finances, patronage, right-of-way acquisitions, environmental clearances, construction, equipment, and technology; and strategies, processes or other actions to manage risks. | 6/4/13 | Signed into Law: Chapter #237 |
| **AB 574 (B. Lowenthal)**  
Sustainable Communities Infrastructure Program | Establishes the Sustainable Communities Infrastructure Program to provide a statutory framework for the distribution of any cap-and-trade revenues that are allocated for transportation purposes. Requires such revenues to be allocated to transportation projects that do all of the following: (1) provide cost-effective and feasible reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; (2) combine transportation investments with local land-use modifications and other local policy changes to provide greenhouse gas emission reductions and, where feasible, to achieve other public benefits; (3) implement either an approved sustainable communities strategy or alternative planning strategy pursuant to SB 375 (Steinberg) within existing urbanized or developed areas in regions with a metropolitan planning organization (MPO); (4) are selected through a competitive process based on cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions using criteria for evaluating such benefits established by CARB; and (5) comply with the requirements to benefit economically disadvantaged communities pursuant to current state law. Requires the agency responsible for the development of the regional transportation plan (RTP) to be the regional granting authority for these revenues for its area. Requires these revenues to be allocated to regional granting authorities on a per capita basis. Requires CARB, in consultation with CTC and SGC, to establish the criteria for the development and implementation of the regional grant programs. Requires regional entity to allocate funds through a competitive public process based on greenhouse gas emission reductions. Eligible uses of revenues: (1) transportation network and demand management; (2) public transportation, including operations, maintenance and capital costs; (3) road and bridge maintenance, complete streets, bike projects, pedestrian safety enhancements, safe routes to school, and urban greening; (4) clean transportation fueling infrastructure and support; (5) multi-modal network connectivity to reduce travel distances and improve access to parks, schools, jobs, housing, and markets for rural and urban communities; (6) development and adoption of local plans and land-use policies that help to implement regional plans; (7) community infrastructure to support transit-oriented development, affordable housing, infill in existing urbanized areas, and small walkable communities in rural neighborhoods; (8) multi-use facilities and accommodations for bicyclists, pedestrians and neighborhood electric vehicles; and (9) interregional rail modernization and related community infrastructure. | 4/15/13 | Assembly Appropriations Committee |
| **AB 662 (Atkins)**  
Infrastructure Financing Districts: Redevelopment Areas | Allows an infrastructure financing district to include any portion of a former redevelopment project area within its boundaries. | 9/6/13 | Governor’s Office, not signed as of 10/10 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Last Amend</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 716 (Quirk-Silva) State Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td>Requires the five-year state infrastructure plan to include an analysis of investment coordination opportunities related to infill and transit-oriented development. For purposes of the plan, expands the definition of infrastructure to include housing.</td>
<td>6/18/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 730 (Alejo) Monterey-Salinas Transit District: Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>Exempts the Monterey-Salinas Transit District from the requirement to seek voter approval prior to issuing revenue bonds, if two-thirds vote of its Board approve. Authorizes the district to pledge revenues or other dollars available to it from any source, including a transactions and use tax, for payment of such bonds. Max. of $50 million in revenue bonds may be issued. Bonds issued for the acquisition of equipment shall be of a duration that does not exceed the useful life of the equipment.</td>
<td>9/3/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: 9/27/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 738 (Harkey) Public Entity Liability: Bicycles</td>
<td>Specifies that a public entity or an employee of a public entity acting within his or her official capacity is not liable for an injury caused to a person riding a bicycle while traveling on a roadway where the public entity has provided a bike lane.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Judiciary Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 749 (Gorell) Public-Private Partnerships</td>
<td>Extends the statutory authority for Caltrans and regional transportation agencies to utilize public-private partnerships for transportation projects to January 1, 2022. Declares the intent of the Legislature that a project utilizing a public-private partnership should have the following characteristics: (1) a revenue source; (2) the purpose of constructing additional capacity for the transportation system; and (3) to the extent the project is proposed solely by a regional transportation agency and does not involve the use of any state funds, the regional transportation agency and its private-sector partners should be entirely responsible for the risks associated with the project, and the state should be protected from any liability associated with the project.</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 755 (Ammiano) Bridges: Suicide Barriers</td>
<td>Requires a project study report prepared for any new project involving the construction of a new bridge or the replacement of a bridge with a history of suicides that is incorporated in a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), in the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), or in the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) to include a document demonstrating that a suicide barrier was a feature considered during the project’s planning process.</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: 10/5/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 840 (Ammiano) Driver’s License Application</td>
<td>Requires that every application for an original or a renewal of a driver’s license contain a statement requiring the applicant to acknowledge that he or she knows of the dangers of distracted driving.</td>
<td>5/24/13</td>
<td>Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 863 (Torres) Caltrans: NEPA Delegation for Transit</td>
<td>Consistent MAP-21, authorizes Caltrans to assume the responsibilities of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for environmental review and clearance for transit projects under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 918 (Cooley) State Emergency Plan</td>
<td>By July 31, 2015, requires the Office of Emergency Services to update the State Emergency Plan to include best practices for local governments and non-governmental entities to use to mobilize and evacuate people with disabilities, and others with access and functional needs during an emergency or natural disaster.</td>
<td>5/1/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*AB 946 (Stone) Transit-Bus-Only Traffic Corridors</td>
<td>Allows the Monterey-Salinas Transit District (MST) and the Santa Cruz County Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz Metro) to utilize the shoulders of certain state highways within their service areas as transit-bus-only traffic corridors, subject to the approval of Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol (CHP). Requires MST and Santa Cruz Metro to determine jointly with Caltrans and the CHP which state highway segments within their service areas would be designated as transit-bus-only traffic corridors based on right-of-way availability and capacity, peak congestion hours, and the most heavily congested areas. Requires MST and Santa Cruz Metro to actively work with Caltrans and the CHP to develop guidelines that ensure driver and vehicle safety, as well as the integrity of the highway infrastructure. Requires MST, Santa Cruz Metro and Caltrans to monitor the state of repair of highway shoulders used as transit-bus-only traffic corridors. Requires MST and Santa Cruz Metro to be responsible for all costs associated with this effort, including those costs related to repairs attributable to the operation of transit buses on highway shoulders.</td>
<td>6/26/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Last Amend</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1002 (Bloom) Vehicle Registration Surcharge: Sustainable Communities Strategies</td>
<td>Imposes a vehicle registration surcharge of $6, deposited into the Sustainable Communities Strategy Subaccount, to be made available for implementation of sustainable communities strategies adopted pursuant to SB 375. Requires the revenues from this surcharge to be distributed as follows: (a) 50 percent appropriated to cities and counties on a per capita basis for planning and implementing projects that are consistent with the purposes of sustainable communities strategies, including first-mile-last-mile bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects that are intended to improve transit access in transit priority zones; bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure complete streets projects; Safe Routes to School projects; road and highway maintenance and repair projects that also facilitate transit and bicycle use; and pedestrian safety projects if the road and highway maintenance and repair costs make up no more than 20 percent of the total pedestrian safety project cost; (b) 40 percent appropriated to transportation commissions and transit operators to support transit operations, and maintain and expand reduced fare programs; and (c) 10 percent appropriated to metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) and transportation planning agencies for competitive grants for implementing sustainable communities strategies, including livable communities projects, transit-oriented development and urban infill projects; complete streets projects; and bicycle and pedestrian projects and plans.</td>
<td>4/23/13</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1046 (Gordon) Innovative Delivery Team Demonstration Program</td>
<td>Authorizes the director of Caltrans District 4 to direct existing resources to the Innovative Delivery Team Demonstration Program (iTeam), and to utilize department staff to perform reimbursed work for projects on and off the state highway system within Santa Clara County pursuant to the demonstration program’s master agreement and accompanying work programs.</td>
<td>3/21/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1051 (Bocanegra) Sustainable Communities for All Program</td>
<td>Establishes the Sustainable Communities for All Program with the goal of providing transportation and housing choices that allow lower-income Californians to drive less and reduce their household costs. Funds the following through competitive grants and loans: (1) expanded or improved public transit service; (2) public transit capital maintenance; (3) development and rehabilitation of transit-oriented residential development that is affordable to low-income households and provides trip reduction strategies, including public transit passes and car-sharing; (4) expanded bicycle and pedestrian networks, facilities and programs that promote additional use and safety, and that provide access to public transit, schools, colleges, shopping, and other destinations; (5) expanded vanpooling, car-share and carpool promotion programs; (6) transportation demand management strategies and incentives that reduce both vehicle travel and ownership, including discounted public transit passes in transit priority zones; (7) invest in energy efficiency improvements in existing multi-family rental homes affordable to low-income households; and (8) open-space protection, local parks and urban forestry. Provides that the implementation of the Sustainable Communities for All Program is contingent upon the appropriation of funds for this purpose by the Legislature. Appropriates an unspecified amount of money from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to be allocated as follows: (1) an unspecified amount to the Department of Housing and Community Development to be expended for loans for the development and construction of affordable housing within close proximity to public transit stations; (2) an unspecified amount to projects and programs that are eligible to receive funds through the State Transit Assistance Program (STA), and that show greenhouse gas emissions reductions; (3) an unspecified amount to projects and programs that are eligible to receive funds through the Bicycle Transportation Account, and that show greenhouse gas emissions reductions; (4) an unspecified amount to projects and programs that are eligible to receive funds through the Safe Routes to School Program, and that show greenhouse gas emissions reductions; (5) an unspecified amount to projects and programs that are eligible to receive funds through the federal Transportation Alternatives Program, and that show greenhouse gas emissions reductions; (6) an unspecified amount to the Energy Savings Assistance Program and the Weatherization Assistance Program; and (7) an unspecified amount to the Natural Resources Agency to fund urban forestry, local parks and open-space protection projects that show greenhouse gas emissions reductions.</td>
<td>4/8/13</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Last Amend</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1077 (Muratsuchi) Alternative Fuel Vehicles</td>
<td>Until January 1, 2022, in calculating the sales tax owed, excludes from the terms “gross receipts” and “sales price” any amount allowed as a credit under federal or state law as an incentive to further reduce the purchase price of a new alternative fuel motor vehicle.</td>
<td>6/15/13</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1080 (Alejo) Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities</strong></td>
<td>Authorizes cities, counties and special districts to establish community revitalization and investment authorities to invest property tax increment revenues to relieve conditions of unemployment, reduce high crime rates, repair deteriorated or inadequate infrastructure, promote affordable housing, and improve conditions leading to increased employment opportunities. Prohibits a city or county with a redevelopment agency that was dissolved from forming a community revitalization and investment authority, unless the successor agency or designated local authority for the former redevelopment agency has received a finding of completion from the Department of Finance. Requires at least 80 percent of the land calculated by census tracts within the area for which a community revitalization and investment authority is proposed to be formed to be characterized by both of the following conditions: (1) an annual median household income that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median income; and (2) three of the following four conditions: non-seasonal unemployment that is at least 3 percent higher than statewide median unemployment, crime rates that are 5 percent higher than the statewide median crime rate, deteriorated or inadequate infrastructure, or deteriorated commercial or residential structures. Allows a community revitalization and investment authority to: (1) provide funding to rehabilitate, repair, upgrade, or construct infrastructure; (2) provide funding for low- and moderate-income housing; (3) make loans or grants for owners or tenants to improve, rehabilitate or retrofit buildings or structures; and (6) provide direct assistance to businesses in connection with new or existing facilities for industrial or manufacturing uses. Allows a community revitalization and investment authority to receive property tax increment revenues from only those affected taxing entities that have adopted a resolution approving the authority’s investment plan. Every 10 years, requires a community revitalization and investment authority to conduct a protest proceeding to consider whether the property owners within the area wish for the authority to continue to take further actions to implement its investment plan.</td>
<td>8/20/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1081 (Medina) Goods-Movement-Related Infrastructure</td>
<td>Requires the state’s five-year infrastructure plan to include: (1) information pertaining to new, rehabilitated, modernized, improved, or renovated infrastructure identified by state or federal agencies, or by regional transportation agencies that directly relates to enhancing the movement of goods; (2) identification of state goods movement needs and strategies to address them, as outlined in the state freight plan; (3) recommendations for private-sector financing for goods-movement-related infrastructure; and (4) any goods-movement-related infrastructure projects identified by Caltrans.</td>
<td>8/12/13</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1092 (Levine) Building Standards: EV Charging Stations</td>
<td>Requires the California Building Standards Code to include building standards for the installation of future electric vehicle charging infrastructure for parking spaces in multi-family dwellings and non-residential development.</td>
<td>6/10/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1158 (Waldron) On-Street Parking for Electric Vehicles</td>
<td>Authorizes local agencies to adopt rules and regulations by ordinance or resolution regarding designating and enforcing on-street parking spaces for electric vehicles.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* AB 1179 (Bocanegra) SCS: School Sites</td>
<td>Requires a sustainable communities strategy prepared pursuant to SB 375 to identify: (1) how it may impact school enrollments and capacities; and (2) the need for new school sites, or expansion or modernization of existing school sites.</td>
<td>3/21/13</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* AB 1193 (Ting) Bikeways</td>
<td>Requires local and regional agencies responsible for the development or operation of roadways where bicycle travel is permitted to utilize all minimum safety design criteria and uniform specifications for signs, markers and traffic control devices pursuant to industry standards, rather than standards developed by Caltrans.</td>
<td>4/25/13</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Last Amend</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1222 (Bloom)</td>
<td>Public Employees’ Retirement: 13(c) Specifies that the California Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA) does not apply to public employees whose interests are protected under 13(c) until: (a) a federal district court rules that the U.S. Department of Labor erred in determining that the application of PEPRA precludes certification of federal transit grant funds; or (b) January 1, 2015, whichever occurs first. Provides that if a federal district court upholds the U.S. Department of Labor’s determination, then PEPRA shall not apply to such public employees.</td>
<td>9/4/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: 10/4/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 160 (Alejo)</td>
<td>PEPRA: Exemption for Transit Union Employees Exempts the retirement plans for public transit employees whose collective bargaining rights are protected under the “13(c)” provisions of federal law from the California Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act (PEPRA), if the U.S. Department of Labor has issued a written determination that PEPRA is in conflict with federal law. See AB1222</td>
<td>5/28/13</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee - replaced by AB1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1290 (J. Perez)</td>
<td>Transportation Planning Changes the composition of the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to include 16 members appointed as follows: (1) nine members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate; (2) two members appointed by the Senate Rules Committee; (3) two members appointed by the speaker of the Assembly; (4) the chairperson of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to serve as an ex-officio member; (5) one ex-officio member appointed by the Senate Rules Committee; and (6) one ex-officio member appointed by the speaker of the Assembly. Requires the Governor, the Assembly speaker and the Senate Rules Committee to make every effort to assure that transportation expertise that has not traditionally been represented on the CTC is reflected in future appointments to the commission, with a particular emphasis on stakeholders involved and engaged in efforts to make California’s transportation system more sustainable. Requires the CTC’s Planning Committee to be responsible for monitoring outcomes from the sustainable communities strategies required to be adopted by transportation planning agencies as part of their regional transportation plans (RTPs). Requires each transportation planning agency to provide the CTC with a copy of its sustainable communities strategy and a brief report describing the progress that the agency has made in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Provides that the report may also outline the challenges that affect the implementation of an agency’s sustainable communities strategy, and the attainment of its greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. Requires the CTC’s annual report to the Legislature to include a summary of its actions in monitoring the outcomes from the adoption of sustainable communities strategies. Requires a regional transportation improvement program (RTIP) to include a discussion of how the program relates to the region’s adopted sustainable communities strategy.</td>
<td>9/3/13</td>
<td>Vetoed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1235 (Gordon)</td>
<td>Local Agencies: Financial Management Training If a local agency provides any type of compensation, salary or stipend to, or reimburses any expenses incurred in the performance of official duties by, members of its legislative body, requires the members of the agency’s legislative body to receive financial management training once per term of office. Requires a local agency that requires the members of its legislative body to complete such training to maintain records indicating both of the following: (1) the dates when the training was received; and (2) the entity that provided the training. Requires the Treasurer’s Office and Controller’s Office to work together to develop standardized criteria that sufficiently meet the requirements of this bill.</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>Vetoed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1248 (Cooley)</td>
<td>Local Agencies: Internal Control Guidelines By January 1, 2015, requires the Controller’s Office to develop internal control guidelines applicable to local agencies to prevent and detect financial errors and fraud. Requires these guidelines to be based on standards adopted by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and to be developed with input from local agencies and organizations representing the interests of local agencies. Requires the Controller’s Office to post the completed internal control guidelines on its Internet Web site to assist local agencies in establishing a system of internal controls to safeguard assets, and to prevent and detect financial errors and fraud.</td>
<td>5/24/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Last Amend</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1371 (Bradford) Bicycles: Passing Distances</td>
<td>Requires the driver of a motor vehicle overtaking and passing a bicycle that is proceeding in the same direction on a highway to pass at a safe distance, generally at a minimum clearance of three feet, and without interfering with the safe operation of the bicycle. If the driver of a motor vehicle is unable to comply with this requirement because of traffic or roadway conditions, the driver must slow to a speed that is reasonable and prudent, and may pass only when doing so would not endanger the safety of the operator of the bicycle, considering size and speed of the motor vehicle and bicycle, traffic conditions, weather, and road surface and width.</td>
<td>8/20/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Bills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1 (Steinberg) Sustainable Communities Investment Authorities</td>
<td>Allows a city, county or special district to form a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority for a designated Sustainable Communities Investment Area. Provides that a city or county that created a redevelopment agency that was dissolved pursuant to state law cannot form a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority, unless the successor agency or designated local authority for the former redevelopment agency has received a finding of completion from the Department of Finance. Also provides that a city, county or special district that has declared a fiscal emergency cannot form a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority, unless it subsequently declares that the fiscal emergency has been resolved. Requires a Sustainable Communities Investment Area to include only the following: (1) transit priority project areas; (2) areas that are small walkable communities; or (3) sites that have land-use approvals, covenants, conditions, or other effective controls restricting them to clean energy manufacturing. Provides that a taxing agency participating in or approving the formation of a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority, or appointing governing board members to the authority may authorize an allocation to the authority of all or part of the tax increment revenues that would otherwise be paid to that taxing agency. Excludes school districts from participating in a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority. Allows an authority to adopt a plan for a Sustainable Communities Investment Area, which may include a provision for the receipt of tax increment funds, if the local government with land-use jurisdiction has adopted all of the following: (1) a sustainable parking standards ordinance that restricts parking in transit priority project areas to encourage public transit use to the greatest extent feasible; (2) an ordinance creating a jobs plan; (3) for transit priority project areas and small walkable communities within a metropolitan planning organization (MPO), a plan consistent with the use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the Sustainable Communities Investment Area in the sustainable communities strategy; (4) within small walkable communities outside an MPO, a plan that provides a density of at least 20 dwelling units per net acre for new residential construction and a minimum floor area ratio of 0.75 for non-residential uses; and (5) an ordinance that prohibits the number of housing units occupied by extremely low-income, very low-income and low-income households from being reduced in the Sustainable Communities Investment Area, and that requires the replacement of any such units upon their removal. If a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority includes a provision for the receipt of tax increment revenues in its plan, requires the authority to dedicate no less than 20 percent of these revenues for affordable housing purposes. Allows a state or local pension fund system to invest capital in the public infrastructure projects, and private commercial and residential developments undertaken by an authority. Allows a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority to implement a local transactions and use tax, and to issue bonds. Prohibits pledging school district property tax revenues for the repayment of bonds issued by a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority.</td>
<td>9/3/13</td>
<td>Senate Floor: Concurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Last Amend</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 11 (Pavley) Alternative Fuel and Vehicle Technologies: Funding Programs</td>
<td>Extends the authorization and various funding sources for the following three alternative fuel and vehicle technology programs until January 1, 2024: (1) the Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB); (2) the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program administered by the California Energy Commission; and (3) the Air Quality Improvement Program administered by CARB. Extends the authorization for the Carl Moyer Program administered by local air districts until January 1, 2024. Bill shall become operative only if AB 8 (Perea) is also enacted.</td>
<td>9/6/13</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 64 (Corbett) Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: Clean Technology Investment Account</td>
<td>Creates the Clean Technology Investment Account within the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. Requires the Legislature to annually appropriate cap-and-trade revenues or other funds to the Clean Technology Investment Account in the Budget Act. Requires the revenues in the account to be made available to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to provide grants to non-profit public benefit corporations and regional technology alliances to design and implement programs that accelerate the development, demonstration and deployment of transformative technologies that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions and foster job creation in the state.</td>
<td>6/14/13</td>
<td>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 99 (Budget &amp; Fiscal Review Committee) Active Transportation Program</td>
<td>Consolidates the Bicycle Transportation, Safe Routes to School and Recreational Trails Programs into a new Active Transportation Program. Expresses the intent of the Legislature that the program achieve all of the following goals: (1) increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking; (2) increase safety and mobility for non-motorized users; (3) advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals; (4) ensure public health; (5) ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program; and (6) provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users. Provides that the Active Transportation Program shall be funded as follows: (1) 100 percent of the state’s share of federal Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds, except for any federal Recreational Trails Program funds appropriated to the Department of Parks &amp; Recreation; (2) $21 million in federal Highway Safety Improvement funds; and (3) State Highway Account funds. Requires Active Transportation Program funds to be distributed as follows: (1) 50 percent awarded to projects through statewide competitive grants; (2) 40 percent allocated by formula to large, urban metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs); and (3) 10 percent allocated on a competitive basis to projects in small urban and rural areas. Except in the case of the formula allocations to the large, urban MPOs, requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to be responsible for evaluating grant applications and selecting projects. Requires the CTC to develop guidelines, a list of eligible project types, project selection criteria, and performance measures for the Active Transportation Program. Requires the CTC’s guidelines to include a process for ensuring that a minimum of 25 percent of overall program funding benefits disadvantaged communities. Requires the CTC to adopt a program of projects by April 1 of each odd-numbered year.</td>
<td>9/3/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: 9/26/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 142 (DeSaulnier) Public Transit: Special Benefit Districts</td>
<td>Until January 1, 2021, authorizes a public transit agency to establish benefit assessment districts, under which assessments would be levied on property lying within a half mile of any existing or proposed rail station, bus transfer station or ferry terminal. Requires the proceeds from such assessments to be used to finance the acquisition, construction, development, joint development, operation, maintenance, or repair of the station or terminal located within a particular benefit assessment district. Also authorizes a public transit agency to issue revenue bonds to be repaid by the assessments levied within a benefit assessment district.</td>
<td>8/22/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: 10/8/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 286 (Yee) HOV Lanes: Green Sticker</td>
<td>Extends the authorization for plug-in hybrid vehicles to use high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes regardless of the number of occupants to January 1, 2019. Subject to enactment of AB 266 (Blumenfield).</td>
<td>8/22/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: 9/28/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 407 (Hill) Local Government Officials and Employees: Employment Contracts</td>
<td>Prohibits an employment contract for any person who is a deputy or assistant chief executive officer for a local agency from providing an automatic renewal of the contract if the contract includes an automatic compensation increase in excess of a cost-of-living adjustment or a maximum cash settlement in excess of certain limits. Also applies this prohibition to any person whose position is held by an employment contract between the local agency and that person.</td>
<td>4/1/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Last Amend</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 408 (De Leon)</td>
<td>STIP Funds</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 469 (Corbett)</td>
<td>Public Contracts: Local Public Transit Vehicles</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Transportation &amp; Housing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 486 (DeSaulnier)</td>
<td>CT: Performance Measurement Benchmarks</td>
<td>9/3/13</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 557 (Hill)</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail: Peninsula Corridor</td>
<td>5/2/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 605 (Lara)</td>
<td>California Global Warming Solutions Act: Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and Scoping Plan</td>
<td>7/3/13</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Last Amend</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 628 (Beall)</td>
<td>Infrastructure Financing Districts: Transit Priority Projects</td>
<td>8/5/13</td>
<td>Senate Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Allows for the formation of an infrastructure financing district, adoption of an infrastructure financing district plan, and the issuance of bonds to implement a transit priority project. Use at least 25 percent of revenues from the infrastructure financing district to increase, improve and preserve the supply of lower- and moderate-income housing in the district. Development of transit priority projects should be environmentally conscious and sustainable based on CA Green Building Standards Code. Local government with land-use jurisdiction must adopt an ordinance that: (1) prohibits the number of housing units occupied by extremely low, very low and low-income households from being reduced in the district during the effective period of the infrastructure financing plan; and (2) requires the replacement of dwelling units for extremely low, very low or low-income households within two years.</td>
<td>8/5/13</td>
<td>Senate Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 731 (Steinberg)</td>
<td>CEQA Modernization Act of 2013</td>
<td>9/9/13</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States the intent of the Legislature to appropriate $30 million in the annual Budget Act to the Strategic Growth Council to provide competitive grants to local agencies for planning activities related to the implementation of regional sustainable communities strategies. Upon the request of a project applicant, requires the lead agency for CEQA purposes to prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation, adoption or certification of an environmental document for a project, as specified. Provides that aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential or employment center project on an infill site within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment. By July 1, 2015, requires the Office of Planning &amp; Research to prepare and submit to the Natural Resources Agency for certification and adoption proposed revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for a lead agency to assess the need for translating notices into non-English languages for projects considered pursuant to CEQA and requirements for the posting of those notices in non-English languages. Until January 1, 2017, establishes in the Governor’s Office the position of Renewable Energy Facilities Advisor. If a court finds, as a result of a trial, hearing or remand from an appellate court, that any determination, finding or decision of a public agency has been made without complying with CEQA, requires the court to enter an order that includes issuing an peremptory writ of mandate specifying what action by the public agency is necessary to comply with CEQA. Requires the writ to be limited to that portion of a determination, finding or decision, or the specific project activities found to be in non-compliance only if the court finds all of the following: (1) the portion or specific project activities are severable; (2) severance will not prejudice complete and full compliance with CEQA; and (3) the court has not found the remainder of the project to be in non-compliance. Requires the lead agency, as part of the mitigation monitoring plan and upon the request of a member of the public, to prepare or cause to be prepared an annual report on project compliance with the required mitigation measures that is publicly available online. Requires the Office of Planning &amp; Research to prepare and transmit to the Natural Resources Agency for certification and adoption proposed revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects within transit priority areas. Requires these criteria to promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multi-modal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses. In preparing the criteria, requires the Office of Planning &amp; Research to recommend potential metrics to measure transportation impacts that may include vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated. Specifies that upon certification of these revisions by the Natural Resources Agency, automobile delay as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment for projects located in a transit priority area. Authorizes the Office of Planning &amp; Research to adopt revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing alternative metrics to traffic levels of service for measuring transportation impacts outside transit priority areas. Requires the Office of Planning &amp; Research to produce a report on economic displacement.</td>
<td>9/9/13</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Last Amend</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 743 (Steinberg)</td>
<td>CEQA: Sacramento Kings Arena and Transit-Oriented Infill Projects. Requires the Office of Planning &amp; Research to prepare and transmit to the Natural Resources Agency for certification and adoption proposed revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects within transit priority areas statewide. Requires these criteria to promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multi-modal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses. In preparing the criteria, requires the Office of Planning &amp; Research to recommend potential metrics to measure transportation impacts that may include vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated. Specifies that upon certification of these revisions by the Natural Resources Agency, automobile delay as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment for projects located in a transit priority area. Authorizes the Office of Planning &amp; Research to adopt revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing alternative metrics to traffic levels of service for measuring transportation impacts outside transit priority areas. For purposes of CEQA, provides that aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment. Establish a new CEQA exemption for projects that are: (1) located in a transit priority area; (2) undertaken to implement a local specific plan for which an environmental impact report has been certified; and (3) consistent with the general-use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in a sustainability communities strategy.</td>
<td>9/12/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: 9/27/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 751 (Yee) *</td>
<td>Public Meetings: Publication of Actions Taken. Requires the legislative body of a local agency to publicly report any action taken, as well as the vote or abstention on that action of each member present for the action.</td>
<td>6/17/13</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 785 (Wolk)</td>
<td>Design-Build Contracting. Eliminates numerous existing individual agency statutes and, instead, enacts one general statute providing local agencies with the authority to utilize design-build contracting for any public works project exceeding $1 million in cost, except for projects on the state highway system. Allows a local agency to use either low bid or best value to award a design-build contract. Defines “local agency” to mean the following: (1) a city or county; (2) a special district that operates wastewater facilities, solid waste management facilities or water recycling facilities; or (3) any transit district, including municipal operators.</td>
<td>5/2/13</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 791 (Wyland)</td>
<td>Gas Tax. Requires the Legislature, by a two-thirds majority of both chambers, to approve any adjustments to the state’s excise tax on gasoline that may be necessary pursuant to the transportation tax swap enacted in 2011.</td>
<td>4/4/13</td>
<td>Senate Trans &amp; Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 798 (De Leon)</td>
<td>California Green Infrastructure Bank. Creates the California Green Infrastructure Bank to provide financial assistance to facilitate green economic development. Requires the bank to establish criteria, priorities and guidelines for the selection of projects to receive assistance from the bank. Declares the intent of the Legislature that 50 percent of the proceeds in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund be used for carrying out the purposes of the bank.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Governance &amp; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 3 (Leno)</td>
<td>Public Information. Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to require local agencies to comply with the California Public Records Act and the Brown Act, as well as any subsequent statute enacted to further the purposes of those two acts. Specifies that the costs incurred by local agencies to comply with California Public Records Act and the Brown Act are not required to be reimbursed by the state as a mandate.</td>
<td>6/20/13</td>
<td>Signed: 9/20/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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