1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Announcements
4. 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.

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

CONSENT AGENDA

All items appearing on the consent agenda are considered to be minor or non-controversial and will be acted upon in one motion if no member of the Committee or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members of the Committee may raise questions, seek clarification or add directions to Consent Agenda items without removing the item from the Consent Agenda as long as no other committee member objects to the change.

6. Approve draft minutes of the February 22, 2010 Bicycle Committee meeting (pages 4-7)
8. Accept letter of support for the City of Capitola’s grant funding application for a Bikeway, Pedestrian and Public Transit Master Plan (page 12)
9. Accept Staff Report presented at the April 1, 2010 RTC meeting from Executive Director George Dondero regarding recommendation to enter into a Purchase and
Sale Agreement with Union Pacific to acquire the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (pages 13-17)

10. Accept Hazard Report (page 18)

11. Accept Bicycle Committee Roster – (page 19)

REGULAR AGENDA

12. Aptos Village Plan – Update from Jack Sohriakoff, Santa Cruz County Public Works Department (pages 20-24)

13. Featured Jurisdiction: County of Santa Cruz – Receive oral presentation from Jack Sohriakoff, Santa Cruz County Public Works Department

14. Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Update – Consider recommendations from Ad Hoc Committee and receive summary comments from Rachel Moriconi, RTC staff (pages 25-51)

15. Community Traffic Safety Coalition and Ride ‘n Stride FY 10/11 Transportation Development Act Funding Request – Presentation from Theresia Rogerson, County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency (pages 52-66)

16. Bike to Work FY 10/11 Transportation Development Act Funding Request – Presentation from Piet Canin, Ecology Action (pages 67-83)

17. Santa Cruz County Bicycle Injuries and Fatalities Data Report for 2008 – Presentation from Theresia Rogerson, County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency (page 84-86)

18. Officer Elections (page 87)

19. Project Tracking/Subcommittee Tasks: Oral Reports (actions may be taken at the meeting)
   a. City of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Fieberling/Hyman/Garza
   b. City of Capitola Project Tracking: Kostelec/Ward
   c. City of Scotts Valley Project Tracking: Milburn/Lau
   d. City of Watsonville Project Tracking: Montague
   e. County of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Akol/Lewis
   f. Bike To Work Update: Canin/Lucas
   g. CTSC and the South County Bike/Pedestrian Work Group Update: Langley/Jed/Montague
   h. UCSC: Scott/Menchine
   i. Legislative Tracking: Ward/Jed
   j. Sanctuary Scenic Trail: Fieberling
   k. Committee Effectiveness: Milburn/Kostelec/Casterson/Menchine/Akol
   l. Technical Subcommittee: Menchine/Casterson
   m. Bicyclist/Motorist Safety Education: Jed/Menchine/Montague
   n. RTC Packet Monitoring Subcommittee: Hyman
   o. Shared Lane Pavement Marking (aka Sharrows): Menchine/Jed/Ward
   p. Safe Routes to School: Horton/Menchine/Akol

20. Adjourn
NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 14, 2010 at the Special Meeting Time of 6:30 p.m. at the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

HOW TO REACH US
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax (831) 460-3215
email: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org

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

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

SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/ TRANSLATION SERVICES
Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de anticipado al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis. Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance by calling (831) 460-3200.
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Minutes-Draft
Monday, February 22, 2010
6:30 p.m.

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

1. Call to Order

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Kem Akol, District 1
David Casterson, District 2
Jim Langley, CTSC
Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz
Eric Horton, District 2 (Alt.)
Rick Hyman, District 5
Leo Jed, CTSC (Alt.)
Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola, Chair
Bob Montague, City of Watsonville
Lex Rau, Scotts Valley (Alt.)
Peter Scott, District 3

Staff:
Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner

Excused Absences:
Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley
Saskia Lucas, Bike to Work (Alt.)
Michael Lewis, District 1 (Alt.)
Andy Ward, City of Capitola (Alt.)
Penni Bengtson, District 5 (Alt.)
Piet Canin, Bike to Work
Carlos Garza, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)

Unexcused Absences:

Vacancies:
District 4 – Voting and Alternate
City of Watsonville – Alternate

3. Announcements - Cory Caletti announced that some Bicycle Committee members’ terms expire at end of March, that she was working on re-nominations, and that officer elections will take place at the April Bicycle Committee meeting.

Cory informed member that the Arana Gulch Master Plan coastal permit will be heard by the California Coastal Commission on March 11, 2010 at the County of Santa Cruz Board of Supervisor Chambers.
She provided a handout regarding the formation of a U.S. Bicycle Route System which is a joint project between the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and Adventure Cycling Organization to identify and route an interstate system of cycling networks.

4. Oral Communications - None

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – None

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A motion (Fieberling/Langley) to approve the consent agenda passed unanimously.

6. Approved draft minutes of the December 14, 2009 Bicycle Committee meeting

7. Accepted Bike Secure III Final Report as submitted to the Funding Agency: Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District

8. Approved Bike Secure application from Wave Crest Development and correction to previously approved subsidy for Pacific Veterinary Specialists

9. Accepted correspondence from the Bicycle Committee to the California Coastal Commission regarding support for the Arana Gulch Master Plan

10. Accepted Hazard Report

11. Accepted Bicycle Committee Roster

**REGULAR AGENDA**

12. Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Update: Consider Information Item and Forming a Review Subcommittee – Cory Caletti provided members an overview regarding the update of the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Projects need to be identified in the RTP to secure Federal, State and local funding. The next plan update will be in 2012 and will incorporate greenhouse gas emissions targets. Cory Caletti said that although the current update is a minor one, the Bicycle Committee has the opportunity review and provide feedback. The draft RTP document along with the Draft Supplement Environmental Impact Report will be released to public on March 1st and will be available for public review until April 19th. The Commission is holding a public hearing on April 1st and the next regular Bicycle Committee meeting meets on April 12th. It was suggested that one of the Bicycle Committee sub-committees or a new ad-hoc sub-committee be formed to review and provide feedback for the plan before the April 1st public hearing. In response to a question, Cory Caletti clarified that the plan will not have a prioritized list of projects but will be divided into a constrained list of projects for which funds have been allocated and an unconstrained list. A notification will be sent to members to announce when the draft documents will be posted to the SCCRTC website. A CD containing all documents will also be available. A motion (Akol/Hyman) was made to appoint an ad-hoc sub-committee to review the draft documents and present recommendations to the Bicycle Committee at the April 12th meeting. Bob Montague, Kem Akol, Rick Hyman, and Daniel Kostelec volunteered to serve on the sub-committee. The motion passed unanimously.

Receive Oral Presentation and Consider Draft Aptos Village Master Plan – Bicycle Committee members David Casterson, Will Menchine, Bob Montague met with Glenda Hill from the County Planning Department met with Commissioner Ellen Pirie to discuss the Draft Aptos Village Master
Plan. Mr. Casterson explained to members the details of the plan and the area that encompasses the draft plan. He mentioned that much of the discussion focused on safe bicycle travel, general motor vehicle speeds and treatments such as Shared Lane Pavement Markings (aka “sharrows”). David indicated that the Santa Cruz Sentinel reported that there would be no need for bike lanes due to slow moving auto traffic which is a mis-quote needing correction or retraction. The final decision on the approval of the plan will take place on February 23rd, 2010.

A motion (Hyman/Scott) was made and passed unanimously to appoint Kem Akol to present the following recommendations on behalf of the Bicycle Committee at the February 23rd Public Hearing:

- Speed tables and other methods to slow traffic on Soquel Drive be installed
- A connection for bicycles from Trout Gulch Road to Aptos Creek Road behind the new development be considered
- A mix of enclosed and inverted U-rack bike locking facilities be installed
- Left turn bike pockets on Soquel Drive at Trout Gulch Road and at Aptos Creek Road be provided
- Bike lanes on the east/west road and the two new roads be provided
- A south-bound bike detour off Soquel to Aptos Street be provided

13. Review Draft Online Bicycle/Pedestrian Hazard Report Form – Cory Caletti presented the draft online version of the Hazard Report Form for both bicycle and pedestrian network deficiencies or hazards. She requested feedback from members and pointed out the proposed features of the form, preliminarily including the ability to insert a picture and map. Cory Caletti said that she has gotten comments and feedback from the local jurisdictions and other agencies. She addressed why the RTC receives the hazard reports, in addition to local jurisdictions directly, saying that often individuals are unaware what jurisdictions a hazard is located in and that a central depository for the reports provides a valuable resource to the community. The RTC facilitates this reporting process so that the complaint is submitted to the correct department, jurisdiction or agency. As a second phase, Cory Caletti noted the goal of developing a way to “close the loop” on reporting follow-up action pertaining to the hazard report submitted to the submitter. Members discussed features of the new form and the responsibility of the local jurisdictions to repair hazards.

14. Review Subcommittees and Membership – Committee structure for all existing project tracking/sub-committees will remain the same with the following exceptions:

- Michael Lewis will be removed from all subcommittees as his term is expiring and he is not seeing re-appointment. Lex Rau will be added to City of Scotts Valley subcommittee.
- David Casterson asked to be added to technical sub-committee.

15. Discuss Bicycle Committee Meeting Time - Chair Kostelec asked members of their preference of the 6:30 pm start time for Bicycle Committee meetings and members indicated they appreciated the earlier start time. Cory Caletti said that when the next Rules and Regulations update occurs, a permanent change to a 6:30 pm start time will be considered. In the meantime, the meeting will be announced as being held “at a special time of 6:30 pm”.

16. Project Tracking/Subcommittee Tasks: Oral Reports

a. City of Santa Cruz Project Tracking:
   Bill Fieberling said that many letters in favor of the Arana Gulch Master Plan’s Broadway/Brommer multi-use path connection were submitted to the California Coastal Commission. He said that additional funds were needed to complete the pathway under
Highway 1 to the Tannery Complex. He also mentioned that Sierra Northern has been contracted as the freight short line operator. In response to comments regarding the rail acquisition project, Cory Caletti said that, if possible, she will agendize the item and will invite Deputy Director Luis Mendez to present rail acquisition documents once they are released.

b. City of Capitola Project Tracking: Daniel Kostelec said that a new bike lane has been installed on Monterey Avenue from New Brighton Middle School to Bay Avenue.

c. City of Scotts Valley Project Tracking: Cory Caletti said that construction on Bean Creek Road has been delayed due to heavy rains and is a month behind schedule.

d. City of Watsonville Project Tracking: Bob Montague said that South County Bicycle/Pedestrian Work Group is establishing its priorities and working to develop a Bicycle Plan for the City of Watsonville. Completion of the plan is expected for the end of 2010.

e. County of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: No report was provided.

f. Bike To Work Update: New Bicycle Coordinator Nick Muchas indicated that the next Bike-to-Work Week event is scheduled for May 9th through the 15th.

g. CTSC Update: Jim Langley supplied a report from Theresia Rogerson saying that the CTSC is finalizing their work plan for next fiscal year. He mentioned that CTSC and the Santa Cruz Bike/Pedestrian Work Group are considering purchasing a media campaign jointly called Street Smarts and are working to find ways to provide information to teen and young adult drivers. He reported the number of bicycle and pedestrian safety presentations performed at elementary schools and pre-schools.

h. UCSC: No report was provided.

i. Legislative Tracking: No report was provided.

j. Sanctuary Scenic Trail: No report was provided.

k. Committee Effectiveness: No report was provided.

l. Technical Subcommittee: No report was provided.

m. Bicyclist/Motorist Safety Education: No report was provided.

n. RTC Packet Monitoring Subcommittee: No report was provided.

o. Shared Lane Pavement Marking (aka Sharrows): No report was provided.

p. Safe Routes to School: Eric Horton reported that he had a meeting with Jack Sohriakoff of the County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department regarding bicycle safety at Rio Del Mar Elementary School. Mr. Sohriakoff recommended that Mr. Norton meet with the school administration to ascertain interest in bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Eric Horton scheduled a meeting with the principal on March 3 to discuss traffic calming, additional bicycle treatments on the roadways approaching the school (such as Sharrows) and the installation of bicycle racks. He will report back to the Bicycle Committee.

17. Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 12, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. at the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant II and Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
United States Department of Transportation
Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and Recommendations

Purpose

The United States Department of Transportation (DOT) is providing this Policy Statement to reflect the Department's support for the development of fully integrated active transportation networks. The establishment of well-connected walking and bicycling networks is an important component for livable communities, and their design should be a part of Federal-aid project developments. Walking and bicycling foster safer, more livable, family-friendly communities; promote physical activity and health; and reduce vehicle emissions and fuel use. Legislation and regulations exist that require inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian policies and projects into transportation plans and project development. Accordingly, transportation agencies should plan, fund, and implement improvements to their walking and bicycling networks, including linkages to transit. In addition, DOT encourages transportation agencies to go beyond the minimum requirements, and proactively provide convenient, safe, and context-sensitive facilities that foster increased use by bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities, and utilize universal design characteristics when appropriate. Transportation programs and facilities should accommodate people of all ages and abilities, including people too young to drive, people who cannot drive, and people who choose not to drive.

Policy Statement

The DOT policy is to incorporate safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects. Every transportation agency, including DOT, has the responsibility to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into their transportation systems. Because of the numerous individual and community benefits that walking and bicycling provide — including health, safety, environmental, transportation, and quality of life — transportation agencies are encouraged to go beyond minimum standards to provide safe and convenient facilities for these modes.

Authority

This policy is based on various sections in the United States Code (U.S.C.) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) in Title 23—Highways, Title 49—Transportation, and Title 42—The Public Health and Welfare. These sections, provided in the Appendix, describe how bicyclists and pedestrians of all abilities should be involved throughout the planning process, should not be adversely affected by other transportation projects, and should be able to track annual obligations and expenditures on nonmotorized transportation facilities.

Recommended Actions

The DOT encourages States, local governments, professional associations, community organizations, public transportation agencies, and other government agencies, to adopt similar policy statements on bicycle and pedestrian accommodation as an indication of their commitment to accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians as an integral element of the transportation system. In support of this commitment, transportation agencies and local communities should go beyond minimum design standards and requirements to create safe, attractive, sustainable, accessible, and convenient bicycling and walking networks. Such actions should include:

- Considering walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes: The primary goal of a transportation system is to safely and efficiently move people and goods. Walking and bicycling are efficient transportation modes for most short trips and, where convenient intermodal systems exist, these nonmotorized trips can easily be linked with transit to significantly increase trip distance. Because of the
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benefits they provide, transportation agencies should give the same priority to walking and bicycling as is given to other transportation modes. Walking and bicycling should not be an afterthought in roadway design.

- Ensuring that there are transportation choices for people of all ages and abilities, especially children: Pedestrian and bicycle facilities should meet accessibility requirements and provide safe, convenient, and interconnected transportation networks. For example, children should have safe and convenient options for walking or bicycling to school and parks. People who cannot or prefer not to drive should have safe and efficient transportation choices.

- Going beyond minimum design standards: Transportation agencies are encouraged, when possible, to avoid designing walking and bicycling facilities to the minimum standards. For example, shared-use paths that have been designed to minimum width requirements will need retrofits as more people use them. It is more effective to plan for increased usage than to retrofit an older facility. Planning projects for the long-term should anticipate likely future demand for bicycling and walking facilities and not preclude the provision of future improvements.

- Integrating bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on new, rehabilitated, and limited-access bridges: DOT encourages bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on bridge projects including facilities on limited-access bridges with connections to streets or paths.

- Collecting data on walking and biking trips: The best way to improve transportation networks for any mode is to collect and analyze trip data to optimize investments. Walking and bicycling trip data for many communities are lacking. This data gap can be overcome by establishing routine collection of nonmotorized trip information. Communities that routinely collect walking and bicycling data are able to track trends and prioritize investments to ensure the success of new facilities. These data are also valuable in linking walking and bicycling with transit.

- Setting mode share targets for walking and bicycling and tracking them over time: A byproduct of improved data collection is that communities can establish targets for increasing the percentage of trips made by walking and bicycling.

- Removing snow from sidewalks and shared-use paths: Current maintenance provisions require pedestrian facilities built with Federal funds to be maintained in the same manner as other roadway assets. State Agencies have generally established levels of service on various routes especially as related to snow and ice events.

- Improving nonmotorized facilities during maintenance projects: Many transportation agencies spend most of their transportation funding on maintenance rather than on constructing new facilities. Transportation agencies should find ways to make facility improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists during resurfacing and other maintenance projects.

**Conclusion**

Increased commitment to and investment in bicycle facilities and walking networks can help meet goals for cleaner, healthier air; less congested roadways; and more livable, safe, cost-efficient communities. Walking and bicycling provide low-cost mobility options that place fewer demands on local roads and highways. DOT recognizes that safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities may look different depending on the context — appropriate facilities in a rural community may be different from a dense, urban area. However, regardless of regional, climate, and population density differences, it is important that pedestrian and bicycle facilities be integrated into transportation systems. While DOT leads the effort to provide safe and convenient accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists, success will ultimately depend on transportation agencies across the country embracing and implementing this policy.

Ray LaHood, United States Secretary of Transportation

---

**APPENDIX**

**Key Statutes and Regulations Regarding Walking and Bicycling**

**Planning Requirements**

The State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) planning regulations describe how walking and bicycling are to be accommodated throughout the planning process (e.g., see 23 CFR 450.200, 23 CFR 450.300, 23 U.S.C. 134(h), and 135(d)). Nonmotorists must be allowed to participate in the planning process and transportation agencies
are required to integrate walking and bicycling facilities and programs in their transportation plans to ensure the operability of an intermodal transportation system. Key sections from the U.S.C. and CFR include, with italics added for emphasis:

- The scope of the metropolitan planning process "will address the following factors... (2) Increase the safety for motorized and non-motorized users; (3) Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users; (4) Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life..." 23 CFR 450.306(a). See 23 CFR 450.206 for similar State requirements.

- Metropolitan transportation plans "...shall, at a minimum, include...existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, transit, multimodal and intermodal facilities, pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities, and intermodal connectors that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system..." 23 CFR 450.322(f). See 23 CFR 450.216(g) for similar State requirements.

- The plans and transportation improvement programs (TIPs) of all metropolitan areas "shall provide for the development and integrated management and operation of transportation systems and facilities (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities)," 23 U.S.C. 134(c)(2) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(c)(2). 23 CFR 450.324(c) states that the TIP "shall include ...trails projects, pedestrian walkways; and bicycle facilities..."

- 23 CFR 450.316(a) states that "The MPOs shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing...representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, and representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan planning process." 23 CFR 450.210(a) contains similar language for States. See also 23 U.S.C. 134(i)(5), 135(f)(3), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(5), and 5304(f)(3) for additional information about participation by interested parties.

Prohibition of Route Severance

The Secretary has the authority to withhold approval for projects that would negatively impact pedestrians and bicyclists under certain circumstances. Key references in the CFR and U.S.C. include:

- "The Secretary shall not approve any project or take any regulatory action under this title that will result in the severance of an existing major route or have significant adverse impact on the safety for nonmotorized transportation traffic and light motorcycles, unless such project or regulatory action provides for a reasonable alternate route or such a route exists." 23 U.S.C. 109(m).

- "In any case where a highway bridge deck being replaced or rehabilitated with Federal financial participation is located on a highway on which bicycles are permitted to operate at each end of such bridge, and the Secretary determines that the safe accommodation of bicycles can be provided at reasonable cost as part of such replacement or rehabilitation, then such bridge shall be so replaced or rehabilitated as to provide such safe accommodations." 23 U.S.C. 217(e). Although this statutory requirement only mentions bicycles, DOT encourages States and local governments to apply the same policy to pedestrian facilities as well.

- 23 CFR 652 provides "procedures relating to the provision of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations on Federal-aid projects, and Federal participation in the cost of these accommodations and projects."

Project Documentation

- "In metropolitan planning areas, on an annual basis, no later than 90 calendar days following the end of the program year, the State, public transportation operator(s), and the MPO shall cooperatively develop a listing of projects (including investments in pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) for which funds under 23 U.S.C. or 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 were obligated in the preceding program year." 23 CFR 332(a).

Accessibility for All Pedestrians

- Public rights-of-way and facilities are required to be accessible to persons with disabilities through the following statutes: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504) (29 U.S.C. §794) and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) (42 U.S.C. §§ 12131-12164).

- The DOT Section 504 regulation requires the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to monitor the compliance of the self-evaluation and transition plans of Federal-aid recipients (49 CFR §27.11). The FHWA Division offices review pedestrian access compliance with the ADA and Section 504 as part of their routine oversight activities as defined in their stewardship plans.

- FHWA posted its Clarification of FHWA's Oversight Role in Accessibility to explain how to accommodate
accessibility in policy, planning, and projects.

Additional Resources

For more information about:

FHWA Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Resources

- FHWA’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Program
- FHWA guidance documents on walking and bicycling
- Publications related to walking and bicycling
- Information about State and local resources
- Equestrian and Other Nonmotorized Use on Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
- Framework for Considering Motorized Use on Nonmotorized Trails and Pedestrian Pathways
- Manuals and Guides for Trail Design, Construction, Maintenance, and Operation
- Recreational Trails
- Shared-Use Paths Along or Near Freeways and Bicycles on Freeways
- Snow Removal on Sidewalks Constructed with Federal Funding
- Federal Aid funding resources for walking and bicycling facilities
- Federal funding spent on walking and bicycling facilities

Accessibility

- FHWA American with Disabilities Act (ADA) resources
- U.S. Access Board information about ADA for public rights of way
- Accessibility Guidance for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities, Recreational Trails, and Transportation Enhancement Activities

Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety

- FHWA Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program
- FHWA Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Research
- The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Programs

Context Sensitive Solutions

- FHWA and Context Sensitive Solutions

State Bicycle and Pedestrian Contacts

- State Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinators

To provide Feedback, Suggestions, or Comments for this page contact Gabe Rousseau at gabe.rousseau@dot.gov

This page last modified on March 11, 2010
March 25, 2010

David Foster  
Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager  
City of Capitola  
420 Capitola Avenue  
Capitola, CA 95010  

RE: Letter of Support for the City of Capitola's Grant Funding Application for a Bikeway,  
Pedestrian and Public Transit Master Plan

Dear Mr. Foster:

As Chair of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Bicycle Committee, I'd like to offer you our support for the City of Capitola's grant application for $100,000 to Caltrans Community Planning Grant for FY 2010-2011 for the development of a Bikeway, Pedestrian and Public Transit Master Plan. We appreciate the City providing $25,000 in matching funds and an additional $25,000 in in-kind staff support.

The RTC's Bicycle Committee serves to assist in the development and maintenance of a complete, convenient and safe regional bicycle network, bicycle parking program, and other amenities essential to attract bicycle ridership. A comprehensive bicycle network increases the opportunity and appeal of bicycle trips for transportation, utility, recreation and fitness purposes. The Bicycle Committee's charge includes endorsements of grant funding applications for projects within their purview.

The Caltrans grant and the City of Capitola's Bikeway, Pedestrian and Public Transit Master Plan would complement the Bicycle Committee's goals by providing additional bicycle facilities and increased safety measures resulting in increased bicycle ridership and general city-wide traffic calming.

Please feel free to contact the Regional Transportation Commission's Bicycle Coordinator and staff to the Bicycle Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org, for this and any other Bicycle Committee related matters.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Daniel Kostelec  
Chair, SCCRTC Bicycle Committee

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Bicycle Committee
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AGENDA: April 1, 2010

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director
RE: Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Acquisition – Executive Director’s Recommendation

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Executive Director recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Enter into a purchase and sale agreement with Union Pacific (UP) to acquire the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Branch Line) for a total cost of $19.2 million, with $14.2 million to be paid to Union Pacific and at least $5 million of improvements to be made to the structures and other components of the Branch Line;
2. Enter into an administration and coordination agreement with a short line operator for continued freight operations, and recreational rail service between Santa Cruz and Davenport; and
3. Release the draft agreements and the remainder of the due diligence reports for a 30-day public review period with the exception of the lease analysis report.

As communicated in the staff report provided in the agenda packet for this item, due to the very limited options to accommodate the travel needs of most of the County’s population and activity centers along a narrow coastal shelf between Watsonville and Santa Cruz, the RTC has been working to make more effective use of existing transportation corridors including the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Branch Line). The only way for the community to more effectively use the Branch Line for transportation is through public ownership. For these reasons, it is recommended that the RTC proceed with acquisition of this 32 mile, 300 acre continuous transportation corridor.

Since 2001, the RTC has been negotiating with the current owner of the Branch Line, Union Pacific Railroad (UP), and undertaking a comprehensive, thorough and detailed assessment of the Branch Line for possible purchase. The assessment includes appraisals, hazardous materials investigations and inspections.

Appraisal Reports

For railroad purchases, in order to determine the highest and best use of the property and a fair price, Caltrans requires that the value of the property be assessed using a variety of methods. Caltrans Right of Way division provides analysis and recommendations to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) when a public agency seeks to purchase railroad property using state transportation funds. The RTC’s appraisal reports indicate value
assessments with a range of $363,930 for the freight business, to $33.3 million for the depreciated value of the railroad assets at a Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) Class 1 service level. Due to the level of freight business on the Branch Line, especially after the closure of the CEMEX cement plant, the appraisers determined that the highest and best use for the property is achieved through liquidation for other uses.

The net liquidation value was assessed by two different firms in 2004 and in 2007, with a third assessment completed in 2010. The first assessment by Arthur Gimmy International estimated the net liquidation value at $6.5 million using a valuation date of March 1, 2004 and applying a value to only 31% of the property, due to a variety of title issues. The second assessment conducted by the firm of Colliers Pinkard used a valuation date of December 12, 2007, discounted to September 4, 2009, and applied the marketable parcels ratio (31%) from the first assessment. Colliers Pinkard arrived at a net liquidation value of $14.3 million. In March 2010, Sierra West Valuation (no relation to shortline operators Sierra Northern) completed a review appraisal report, which analyzed and updated all of the appraisal work, and concluded with a net liquidation value of $12.275 million and the statement, "...at either $14,300,000 or $12,275,000 the Santa Cruz Branch Line is a bargain for the general public while meeting the requirement of 'fair and reasonable price' to be paid the railroad."

Environmental Assessment

In 1997, consulting firm Geomatrix completed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the Branch Line for the RTC. The Phase I ESA investigated the history of the Branch Line and assessed the property for locations with potential environmental concerns. Based on the 1997 Phase I ESA and site reconnaissance, Geomatrix completed soil sampling and analysis for 54 locations at varying depths in 2005 and recommended additional soil sampling. In 2009, AMEC Geomatrix completed soil sampling and analysis at an additional 49 locations. The December 2009 report produced by AMEC Geomatrix includes the analysis of all soil samples and a human health risk assessment for arsenic, a chemical element used in pesticides, herbicides, insecticides that also occurs naturally in Santa Cruz County area soils.

Soil sampling was used to establish a background level for arsenic and analyze areas that exceed that background level. The report concludes that there are elevated levels of arsenic present along the branch line likely due to the use of herbicides by the railroad and adjacent farms. Using a conservative approach of risk to construction workers and recreational users of the property, the human health risk assessment concludes, "...potential exposures to arsenic in soil are not significantly different than naturally occurring levels." In addition to arsenic, lead and chromium were "detected at some locations at concentrations that could require special handling during construction activities." Therefore, the report recommends, "a management plan to address arsenic-containing soil during future construction." The management plan would include soil excavation, sampling, analysis, stockpiling and disposal procedures and construction monitoring guidelines. Because arsenic is commonly found in this area, many jurisdictions require similar management plans to minimize the disturbance of these elements during construction activities.

The Phase II ESA also discovered petroleum-based contamination at one location in the Watsonville area resulting from a discharge by a business adjacent to the Branch Line. UP
has been working with that adjoining business to clean the location. According to various consultants, this rail line is considered relatively clean, considering what is often found at many other rail lines.

Inspections

In 2005 and 2006, the RTC hired structural engineers to complete inspections of the bridges and other structures along the Branch Line. These inspections concluded that improvements to some of the structures are needed. The estimated cost of those improvements was updated in April 2008 to a range of $3.9 to $5.4 million. In 2009, the RTC completed a track inspection to get a thorough assessment of the condition of the track and roadbed, as well as the maintenance and capital improvement needs. The inspection concludes that the Branch Line can be maintained at the current level of service (with CEMEX in operation) with a maintenance cost of $370,000 annually by a short line operator.

Business Plan

In 2004, the RTC completed a draft business plan for the Branch Line with the cement plant in operation and recreational rail service between Capitola and Seascape. In December 2008, the RTC completed another business plan that included only freight operations under different arrangements. Due to the recent closure of the CEMEX cement plant and the interest of the short line operator to provide recreational rail service between Santa Cruz and Davenport, RTC consultants completed an additional business analysis for the Branch Line in March 2010. The business plan includes revenues and expenditures for the RTC, a freight operation and recreational rail operation under four different scenarios.

The RTC has been negotiating Scenario 1 in which there are limited freight operations and recreational rail service between Santa Cruz and Davenport. Under this scenario, the RTC will derive revenue from real estate leases and short line rail operations. In the first three years, the estimated revenues derived by RTC are not projected to cover the estimated costs associated with the Branch Line. As the RTC updates existing leases and develops new leases, more revenue will be derived, as is currently the case with the Transportation Agency in Monterey County’s revenues from their branch rail line acquisition. The lease analysis for the Santa Cruz Branch Line estimates a total annual lease revenue potential of $596,963. However, the business plan uses a very conservative revenue growth up to $200,000 annually.

The business plan also shows that even with the addition of new freight customers in the Watsonville area, the closure of the cement plant has a negative impact on freight revenues. However, the recreational rail service does yield revenue and can be sustainable, which helps the freight operation. The shortline operator wants to continue the freight operation and try to make it viable with car storage in the short term and potential growth in freight business in the mid to long-term as the economy recovers. However, if the freight operation cannot be made viable, it may be abandoned. It should be noted that the business plan employs a conservative approach and does not include revenues that can be achieved from potential enhancements such as a federal track maintenance tax credit and a state subsidy for maintenance of grade crossing signals. This tax credit and subsidy are subject to annual
federal renewals and annual state budget approvals and, therefore, may not always be available.

The RTC has been working to acquire the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Branch Line) since 2001. In December 2004, the RTC entered into a non-binding letter of intent with Union Pacific (UP) to purchase the Branch Line for $19 million. Subsequently, the parties renegotiated the purchase price to account for findings made during the initial due diligence work. In August 2008, the RTC reached a new agreement, in principle, with UP to purchase the Branch Line for $14.2 million with the commitment that $5 million would be set aside for improvements to the rail line with the available funding. In February 2010, the RTC added recreational rail service between Santa Cruz and Davenport to the project and submitted a revised application for Proposition 116 funds and an allocation request for State Transportation Improvement Program funding to the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

Agreements

The RTC has been negotiating a purchase and sale agreement (PSA) with the current owner, UP, to purchase the Branch Line for $14.2 million with a condition of investing $5 million for improvements to the Branch Line. The PSA also stipulates that UP will retain a freight easement that will be transferred to a short line operator upon purchase. This means that if freight service continues, the short line operator, rather than UP or the RTC, will be responsible for the common carrier obligations on the Branch Line. If the freight service is abandoned, the RTC will either railbank the Branch Line, or find another short line operator. The PSA states that the $5 million for improvements will be placed in an escrow account to ensure that it is used for improvements agreed to by the RTC and UP. Although staff at the California Transportation Commission initially indicated that this was acceptable, they have recently determined that this arrangement will need to be re-examined. RTC negotiators will revisit this item with UP.

The RTC has also been working with attorneys to negotiate an administration and coordination agreement (ACA) with the current short line operator, Sierra Northern Railway. The agreement outlines the limitations of the freight easement, maintenance responsibilities, revenue sharing provisions, insurance requirements, passenger rail license, etc. The RTC will have some maintenance responsibilities under this agreement for the area outside of the freight easement. A few details of this agreement are still being negotiated; however, staff recommends that, if the RTC reaches agreement with an operator consistent with the draft presented to the RTC, the RTC should enter into such an agreement.

Conclusion

Purchasing a railroad right of way is an extremely complicated endeavor, especially if the railroad is in operation. However, similar to the process a person undertakes to purchase a home, one must consider all of the information available and their established goals to determine whether the purchase should be made. The various inspections and analyses show that the property is overall in good shape, that there is revenue potential through leases, recreational rail service and future freight rail services, and that the current owner
made adequate concessions for needed improvements. As such, the property is a worthwhile asset for the community and its future transportation uses.

The RTC’s prime goal in pursuing this purchase has been to preserve the Branch Line as a transportation corridor for future uses. The closure of the CEMEX cement plant makes the possibility of losing this Branch Line as a transportation corridor even more imminent. Developing or acquiring a new corridor running the length of Santa Cruz County will be prohibitively difficult and expensive. The appraisals show an assessed value that supports the purchase price. The Branch Line can sustain recreational rail service that will help stimulate the local economy. The Branch Line will offer transportation options to future generations that would not be available to them otherwise. Therefore, your Executive Director recommends purchase of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for $14.2 million with the investment of $5 million for improvements to the Branch Line and an agreement with an operator for freight service and recreational rail service from Santa Cruz to Davenport.
Bicycle Hazard Report

This Hazard Reporting Form is available to all who wish to report a hazard affecting cyclists traveling on roads and bikeways. The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission will forward your comments to the appropriate Public Works Department. It will be up to you to let the Regional Transportation Commission know that the hazard reported has been fixed. Please mail your completed form to the Regional Transportation Commission at:

1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 or fax to (831) 460-3215.

Location of Hazard: 17th Ave at Felt St, Live Oak

Please circle one: Northbound Southbound Eastbound Westbound

Cross Streets: 

City: 

Please check all that apply:

- Pothole or Pavement Cracks
- Rough Surface
- Debris on Shoulder
- Debris in Bikeway
- Hazardous Drainage Grate
- Protruding of Sunken Access Cover
- Overgrowth Interfering with Line of Sight
- Traffic Signal Not Triggered by Bicycles
- Bikeways (paths, lanes, routes) Not Clearly Marked
- Railroad Hazard
- Damaged Bikeway Signs
- Construction Hazard (describe, work done by whom?)

Other (please describe): Left turn pocket does not detect bike

Please comment on how this hazard has impacted you.

I don't like going through the red in front of the county sheriff's office

Date: 2/10/110 Name: Cheryl Schmitt

Phone/Fax Number or E-mail Address: pppup @ cruzio.com

Where did you obtain this form?

The Regional Transportation Commission is not responsible for repairing any hazards. This form is forwarded to the appropriate public works department for the agency with jurisdiction over the right of way on which the hazard exists.

Thank you for participating in the Hazard Reporting Program!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Member Name/Contact Info</th>
<th>Appointment Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **District 1 - Voting**  
Soquel, Live Oak, part of Capitola | Kem Akol  
kemakol@msn.com  
247-2944 | First Appointed: 1993  
Term Expires: 3/13 |
| Alternate | Holly M. Tyler | First Appointed: 2010  
Term Expires: 3/13 |
| **District 2 - Voting**  
Aptos, Corralitos, part of Capitola,  
Nisene Marks, Freedom, PajDunes | David Casterson  
dcasterson@comcast.net | First Appointed: 2005  
Term Expires: 3/12 |
| Alternate | Eric Horton  
erichorton@design@yahoo.com  
419-7296 | First Appointed: 3/09  
Term Expires: 3/12 |
| **District 3 - Voting**  
Big Basin, Davenport, Bonny Doon, City of Santa Cruz | Peter Scott  
drip@ucsc.edu  
423-0796 | First Appointed: 2007  
Term Expires: 3/13 |
| Alternate | William Menchine (Will)  
menchine@cruzo.com | First Appointed: 4/02  
Term Expires: 3/13 |
| **District 4 - Voting**  
Watsonville, part of Corralitos | Brandon Kett  
722-4646 | Term Expires: 3/12 |
| Alternate | Vacant | Term Expires: 3/12 |
| **District 5 - Voting**  
SL Valley, Summit, Scotts Valley,  
part of Santa Cruz | Rick Hyman  
bikerick@att.net | First Appointed: 1989  
Term Expires: 3/13 |
| Alternate | Vacant | Term Expires: 3/13 |
| **City of Capitola - Voting** | Daniel Kostelec, Chair  
dkostelec@sbcglobal.net  
325-9623 | First Appointed 4/02  
Term Expires: 3/11 |
| Alternate | Andy Ward  
Andrew.ward@planetronics.com  
462-6653 | First Appointed: 2005  
Term Expires: 3/11 |
| **City of Santa Cruz - Voting** | Wilson Fiebeling  
anfiebel@yahoo.com | First Appointed: 2/97  
Term Expires: 3/12 |
| Alternate | Carlos Garza  
carlos@cruzo.com | First Appointed: 4/02  
Term Expires: 3/12 |
| **City of Scotts Valley - Voting** | Gary Milburn  
g.milburn@sbcglobal.net/438-2885  
427-3839  
210 wk | First Appointed: 1997  
Term Expires: 3/11 |
| Alternate | Lex Rau  
lexrau@sbcglobal.net  
419-1817 | First Appointed: 2007  
Term Expires: 3/11 |
| **City of Watsonville - Voting** | Bob Montague  
bob.montague@sbcglobal.net  
332-8025 | First Appointed: 8/08  
Term Expires: 3/13 |
| Alternate | Vacant | Term Expires: 3/13 |
| **Bike To Work - Voting** | Piet Canin  
pccanin@ecoact.org  
426-5925 ext. 127 | First Appointed: 4/02  
Term Expires: 3/13 |
| Alternate | Saskia Lucas  
saskia@ecoact.org  
426-5925 ext. 129 | First Appointed: 1/05  
Term Expires: 3/13 |
| **Community Traffic Safety Coalition - Voting** | Jim Langley  
jim@jimlangley.net  
423-7248 | First Appointed: 4/02  
Term Expires: 3/12 |
| Alternate | Leo Jed  
leojed@gmail.com  
425-2650 | First Appointed: 3/09  
Term Expires: 3/12 |

All phone numbers have the (831) area code unless otherwise noted.
TO: Bicycle Committee

FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

RE: Draft Aptos Village Plan

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee receive an update and presentation from Jack Sohriakoff of the Santa Cruz Public Works Department on circulation elements of the Aptos Village Plan.

BACKGROUND

Bicycle Committee members David Casterson, Will Menchine and Bob Montague met with Commissioner Ellen Pirie and County of Santa Cruz Planning Department staff in early 2010 to receive information about the draft Aptos Village Plan. The Bicycle Committee, after discussion at the February 22nd, 2010 meeting, directed member Kem Akol to request the circulation treatments during the public testimony to the Board of Supervisors at their February 23, 2010 meeting:

- Speed tables and other methods to slow traffic on Soquel Drive be installed
- A connection for bicycles from Trout Gulch Road to Aptos Creek Road behind the new development be considered
- A mix of enclosed and inverted U-rack bike locking facilities be installed
- Left turn bike pockets on Soquel Drive at Trout Gulch Road and at Aptos Creek Road be provided
- Bike lanes on the east/west road and the two new roads be provided
- A south-bound bike detour off Soquel to Aptos Street be provided

The Board of Supervisors approved the Plan at their February 23, 2010 meeting after the Public Hearing concluded.

DISCUSSION

Jack Sohriakoff of the Santa Cruz Public Works Department will present preliminary circulation plans at the April 12, 2010 Bicycle Committee meeting. Mr. Sohriakoff provided three transportation conceptual plans (Attachment 1) for Committee review at Monday’s meeting. RTC staff also provided a schematic demonstrating layout of a bike left-turn lane (Attachment 2).

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee receive a report on the Aptos Village Plan preliminary circulation plans.

Attachments:
1. Aptos Village Plan – Preliminary Circulation Plans
2. Schematic of a Bike Left-Turn Lane
Bike Left-Turn Lane
WSDOT, Design Manual, Facilities for Non-motorized Transportation
TO: Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
    Bicycle Committee

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and Environmental Impact Report

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the RTC’s Advisory Committees review the Draft Regional Transportation Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Report and recommend any changes for the final documents.

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is currently in the process of updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP is a state-mandated, long-range plan which is intended to provide a vision of regional transportation goals, policies, objectives and strategies, providing a basis for transportation infrastructure and operation/maintenance decisions for both the short and longer (25-year) term. The document covers all modes of transportation to, from, and within the county.

The 2010 RTP is a minor update to the 2005 RTP. Program-level environmental analysis of changes since 2005 is provided in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report.

DISCUSSION

On March 1, 2010, the Commission released the Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for public review. The documents are available for review on the Commission’s website, www.sccrtc.org/rtp.html, and at local libraries. A public hearing on the draft plan was held on April 1, 2010.

Commission staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee reviews and provides input on the draft documents at this meeting. Recommendations and an analysis is also being provided to you for consideration by your ad-hoc committee formed at the last Bicycle Committee meeting. The ad-hoc committee was charged with presenting you with an analysis and suggested recommendations. Comments on the draft documents are due April 19, 2010.

While we recognize that the Committee has reviewed the project lists and policies in the past, RTC staff wanted to give you an additional opportunity to provide input on the document as a whole. Certification of the EIR and adoption of the 2010 RTP are currently scheduled for the RTC’s June 3, 2010 meeting.
SUMMARY

The draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Report have been released for review. Staff requests that committee members review the draft documents and submit comments before the April 19, 2010 deadline. Attached please find document summaries as well as recommendations from your ad-hoc committee formed at the last full. The ad-hoc committee was charged with presenting you with an analysis and suggested recommendations.

Attachment 1: Draft RTP Executive Summary
Attachment 2: Supplemental DEIR Executive Summary
Attachment 3: RTP Ad-hoc Committee Report
RTP 2010
DRAFT
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan

March 2010
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
DRAFT

2010 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (herein referred to as the "RTC" or "Commission") periodically completes a Regional Transportation Plan to guide short- and long-range transportation planning and project implementation for the county.

This 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (called the "2010 RTP") is a minor update of the last version, completed in 2005, and provides guidance for transportation policy and projects through the year 2035. The 2010 RTP is the RTC's comprehensive planning document, which identifies the goals, projects, and programs that will improve and maintain our transportation system over the next twenty-five years. Individual projects listed in the 2010 RTP must still undergo separate design and environmental processes, and can only be implemented as local, state and federal funds become available.

2010 PLAN ORGANIZATION

The 2010 RTP is organized into the following chapters:

Chapter One Introduction
Chapter Two Our Transportation System
Chapter Three Goals and Policies
Chapter Four The Investment Program
Chapter Five Environmental and Air Quality Review of the 2010 RTP
Chapter Six Greenhouse Gas Emissions- Meeting the Challenge

DEVELOPING THE 2010 RTP

The 2010 RTP is a minor update of the 2005 Plan which addresses the existing transportation system and transportation needs of the entire county. Such a comprehensive plan necessarily involves the cooperation of many local, regional and state agencies. Public input is also critical to the RTC's planning and decision-making process. Comments from a wide range of individuals, public interest groups, and local agencies have been solicited over the past five years, most notably during extensive Transportation Funding Task Force workshops in 2006 and 2007. During development of the 2010 RTP, public input was sought through public meetings on key elements of the RTP. Additionally, in submitting projects for consideration, project sponsors took into consideration input they receive directly from the public.
INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND COMPETING DEMANDS FOR LIMITED TRANSPORTATION DOLLARS

Public sentiment on policy and funding decisions can be strong in Santa Cruz County, and transportation issues are no exception. Traffic congestion in the county continues to be a source of frustration and the community has expressed many ideas about how the limited funds available for highway, transit, road, and alternative transportation projects should be spent. A number of factors are clear:

➢ Santa Cruz County has a rich multi-modal transportation network. The county’s existing transportation network comprises a broad range of transportation facilities and modes, including: state highways, local roads and streets, an extensive bus system and specialized transport system for seniors and people with disabilities, bikeways, sidewalks, a rail line, an airport, and traffic management systems such as carpool programs, Park and Ride lots, Intelligent Transportation System technology, and signal synchronization. This “multi-modal” transportation network is crucial to meeting the travel needs of all county residents, including drivers, non-drivers and commercial traffic. Notably, approximately one-third of county residents do not drive, and an aging population is likely to increase the demand for transit, safe pedestrian routes, and specialized transport services.

➢ Traffic congestion exists in Santa Cruz County and will not go away in the foreseeable future. Population growth and region-wide jobs to housing imbalances that encourage driving as the mode of choice result in more drivers making more automobile trips. The daily traffic jams on Highway 1 and local streets are only the most obvious example of increasing congestion on county roadways.

➢ Transit service is limited by available revenues. In response to reduced revenues from the half-cent local transit sales tax and state cuts to transit funding, bus service reductions will be considered.

➢ Maintenance needs for the existing transportation network are increasing. Roadway, bikeway, sidewalk, bridge and other repairs must be addressed in parallel with capacity and operational enhancements. If ongoing routine maintenance needs are not addressed, the cost of deferred maintenance will grow exponentially, leaving little funding for major improvements.

➢ The complexity of transportation solutions is increasing as communities find that new projects must be shoe-horned into existing urban areas. Adding new highway lanes, widening city streets, building new roads, adding passenger rail service, or building new bus facilities are neither simple nor inexpensive propositions. Project delays, environmental concerns, neighborhood opposition, and right-of-way needs can increase cost, and, in some cases, may cause a funded project to be withdrawn.

➢ All transportation modes and facilities are subsidized with public funding generated from tax revenues—including freeways, local roads, bus and rail transit, and transportation for people with special needs. Many of the subsidies are indirect and
are not covered in the 2010 RTP or administered by the RTC. Examples of indirect transportation subsidies include pollution clean-up costs, law enforcement, emergency response costs and parking subsidies.

➢ The RTC has discretion over less than 10% of the transportation funds typically available to the region. The vast majority of transportation funding is dedicated to specific uses—such as airport improvements, highway safety and transit operations.

➢ The ebb and flow of federal, state, regional, and local funding affects project timing. Many needed projects with already identified funding have been delayed several years as the result of downturns in the economy that affect the availability of those funds.

➢ Existing funds are insufficient to finance major transportation improvements and ongoing maintenance. Additionally, the competition for limited state and federal funds favors large urban areas with local sources of revenues, such as local transportation sales taxes. New revenue sources will be needed to make major modifications to our transportation system and to eliminate the backlog of maintenance needs.

➢ Reaching consensus on transportation improvements is difficult, especially in light of limited funds, competing interests, and the inevitable impacts of major projects. In an attempt to generate sufficient funds for local transportation projects, the RTC proposed a new half-cent sales tax on the November 2004 ballot. Though voters rejected this first attempt, efforts continue to generate consensus and the 2010 RTP assumes that voters will approve a new tax in the next few years.

GOALS AND POLICIES

The 2010 RTP carries forward goals from the 2001 and 2005 RTP, which are to:

➢ Preserve and maintain the existing transportation system, emphasizing safety and efficiency.

➢ Increase mobility by providing an improved and integrated multi-modal transportation system.

➢ Coordinate land use and transportation decisions to ensure that the region’s social, cultural, and economic vitality are sustained for current and future generations.

➢ Ensure that the transportation system complements and enhances the natural environment of the Monterey Bay region and minimizes greenhouse gas emissions.

➢ Make the most efficient use of limited transportation financial resources.

➢ Solicit broad public input on all aspects of regional and local transportation plans, projects, and funding.
THE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The Goals and Policies — along with local priorities, potential environmental impacts, safety, economic and transportation equity considerations, funding constraints, and identified gaps in the existing transportation network — provided the basis for the identification of over 450 transportation improvement projects and programs that are needed to address the region’s mobility, accessibility, and economic and environmental sustainability needs over the next 25 years. Together with a discussion of how they will be funded, these projects and programs constitute the 2010 RTP’s “Investment Program,” described in Chapter 4.

FUNDING PROJECTION

During the next 25 years, approximately $2.6 billion from federal, state, and local funding sources is projected to be available to finance transportation projects in Santa Cruz County.

Of the $2.6 billion projected to be available, over 75 percent is dedicated to specific types of projects. Approximately $1 billion of that dedicated funding is slated for transit service and capital improvements. A large proportion of transit revenues come from our county’s dedicated half-cent local sales tax for transit.

As noted earlier, the RTP also assumes that the region’s voters will approve a new half-cent transportation sales tax measure in the next few years. Approximately 14 percent of the $2.6 billion is anticipated from that new sales tax, and it would be up to the discretion of the voters which projects receive those funds, though this RTP assumes that those funds will be dedicated to the projects and programs listed in the 2010 RTP.

Less than 10% of the $2.6 billion, $200 million over the coming 25 years, are discretionary funds under the direct control of the RTC.

It is important to note that transportation funding can be incredibly unpredictable. State and federal actions can result in elimination of certain funding programs or diversion of transportation funds to the State General Fund, as has happened regularly to transit funds over the past several years. Inevitably, some of the funding sources assumed within the financial projections for this plan will not actually be realized, depending on decisions made by voters and the state and federal governments. In addition, the RTC is constantly working with other transportation planning agencies to develop new transportation revenue sources, but it is always very challenging to do so.

Even if all of the revenues assumed in this document are realized these projected funds are insufficient to keep up with maintenance, operational, safety, and major improvement needs of the region. As such, this document identifies additional sources for new funds that could be made available for "unconstrained" projects. These could include new local or state gas taxes, vehicle registration fees, statewide transportation bonds, special federal funding programs (such as American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), Jobs for Main Street Act, special state legislative budget requests, and new grant or transportation impact fee programs.
FUNDING PROJECTS

The costs of individual projects and programs listed in the Investment Program are divided in two categories based on priority, funding availability, and potential environmental effects. Transportation improvements that can be funded with foreseeable transportation revenues between 2010 and 2035 are shown as “Constrained”. This group includes already funded projects to be constructed in the short term, and planned projects that could be constructed anytime within the 2010 RTP’s 25-year time-line as projected funds become available. Transportation improvements to be implemented if new revenues are generated or become available show their funding as “Unconstrained”. Some projects are identified with both constrained and unconstrained funds, indicating a need for additional funds to complete the entire project, though portions of those projects may be completed using anticipated funding.

The 2010 RTP assigns future transportation funds to a range of projects and programs designed to maintain the current transportation system, provide traffic congestion relief and broaden transportation options. Key proposals include:

- Maintenance of the existing transportation network including roads, highways, bike lanes, sidewalks, and transit
- Safety and operational improvements to Highways 1, 9, 17, 129 and 152
- Adding High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on Highway 1 between Aptos and Santa Cruz to facilitate increased carpool, vanpool and transit use
- Improvements to major arterial roads -- including bus, pedestrian and bicycle facilities -- to better accommodate local and commute traffic
- Expanded bus service, with additional Highway 17 Express buses and more Park and Ride lots to serve Silicon Valley, UCSC, and south county commuters
- Construction of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network along the coast
- Local bicycle and pedestrian projects designed to improve the feasibility of bicycle commuting, and provide safe bicycle and pedestrian routes to schools
- Expansion of specialized transport services to meet the projected increases in senior and disabled populations
- Increased availability of accurate and timely information about road conditions, transit operations, and other transportation options
- Landscaping and lighting improvements to make transportation corridors part of livable communities
IMPLEMENTING THE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Development of the RTP project list is only the first step towards actual implementation of the projects identified in the 2010 RTP. Prior to the beginning of construction for each project, a number of steps must be taken to secure funds and satisfy environmental and funding requirements, requiring from 6 months to 20 years, depending on the particular project’s complexity, impacts, level of public interest, and availability of funds. These steps include: developing a detailed project cost estimate; obtaining local, state and/or federal grants; designing the project; determining the project’s environmental impacts according to state and federal laws; securing right-of-way, if necessary; and throughout the process, incorporating public input.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS STRATEGIES

New for the 2010 RTP, the RTC has included a discussion on greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) in relation to transportation planning. In the absence of tools to measure the effectiveness of specific RTC policies towards reducing GHGs and without having the specific GHG reduction targets from the state, the new chapter introduces some of the best practices which could be included in a portfolio of strategies to meet future emission reduction goals in Santa Cruz County. The discussion suggests that a combination of strategies is essential to bending the curve of future emissions downward. While technological developments in vehicle design and clean fuels are outside the purview of the RTC, the RTP can focus on strategies that transform mobility as a way to affect GHG trends. The RTP includes many projects that pro-actively implement GHG reduction strategies such as: operating a Commute Solutions program to encourage ridesharing; funding freeway service patrols to remove incidents and improve traffic flow; adding high occupancy vehicle lanes in the Highway 1 corridor to encourage carpools, vanpools and transit use; acquiring the rail corridor for goods movement, bicycle and pedestrian access and possible passenger service; and supporting bicycle, pedestrian and transit projects.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND AIR QUALITY REVIEW OF THE 2010 RTP

The California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) requires that the environmental effects of the 2010 RTP be fully analyzed. This analysis was prepared as a separate program level Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the 2005 RTP EIR, released along with the 2010 RTP. The SEIR was prepared in coordination with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), the San Benito Council of Governments (SBCOG), and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). The SEIR supplements the certified 2005 RTP EIR by adding to the information provided in the 2005 EIR based on minor changes to the project lists and policies and addressing new information not previously available. The SEIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the 2010 RTP, including alternative investment scenarios, and identifies potential mitigation measures for impacts of the transportation program for the whole region. The SEIR does not analyze impacts of, or mitigations for, individual projects, as each project will undergo a separate environmental review process. The respective agency sponsors will conduct this project-specific review once funding is received and the project development process is initiated.
Together Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties comprise the North Central Coast Air basin (NCCAB). The three county region (or NCCAB) is an attainment area for ozone precursors and therefore exempt from conformity analysis. However, several projects in the plan implement the Air District’s approved Transportation Control Measures for the region, which are developed to reduce transportation-related emissions by reducing vehicle use or improving traffic flow.
SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (REPLACED IN ENTIRETY)

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) represents the environmental review for the 2010 Monterey Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Plan ("2010 MTP"), which is the "project" under review. This document supplements the certified 2005 Monterey Bay Area MTP EIR, which is incorporated by reference. The information contained in this SEIR is intended to provide AMBAG with the environmental information necessary to consider approval and adoption of the project. The 2010 MTP, collectively, consists of the 2010 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan (2010 MC-RTP), the 2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (2010 SCC-RTP) and the 2010 San Benito County Regional Transportation Plan (2010 SBC-RTP).

2010 MTP Project Overview

A series of transportation projects and programs as proposed, evaluated and selected at the county-wide level, serve as the basis for the 2010 MTP. In receipt of each county’s project list, AMBAG has been assured by the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) of each county that their RTP was developed taking into account transportation need, an evaluation of alternatives to meet that need, and the resultant plan and/or program selection to satisfy transportation needs. Most importantly, the RTPs reflect an extensive public involvement and participation process, as outlined in AMBAG’s Monterey Bay Region Public Participation Plan (June 11, 2008). The end product is a vision for a transportation system to serve the three-county region, based on public input, which embraces various modes of transportation to efficiently maximize the movement of people and goods, and to reduce energy consumption and air pollution through the year 2035.

The 2010 MTP does not provide project designs or construction schedules, and adoption of this comprehensive planning document does not represent an approval action for any of the individual transportation programs or projects. Details relating to the site-specific alignment, location, design and scheduling of the transportation improvement projects identified in the 2010 MTP are not fixed in, or defined by, this document. The adoption of the 2010 MTP represents an essential first step in qualifying for the receipt of the funding necessary to permit the implementation of programs and projects in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP.

AMBAG as Lead Agency under CEQA

The Lead Agency in the development of the 2010 MTP and in the preparation of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) is the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). The 2010 MTP expresses the priorities of AMBAG, TAMC, SCCRTC, SBCOG and
their partner planning/programming agencies, for transportation system improvements and programs within the Monterey Bay region. This Program SEIR describes, in general terms, the probable environmental effects which may be associated with those expressed priorities on a regional, system-wide basis, rather than on a project-by-project basis.

The SEIR updates information provided in the previous EIRs prepared on earlier MTPs and RTPs. These changes include slight revisions to policy statements; the deletion of some projects which appeared on previous financially constrained Action Element lists (but which have since been completed or have been dropped from consideration); the addition of new projects to the financially constrained Action Element and the Financially Unconstrained Project Lists; revisions of the Financial Element to reflect changes in anticipated revenues; a standalone Consistency Analysis to evaluate 2010 MTP consistency with other plans and programs currently in force within the region; a programmatic Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Analysis; the addition of another alternative - the “GHG-Reduction” Alternative - and new population and housing forecasts released by AMBAG in 2008.

This SEIR identifies measures which appear to be available for, and effective in, mitigating the significant environmental effects associated with the implementation of the programs and projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP. These mitigation measures, as identified, are recommendations to the appropriate agency responsible for the actual implementation of the projects. The identified mitigation measures may be subject to change based on comments received on the SEIR during the review period, and on the determination made by the respective governing boards in reviewing the SEIR.

What the 2010 MTP SEIR Is

This SEIR identifies the long-term environmental impacts of the components of the 2010 MTP and provides the basis for further project-level CEQA (and National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA]) compliance for implementation of future transportation projects. There are only a few chapters from the certified 2005 MTP EIR that have been updated in their entirety to contain “new information of substantial importance” based on updates from the 2010 MTP.

What this SEIR is Not

This SEIR is not a ‘comprehensive’ update to every chapter of the certified 2005 MTP EIR. As discussed above, several chapters have been updated in their entirety. Several other chapters, however, have been updated with minor additions or clarifying information. In those cases, chapters are identified with the label “Errata Changes Only”, and only the pages with text changes are reproduced.

The remaining chapters of the 2005 MTP EIR, requiring only temporal edits that do not include new information of substantial importance, remain valid, and are not reproduced within this SEIR. Those chapters are labeled with the heading “No Changes”.
The full text of the 2005 MTP EIR is available for reference at: www.ambag.org.

Alternatives Evaluated

The SEIR evaluates four alternatives to the adoption of the 2010 MTP. In this document, the “No Build” alternative represents a scenario in which no new construction on transportation system improvement projects would take place in the absence of the 2010 MTP, although maintenance of the existing transportation infrastructure would continue. The “Financially Unconstrained” alternative represents a more extensive range of transportation system improvements than anticipated under the 2010 MTP, since it would encompass all of the transportation system improvement programs and projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP, as well as all of the transportation system improvement programs and projects identified in the Financially Unconstrained Project Lists of the 2010 MTP. The “Financially Constrained – No New Revenues” evaluates a scenario where some major projects may be postponed or jeopardized in the absence of new funding sources. Finally, the “GHG-Reduction” alternative assumes long-term changes in land use and circulation patterns (consistent with Senate Bill (SB) 375 and the AMBAG Draft Blueprint Plan), resulting in enhanced coordination between land use and transportation systems, with the ultimate goal of further reducing greenhouse gases and other environmental benefits.

For the purposes of CEQA analysis, the “GHG Reduction” alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Such an alternative, however, will rely upon the long term coordination of regional land use and transportation planning efforts, and is not considered a viable “option” to the 2010 MTP at this time.

Impact and Mitigation Summary Table

A “program-level” summary of the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the project is identified in the table on the following pages, along with corresponding mitigation measures and strategies. Although the impact analysis and resulting mitigation changed very little from 2005, the entire table has been produced here so that the public and reviewing agencies will have a complete summary of all impact and mitigation statements in one place.

In reviewing this analysis summary, it is important to remember that these potential impacts are not directly related to the adoption of the 2010 MTP. By itself, the adoption of the 2010 MTP would not be sufficient to enable any of the projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP to proceed, and would not directly result in any adverse environmental impacts. Under CEQA, each of the appropriate agencies responsible for the actual implementation of projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP will be required to provide some level of project-specific environmental review for each of the projects listed once such projects have been designed and formally proposed for approval.

As a result, several impacts are identified as “significant and unavoidable” until such time that they are reviewed, analyzed and mitigated at the project specific level.
April 12, 2010

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

Dear Commissioners,

Per your request, the Bicycle Advisory Committee has reviewed the draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and has prepared a list of recommendations to modify the draft document. Included are recommendations for policy revisions, policy additions, project revisions, and project additions.

**Our recommendations to Chapter Three: Goals and Policies are shown with strikeouts and underlines as follows, with explanations in italics:**

1.3.12 Encourage **and consider patronizing** bicycle delivery services.

1.3.13 Encourage employers to make bicycles and bike facilities available for business related trips; to **subsidize** employees who use their own bicycles for business-related trips and to allow employees to be eligible for bicycle commuting reimbursement pursuant to section 132 (f) of the Internal Revenue Service Code.

1.4.1 Encourage signal standardization and signal timing improvements, with respect for pedestrian mobility and bicycle access, and discourage unwarranted stops on arterial streets.

1.6.3 Minimize adverse impacts on bicyclists and pedestrians during construction and maintenance activities by prompt repair, sweeping, and avoiding longitudinal seams on all road edges and curb areas including bicycle lanes and by following the Traffic Safety Coalition’s "Recommended Guidelines to Protect the Safety of Bicyclists, Pedestrians, and Disabled Travelers during Road Construction."

1.6.5 Encourage driver instruction about sharing the road with bicycles and encourage bicyclists to attend safety education programs; **continue bicycle traffic school for bicyclist offenders.**

1.6.9 Improve bicyclists' safety by eliminating impediments such as uneven railroad crossings and drainage grates with wide spacing along bikeways all streets, conducting regular street and pathway sweeping, bike lane repainting, trimming vegetation adjacent to or overhanging areas where bicycles travel, using pavement marking materials that are least slippery and skid-prone and implementing traffic signal detection of bicycles.

2.1.1 Consider the needs of the non-motorized traveler in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations, and project development activities and products. Whenever feasible, the incorporation of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities should be incorporated in all capital projects. **Projects conceived primarily to benefit motor vehicular travel should receive extra rating points in funding prioritization if they include significant, new bicycle components. (This has been the recent policy of SCCRTC is scoring projects and should be memorialized in the RFP).**

2.7 To achieve a goal of five percent of all trips and 30 percent of all work trips by bicycle, prioritize **Increase all work trips by bicycle by 10% each year by prioritizing bikeway projects based on: 1) increased safety or access;**
2) complete gaps in the regional bicycle network; 3) high-demand, high-density areas and commute routes; 4) along popular recreational routes. Develop a meaningful program to measure and monitor growth rate.

2.7.5 Ensure that the public is informed about safe bicycling routes and options by periodically updating the County bikeways map and by providing links from SCCRTC website to Google and other map sources.

2.8.1 Provide bicycle racks that provide equal stability and locking points for bicycles and/or lockers at park and ride lots, transit centers and bus stops; bicycles on transit and pedestrian connections to transit; and potential interconnections with future uses of the rail line within Santa Cruz County. (Too many good intentioned bicycle racks are not adequate. The RTC has specifications for appropriate racks.)

3.1.1 Regularly develop and update local pedestrian and bike plans of all local jurisdictions, UCSC, and Cabrillo College, and implement projects from those plans. Provide technical assistance to the jurisdiction to help with bicycle plan preparation and updating. (SCCRTC’s staff and bicycle committee were instrumental in seeing Scotts Valley and Watsonville’s initial bike plans come to fruition, thus this assistance should be recognized as a function to continue.)

3.3.2 Limit on-street parking on arterial and collector streets, encourage parking alternatives, and pursue off-street parking as methods to accommodate bicycle lanes. (This was in previous RTPs. Most of the major streets that currently lack bike lanes have on-street parking. Unless, funding is allocated for off-street parking, bike lanes will never get installed, given that further street widening would be infeasible or much more costly.)

3.4.3 Encourage new recreation/visitor-serving development to include transit and bicycle improvements and to provide bicycles for their patrons.

3.4.4 Provide alternative transportation information as well as adequate and secure bicycle parking at special events and at public, private, commercial and educational facilities and encourage employers to participate in the Emergency Ride Home program.

3.7.2 Encourage safe routes to schools by providing improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities, improved transit service traffic-calming measures, and bicycle rider training programs for elementary students and by applying for Safe Routes to School funding whenever available.

5.2.3 Encourage private development proposals to include transit, bike, car sharing and pedestrian service improvements and financial support of transit service, consistent with transit improvement plans; use Traffic Impact Fees to ensure that developers pay a fair share of circulation system improvements and continue the availability of bicycle parking subsidies.

Please add the following sub-policies to the RTP to support bicycling:

Under Goal 1:

Continue the cooperative bicycle hazard reporting program and respond to problems as soon as possible. (This policy was in past RTPs. This program has been extremely successful and should be supported. Roadway problems that are imperceptible to motorists can cause serious accidents to bicyclists; therefore, this is a significant safety issue.)

Do not reduce access to bicyclists on streets, such as by making them one-way, adding diagonal parking, closing them off to through traffic, etc.; choose traffic calming devices to install that do not slow down or inconvenience bicyclists and increase bicycle access in existing restrictive cases such as by providing contraflow lanes or bicycle-
only cut throughs. (Access restrictions implemented to either help motor vehicle traffic flow or make streets more liveable have the unintended effect of either making bicycling less convenient or encouraging cyclists to disobey the law.)

Do not allow obstructions within the roadway where bicyclists ride; instruct residents and businesses to place waste collection barrels out of the bicycle travel path and to remove them from the street as soon after pickups as possible and work with delivery companies to identify locations out of bicycle lanes for delivery trucks to stop.

Under Goal 2:

Ensure that all transportation projects are implemented in a bicycle-friendly manner by having the RTC's Bicycle Committee review plans for all bike projects, funding only projects that are built according to approved plans, and accepting as complete only projects that have been inspected from a bicyclist's perspective. (Despite state guidelines, it is the Committee's experience that often projects are designed with flaws that will inhibit bicycling. Early review by an experienced committee can save money later. Similarly, to date there has been a lack of inspection of funded projects to determine if they were really built correctly before final funding is dispersed, and the Committee has had to write several letters over the years requesting corrections in completed projects. One frustration bicyclists have experienced is to ride in a completed project location and discover an impediment to cyclists that is too late to easily fix because the work has already been signed-off.)

Under Goal 2; Policy 2.7

Facilitate cooperation among adjacent jurisdictions, both in-county and with adjacent counties, to install continuous bikeways and bike routes

Under Goal 2; Policy 2.7

Work towards all communities in the county achieving and maintaining Bicycle Friendly Community status, striving for the highest (platinum) level by encouraging the development of a Regional Bike Plan. (Santa Cruz City became a silver level bicycle friendly community in 2008, a designation that will expire in 2011, unless renewed. The sponsors, League of American Bicyclists, have no definitive rules as to what is a community so different entities in the county can either submit separate applications or partner together.)

Encourage and promote community events to showcase and popularize bicycling such as experimental street closings, community rides, bike to work week celebrations, car-free days and bike races.

Support programs to increase access to bicycles such as bike-sharing; discounts for bikes, helmets and other accessories; free bikes; inexpensive bike loans or rentals.

Support programs to encourage and mentor citizens to begin cycling or to cycle more often, such as bicycle buddies, effective cycling classes, maintenance classes, and bike rodeos.

Under Goal 3:

Maintain a bicycle planner position in the RTC. (Although the bicycle committee understands that funding is tight and while many staff people can and do work on bicycle issues, having one professional who is empowered to see
the broad picture and be able to disseminate information to others and staff the bicycle committee is imperative to implementing the RTP’s bicycle policies.)

Under Goal 5:

Encourage more bicycle projects to be ready to compete for available grants by supporting preparation of conceptual designs and refined cost estimates of prioritized bike projects ahead of funding cycles; timely alerting agencies in the County that can provide bike facilities of all available funding sources and deadlines; and actively soliciting applications. (Many great bike projects have been built but many more worthy ones, including several inexpensive ones, have not happened. To complement the many fine RTP policies that promote alternative transportation projects, there needs to be a greater commitment towards getting projects onto the drawing board. Too often a funding cycle is announced with only a short turn around-time, and so if there has been no advanced planning of listed bicycle projects they cannot be funded even if they have support.)

We have reviewed the list of projects in Appendix B and recommend the following revisions, with explanations in italics:

City of Capitola:

Bay Avenue Improvement CAP-P29 Traffic calming features along Bay Avenue from Highway 1 to Monterey Avenue, including installation of left turn pocket at Center Street.

Bay Avenue/Monterey Avenue Intersection Improvements CAP-P32 Multimodal improvements to the intersection. Include signalization or roundabout along with pedestrian, bicycle and transit access.

City of Santa Cruz:

Delaware Avenue Bike/Pedestrian Path SC-P23 Install a Class II bicycle/pedestrian facility lane. $500
$500 $0 (City of Santa Cruz Bicycle Transportation Plan (2008) shows bike lanes the length of Delaware; parts of Delaware have bike lanes, parts lack them. We are not sure where this pathway would be located.)

Delete: Swanton Blvd. Path SC P40 Install a Class 1 bicycle/pedestrian facility. $175 $0 $175 (In preparing the latest City of Santa Cruz Bicycle Transportation Plan (2008), this former project was left out, because there are already bike lanes on Swanton Blvd.)

City of Watsonville:

WAT-P28 Airport Blvd Improvements – Constrained $1,500 0 Unconstrained $0-1,500 (This should be a low priority project. There are other roads in the city in greater need of improvement that do not have bike lanes. It is probable that the constrained funds for this project could be better used elsewhere)

WAT-P06 Citywide maintenance & ops –including maintenance of bicycle lanes and other bicycle facilities and responses to bicycle hazards
WAT-P24 Citywide Transportation Projects (There should be a more specific list of projects that would allow for public input. Priority can’t be specified without more info)

WAT-P29 Crestview/Wagner Extension - Constrained $1,500 Unconstrained $4,000 (This could provide an alternative bike route to Freedom and thus is a higher priority for cyclists)

WAT-P01 Freedom Blvd Reconstruction (Lincoln to Alta Vista) – Reconstruction of the asphalt pavement, replacement of sidewalk, curb and gutter and installation of curb ramps, bike lanes and bike signage (including sharrows and bikes have full use of the lane signs where bike lanes are not possible from Lincoln St. to Alta Vista Ave.

Wat 01 Hwy 1/Harkins Slough Rd Interchange - Constrained $10,500 Unconstrained $0 - $10,500 (This project primarily facilitate motor vehicle movement and therefore should be lower priority.)

WAT-P19 Lump Sum Bicycle Projects (There should be a more specific list of projects that would allow for public input-H)

WAT 27a Main St (Hwy 152) Freedom Blvd Roundabout - Constrained $1,250 Unconstrained $0 $1,250 (We have serious concerns as to how bicyclists and pedestrians will be protected and maintain access in a roundabout in such a busy location. This project should be lower priority. Santa Cruz City will soon install two roundabouts and the RTP should not fund additional ones until these can be evaluated for their effects on bicycle and pedestrian safety.)

WAT-P04 Neighborhood Traffic Plan – Plan to identify and address concerns regarding speeding and other neighborhood traffic issues, including bicycle and pedestrian access and safety.

WAT-P13 Neighborhood Traffic Plan Implementation – Address concerns about traffic complaints through Education, Enforcement, and Engineering solutions. Install traffic calming devices, that do not impede bicyclist access.

WAT-P27 Watsonville Shuttle Year round public transit service. (It is not clear what this project is and who it serves and thus, priority can’t be specified. However, pursuant to our other comments, any transit service should carry bicycles.)

CALTRANS:

CT-P39 Hwy 129 Bikeway - Lee to Lakeview city limits.

CT-P32 Hwy 129 Widening - (Union to Bridge St)-including bike lanes.

CT-P33 Hwy 152 Widening including bike lanes.

CT-P38 Hwy 152 Bikeways - (Main St- GV to Mont Co line, Beach St - Walker to Lincoln, Lake Ave - Main St to Fairgrounds-Casserly/Carlton)- Cost unknown. (This is a crucial project for the future of cycling in Watsonville. This is our main street and it must be made safe for all users of the road. It should be a high priority for funding.)

CHP:

CHP-P03 Hwy 129 Safety Program including enforcement and education for bicyclists’ safety.
CTSA:

CTSA-P05 Ag Worker Transportation Program – Vanpool program to agricultural work sites aimed at increasing safety and reducing vehicle trips to job sites and incentive program to encourage workers to bike to work in the fields.

County Health Services Agency:

CO 50B South County CTSC Program - Constrained $100 2,500 Unconstrained $2,400-0  (South county deserves a higher priority just as the Community Traffic Safety Coalition is afforded.)

County of Santa Cruz:

CO-P26e Buena Vista Rd Improvements (San Andreas to Freedom) – Constrained $2,900 0 Unconstrained $ 2,900 (This is less important than providing bike lanes on Beach-Street.)

CO-P11 Freedom Blvd Multimodal Improvements (Bonita to Watsonville) – Constrained $1000 3,000 Unconstrained $2,000- 0 (This is a high priority project for bicyclists.)

CO-P32c Harkins Slough Rd improvements (entire length - Buena vista to Hwy1) – (This project would likely take some major engineering and a raised roadway to possibly be feasible because the road is flooded and closed. We would suggest consideration of a ped/bike bridge.)

CO-P69 Hwy152/Holohan/College Intersection Improvements - Operational Improvements at Hwy 152/Holohan/College Road. New signal, lengthen turn lanes, channelization, and drainage improvements, bike lanes.

CO-P38 Pajaro River Bike Path System- Constrained $0 5,000 Unconstrained $9,200- 4,200 (This is a high priority project for cyclists, so at least part should be funded in the near term.)

CO-P28i Varni Rd improvements (Corralitos Rd to Amsden to Green Valley Rd) -

UCSC:

Revise: Hagar-Coolidge Connector Road UC-P47 New roadway connector between Hagar Drive and Coolidge with bike lanes $2,000 $0 $2,000 (In the UCSC Bicycle Plan (2008))

Revise: Northern Entrance UC-P08 Construct Northern Entrance including Cave Gulch Bridge to Empire Grade and road to Northern Heller Dr. with bike lanes $6,000 $0 $6,000 (In the UCSC Bicycle Plan (2008))

Revise: Northern Loop Roadway UC-P07 Construct new roadway on upper campus with bike lanes, $6,000 $0 $6,000 (In the UCSC Bicycle Plan (2008))

Various Agencies:

VAR-P03 Bicycle Sharrows - Constrained $0 100 Unconstrained $500 400 (Some funds should be allocated in the near term to at least start pilot programs for this and the following two projects as they all have the potential to improve cycling at relatively low costs.)
VAR-P16 Bike Share - Constrained $0 1,000 Unconstrained $5,000- 4,000
VAR-POS Bike Activated Traffic signal program - Constrained $0 200 Unconstrained $1,000- 800

In addition to the above recommendations to the Goals and Policies section, the Bicycle Committee has also prepared a list of recommended projects to be added to RTP project list. These project recommendations are attached as Appendix A.

It is our hope that your inclusion of these recommendations into the 2010 RTP will enhance current efforts to provide safe facilities for bicycle commuting and in doing so motivate more members of the public to switch to this healthy and environmentally sustainable form of transportation. We note that there are many bicycle projects listed in Appendix B and we support these. However, a lot more can be done for cycling at a comparatively lower cost than roadway projects for motor vehicles. Since the RTC’s goal is to increase the number of cyclists, it is important to have roadways and pathways designed and improved for bicyclists’ use. Even if funding is not yet available or even foreseeable, having a list of all needed bicycle projects is important for planning purposes and to justify seeking funding. We note that Section 65080 of the Government Code requires that for RTPs “Each transportation planning agency shall consider and incorporate, as appropriate, the transportation plans of cities, counties, districts, private organizations, and state and federal agencies.” Thus, the following projects that are contained in adopted bicycle transportation plans need to be incorporated into the RTP.

Appendix A – Recommended Additions to 2010 RTP Project List (Appendix B)

Recommendations to City of Santa Cruz Project List

All of the following projects are in the adopted 2008 City of Santa Cruz Bicycle Transportation Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description/Scope</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arana Gulch Connection (Agnes St to Arana Gulch path)</td>
<td>bike/multi-purpose path</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Seco Trail (Meder Street to Grandview Street)</td>
<td>Improve existing trail</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Connection (Murray St/RR to Harbor path)</td>
<td>Improve path</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor High Connection (La Fonda to Park Way)</td>
<td>Acquire easement; improve path</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street Bridge over SR1</td>
<td>Replace ped bridge with bike/ped bridge</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street Connection (Grandview St to King St)</td>
<td>Acquire easement in alley behind motel, open access &amp; pave</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Avenue Bridge crossing Branciforte Creek</td>
<td>new bridge &amp; connections</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street Connection (River St to west San Lorenzo River levee)</td>
<td>bike/multi-purpose path</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trestle Bridge Connection (Beach St to railroad bridge)</td>
<td>bike/multi-purpose path/ramp</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevethan St Bridge over SR1</td>
<td>New bike/ped bridge</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga Ave (Soquel Ave to Hiawatha Ave)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut St (Laurel St to end or intersection with future Rail Trail)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral St (River St. to Limekiln St)</td>
<td>bike lane south side only</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral St (Limekiln St to Evergreen St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois St (Harvey West Blvd to Encinal St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinal St (DuBois St to SR9)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmount Ave (Branciforte Ave to Morrissey Blvd)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick St (Soquel Ave to Broadway)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$23,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gault St. (Seabright Ave to Frederick St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Ln (Goss Ave to Rooney St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goss Ave (Market St to N. Branciforte Av)</td>
<td>bike lane on uphill side</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goss Ave (N. Branciforte Av to Elk St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant St (Plymouth St to Market St )</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey West Blvd (DuBois St to Coral St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Fonda Ave (Soquel Ave to SR1)</td>
<td>bike lane on downhill side</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Fonda Ave (SR1 Bridge)</td>
<td>New bridge over SR1 with bike lanes</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Fonda Ave (SR 1 to Prospect Heights)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel St (King St to California St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limekiln St (Encinal St to Coral St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St (Water St to beyond Curtis St )</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St/ Branciforte Dr (Avalon St to City Limits)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meder St. (Western Dr to Bay Dr)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission St Ext. (Burkett St to Swift St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrissey Blvd (Park Way to Prospect Hts)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Pacific Ave (River St to Water St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean St (Barson St to San Lorenzo Blvd)</td>
<td>bike lane west side</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth St (City Limits/El Rancho Dr to Lee St)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Heights (Morrissey Blvd to Brookwood Dr)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooney St. (Gilbert Ln to Pacheco Av)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel Ave (Branciforte to Ocean)</td>
<td>bike lane on downhill side</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Branciforte Ave (Broadway to Peck Terrace)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR9 (River St) (SR1 to City Limits)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvania Ave (Encinal St to Harvey West Blvd )</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third St (Beach St to Riverside Av)</td>
<td>northbound bike lane</td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Dr (Mission St. to SR1)</td>
<td>bike lanes</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Dr (SR1 to High St)</td>
<td>bicycle lanes</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acadia Av (Seaside St to California St)</td>
<td>bicycle route</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California St (Laurel St to Walnut Av)</td>
<td>bicycle route</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Av (Van Ness Av to Walnut Av)</td>
<td>bicycle route/boulevard</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Health Center driveways (Emeline St to North Plymouth St)</td>
<td>bicycle route</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen St (Coral St to end)</td>
<td>bicycle route</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee St (North Plymouth St to Emeline Av)</td>
<td>bicycle route</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Av (Bay St to Pelton Av)</td>
<td>bicycle route</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Av (Soquel Av to Coulson Av)</td>
<td>bicycle route/boulevard</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Av (Water St to Laurel St)</td>
<td>bicycle route</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine St (Broadway to Seabright Av)</td>
<td>bicycle route/boulevard</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside St (Rankin St to Acadia St)</td>
<td>bicycle route</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR1 (Mission St) (Union St to Swift St)</td>
<td>bicycle route</td>
<td>negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Way Bridge (Berkeley Way to Market St)</td>
<td>Improve connection at Market St</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookside Connection (Brookside Ave to County HAS)</td>
<td>New bike/ped bridge</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cliff/Murray St Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Reconfigure/restripe intersection</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former church parcel next to Frederick St Park (S end of Harbor Dr to Frederick St Park )</td>
<td>Sign/maintain pathway in new development</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former church parcel next to Frederick St Park (Frederick St to east end of parcel)</td>
<td>Sign/maintain pathway</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview St (at Western Dr)</td>
<td>Cut-through for bikes/peds</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Dr. north end (Harbor Dr to Broadway extension)</td>
<td>Cut-through for bikes/peds</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey West Park Connection (Evergreen St to Harvey West Blvd)</td>
<td>Sign existing pathway for bikes</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Connection (End of Mountain View to Rail Trail)</td>
<td>Cut-through for bikes/peds</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All railroad crossings</td>
<td>Retrofit to be bicycle friendly</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR1 Expressway (Chestnut St to River St)</td>
<td>Allow bike access</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations to City of Watsonville Project List**

*This list is based on project lists developed for the previous City of Watsonville bicycle plan and observations of and discussions with area cyclists.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln St</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>at least from Freedom Blvd to E. Beach St, and it should extend to Hwy129 (Riverside Dr.)</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinelli St</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>From Freedom Blvd to Hwy 152</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewington Ave</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Entire Length</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Ave</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>E. Lake to Sudden</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California St</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Sudden to Tuttle</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez St</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Hwy 152 to Hwy 129</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Walker to Main St (152)</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson / Whiting Rd</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Green Valley to Casserly</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Rd / Auto Plaza Wy</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Hwy 152 / Main St . to Freedom Blvd</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Vista Ave</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Arthur Rd to Freedom Blvd</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach St</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>from Lee to Main St (Hwy 152)</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>from Main St (Hwy 152 to Freedom Blvd )</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohlone Pkwy</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Beach St to Harkins Slough</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn St</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>from Hwy129 to E. Lake</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial St</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Riverside to W. Beach St</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden St</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>From Freedom Blvd to E. Lake</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th St</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Walker to Madison</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 129</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Main St to Hwy 101</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Rd</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Main St to Hwy 101</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Blvd</td>
<td>Bike Lanes, Sharrows &amp; Signage</td>
<td>probably not going to be able to have bike lanes in all sections due to physical constraints. In those sections, both sharrows and clear signage should be mandatory. Freedom is a major cross town route.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas Rd</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Main St to Hwy 1</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for bike cages, racks and lockers at schools, parks, parking lots &amp; businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary Trail System</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough Trail System</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations to UCSC Project List

*All of the following are in the UCSC Bicycle Plan which is incorporated in the 2008 City of Santa Cruz Bicycle Transportation Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description/Scope</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Lane entrance</td>
<td>Replace chain with bollards</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinaquapin Dr. (McLaughlin Dr to</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown-Merrill apartments</td>
<td>Bike route</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hager Dr (Meyer Dr. extension to McLaughlin)</td>
<td>Bike lane hill only</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heller Dr. (Meyer Dr. to McLaughlin Dr.)</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heller Dr. (Empire Grade to Meyer Dr.)</td>
<td>Bike lanes on new road</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer Dr. extension</td>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer Dr.</td>
<td>Convert to multi-use path</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaks to Performing Arts path</td>
<td>Bike routes</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA: April 12, 2010

TO: Bicycle Committee

FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

RE: FY 10/11 TDA Funding Request and Review of Work Plans for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition and the Ride 'n Stride Program

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee:

1. Review the attached proposed FY 10/11 Work Plans and Budgets from the County Health Services Agency (HSA) for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) and Ride 'n Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian School Education Program (Attachments 1 through 7); and

2. Recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the claim for $86,064 in FY 10/11 Transportation Development Act funds.

BACKGROUND

Since FY 98/99, the Regional Transportation Commission has included $50,000 in Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC), operated by the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency (HSA).

Since FY 01-02, the Commission has also funded HSA’s Ride ‘n Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian School Education Program with TDA funds. In prior years, funding for this program came from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program and Commission reserves. In 2001, the Commission stated its intention of approving up to $100,000 in TDA funds in future fiscal years for the CTSC and its related programs.

Per the agreement between the Commission and HSA for receipt of TDA funds, the Commission has the opportunity to provide input or contingencies on funding or the work plan as part of any funding approval.

DISCUSSION

The County HSA submitted the attached TDA claim forms, work plans and budgets for Bicycle Committee and Commission review and approval of funding. While the HSA generally submits a request for $100,000 for both CTSC and the Ride ‘n Stride Programs, current financial challenges caused by the worst economic recession in decades has impacted available apportionments. The RTC reduced apportionments to all TDA recipients making only $87,040 available for the HSA’s programs. The attached claims are for a combined total of $87,040.
The first work program, claim form and budget are for the ongoing work of the CTSC (see Attachments 1-4). The TDA funding request amount for the CTSC is $43,777. The second work plan and budget request is for continuation of the Ride 'n Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian School Education Program (Attachments 5-7). This project includes staff costs but also relies on volunteers to present lessons on bicycle and pedestrian safety to elementary school students. The FY 10/11 funding request for this program is for $42,287.

The total amount requested for the two programs does not exceed the $86,064 currently available. HSA and other Coalition members have again provided over $87,040 in matching funds to the requested allocation.

This year, funding requests for the Health Services Agency's two programs will be accomplished in three steps: 1) Inclusion in RTC budget for next fiscal year (conducted at the March 4, 2010 RTC meeting). 2) Bicycle Committee review and recommendation (on April 12, 2010, and 3) RTC review and approval (scheduled for the May 6, 2010 RTC meeting).

It is uncertain whether current TDA revenue estimates will be realized. Staff will continue to monitor TDA revenues and report any further downwards adjustments needed to HSA staff and the RTC.

Work Plan Review

The agreement between the SCCRTC and County HSA for the CTSC and Ride 'n Stride programs includes annual review, feedback and comment by the Commission on their respective work plans as part of the funding review and approval process. Staff suggests that Committee members provide any input to HSA staff at the Committee meeting.

SUMMARY

Attached is a request for $86,064 in FY 10/11 TDA funding from the Health Services Agency for the CTSC and Ride 'n Stride Programs. While the Commission has indicated its intention to continue funding these programs through the TDA program, this year's amount reflects a reduction from prior funding levels due to severe funding shortfalls. Staff recommends that the Committee recommend to the Regional Transportation Commission approving the funding request at the $86,064 level with $43,777 going to the Community Traffic Safety Coalition and $42,287 going to the Ride 'n Stride Program.

Attachments:

1. Request Letter from Katie LeBaron, Project Director
2. Community Traffic Safety Coalition Transportation Development Act Claim Form
5. Ride 'n Stride Transportation Development Act Claim Form
6. Ride 'n Stride (Bicycle and Pedestrian Education) Program FY 10/11 Work Plan
7. Ride 'n Stride (Bicycle and Pedestrian Education) Program FY 10/11 Budget
March 25, 2010

George Dondero
Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060-3911

Regarding: FY 2010/11 TDA Request for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) and Ride n’ Stride programs

Dear Mr. Dondero:

CTSC continues to serve as the primary community-based coalition in Santa Cruz County focusing on bicycle and pedestrian traffic safety for all age groups, bringing together various agencies and individuals to address community issues and develop and implement strategies to increase the use of safe alternate modes of transportation. The Ride n’ Stride program also continues to positively impact the community through its elementary school-based classroom education model that teaches road safety practices to thousands of children every year as the foundation for life-long behaviors.

Based on SCCRTC staff’s recommendation to maintain HSA’s TDA funding at its current level, the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency (HSA) is requesting $43,777 to provide funding for a portion (50%) of the fiscal year budget for CTSC, and $42,287 to provide funding for a portion (50%) of the Ride n’ Stride program costs. The total TDA requested for both the CTSC and the Ride n’ Stride programs for FY 2010/11 is $86,064. HSA will be providing $87,040 in matching grant funds and other in-kind from member agencies and schools, for a total CTSC/Ride n’ Stride budget cost of $173,104. This amount reflects an overall budget reduction of 8.7% compared to FY 09-10, and our program deliverables have been reduced to be in line with anticipated staffing capacity.

Enclosed you will find the Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds Claim forms for our Bike/Pedestrian Projects, along with attachments outlining the new work plans and budgets for each program. I attest to the accuracy of this claim and all its accompanying documentation. As you will see in the following pages, CTSC and Ride n’ Stride work plans reflect the needs and concerns of the community. Thank you for your consideration and continued support.

Sincerely,

Katie LeBaron, MPH
Senior Health Educator
Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention, HSA
(831) 454-5477
katie.lebaron@health.co.santa-cruz.ca.us
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/c/o Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention Unit, Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency
1070 Emeline Avenue, P.O. Box 962, Santa Cruz, CA 95061, 831/454-4141
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Pedestrian Projects
Submit a separate form for each project.

If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)

2. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $43,777.00

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 10/11

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims (ex. Article 8 Bicycle project): Article 8 Bike/Ped Project

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Katie LeBaron
   Telephone Number: (831) 454-5477   E-mail: katie.lebaron@health.co.santa-cruz.ca.us
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Dena Loijos
   Telephone Number: (831) 454-5018   E-mail: dena.loijos@health.co.santa-cruz.ca.us

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): See Attachment A - CTSC Work Plan for FY 2010-12

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program: The number of people served will depend on the strategies incorporated in most projects, such as public campaigns. For projects involving direct education, media outreach, etc. the numbers of users will be documented or estimated.

10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names): Most CTSC projects are countywide. Activities conducted through the South County Bike and Pedestrian Work Group will focus on the Watsonville/south county area, and as needs and opportunities arise, other jurisdictions may also be specifically targeted for bike and/or pedestrian safety activities.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community): The CTSC continues to be the primary community-based coalition in Santa Cruz County that focuses on bicycle and pedestrian traffic safety for all age groups. The Coalition provides a forum for various agencies and individuals to share information, address community issues, collaborate on solutions, and act as a resource for its members and the community. The CTSC has seen many accomplishments since it was established in 1992, some of which can be found at http://www.sctrafficssafety.org/accomplishments.html.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project...
or Policy number: Programmed into the RTP under project #CO50

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program: Please see attached Work Plan for evaluation measures.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed): A primary goal of the CTSC is to encourage people to use alternative forms of transportation safely. For example, in last year's work plan, objectives included working to promote Walk and Bike to School Day and marketing bicycle and pedestrian safety programs currently offered in the county.

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (complete "15a" or "15b")

### 15a. Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost/Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$TDA requested</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source 4:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in "Other":*

### 15b. Non-Capital Projects – Cost/Schedule: List any tasks and amount per task for which TDA will be used. Can be substituted with alternate budget format.

See attached Community Traffic Safety Coalition Budget for FY 2010-11.

16. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution, consistent with the RTC Rules and Regulations (a. 90% prior to completion/10% upon completion; or b. 100% after completion, county transfer fund (journal)

17. Proposed schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation of prior year’s activities: Biannual progress report to be submitted by February 28, 2011 and final report to be submitted by July 31, 2011.

18. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES?/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</td>
<td>Yes, on file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: )</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee to review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. For &quot;bikeways,&quot; does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

All Claims

- A letter of transmittal to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- Resolution from TDA eligible claimants indicating their roles and responsibilities; and, if applicable, commitment to maintain facilities as indicated in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

Bike to Work, Community Traffic Safety Coalition/Ride 'n Stride – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF

19. Improving Program Efficiency

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:

In the face of increasing County fiscal challenges and TDA budget reductions, HSA has continued to support knowledgeable and experienced health educators as CTSC staff and continues to work with staff to increase efficiency while maintaining and improving program quality. Previous to the budget crisis, more than half of CTSC program costs were covered by County general fund dollars. Due to cuts in Net County Costs in recent years, a majority of CTSC (and Ride n’ Stride) program costs is now secured, when possible, through competitive grants, shown in the Budget as HSA Match. Staff hours dedicated to CTSC were reduced last fiscal year to allow for hours to fulfill other grant obligations. Even with this reduction in CTSC staff hours, the coalition has continued to implement the work plan each year through increased coalition member involvement, volunteer recruitment, reduced meeting schedule, development of a two-year vs. one-year work plan, and collaboration with coalition member agencies.

A main premise of the CTSC is to bring together groups with an interest in traffic safety to maximize collaboration and avoid duplicate efforts within the community. An example is the formation of the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) subcommittee of CTSC, which brought together bicycle and pedestrian grade school educators from around the county to collaborate and share ideas. The CTSC also continues to utilize creative media strategies and collaborative partnerships to conduct cost-effective traffic safety outreach. Internally, CTSC staff maintain the CTSC website, create public information products, conduct surveys and evaluations, and analyze data in lieu of paying outside contractors.

20. What is different from last year’s program/claim?
Based on SCCRTC staff’s recommendation to maintain HSA’s TDA funding at its current level, the total FY 2010/11 allocation requested for CTSC and Ride n’ Stride is $86,064. This amount reflects a 9.9% reduction from HSA’s TDA budget initially approved for FY 09/10 ($97,510), and a 13.9% reduction compared to FY 08/09 ($100,000). While HSA has been able to secure matching funds through other grants and funding sources to maintain an adequate level of staffing for these projects, future restoration of TDA funds to prior levels will help ensure their continuing success and resulting benefits to the community.
Community Traffic Safety Coalition
Work Plan for Fiscal Years 2010-2012

Mission:
The mission of the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) is to reduce traffic-related injuries, while promoting the use of alternative modes of transportation. The primary focus is on bicycle and pedestrian safety issues. The Coalition educates all road users in safety practices to decrease the risk and severity of collisions, and advocates for improved conditions to make all methods of transportation safer.

Staff Responsibilities:
Staff to the Coalition is responsible for recruitment, retention and satisfaction of coalition members, coordinating and facilitating bimonthly coalition meetings and regular project subcommittee meetings, acting as a liaison between agencies, tracking county bicycle and pedestrian injury statistics, writing all reports and letters of advocacy/support, representing the coalition at other agency meetings, and maintaining the coalition web site.

Narrative:
Coalition members select and implement projects according to current issues, public requests, and direction from community agencies and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission. The Coalition also has several ongoing projects, including the Ride n’ Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian Education Program, the Pace Car Program, the CTSC website, the Bicycle Traffic School, and the South County Bike and Pedestrian Work Group (SCBPWG). The SCBPWG implements traffic safety projects that address the unique needs of South Santa Cruz County. CTSC staff support these programs in addition to coordinating the work plan projects chosen by the Coalition members.

The work plan below is based on two-year projects, which are to be completed by the end of FY 11/12. Activities have been listed to show how the projects will be accomplished and an evaluation component to determine the effectiveness of projects and provide feedback for improving future projects.

Guidelines for implementing this work plan will include attaching budget figures to activities, identifying agencies and members who will work on certain projects, looking at collaborative opportunities with the SCBPWG, and prioritizing activities.

The Coalition has chosen the following projects for Fiscal Years 2010-12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Media Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increase awareness, respect, and safety for all road users through a public media campaign.

- Target larger, contained audiences, like back to school night or open house, using short videos, like the 20-minute “Getting There By Bike”
- Present data visually, like using a visual graphic depicting a motorist’s field of vision at varying speeds
- Develop or use a slogan less ambiguous than “Share the Road”, such as “Pass Safely” or “Bikes may use full lane”
• Use media campaigns that have already been produced and are being used in other communities
• Distribute stickers for garbage bins, with message such as "Slow Down" or "Watch for Children", plus education about proper placement of the bins
• Inform the public on the meaning of the "Bicycles May Use Full Lane" sign as well as sharrows (shared lane pavement markings) on the roadway
• Use creative, less expensive outlets, such as social networking sites like Twitter and Facebook, online media like Santa Cruz Wire, or videos on YouTube
• Use emotional, personal media messages, such as those outlined by Bikes Belong
• Contact the public relations school at SJSU, Cabrillo digital media classes, or USCS interns to do a media project or design competition
• Approach Community TV to produce a PSA to inform motorists and students
• Use wide distribution of media to impact more people in the general public, instead of just targeting smaller groups
• Continue updating and revamping CTSC website to be more current and user-friendly

Evaluation: Quantify audiences reached in all direct media campaign activities and create a catalogue of all media outreach tools created or acquired.

---

### Education and Training

Provide traffic safety education and training opportunities to specific populations of road users, stakeholders, and community partners.

• Publicize data on bike/ped issues to educate elected officials, public works, police departments
• Utilize League of American Bicyclists (LAB) motorist education curriculum to target groups of motorists
• Offer bike/ped education on protective gear and safety behavior
• Take a photo a month of a sign or traffic situation that is misleading and use it for education
• Conduct more motorist, parent and adult education
• Conduct more traffic safety education checkpoints

Evaluation: Quantify audiences reached in direct education and training activities and track outreach to all jurisdictions throughout the county.

---

### Advocacy and Encouragement

Promote more bicycling and walking in Santa Cruz County and advocate for treatment of walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes, as outlined in the March 11, 2010 US Department of Transportation policy statement.

• Advocate for current traffic safety throughout the county
• Provide positive promotion of bicycling and walking as transportation and recreation
**Evaluation:** Create log of support letters written in support of traffic safety and alternative transportation projects.

### Engineering

Coordinate and collaborate with public works jurisdictions and neighborhoods to carry out traffic calming and complete streets efforts.

- Conduct a traffic calming demo, such as street painting in front of a preschool or daycare program
- Plan for sidewalk construction and improvement of sidewalks with public works departments
- Include bike/ped interests as priorities in all design, planning and construction

**Evaluation:** Track number of community members, sidewalks improvements, and complete streets efforts by activity and/or jurisdiction.

### Enforcement

Collaborate with police departments and the CHP on enforcement of traffic laws for all road users and on educational efforts to increase awareness and safe behavior on the roadways.

- Create opportunities for law enforcement to receive bike/ped specific training
- Expand Bicycle Traffic School to other jurisdictions and general public
- Share information, feedback and promotion of Bicycle Traffic School with police departments

**Evaluation:** List bike/ped training opportunities provided to law enforcement, utilize Bicycle Traffic School classroom evaluation form in classes, and summarize evaluations and data on students in annual report.

**Overall outcome evaluation methods:** Utilize available data to evaluate changes in pedestrian and bicycle traffic injuries/fatalities in Santa Cruz County. Utilize local observational survey results and other sources to evaluate pedestrian, bicyclist and motorist behaviors, and changes in numbers of road users who are bicycling and walking as alternate modes of transportation.
# Community Traffic Safety Coalition
## TDA Budget, FY 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>TDA Budget</th>
<th>HSA Match</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel (Salary + Benefits @ 45%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Health Educator (.10 FTE)</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>8,564</td>
<td>11,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Educator (.50 FTE)</td>
<td>38,222</td>
<td>14,757</td>
<td>52,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel</strong></td>
<td>41,077</td>
<td>23,321</td>
<td>64,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead (15% of Personnel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>9,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel/Mileage</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/Office Supplies</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Project Implementation items</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inkind</strong> (estimate based on prior FY's)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$43,777</td>
<td>$44,181</td>
<td>87,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TDA &amp; Match funds</td>
<td>$86,064</td>
<td>87,040</td>
<td>173,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CTSC & Ride n' Stride)
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Pedestrian Projects
Submit a separate form for each project.

If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project: Title: Ride n’ Stride (bike & pedestrian safety education program of CTSC)

2. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $42,287.00

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 2010/11

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims (ex. Article 8 Bicycle project): Article 8 Bike/Ped Project

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Katie LeBaron
   Telephone Number: (831) 454-5477  E-mail: katie.lebaron@health.co.santa-cruz.ca.us
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Dena Loijos
   Telephone Number: (831) 454-5018  E-mail: dena.loijos@health.co.santa-cruz.ca.us

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): See attached Ride n’ Stride Education Work Plan for FY 2010/11

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program: Primary work plan objective will reach a minimum of 2,500 elementary- and pre-school aged children in Santa Cruz County. In addition, it is anticipated that community-based presentations and participation in local events, including Bike to School/Work and bike helmet distribution activities, will reach 100’s more children and parents throughout the county.

10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names): All projects are county wide.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community): Local traffic collision and observation survey data continue to show that school-aged children are at risk as bicyclists and pedestrians. The Ride n’ Stride Program provides a unique service to the community through its elementary school-based classroom education model, with the goal of teaching children road safety practices as the foundation for life-long behaviors. Program staff is bilingual and bicultural, enabling the program to be effective in reaching the county’s diverse population of students and parents with key messages promoting safe riding and walking. Over the last five years, evaluation methods have consistently shown 25-30% average increases in bike safety knowledge among 3rd-6th grade level students, and high satisfaction rates among teachers. In addition, school administrators and parents
have expressed appreciation of this program and a desire to for it to continue in their schools. Ride n’ Stride staff has also been working with CTSC staff and the community to coordinate helmet fittings and distribution to over 500 low-income children, youth and adults each year, through grant funding from the CA Office of Traffic Safety.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy number: Programmed into the RTP under project #CO50.

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program: Please see attached work plan for evaluation measures.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed): Through road safety education, promotion and provision of bike helmets, more students and parents will gain confidence for students to walk and/or ride a bicycle to school, thereby reducing the numbers of vehicles traveling to and from school sites.

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (complete “15a” or “15b”)

15a. Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other *</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD requested Source 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in “Other”:

15b. Non-Capital Projects – Cost/Schedule: List any tasks and amount per task for which TDA will be used. Can be substituted with alternate budget format.

See attached Ride n’ Stride Safety Program Budget for FY 2009-10

16. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution, consistent with the RTC Rules and Regulations (a. 90% prior to completion/10% upon completion; or b. 100% after completion, county transfer fund (journal)

17. Proposed schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation of prior year’s activities: Biannual progress reports to be submitted by January 31, 2011 and final report to be submitted by July 31, 2011.

18. TDA Eligibility:

A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If "NO," provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)

B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?

C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years? (If an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, on file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name:  

D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If "NO," project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).  

Bicycle Committee to review.


N/A

Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

All Claims

- A letter of transmittal to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- Resolution from TDA eligible claimants indicating their roles and responsibilities; and, if applicable, commitment to maintain facilities as indicated in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

Ride 'n Stride education program – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF

19. Improving Program Efficiency

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.
- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:

In the face of increasing fiscal challenges, HSA has strived to maintain the Ride n' Stride education program's high level of achievement and credibility through the retention of experienced bilingual staff and focusing on program quality. This program consistently meets or exceeds its stated goals and objectives, utilizing cost-effective outreach strategies to school district staffs and teachers, as well as to family service agencies and other community partners. Efforts are made to utilize existing or low-cost/no-cost educational materials that reflect current best practices and are developmentally appropriate for the target populations.

20. What is different from last year's program/claim?

Based on SCCRTC staff's recommendation to maintain HSA's TDA funding at its current level, the total FY 2010/11 allocation requested for CTSC and Ride n' Stride is $86,064. This amount reflects a 9.9% reduction from HSA’s TDA budget initially approved for FY 09/10 ($97,510), and a 13.9% reduction compared to FY 08/09 ($100,000). While HSA has been able to secure matching funds through other grants and funding sources to maintain an adequate level of staffing for these projects, future restoration of TDA funds to prior levels will help ensure their continuing success and resulting benefits to the community.
Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)
Ride n’ Stride Education Work Plan
FY 2010-11

The goal of the Ride n’ Stride program is to increase safe bicycling and walking among youth in Santa Cruz County. Ride n’ Stride bilingual staff utilize a school-based education model to teach basic safety practices to children, inspire students to ride and walk to school more often, and encourage participants to convey their new knowledge and skills to parents, siblings and friends. Interactive classroom education sessions on bicycle (and other wheeled sports, such as scooters and skateboards) safety target primarily 3rd to 6th graders. Pedestrian safety education sessions target primarily, though not exclusively, pre-kindergarteners to 3rd graders. Curricula and educational approach are tailored to be age-appropriate and culturally competent. Since its inception in 1995, Ride n’ Stride staff have conducted over 2,000 presentations, reaching an estimated 45,000 children, and have reached countless parents, caregivers and other community members.

During fiscal year 2008-09, Ride n’ Stride program reached over 4,000 elementary and pre-school students, and close to 2,800 to date in FY 09/10. Pre-/post-test results consistently have shown at least 25% average increase in bike safety knowledge among samplings of 3rd-6th graders. Staff continues to participate in community education events, Bike to School/Work activities, distribution of helmets and other safety gear, and CTSC bike and pedestrian safety observation surveys. Based on available traffic collision injury/fatality data, local observation surveys and other evaluations methods, more education and outreach are needed to increase traffic safety practices among children and youth, particularly in South Santa Cruz County, an area that consistently has had lower rates of helmet use and ridership.

FY 2010-11 Objectives and Activities Work Plan:

- Conduct bicycle and pedestrian safety classroom presentations for at least 2,500 elementary school students and pre-school children in Santa Cruz County school districts.
- Provide 4 traffic safety presentations to parents and caregivers through schools, community agencies and neighborhood groups to promote safe bicycling and walking in Santa Cruz County.
- Participate in 4 community fairs and/or events to provide traffic safety information and promote safer bicycling and walking in Santa Cruz County.
- Collaborate with CTSC and HSA staff to conduct annual bicycle and pedestrian safety observation surveys.
- Work with CTSC and HSA staff to conduct helmet fittings and distribution activities.
- Participate in the fall and spring Bike to School/Work events.
- Attend CTSC’s South County Bike/Pedestrian Work Group (formerly Watsonville Bike/Pedestrian Safety Task Force), Safe Routes to School subcommittee, and Safe Kids Chapter meetings, as staffing capacity permits.
# Ride n' Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian Education Program
## TDA Budget, FY 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>TDA Budget</th>
<th>HSA Match</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong> (Salary + Benefits @ 45%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Health Educator (.10 FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,418</td>
<td>11,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Health Program Specialist (.60 FTE)</td>
<td>40,787</td>
<td>13,748</td>
<td>54,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Personnel</strong></td>
<td>40,787</td>
<td>25,167</td>
<td>65,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overhead (15% of Personnel)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,893</td>
<td>9,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel/Mileage</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication/Office Supplies</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inkind (estimate based on prior FY's)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>42,287</td>
<td>42,860</td>
<td>85,146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Bicycle Committee

FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

RE: FY 10/11 Bike to Work Funding Request

---

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Committee:

1. Review the attached FY 10/11 Bike to Work (BTW) funding request, work plan and budget;

2. Recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve in $34,427 FY 10/11 funds.

---

BACKGROUND

The RTC has a long history of supporting the Bike to Work program. Bike to Work is a project of Ecology Action, a non-profit environmental organization, which houses a number of other transportation programs. In February 2003, the Commission approved $40,000 in FY 03/04 TDA funds for the Bike to Work (BTW) program and committed to providing on-going funding at a level of $40,000 per year as approved each year in its annual budget.

BTW’s goals of increasing levels of cycling in Santa Cruz County are consistent with the Commission’s Regional Transportation Plan, and the project provides an unparalleled level of bicycle promotion throughout the County on an ongoing basis. Now in its twenty-third year as a community project, BTW has grown steadily in participation and organization over the years.

Per the agreement between the Commission for receipt of TDA funds, the Commission has the opportunity to provide input or contingencies on funding or the work plan as part of any funding approval.

DISCUSSION

Ecology Action submitted the attached TDA claim form, work plan and budget for Bike to Work Program for Bicycle Committee and Commission review and approval. While Ecology Action generally submits a request for $40,000 for the Bike to Work Program, current financial challenges caused by the worst economic recession in decades has impacted available apportionments. The RTC has thus reduced apportionments to all TDA recipients making only $34,427 available for the Bike to Work Program.
BTW is requesting the $34,427 amount available in FY 10/11 TDA funds to support ongoing efforts (Attachment 1). The amount has been budgeted in the RTC’s FY 10/11 budget for the Bike to Work program.

The Transportation Development Act Claim Form (Attachment 2) and the FY 10/11 Scope of Work (Attachment 3) provide a detailed description of services BTW proposes to provide under contract with the Commission during the coming fiscal year.

As can be seen in BTW’s FY 10/11 Budget (Attachment 4), the requested amount represents a fraction of BTW’s annual budget of $131,684.

Piet Canin, Bicycle Committee member and Program Director at Ecology Action, will provide a summary of services provided by BTW under contract with the Commission during the 2009 calendar year (Attachment 5) at the Bicycle Committee meeting.

This year, funding requests for Bike to Work Day will be accomplished in three steps: 1) Inclusion in RTC budget for next fiscal year (conducted at the March 4, 2010 RTC meeting), 2) Bicycle Committee review and recommendation (on April 12, 2010), and 3) RTC review and approval (scheduled for the May 6, 2010 RTC meeting).

It is uncertain whether current TDA revenue estimates will be realized. Staff will continue to monitor TDA revenues and report any further downward adjustments needed to Ecology Action staff and the RTC.

**Staff recommends that Committee members review and provide feedback or to Bike to Work staff at the April 12, 2010 meeting.**

**SUMMARY**

Attached is a request from Ecology Action for the Bike to Work Program for $34,427 in FY 10/11 TDA funding. While the Commission has indicated its intention to continue funding the program through the TDA revenues, this year’s amount of $394,427 reflects a reduction from prior funding levels due to severe funding shortfalls. Staff recommends that the Committee recommend to the Regional Transportation Commission approving the funding request at the $34,427 level.

**Attachments:**

1. Letter from Piet Canin, Program Director
2. Transportation Development Act Claim Form
3. FY 10/11 Scope of Work
4. FY 10/11 Budget
5. 2009 Program Summary/Annual Report
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March 18, 2010

George Dondero
Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Mr. Dondero:

Ecology Action is requesting $34,427 of TDA funds for FY 2010-2011 to support the Santa Cruz County Bike to Work/School (BTW/S) program. The Commission’s allotment has proven crucial for the continuing success and expansion of our programs aimed at increasing bicycle commuting. At the current funding level BTW/S has improved both the quality and quantity of its effort. Ecology Action collects travel data from BTW/S participants to determine program effectiveness.

US Census American Community Survey data from 2008 shows that Santa Cruz County bike to work trips as a percentage of overall commuters (16 years or older) increased 65% from 2000 to 2008. Santa Cruz County, including all jurisdictions, had a rate of 3.3% of bike to work trips an increase from 2000’s rate of 2%. This compares favorably to San Francisco with a 2.75%, San Jose at 1.23%, and a national rate of .55%. There are many factors for this bike ridership increase and the RTC funded Bike to Work program is one important effort that has pushed bike numbers upward. This US Census data illustrates that biking is a viable and growing means of green transportation throughout Santa Cruz County.

In considering this request please note the following 2009 Bike to Work/School Highlights:

- **Over 11,336 youth and adults biked** on the spring & fall Bike to Work/School Days (an 11.3% increase from 2008)
- **50% increase of Bike to Work participation county-wide** over the past decade.
- **300% increase of Bike to School participation county-wide** over the past decade.
- **53,915 miles were biked** instead of driven for all BTW/S participants.
- **Over 53,900 pounds of CO2 emissions** were prevented from entering the atmosphere
- **Over One million calories were burned** by all participants (22 calories/mile)

Santa Cruz County Bike to Work (BTW) has successfully utilized past funds received from the SCCRTC. We are requesting $34,427 for FY 2010-2011 to support BTW’s successful programs. Bike to Work (and School) continues to be a viable and significant program. We realize public funding continues to be cut back in these tough financial times but we would request that the RTC consider increasing TDA funds for the cost effective BTW program if revenues improve in FY 2010-2011. Ecology Action is challenged to meet the increasing demand for this program at the same time our main funding source has diminished. Bike to Work not only reduces traffic congestion, pollution and parking demand but also improves the health and well being of individuals.

The Bike to Work program continues to leverage RTC funding with over $22,000 in cash support and some $75,000 of in-kind contributions from local businesses, individuals, and public agencies. Ecology Action supplements RTC funding with federal and regional funds where possible to meet the growing demands especially for our school bike encouragement services.
Bike To Work’s impact on bike commuting trends reaches beyond the popular Bike To Work/School Days. Participants of these biannual events will more likely continue to bike because they have experienced the benefits of biking and have successfully overcome barriers to bike commuting. They realize that biking is an efficient, healthy, and cost saving way to get to and from work. Bike To Work/School Day is a steppingstone for recruiting year-round bike commuters. Getting someone to bike to work and therefore experience it first-hand is much more powerful than simply telling someone about the benefits of biking to work. Throughout the year, we also provide resources such as our Tips for Winter Bike Riding pamphlet, our web bike commuter resource guide and email updates on bike commuting news.

I attest to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documents.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Piet Canin
Program Director
Ecology Action Transportation Group
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Pedestrian Projects
Submit a separate form for each project.

If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: Bike to Work/School program

2. Implementing Agency: Ecology Action

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant: SCCRTC

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $34,427

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 10/11

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims (ex. Article 8 Bicycle project): Article 8 Bicycle project

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Piet Canin
   Telephone Number: 426-5925 x 127
   E-mail: pcanin@ecoact.org

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Virginia Johnson
   Telephone Number: 426-5925 x 115
   E-mail: gjohnson@ecoact.org

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): The Bike to Work/School program consists of the following main activities: 1) Fall Bike to Work/School Day; 2) Spring Bike to Work and School Day; 3) Spring Bike Week, which features up to 10 inclusive, fun and informative bicycle activities; 4) Ongoing support targeting novice or infrequent bike commuters via online communications. Use email list from Bike to Work participants who have identified themselves as novice or infrequent bike commuters with emails, Facebook and website updates.

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program: We anticipate over 10,000 people will participate directly in the program.

10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):
    The project includes the entire Santa Cruz County area including all the incorporated cities.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community)
    Bike to Work/School (BTW/S) fulfills the need to promote, encourage and support school students and adults to bike to school or work. The program provides incentives and tools for local commuters to bike for transportation therefore reducing their single-occupancy vehicle trips. BTW/S strives to normalize bicycling as a mode of transportation and lets participants experience how biking is possible for many different types of trips. BTW/S uses a variety of promotional, outreach and
publicity methods to reach out to Santa Cruz County residents. BTW/S also offers numerous services to support commuters in switching to bicycle travel and to bike commute more often. The program’s benefits include reducing traffic congestion, reducing air, water, and noise pollution, reducing greenhouse gases, as well as promoting a healthy means of travel that helps combat obesity. As Santa Cruz County grapples with worsening traffic congestion, growing childhood obesity rates, and how to reduce its carbon footprint, Bike to Work/School provides assistance in alleviating these problems.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy number: Project RTC #26

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:
To measure the project’s success, Bike to Work tracks the following data using participant surveys: the number of program participants, the participant’s bike commute mileage, the number of beginning and infrequent bike commuters, the number of first-time participants, and the number of participants who usually drive alone to work. BTW also measures success by the amount of publicity generated through news articles, radio talk shows, TV newscasts, the number of newsprint ads, and the number of radio and TV PSA’s aired. Success is also measured by the number of posters and brochures distributed, direct mailings sent out, website visits, and emails delivered. The number of community, business and school events staffed with informational booths is also tracked.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):
The Bike to Work/School program helps reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips and parking demand while increasing the number of bus/bike combined trips. There might also be a slight increase in people walking to work or school, as a number of walkers participate in the Bike to Work/School Day activities.

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (complete “15a” or “15b”)

### 15a. Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDMA requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in “Other”:

### 15b. Non-Capital Projects – Cost/Schedule: List any tasks and amount per task for which TDA will be used. Can be substituted with alternate budget format.

SEE ATTACHED BUDGET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element/ Activity/Task</th>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</th>
<th>Total Cost per Element</th>
<th>STDA requested</th>
<th>$ Source 2:</th>
<th>Source 3:</th>
<th>Source 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration/ Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution, consistent with the RTC Rules and Regulations (a. 90% prior to completion/10% upon completion; or b. 100% after completion): Quarterly reimbursement for work performed.

17. Proposed schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation of prior year’s activities: Annual report as well as program activity narrative updates with monthly invoices.

18. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES?/NO?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</td>
<td>RTC to consider at their 5/6/10 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: _____________________________ )</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</td>
<td>To be reviewed by the RTC Bike Committee on 4/12/10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. For &quot;bikeways,&quot; does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov">http://www.dot.ca.gov</a>).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documentation to Include with Your Claim:**

**All Claims**
- **A letter of transmittal** to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
• **Resolution from** TDA eligible claimants indicating their roles and responsibilities; and, if applicable, commitment to maintain facilities as indicated in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years. RTC to consider on 4/3/08.

**Bike to Work, Community Traffic Safety Coalition/Ride ‘n Strike – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF**

19. Improving Program Efficiency

• Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.
  Bike to Work/School Day participation increased 11% during the 2009 calendar year from the previous year (we do not have complete program data for FY 09-10 since our spring Bike Week and Bike to Work/School Day has not occurred yet). This significant increase was due to increased outreach to local employers, a fall cash participation incentive, increased awareness of climate change, and the program’s continued comprehensive promotional campaign.

  The Bike to Work program continues to reduce operating costs by recruiting an extensive pool of volunteers and in-kind staff and product donations from a wide variety of supporters. Local businesses, public agencies, and individuals provide a high level of skilled volunteer labor to assure the smooth running of the Bike to Work program. As we strive to increase the scope and results of the program, we are faced with the rising cost of living, product costs, and general increases in doing business. The Bike to Work program has built on its 23 years of success to generate non-TDA cash donations from local businesses, individuals and public agencies. Last year the program raised over $20,000 in cash donations to match the TDA funds. These cash donations are from non-transportation funding sources.

• Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:
  Bike to Work will continue to build on mutually beneficial collaborations to improve efficiency and increase bike ridership. Such collaborations include working with Monterey and San Benito County Bike Week programs to pool resources and take advantage of economies of scale on promotional items such as posters, brochures, stickers, and T-shirts. We will increase efficiency by dividing tasks to get more accomplished with less staff time. We will also increase our alliances with employers to increase bike commuter ridership by providing more incentives for employees. We will stress the importance of bike ridership in reducing greenhouse gases to gain more support and cooperation from employers looking to be green and project a green image.

20. What is different from last year’s program/claim?

  This year’s program will focus even more on providing commuters with the resources to facilitate an increase of bike commuter trips. Ecology Action staff will target novice and infrequent bike commuters from past Bike to Work events through ongoing email newsletters, Facebook and Website updates. As more people are looking for ways to reduce costs we will stress the significant cost saving benefits of biking. Our effort will focus on the year-round importance of biking as a way to reduce carbon emissions as greenhouse gas reducing measures become more prevalent.
Bike to Work Program
Scope of Work FY 10-11

The Bike to Work (BTW) Program, a year-long bike commuter incentive, education, and support service program consists of four main projects 1) Fall Bike to Work/School Day; 2) Spring Bike to Work and School Day; 3) Spring Bike Week, which features inclusive, fun and informative bicycle activities; 4) Ongoing support targeting novice or infrequent bike commuters via online communications. Use email list from Bike to Work participants who have identified themselves as novice or infrequent bike commuters with emails, Facebook and website updates.

Fall Bike to Work/School Day: Thursday, October 7, 2010

Work Schedule/Tasks:
The BTW staff will coordinate the 12th Annual Fall Santa Cruz County Bike to Work/School Day, which features free breakfast for all bike commuters at a minimum of 10 public sites and 30 school sites. Bike to Work staff will secure public and school breakfast sites for BTW/S Day. There will be a special emphasis on reducing car traffic at schools to make school streets safer for all users.

- Solicit donations for food to feed over 5,000 bicyclists.
- Continue expanding Bike to School Day through increased participation of schools and greater outreach to students, teachers, and parents.
- Continue to offer a prize drawing to attract more participation, especially from novice cyclists.
- Increase outreach to novice bike commuters through business site visits, online social marketing, media outreach, and equipment incentives.
- Provide resources for novice commuters to overcome obstacles to bike commuting.
- Coordinate Bike to School Day efforts with bike safety presentations conducted by Bike Smart! and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC).
- Coordinate helmet distribution with the CTSC at school sites.
- Distribute the UCSC Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) bicycle safety video to classrooms.
- Distribute the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) highly sought after Santa Cruz County Bikeways.
- Conduct a promotional campaign utilizing a variety of outreach venues and techniques including TV, radio, newspaper, posters, flyers, and Facebook, website, email, and other virtual outlets. The promotional campaign will blanket the county in general outreach as in preceding years, but will also focus on localized promotion for each breakfast site.
- Continue the "Be Bright, Use a Light at Night," campaign started in fall 2000. Promote bike light use to the general bike riding population. This effort will be coordinated with the Community Traffic Safety Coalition.
- Coordinate with Ecology Action, RSTPX funded, promotion of Go Green at Cabrillo College.
- Recruit and coordinate volunteers to assist with BTW/S activities.

Performance Goals for the Fall Bike to Work/School Day, 2010
• Maintain participation levels from past fall BTWS Day.
• Maintain Bike to School breakfast sites from previous year.
• Maintain the number of schools receiving bike safety presentations, helmet distribution or safety videos.
• Place over 1,000 event and informational posters at local businesses.
• Have a least one article published in a local newspaper regarding bike commuting.
• Develop and send at least 6 mass and targeted emails to past Bike to Work Day participants with bike commuting news, incentives, and resource information.
• Have two weeks of PSA’s aired on a local radio station.
• Maintain the number of beginning cyclists attending BTW Day.

**Spring Bike Week, Third Week of May 2010**

**Work Schedule/Tasks:**

The BTW staff will coordinate the 24th annual Santa Cruz County Bike Week event, which features a Bike to Work/School Day at least one bike safety activity/commuter instruction workshop, a commuter race event, a food delivery day by bicycle, a rail and trail day, and other events. The main goal of Bike Week will be to continue to promote bicycle commuting as well as bicycle transportation for other trips that replace single occupancy vehicle trips. The variety of events during Bike Week will focus on hands-on, fun, and inclusive methods for motivating residents to bicycle more often and drive less. BTW will integrate the bike commuting and safety message into our events.

- Bike to Work staff will secure 10 public and 30 school breakfast sites for BTW/S Day. We will work with large employers to provide incentives for their employees to bike to work.
- Continue to increase the ever-popular Bike to School Day effort, which gets children accustomed to biking for transportation at an early age.
- Solicit donations for food to feed over 5,000 bicyclists.
- Continue to improve our website services with an online Bike to Work Day survey, which would allow more commuters to participate in Bike to Work Day. Also provide commuter maps and updated bike commuter resources. Promote the new Google Map bicycle option.
- Mass emails to past Bike to Work participants with a focus on novice and infrequent bike commuters.
- Maintain Facebook page with frequent updates and news.
- Coordinate Bike to School Day efforts with bike safety presentations conducted by Bike Smart! and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition.
- Coordinate helmet distribution with the CTSC at school sites.
- Distribute the UCSC TAPS bicycle safety videos to classrooms.
- Recruit volunteers to staff all Bike Week events, especially breakfast sites and food delivery day.
- Promote bike commuter equipment to make bikes more functional for commuting, running errands, or getting to a social activity.
- Recruit other bicycle and community groups as well as businesses to host Bike Week events.
- Provide staff and promotional support to other groups who host Bike Week events.
- Keep business sponsors updated on Bike Week activities and bike commuter services for their employees to use.
- Conduct a promotional campaign utilizing a variety of outreach venues and techniques including TV, radio, newspaper, posters, brochures/postcards, emails, and workplace booths. The promotional campaign will blanket the county in general outreach as we have done previously. We will also focus on localized promotion for each breakfast site.
- Solicit cash donations from local public agencies and businesses to fund material purchases.
- Host an innovative and attention getting media event that demonstrates the appeal of bike commuting versus commuting by car.
- Coordinate artwork, T-shirt and color poster production with Monterey and San Benito County Bike Week staff.
- Coordinate TV and radio promotion as a tri-county Bike Week effort, in conjunction with Clean Air Month activities.
- Utilize the tri-county Clean Air Month cash prize drawing to attract more participants, especially novice cyclists.
- Continue to work with local transportation agencies to promote bike commuting as well as other forms of alternative transportation during Bike Week.
- Coordinate promotion with other Ecology Action transportation programs.
- Work closely with Cabrillo College and UCSC to promote their breakfast sites for BTW/S Day.
- Continue to expand efforts into South County and improve outreach to the Latino community.

Performance Goals for the Spring Bike Week, 2010

- Maintain participation from the previous spring Bike Week.
- Maintain participation from the previous spring Bike to Work/School Day.
- Maintain number of schools for the Bike to School breakfast sites.
- Maintain the outreach/promotion to businesses through company liaisons from the previous spring Bike Week by using email, flyers, posters, and business site presentations/booths.
- Maintain the number of beginning cyclists attending BTW Day from spring BTW Day 2009.

Bike Safety and Commuter Information Resources

Work Schedule/Tasks:
BTW promotes and provides resources for safe cycling throughout the year. Information is provided via www.bike2work.com, our office information library, booths at special events, and via emails to BTW Day participants and sponsoring businesses. Staff also works with other public agencies to help them in their road safety and bike resource projects. Staff is an active member of the SCCRTC’s Bicycle Committee and the County Health Service’s Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) and the South County Bike/Ped Safety Work Group. We promote issues such as bike theft prevention, helmet use, bicycling in the rain and cold, and bike parking. These are some of the ways we conduct outreach on these issues:

- Maintain current bike resource information on the BTW website.
- Staff information booth at local special events.
- Communicate with BTW participants on important bike issues.
- Attend RTC Bicycle Committee and CTSC meetings.

Performance Goals for Bike Safety/Commuter Resources:
- Keep bike resource information current on our website, Facebook and mass emails.
• Staff at least 5 information booths at community special events.
• Keep BTW participants updated on important bike issues via email.
Bike to Work
Budget Request of
$34,427 FY '10-'11
TDA Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>SCCRTC</th>
<th>Match*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Director (.14 FTE)</td>
<td>$9,427.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Specialist (.5 FTE)</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Specialist (.013 FTE)</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs (program materials &amp; supplies)</td>
<td>$15,257.00</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkind services (staff &amp; supplies)</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkind product donations</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(food, advertising, prizes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$34,427.00</td>
<td>$97,257.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET</strong></td>
<td>$131,684.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Local business and public agencies donations, raffle and T-shirt sales, contribute an estimated $22,000** (pays for percentage of staff and direct costs) in cash plus an additional $75,000 of inkind services and product annually for Bike to Work.
Santa Cruz County Bike to Work/School Program 2009
Program Summary/Annual Report

Program Summary
The Bike to Work/School Day (BTW/S) program continues to generate the most extensive publicity, outreach, and public education for bicycle transportation in Santa Cruz County. This twenty-two year old community program provides local employers, employees, residents, and students with quality education, incentives, and services. BTW/S achieved a 11.3% increase in participation from the previous year. Ecology Action also collected important data quantifying the program’s impact in reducing carbon dioxide emissions. Bike to Work/School continued to generate a significant amount of good press for bicycle transportation.

Last year the highest number ever participated in Bike to Work/School Day with 11,336 residents participating in the spring and fall events. The Bike to School program had the highest participation with 8,709 kids, teenagers, teachers and parents biking to school. The Bike to Work/School Day cyclists rode 53,915 miles for the spring and fall events. This significant mileage helped reduce CO2 emissions by some 53,900 pounds.

Contributes to the documented growth of Bike to Work Trips
BTW has successfully recruited new bike commuters as the percentage of ongoing weekly bike to work trips in the county has significantly increased since 2000. Last year, 414 beginning bike commuters rode their bikes for BTW Day and 503 participants where infrequent bike commuters. Some 827 BTW cyclists reported driving alone to work prior to participating in Bike to Work Day. This documents that the program is reaching out to commuters who currently drive to work.

US Census American Community Survey data from 2008 shows that Santa Cruz County bike to work trips as a percentage of overall commute trips (of commuters 16 years or older) increased 65% from 2000 to 2008. Santa Cruz County, including all jurisdictions, had a rate of 3.3% of bike to work trips. This US Census data illustrates that biking is a viable and growing means of green transportation throughout Santa Cruz County. The SCCRTC’ bike mode share goal is 5% of bike to work trips and 20% of all trips as stated in the RTP.

Benefits of increased bicycle commuting
BTW activities contribute to a healthier community: less air, noise, run-off pollution, less traffic congestion, safer streets and healthier individuals. BTW uses a multi-faceted program approach to target and change the behavior of non-bike commuters, novice bike commuters and experienced bike commuters. We use positive, fun and interactive methods to encourage commuters to try bicycling, to commute by bicycle more frequently and to bicycle safely and responsibly.

Broad-base Support
BTW leveraged a considerable amount of private and public money to extend SCCRTC’s funding. We generated over $22,000 in cash from local businesses, individuals and public agencies, plus some $75,000 of in-kind services and product donations in 2009. Over 75 businesses and public agencies, plus 100 individuals volunteered time and contributed to this community effort.
Major Accomplishments for Bike to Work/School Day
Combined figures for 2009

- Over 11,336 youth and adults biked on the spring & fall Bike to Work/School Days (an 11.3% increase from 2008). There were 8,709 kids, parents and school staff biked on Bike to School and 2,267 Bike to Work cyclists.
- 50% increase of Bike to Work participation county-wide over the past decade.
- 300% increase of Bike to School participation county-wide over the past decade.
- 414 beginning bicycle commuters participated in the spring and fall BTW Day events.
- 677 cyclists were first time Bike to Work Day participants.
- 503 where infrequent bike commuters.
- 53,915 miles were biked instead of driven for Bike to Work/School Day.
- 139,601 miles biked for all Bike Week reported trips.
- Over 53,000 pounds of CO2 emissions were prevented from entering the atmosphere for BTW/S trips.
- Over one million calories were burned by all BTW/S participants (22 calories/mile).

Spring Bike Week Event Highlights

Rail and Trail Day
This event generates a lot of excitement as it provides a unique opportunity for families to bike down Highway 9, with its towering redwood trees, in relative safety provided by a CHP escort. This ride inspires many to ride more as they experience the thrill of biking on a beautiful road. This fourth annual event was again a success with over 450 kids, teenagers and adults riding the Roaring Camp Train up to Felton from Depot Park in Santa Cruz with their bikes.

Commuter Race
This media focused event featured a motorist, bicyclist, tandem bicyclists, electric vehicle driver, and electric bicyclist. The attention generating race was reported in the Santa Cruz Sentinel, Good Times and Santa Cruz Weekly.

Bike to Worship
This event targets trips to local places of worship to reduce the traffic and parking problems associated with religious services. Many congregations support this effort as a way to combat climate change.

Annual Promotion
- Newspaper articles: 3 articles in the Sentinel including several front page placements with captivating photographs.
- More newspaper articles: mention in the Santa Cruz Weekly, article on Commuter Race in the Good Times, article in the Santa Cruz Cycling Club Newsletter, and article in the People Power Newsletter.
- Newsprint Ads: 6 ads in the Sentinel, 1 ad in the Good Times, 1 ad in the Connection Magazine, an ad in the UCSC Rec Guide.
- Radio PSA’s: one week’s worth of PSA’s on KUSP, KZSC, and KPIG.
- TV ads: 2 weeks of ads (200 ads total) on Comcast Cable TV and Community TV.
- Email: Seagate email to employees, Cabrillo email from Student Services, email to past participants and Ecology Action email to members.
- Website: Nine thousand visitors to www.bike2work.com with 78% new site visits.
• **Community events:** Cabrillo Health Fair, Watsonville and Santa Cruz Downtown Farmers Markets, Earth Day Santa Cruz, AMGEN Tour of CA Bike Race Expo, UCSC Fall Festival, Plantronics Wellness Fair.

• **Posters:** over 800 posters placed in shop windows throughout the county and over 100 posters mailed to sponsors and large employers. All event posters were published in English and Spanish.

• **T-shirts:** distributed 325 event T-shirts to volunteers and program participants.

• **Brochures:** Distributed over 4,000 event brochures at events, in mailings, and at shops.

• **Banners:** Large format banners placed in high visibility locations in Scotts Valley, Watsonville, and Capitola. 10 street signs attached to lampposts posted in Santa Cruz.

• **Event site banners:** placed at most of the public breakfast stops one week prior to the event.

• **AMBAG Clean Air Month:** promotions for Bike Week.

• **Share the Road signs:** 28 Share the Road signs posted at Bike to School sites.

### Bike to School Promotions

♦ Bike to School promotional flyers in English/Spanish distributed to all participating schools.

♦ 4-color posters, in English and Spanish, distributed to all participating schools.

♦ Educational/informational bicycling materials on safety, helmet guidelines, traffic rules and regulations, etc. in English and Spanish provided to participating schools.

♦ Worked with Bike Smart and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) to conduct school presentations about safety, helmet guidelines, traffic rules and regulations, responsible bicycling, etc.

♦ Worked with PTA’s, other parent groups, school district and local school administrators to promote.

♦ Collaborated with United Ways’ Go For Health and Jovenes Sanos to promote to schools in south county.

♦ Produced and distributed Bike Week black and white poster art to school kids to color in and add their own bike message. These coloring sheets were distributed to elementary schools.

♦ UCSC TAPS-produced Bike safety DVD and videos distributed to teachers and parents.

### Sponsors and Contributions

Bike to Work continues to receive strong support from 75 local businesses and public agencies for spring Bike Week. These sponsors contributed cash, products, and services to the program. Twenty-three private and public sponsors donated $22,000 in cash.

An estimated $50,000 worth of products (breakfast food and drinks, promotional materials and ads, and event supplies) were donated along with $25,000 in-kind staff and volunteer time. Volunteer services were donated to plan, implement, and promote the various Bike Week activities.

### Collaboration

Bike Week’s success relies on extensive collaboration with community groups, public agencies and local businesses. This year we strengthened our partnership with these entities to get more people to bike commute more often in a safe and responsible manner. We worked jointly with the organizing agencies of Bike Week in Monterey and San Benito Counties to increase promotion in the tri-county area. We also continued to work with an increasing number of local schools to boost Bike to School participation, with city and county agencies to improve planning and promotion, and with business sponsors to do better outreach and provide information to their employees. The following is a partial list of our partnerships:
Regional Bike Week programs: Coordinated with Monterey (TAMC) and San Benito (San Benito COG) Counties to reduce cost and produce an unified look for promotional materials. The three counties shared artwork, poster and T-shirt production, radio and TV station promotions, website content, highway signs and donations/product giveaways. This partnership produces an economy of scale, which reduces cost.

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission: Provided major cash funding and promotional support of BTW outreach materials. The RTC's Bike Committee provided input to Bike Week event planning and BTW updated the Committee on our activities. BTW distributed hundreds of the RTC's Bikeway maps, the RTC's Bike Hazard reporting form and promoted its Bike Secure program to BTW participants.

The Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC): BTW distributed CTSC bike safety pamphlets and BTW staff attended CTSC monthly meetings. CTSC staffed a BTW Day breakfast site, attended Bike to Work Steering Committee meetings, and coordinated school bike safety presentations with Bike to School activities.

Bike Smart! Youth Bicycle Safety Program: Conducted bicycle safety programs including bicycle obstacles courses at several of the highest participating Bike to School Day schools.

Pajaro Valley Transportation Management Association: Promotional support, and staffing for Bike Week events in south county.

The City of Santa Cruz: Provided cash funding, staff support for promotions, facilities and equipment.

County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department: Assisted with logistic and promotional effort.

City of Watsonville: Provided cash funding, staff support for internal promotion, school safety sign placement, facility use and fee waivers.

City of Scotts Valley: Provided staff support for internal promotions.

City of Capitola: Provided cash and staff support for promotion, event planning and implementation. Staff helped with placement of street banners.

HUB for Sustainable Transportation: People Power helped host Rail Trail Day, provided volunteer support and promoted Bike Week. Pedalers Express was hired to coordinate the food donation pick-ups and food deliveries by bicycle to our 40 free breakfast sites.

Friends of the Rail Trail (FORT): Helped organize Rail and Trail Day.

Santa Cruz County Cycling Club: Promoted Bike Week and provided volunteers, especially for Rail Trail Day and.

Seaside Company: Continued to promote a company spring Bike to Work breakfast site.

University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC): UCSC Transportation and Parking Services provided funding and staff support for promotion and provided an unlimited number of free bike safety DVD. The UCSC Bike Coop assisted in setting up and staffing a BTW breakfast site. The UCSC Woman's Center hosted a successful first-time breakfast site on lower campus. The UCSC Cycling Team provided volunteer support.

Cabrillo College: Provided staff support for internal promotion, and assisted in setting up BTW breakfast sites.
AGENDA: April 12, 2010

TO: Bicycle Committee

FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

RE: 2008 Bicycle Injuries and Fatalities Data

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee receive a presentation on Bicycle Injuries and Fatalities Data for 2008 compiled by the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency.

DISCUSSION

The County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency (HSA) works to reduce bicycle-related injuries in Santa Cruz County. HSA agency staff compiles Bicycle Injuries and Fatalities Data from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) annually. According to Caltrans, SWITRS is a statewide records system and acts as a centralized accumulation of data for fatal and injury traffic accidents. In addition, a large proportion of the reported property damage-only accidents are also processed into SWITRS. The reports are generated by over 100 CHP areas and over 500 city police departments, sheriffs’ offices and other local jurisdictions.

HSA staff will present the 2008 Bicycle Injuries and Fatalities Data report. The report shows that the Santa Cruz County bicyclist injury/fatality rate per 100,000 population for 2008 is 75, which is an increase from the 2007 rate of 60. The county bicyclist injury/fatality rate is more than twice the state rate of 32 for 2008. RTC staff would like to point out though that the rate does not reflect the number of bicyclists, or bicycle mode share, per county.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee receive a presentation on the Bicycle Injuries and Fatalities Data for 2008 compiled by the Health Services Agency.

Attachment: Bicycle Injuries and Fatalities for Santa Cruz County 2008
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Bicyclist Injuries and Fatalities for Santa Cruz County 2008

The Santa Cruz County bicyclist injury/fatality rate per 100,000 population for 2008 is 75, which is an increase from the 2007 rate of 60. The average injury/fatality rate for the county since the year 2000 is 62. The county bicyclist injury/fatality rate is more than twice the state rate of 32 for 2008.

State and County Bicyclist Injury/Fatality Rates Per 100,000 Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.C. County Injuries+Fatalities</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>255,602</td>
<td>258,100</td>
<td>258,900</td>
<td>258,900</td>
<td>260,200</td>
<td>261,345</td>
<td>249,705</td>
<td>251,747</td>
<td>253,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury/Fatality Rate</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Injuries+Fatalities</td>
<td>12,261</td>
<td>11,529</td>
<td>9,178</td>
<td>10,795</td>
<td>11,092</td>
<td>10,605</td>
<td>10,507</td>
<td>10,714</td>
<td>11,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, California</td>
<td>33,673,086</td>
<td>34,431,000</td>
<td>35,049,000</td>
<td>35,612,000</td>
<td>35,991,326</td>
<td>36,132,147</td>
<td>36,457,549</td>
<td>36,553,215</td>
<td>36,756,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Injury/Fatality Rate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of bicyclists injured and killed in Santa Cruz County rose from 152 in 2007 to 191 in 2008. The number of bicyclists injured and killed decreased in Scott’s Valley while increasing in all other jurisdictions throughout the county. Bicyclist fatalities remained the same as 2007 with two deaths in 2008, both in the City of Santa Cruz.

Bicyclists Injured and Killed 2000 - 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. County Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. County Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of bicyclist injuries/fatalities increased in the 15 to 34 year and the 45 and older age groups and declined in the 0 to 14 and 35 to 44 year age groups between 2007 and 2008. In 2008, the most significant rise in injuries from 2007 was in the 15 to 24 year age group, from 47 in 2007 to 71 in 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age unknown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>167</strong></td>
<td><strong>162</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>155</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>191</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compared to other counties in California, Santa Cruz County again ranked second for bicyclists injured and killed in 2008 according to the California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS); however, the number of those bicycling in Santa Cruz is known to be high. The 2000 U.S. Census states that 2.0% of commute trips to work in Santa Cruz County are by bicycle. The OTS rankings are based on daily vehicle miles traveled and average population. If the rankings were based on bicycle use, the relative safety or risk indicated would be more accurate. An effort is underway through the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) to include bicyclists in their regular traffic counts, which would provide valuable local data on bicycle trips.

*Production of this report was a collaborative effort funded by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission through the Community Traffic Safety Coalition and by a grant from the California Office of Traffic Safety, through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, with data from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). For more information, please contact the Community Traffic Safety Coalition c/o the Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention Unit of the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency at 1070 Emeline Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060, (831) 454-4312.*
TO: Bicycle Committee

FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Officer Elections

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee nominate and vote for a Chair and Vice-Chair to serve for the next year.

DISCUSSION

Daniel Kostelec and Gary Milburn have served the Bicycle Committee as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, for the previous year. In April of each year, new elections are held. Staff recommends that Committee members consider whether they are interested in serving in either one of these capacities. Interested members should be familiar with Robert’s Rules of Order, be willing to facilitate the meetings in a diplomatic and constructive manner and have some history of the Bicycle Committee and its workings.

The SCCRTC’s Rules and Regulations provides the following information regarding officers’ duties:

A Chairperson and Vice Chairperson for each Committee shall be elected to serve for a term of one year. The Committee shall elect its officers at the first meeting following the March SCCRTC meeting of every year. Election shall be by a roll call vote. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Committee. The Chairperson shall maintain order and decorum at the meetings, decide all questions of order, and announce the Committee’s decisions. The Vice Chairperson shall perform the duties of the Chairperson in his or her absence. In the event both officers are absent from the Committee, the majority of quorum may appoint a presiding officer for that meeting. All officers shall continue in their respective offices until their successors have been elected and have assumed office.

The Chair and Vice-Chair provide assistance to each other in their duties and should be available to sign letters on the Committee’s behalf and to attend occasional meetings.

On behalf of the Bicycle Committee, staff thanks Daniel Kostelec and Gary Milburn for their fine service over the past year.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee hold elections for a new Chair and Vice-Chair to serve the Committee for the next year, through March 2011.