AGENDA
Monday, December 13, 2010
SPECIAL TIME: 6:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Announcements – RTC Staff
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 October 18, 2010 Bicycle Committee meeting (pages 4-8)
7. Accept Hazard Reports (pages 9-11)
8. Accept Bicycle Committee Roster (page 12)
9. Accept letters from the Bicycle Committee to Caltrans regarding support for realignment of the Pacific Coast Bicycle Route within the City of Santa Cruz; and to the City of Santa Cruz Transportation Manager regarding recommended improvements to
the Mission Street Extension Bike/Ped Path (includes recommendation from Technical Subcommittee) - (pages 13-18)

10. Accept copy of correspondence sent from Committee member Rick Hyman to the Governor’s Office of Research and Planning regarding the draft “Update to the General Plan Guidelines: Complete Streets and the Circulation Element” document (pages 19–24)

11. Accept 2011 State and Federal Legislative Programs (pages 25-33)

12. Approve Bikes Secure Parking Subsidy Program applications and requests from Staff of Life and Goodwill Industries (pages 34-45)

REGULAR AGENDA

13. Discuss and approve 2011 Bicycle Committee Calendar – Oral presentation from Cory Caletti, RTC Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator (page 46)

14. Receive 2010 Bicycle Safety Observation Study and 2009 Bicyclist Injury and Fatality Report for Santa Cruz County – Presentation from Theresia Rogerson, County Health Services Department (page 47-56)


16. 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
   f. Bike To Work Update: Canin
   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. Safe Routes to School: Horton/Menchine/Akol

17. Adjourn

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 14th, 2011 at the Special Meeting Time of 6:30 p.m. at the RTC at 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

HOW TO REACH US
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
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 anticipo al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis. Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance by calling (831) 460-3200.
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1. Call to Order

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
- Kem Akol, District 1
- David Casterson, District 2
- Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz
- Eric Horton, District 2 (Alt.)
- Rick Hyman, District 5
- Brandon Kett, District 4
- Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola, Chair
- Jim Langley, CTSC
- Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
- Bob Montague, City of Watsonville
- Lex Rau, Scotts Valley (Alt.)

**Staff:**
- Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner

**Unexcused Absences:**
- Piet Canin, Bike to Work

**Excused Absences:**
- Carlos Garza, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
- Leo Jed, CTSC (Alt.)
- Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley
- Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
- Andy Ward, City of Capitola (Alt.)

**Vacancies:**
- District 4 – Alternate
- City of Watsonville – Alternate
- Bike to Work – Alternate

**Guests:**
- Kate Cassera, County of Santa Cruz
- Tom Cassera, Community Member
- Ariana Green, City of Capitola
- Derek Johnson, City of Capitola Community Development Director
- Cheryl Schmitt, City of Santa Cruz
- Jack Sohriakoff, County of Santa Cruz

3. Announcements - Cory Caletti handed out a **Safety Tips for Motorists and Cyclist** card developed by the South County Bicycle and Pedestrian Work Group for distribution by the City of Watsonville Police Department in lieu of citations. The group will be looking at getting other police departments to issue them as well. Cory distributed flyers for the Bike Secure parking subsidy program for members to distribute to potential applicants. She passed around a copy of a blog she wrote for the Street Smarts column in the Santa Cruz Sentinel on the bike parking program. Cory announced that the County Redevelopment Agency will be holding two public meetings on the Twin Lakes Projects and one for enhancing Soquel Village. Finally, she mentioned that RTP project prioritization item tentatively scheduled for the
October meeting was moved to the December meeting due to the volume of items on the current agenda.

4. Oral Communications - Cheryl Schmitt invited members to the San Lorenzo river path clean up effort scheduled for October 23rd. She passed around an event announcement with specific details.

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas - Cory Caletti indicated that 511 Traveler Information System survey described in Item #13 allows participants to request features that would address our specific communities’ informational needs. Members were encouraged to take the survey.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion (Fieberling/Menchine) to approve items 6 through 13 passed unanimously.

6. Approved draft minutes of the August 9, 2010 Bicycle Committee meeting
7. Accepted Hazard Report
8. Accepted Bicycle Committee Roster
9. Accepted letters from the Bicycle Committee to the City of Watsonville requesting that bicycle lanes be added to the Manabe Ow project and to the City of Santa Cruz in support of new multi-use trail through Pogonip
10. Accepted a letter from the RTC Executive Director to the Coastal Commission in support of the Arana Gulch Master Plan
11. Approved Bikes Secure Parking Subsidy Program Application from Artspace Tannery Lofts
12. Accepted transportation related summaries of November 2010 Ballot Propositions
13. Accepted 511 Traveler Information System Survey information

REGULAR AGENDA

14. City of Capitola Draft Bicycle Plan: Review draft plan and project list – Presentation from Ariana Green, City of Capitola

Cory Caletti gave an overview of the Draft City of Capitola Bicycle Plan which is due to expire December 6, 2010. She mentioned that the plan allows the City of Capitola to apply for Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funds as long as it conforms to requirements identified in the State Streets and Highway Code Section 891.2. She also reported that, while the usual timeline for Bicycle Plan and BTA grant application submissions is December 1st, Caltrans hasn't issued a Call for Projects and doesn’t expect to do so until November. The updated submission deadline is expected to be in February, 2010.

Ariana Green, a graduate student and consultant for the City of Capitola, discussed her significant updates to the City of Capitola’s 2005 Bicycle Plan. She distributed a circulation map and a list of projects, and discussed the goal of carrying out evaluation, engineering, education, encouragement, and enforcement goals to promote bicycling and develop Capitola into a bicycle friendly community. Proposed strategies of the plan include expanding and maintaining bikeways, conducting bicycle counts throughout city, creating an incentive based active transportation program at New Brighton Middle School, encouraging city staff to ride to work and for city errands, working with the police department to improve enforcement and safety
for bicyclists, participating in Bike-to-Work and Bike-to-School events, and constructing the segment of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network that runs through Capitola, among others.

Members requested that consideration be given to adding projects that would enhance bicycle access to neighborhoods north of Hwy 1 and in the Hwy 1/41st Avenue interchange area. Additional existing facilities needing to be mapped more clearly were identified and an “equality” goal was requested to be added to specify equal access to destination via bicycles.

Members requested that the draft plan be agendized for the December meeting at which point members may consider writing a letter of support to the Capitola City Council for the projects in the plan and to Caltrans for the City’s Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) application.

15. Featured Jurisdiction: City of Capitola – Daniel Kostelec provided a brief update on the City of Capitola’s current projects including maintenance, re-striping and re-stenciling bicycle facilities, as well as the 38th Avenue improvement project. Daniel said the City is tying up loose ends for repaving and parking removal on the street in question to finalize installation of the Class II bike lanes. The City is in the process of acquiring additional right of way, as approved by the City Council. Full funding is available for completion of the project.

16. County of Santa Cruz Draft Bicycle Plan: Review draft plan and project list – Presentation from Jack Sohriakoff, County of Santa Cruz Public Works

Cory Caletti gave an overview of the Draft Bicycle Plan review and submittal process. Jack Sohriakoff thanked members for their previous comments on the Draft Plan’s project list and said that revisions have been made as requested. He indicated that the draft was still a work in progress and that some text and figures have yet to be updated. Members requested that Item 11 on list be moved to a high priority status.

Members inquired about repaving of Soquel Drive from State Park Drive to Cabrillo College after expressing concern about the frequent water meters on WB Soquel Drive and the severely cracked paved. Jack indicated that the project had been on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act list but it has been removed. He noted that TDA funds could possibly be used to make those improvements or that the project could be added to the bike maintenance program. Possible improvements will be explored further.

Rick Hyman mentioned that County of Santa Cruz could achieve a Bicycle Friendly Community (BFC) status with the cooperation of the Bike Committee and RTC coordination. He also mentioned that no definition currently exists for what constitutes a “community” and thus, a number of jurisdictions could apply for a BFC status together.

17. City of Santa Cruz Transportation Development Act Allocation Request – Presentation from Cheryl Schmitt, City of Santa Cruz Transportation Coordination

Cory Caletti provided an overview of TDA requirements and funding allocation process as well as a summary of the City of Santa Cruz’s claim. Cheryl Schmitt described plans for the Mission Street Extension Bike/Pedestrian Path Revision
project, provided pictures of existing facilities and outlined details of planned improvements. She said that low plastic delineators with posts at certain frequencies will be used for the Mission Street Extension section east of Shaffer Road and that the existing k-rails will be removed. The City will repair the path and possibly the roadway surface if sufficient funds exist. In the EB direction, the path will be a mixed use facility and in the WB direction, where the road is one-way, bikes will share the roadway with vehicular traffic or may possibly utilize the path. After some discussion, a motion was made (Fieberling/Akol) to recommend to the RTC approval of the City of Santa Cruz TDA claim passed unanimously. A motion was also made (Menchine/Fieberling) to write a letter to City’s Public Works Department and Redevelopment Agency recommending that the following improvements be considered as path of the path improvement: 1) stencil Shared Roadway Markings on Mission Street Extension in the WB direction; 2) extend and connect the path to Natural Bridges Drive; 3) improve the approach to Wilder Ranch in the WB direction; 4) conduct a warrant study to evaluate the possibility of adding a stop sign at the Shaffer Rd and Mission St Extension; 5) plan and implement a street sweeping and maintenance program so debris does not collect and hinder safe travel; 6) reserve the space from the “k-rail” barrier removal for extending the width of the path; and 7) install appropriate signage indicating the type of facility the path is determined to be and manner in which it should be used. The motion passed unanimously. Another motion was made (Fieberling/Casterson) to recommend evaluating the Mission Street Extension as a Class I path (i.e., for two-way bicycle travel). The motion passed. A motion (Menchine/Akol) to request that design plans be brought back to the Committee for review passed unanimously.

18. Consider support of Pacific Coast Bicycle Route designation change to steer bicyclists off Mission Street through City of Santa Cruz - Cory Caletti said that the City of Santa Cruz and RTC staff have been working to re-designate the Pacific Coast Bike Route through the City of Santa Cruz off of Mission Street and on to West Cliff drive along the coast. A continued effort has been under way to improve bicycle safety on Mission Street and to channel bicyclists on to alternate routes after two bicycle fatalities occurred on that corridor in the past few years. RTC staff facilitated the request by cataloging existing signs and producing a Google map of language and photographs of current signs and ones on the proposed route. Caltrans indicated their willingness to re-designate the route and requested a letter of support from the Bicycle Committee as well as a resolution from the City of Santa Cruz Council. Jim Langley supported the plan and suggested that Shared Roadway Markings be placed in both directions on West Cliff Drive to facilitate increased bicycle travel. A motion (Fieberling/Menchine) to send a letter of support to Caltrans in favor of the proposed alternate bike route passed unanimously.

19. Project Tracking/Subcommittee Tasks: Oral Reports
   a. City of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: The need for improvements to Brookwood Drive was discussed. Brookwood Drive crosses from the City of Santa Cruz into the County of Santa Cruz jurisdiction. Better bicycle access is needed and safety enhancements need to be considered as motor vehicles sometimes enter the one-way road in the wrong direction.
   b. City of Capitola Project Tracking: Discussed earlier in the meeting.
   c. City of Scotts Valley Project Tracking: No report was given.
   d. City of Watsonville Project Tracking: Bob Montague indicated that the Manabe Ow project will be heard by the Watsonville City Council on Tuesday, October 10th. Bob expressed disappointment that no provisions were made for safe bicycle
travel within the project area.
e. County of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Discussed earlier in the meeting.
f. Bike-to-Work Update: No report was given.
g. CTSC Update: Jim Langley reported that HSA staff assisted at 4 Bike-to-Work Day sites, conducted bike/pedestrian safety presentations, distributed helmets to Gault Elementary School students in collaboration with the launch of Boltage (a new program aimed at encouraging kids to bicycle and walk to school). Several guest blogs by HSA, Ecology Action and the RTC staff members were written for Santa Cruz Sentinel’s Street Smarts column in September. CTSC members will view a webinar in the near future regarding ways law enforcement can enhance bike/pedestrian safety.
h. UCSC: Will Menchine reported that he and Peter Scott met with Transportation and Parking Services staff Larry Pageler and Cathy Crowe. They discussed various elements of UCSC bicycle parking program including installation of over 700 new racks and efforts to allow bicycle parking inside buildings, among other items. Developing a Pedestrian Circulation Plan is being considered. Bike Committee members suggested than an inventory of campus paths should included as part of the plan. Concerns were expressed over the new traffic signal on Empire Grade and Heller Drive which adds an inconvenient and unnecessary stop for cyclists traveling downhill on Empire Grade.
i. Legislative Tracking: No report was given.
j. Sanctuary Scenic Trail: Cory Caletti said that the RTC will begin work on the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan in the upcoming few months. Committee Effectiveness: No report was given.
k. Technical Subcommittee: No report was given.
l. Bicyclist/Motorist Safety Education: No report was given.
m. RTC Packet Monitoring Subcommittee: No report was given.

20. Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING:** The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 13, 2010 at the **Special Meeting Time of 6:30 p.m.** at the RTC’s office, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

\[Signature\]  \[Signature\]
Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant II and Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Hi Cheryl: Here's a hazard report for you. Thanks, Cory

Cory Caletti  
Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
phone: (831) 460-3201 / fax: (831) 460-3215

From: Saskia Lucas <saskia_lucas@yahoo.com>  
Date: October 20, 2010 9:22:05 PM PDT

Subject: Re: online hazard report?

Thanks Cory. I just wanted to report that the ice plant on the West Cliff Drive multi-use path is growing into the path, specifically the curvy section near Natural Bridges State Park (the beach cove area popular with nudists). It's making the path narrower and harder for different users to share safely.

Thanks for forwarding this on.

Take care,

Saskia
Bicycle Hazard Report

This Hazard Reporting Form is available to all who wish to report a hazard affecting cyclists traveling on road-ways 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: SE corner of Seabright & Murray
Please circle one: Northbound Southbound Eastbound Westbound
Cross Streets: Seabright & Murray
City: Santa Cruz

Please check all that apply:

☐ Potholes 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): cars ignore jay
in road @ end of bus stop
3 feet add bicyclists in the bike lane

Please comment on how this hazard has impacted you.

Extremely dangerous due to curb location and lack of space for bicyclists

Date: 11/10/10 Name: Karen Fushnik
Phone/Fax Number or E-mail Address: KFushnik@securve.org
Where did you obtain this form? etc.

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!
Hi Cory,

I sort of figured it was some political quagmire, glad at least to hear that you are on our team, and that it is on your radar.

Below is an e-mail I sent to the vice principle, Rich Moran, as well at Tawn Kennedy at Greenways to School/People Power.

I have a contact at Caltrans who might be able to help with the off-ramp signage aspect. Do you know of someone I/we can hassie on this? Is it even a Caltrans issue?

In the meantime, any chance the county might be able to drive a street sweeper along that 200 yard section of road and unearth the bike lane?

It might take five minutes and would render the otherwise buried bike lane actually useable.

Seems like a few signs, some lane paint, and a block worth of street sweeping could potentially save a kids life. It's otherwise hard to encourage them to ride bikes to school when I am sending them through such a gauntlet on a daily basis.

I'll see if I can't get some more fuel for the fire.

In the meantime, thanks for getting back to me and please let me know what else I can do to help, -Kirk

Hi Rich,

Just wondering if you and/or Poncho might have any contacts at the city who could help us out with a couple of cycling safety issues that I (and the students) deal with everyday when commuting home.

First item would be the enormous quantity of dirt and other debris that has accumulated in the bike lane heading east on Harkins Slough Rd., from the campus exit to the point where the northbound exit ramp from hwy. 1 ties in. The bike lane and the stripe designating it are pretty well buried under loose dirt, and make for a scary place to ride. I end up in the traffic lane to avoid the debris, and I imagine many students do the same. (When I questioned them in class, they confirmed this)

The next entails the intersection of the northbound off-ramp from hwy. 1, and Harkins Slough Rd. I am routinely threatened by drivers ignoring the yield sign and asserting their assumed right to my right of way/lane. I am surprised that there has yet to be a collision at this junction, and I am afraid that it is just a matter of time.

It would seem that at least some sort of "school crossing/caution" signage would be in order, if not a stop sign for cars making the right hand turn there. Again, I am a seasoned rider with twenty years commuting experience, and I am routinely threatened at this intersection. I fear for the students who I am encouraging to commute to school on bicycles, who with little or no experience are in a lot more danger.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Member Name/Contact Info</th>
<th>Appointment Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 1 - Voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel, Live Oak, part of Capitola</td>
<td>Kem Akol <a href="mailto:kemakol@msn.com">kemakol@msn.com</a> 247-2944</td>
<td>First Appointed: 1993 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Holly M. Tyler</td>
<td>First Appointed: 2010 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 2 - Voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptos, Corralitos, part of Capitola, Nisenos Marks, Freedom, Pajaro Dunes</td>
<td>David Casterson <a href="mailto:dcasteron@comcast.net">dcasteron@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2005 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Eric Horton <a href="mailto:erichortondesign@yahoo.com">erichortondesign@yahoo.com</a> 419-7296</td>
<td>First Appointed: 3/09 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 3 - Voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Basin, Davenport, Bonny Doon, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Peter Scott <a href="mailto:drip@ucsc.edu">drip@ucsc.edu</a> 423-0796</td>
<td>First Appointed: 2007 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>William Menchine (Will) <a href="mailto:menchine@cruzi.com">menchine@cruzi.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 4 - Voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville, part of Corralitos</td>
<td>Brandon Kett 722-4646</td>
<td>Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 5 - Voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL Valley, Summit, Scotts Valley, part of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Rick Hyman <a href="mailto:bikerick@att.net">bikerick@att.net</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 1989 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Capitola - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Daniel Kostelec, Chair <a href="mailto:dkostelec@sbcglobal.net">dkostelec@sbcglobal.net</a> 325-9623</td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02 Term Expires: 3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Andy Ward <a href="mailto:Andrew.ward@plantronics.com">Andrew.ward@plantronics.com</a> 462-6653</td>
<td>First Appointed: 2005 Term Expires: 3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Santa Cruz - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Wilson Fieberling <a href="mailto:anfbieb@yahoo.com">anfbieb@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2/07 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Carlos Garza <a href="mailto:carlos@cruzi.com">carlos@cruzi.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Scotts Valley - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Gary Milburn 427-3839 hml <a href="mailto:milburn@sbcglobal.net">milburn@sbcglobal.net</a>/438-2888 ext 210 wk</td>
<td>First Appointed: 1997 Term Expires: 3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Lex Rau <a href="mailto:lexrau@sbcglobal.net">lexrau@sbcglobal.net</a> 419-1817</td>
<td>First Appointed: 2007 Term Expires: 3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Watsonville - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Bob Montague <a href="mailto:bob.montague@sbcglobal.net">bob.montague@sbcglobal.net</a> 332-8025</td>
<td>First Appointed: 8/08 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike To Work - Voting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plet Canin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pcanin@ecoact.org">pcanin@ecoact.org</a> 426-5925 ext. 127</td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>First Appointed: 1/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Traffic Safety Coalition - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Jim Langley <a href="mailto:jim@jimlangley.net">jim@jimlangley.net</a> 423-7248</td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Leo Jed <a href="mailto:leojed@gmail.com">leojed@gmail.com</a> 425-2650</td>
<td>First Appointed: 3/09 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All phone numbers have the (831) area code unless otherwise noted.
October 28, 2010

Richard Krumholz, District Director
Caltrans District 5
50 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-5415

RE: Pacific Coast Bicycle Route Re-Alignment in the City of Santa Cruz

Dear Mr. Krumholz:

I am writing on behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's (RTC) Bicycle Committee to offer our unanimous support for the re-designation of the Pacific Coast Bicycle Route (PCBR) through the City of Santa Cruz. While the current PCBR through Mission Street provides access to many commercial establishments, the two bicycle fatalities in 2007 and 2008 coupled with the lack of bicycle lanes make re-routing cyclists off Mission Street critical. In addition, the proposed alignment along the coast via scenic West Cliff Drive will facilitate enjoyment of one of Santa Cruz County’s most cherished treasures. A few blocks from the terminus of West Cliff Drive is downtown Santa Cruz where many amenities are available to bicyclists of all persuasions.

The Committee acknowledges with appreciation Caltrans' continued efforts to improve bicycle facilities and enhance the safety of bicyclists. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the RTC Bicycle Coordinator and staff to the Bicycle Committee, Cory Caletti, at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org.

Sincerely,

Daniel Kostelec
Chair, SCCRTC Bicycle Committee

cc: Cheryl Schmitt, City of Santa Cruz Public Works Transportation Coordinator
    Adam Fukushima, Caltrans District 5 Transportation Planner
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Bicycle Committee
October 25, 2010

Jim Burr, Transportation Manager
City of Santa Cruz Public Works
809 Center Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: Mission Street Extension Bicycle/Pedestrian Path improvements

Dear Mr. Burr:

I am writing on behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Bicycle Committee to submit comments regarding the Mission Street Extension Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Revision project. The Bicycle Committee appreciates the City’s ongoing commitment to promoting safe bicycle transportation and improving existing facilities. The current Mission Street Extension bike/pedestrian path and the k-rail barriers used to delineate the path from the motor vehicle lane have presented safety hazards and members have long sought improvements for this segment in the City’s bicycle network. The Committee welcomes this sorely needed revision. At its October 18, 2010 meeting, the Committee supported the City’s application to use TDA funds to make improvements.

The Committee suggests that the City incorporate the following recommendations in the project design:

1) Stencil Shared Roadway Markings on Mission St Extension in WB direction;
2) Extend and connect the path to Natural Bridges Drive in the EB direction;
3) Improve the approach to Wilder Ranch in the WB direction;
4) Plan and implement a street sweeping and maintenance plan so debris does not collect and hinder safe bicycle travel;
5) Reserve the space left from removal of the k-rail barrier for extending the width of the path; and
6) Install appropriate signage indicating the type of facility the path is determined to be and the manner in which it should be used (ex: “Class I Path”, “Stay right”, etc). Add crosswalk markings to improve safety and provide greater clarity to all users.

Additionally, the Committee tasked its Technical Subcommittee to follow up on the suggestions identified above. After a site visit to evaluate the project area, the Subcommittee submitted the attached Memorandum (Attachment 1) with additional details and recommendations.

The Committee also recommended that the City conduct the following evaluations and then also incorporate these elements into the project design, if possible:

7) Conduct a warrant study to evaluate adding an additional stop sign on Shaffer Rd. and Mission St Extension to slow traffic entering the roadway from Highway 1;
8) Consider designating the separate pathway on Mission Street Extension as a Class I path (i.e., for two-way bicycle travel);
9) Evaluate ways to separate pedestrian and bicycle traffic on the pathway.
The Bicycle Committee requests that design plans, once drafted, be brought back for review as stipulated in the RTC Rules and Regulations. Please provide a map of the project, surface and alignment, deviations from the standard cross-sections, changes in the surface and alignment, and any parking restrictions.

The Committee acknowledges with appreciation the City of Santa Cruz’s continued efforts to improve bicycle facilities and enhance the safety of bicyclists. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the RTC Bicycle Coordinator and staff to the Bicycle Committee, Cory Caletti, at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org.

Sincerely,

Daniel Kostelec
Chair, SCCRTC Bicycle Committee

Attachment 1: Memorandum from Technical Subcommittee

cc: Bonnie Lipscomb, City of Santa Cruz Redevelopment Agency Director
    Cheryl Schmitt, City of Santa Cruz Public Works Transportation Coordinator
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Bicycle Committee

\rtcserv2\Shared\Bike\Committee\CORR\2010\MissionStExtension_improvements.doc
Observations from Mission Street Extension and Shaffer Road Bike Path
SCCRTC BAC Technical Subcommittee: William Menchine, David Casterson,
Rick Hyman from City of Santa Cruz Subcommittee joined us

Our subcommittee was tasked with following up on our Bicycle Committee’s recommendations. We conducted a field trip on October 23, 2010 looking at the approach of the contraflow bike lane and sidewalk on Mission Street Extension from both directions. We observed several riders and pedestrians using the path, as well as cyclists using the roadway (in both directions). We looked at the conditions on both the roadway and pathway and offer the following suggested amplifications of our Bicycle Committee’s recommendations, illustrated on the attached aerial view photographs:

- Shared Roadway: It is currently not clear to cyclists, pedestrians or motorists, what the design intent of the multi-use path and roadway is, especially when approaching the facility from the east and heading towards Shaffer road (westbound). In addition to the Committee’s recommendation to place Shared Roadway Markings in the roadway, we suggest posting “Bikes May Use Full Lane” and “Slow” or “Reduce Speed” signs.

- Extend Path to Natural Bridges: We noted that there is no sidewalk fronting Mission Street Extension by the fairly recently constructed SC City Schools building. We recommend installing a sidewalk there. Then, the multi-use pathway could transition to a separate sidewalk and bike lane.

- Additionally, as we cycled to this area along Mission Street Extension we noted the wide pavement, lack of vehicles parked on the street, and several cyclists going to and from the Farmers’ Market and Wilder Ranch. We thus also recommend installing bike lanes on Mission Street Extension all the way from Burkett to Swift Streets to as called for in the 2008 City of Santa Cruz Bicycle Transportation Plan.

- Improve approach to Wilder Ranch: We observed that the pathway on the Wilder Ranch side of Shaffer Road is not aligned with where cyclists would ride on the Mission Street Extension pathway. We recommend that the entrance to the Wilder Ranch Bike Path be modified to align with the pathway on Mission Street Extension and that a crosswalk across Shaffer Road to the multi-use path be marked.

- Pathway signing: As noted previously, we observed some cyclists ride eastbound on Mission Street Extension’s one-way roadway rather than use the pathway to the right. Thus, better signage is needed to direct riders and pedestrians approaching the Shared Use Path from the Wilder Ranch Bike facility to indicate that the “Path” is both a Bike Lane and a Sidewalk. We recommend installing an island or sign adjacent to the north/south crosswalk on Shaffer Road between the uphill roadway and entrance to the shared use path to help delineate and identify.
the roadway and path. West Cliff Drive toward the trestle bridge is an example of a clear delineation directing where contraflow bicyclists are to ride.

- Stop Sign. If a study does not warrant a stop sign on Shaffer Road, then we recommend that a warning sign and/or pavement marking should be placed north of the intersection with Mission Street Extension to alert drivers of a Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing. This would also be a good place to install a speed hump to slow traffic approaching the intersection from Hwy 1. We also noted that the “No Through Traffic” sign is located south of the intersection. We recommend another such sign be installed at the intersection of Shaffer Road with Highway One to inform drivers that the road is dead end. This may prevent some unnecessary traffic on Shaffer.

- Separate pathway traffic: We recommend painting stencils indicating “Keep Right” along the path (in both directions) to improve safety.

Also, we recall that Cheryl Schmitt’s presentation indicated that some pavement repairs may be possible as part of this project should adequate funding exist. We noted some poor pavement conditions on both the pathway and roadway. We concur that repair and/or repaving of the shared path and roadway are needed as part of the plan to replace “K-Rail” with a new lane separation barrier. In the future, as funding becomes available, we recommend upgrading curb, drainage, and guardrail on the north side of Mission Street Extension to enable a more uniform curb with some additional pavement to increase roadway width and fix uneven pavement. Please see note #7 on the attached aerial view of the lower (eastern) section of the facility.
Hi: Sorry, I just got this completed at the deadline, because I would have liked to share with others and maybe get broader support for these suggestions. Feel free to circulate as you see fit, thanks, Rick

Dear OPR staff:

Please consider my comments and suggestions on the draft “Update to the General Plan Guidelines: Complete Streets and the Circulation Element.” These comments are made based on my over three decades of experiences as a professional environmental planner, member of a local bicycle advisory committee, daily bicycle commuter, and consummate reader of bicycle planning literature. Thank you,

Rick Hyman
Santa Cruz

GENERAL COMMENTS:

1. Integration with Bicycle Transportation Plan law:

COMMENT: The introductory pages of the draft Guidelines are a good start in describing the relationship of Complete Streets legislation to other laws. However, there is no mention of Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2. This section details the mandatory requirements for Bicycle Transportation Plans. [1] Preparing these plans is not mandatory, except in order to access Bicycle Transportation Account Funds, which many jurisdictions choose to do. The Plan requirements specify data that must be collected and are geared towards physical infrastructure that can be funded. They do not mandate a comprehensive program to cover all aspects of improvements for cycling, for example: they do not require any minimum standards, a certain level of bike parking, a bicycle policy element; necessary improvements to streets that do not and are not planned to have bike lanes or are not bike routes, an implementation component, nor prioritization of bicycle projects among other transportation projects. However, those local governments that have, or decide to prepare, a Bicycle Transportation Plan may either feel that they have to duplicate efforts to comply with Complete Streets, or alternatively decide that they have to do nothing more to comply with Complete Streets, or may simply be frustrated about seemingly duplicative and/or contradictory state laws.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Include a discussion of Streets and Highway Code Section 891.2.
- Provide suggestions as to how the Circulation Element provisions can relate to Bicycle Transportation Plans prepared pursuant to Streets and Highway Code Section 891.2 and not be in conflict, such as:
  - relate the Guideline’s “Data collection techniques” regarding cycling with the data requirements of the Streets and Highway Code to avoid duplication and ensure that the data is useful in developing policies, projects and programs;
  - adopt bicycling objectives, policies and actions in the general plan circulation element and cross-reference it to the project list and data in the Bicycle Transportation Plan;
  - incorporate a Bicycle Transportation Plan that complies with both Streets and Highway Code and Complete Streets requirements into the circulation element.
2. Integration with funding requirements:

COMMENT: The draft Guidelines are a start in mentioning transportation funding through Regional Transportation Planning Agencies. (Indeed the bulk of transportation money is channeled through RTPAs; although other funds are raised by or given directly to local governments. Chapter 9 of the General Plan Guidelines covers local Capital Improvement Programs.) But, a reader of the draft Guidelines may perceive contradictions in state law in that Regional Transportation Plans have to incorporate local plans but that local general plans do not have to be consistent with Sustainable Communities Strategies and in that RTPs do not have to have multi-modal strategies but local plans must (pp. 6-7). As noted, for bicycle projects determined to be necessary, they can be listed in Bicycle Transportation Plans and then eligible for funding through the Bicycle Transportation Account. And the draft Guidelines detail how Safe Routes to Schools are funded. However, it is not clear from reading the draft Guidelines how bicycle (and other transportation) projects developed to comply with the Complete Streets law can be assured some appropriate level of funding from those sources funneled through RTPAs. While the Guidelines can not change state law, the third paragraph on page 8 could be expanded to suggest specific steps to follow to better integrate the planning and funding processes at regional and local levels.

SUGGESTIONS:
- Expand discussion of how specific transportation projects are listed, prioritized and funded.
- Include a discussion of how local listing of prioritized transportation projects should be derived from the revised circulation element and be consistent with and integrated into Regional Transportation Plans and Regional Transportation Improvement Programs.
- Include in such a discussion how non-motorized transportation projects can be prioritized in order to achieve the goals of Complete Streets.

3. Operational improvements for cyclists:

COMMENT: Although operations are mentioned in the draft Guidelines and a few considerations are presented (e.g., car-free zones, bike boulevards, bike parking facilities and requirements), the emphasis is on general facility planning. Cyclists are legally entitled to use all roadways (except certain freeways) and all jurisdictions have residents who cycle and outsiders who cycle through. Impediments that are either not discernable to motorists or at best are minor irritants to them (e.g., potholes) can have far more detrimental effects on cyclists. A comprehensive program to improve existing road conditions for cycling can do much more for cyclists than adding a new bike facility of comparable cost.

SUGGESTIONS:
- Add a narrative that discusses this role that operational and related supporting improvements can have on improving cycling.
- Include and/or reference a menu of specific operational and related supporting improvements geared toward cyclists that could be included in a local general plan as programs to undertake, such as:
  - Bicycle advisory committees;
  - Removing on-street parking;
  - Bike route signing, mapping and advisories;
  - Bicycle coordinator staff position;
  - Prohibitions on removing or narrowing bike lanes;
  - Bicycle detection at traffic lights;
  - Appropriate drain grate and utility hole cover design and installation;
  - Accommodations for cyclists during road construction, encroachment or closure;
  - Returning roadways to appropriate conditions for smooth cycling after construction projects;
  - Redesigning and limiting new driveway intersections with roads;
  - Cut-throughs to allow bicycle travel through barriers for motor vehicles;
  - Prohibitions on roadway reconfigurations that adversely impact cyclists;
  - Reduced speed limits;
  - Regular sweeping of roads, especially of the parts where bikes normally travel;
  - Program to report and respond to cycling hazards;
  - Program to respond to and alleviate potholes and other uneven street pavement;
  - Use of pavement marking materials that are least slippery and skid-prone;
  - Periodic restriping of bike lanes and re-stenciling of bike facility symbols;
Vegetation maintenance adjacent to or overhanging areas where bicycles travel;
Bicycle-safe railroad crossings.

4. Incentives and other promotions to increase cycling:

COMMENT: The draft guidelines are a good start in mentioning some benefits of cycling (i.e., health, safety and greenhouse gas reduction on p. 5) and noting the legal mandate to reduce greenhouse gas reduction, which in part will have to result from reduced use of fossil fueled vehicles (p. 6). The guidelines also include a consideration of existing and estimated future modal split (p. 13). Implicit in these points is that jurisdictions may wish to or even need to promote cycling in order to boost the number of cycling trips. They may have additional reasons for doing so as well, such as to have more livable streets or to save money that would have to be spent on widening roadways. Providing complete streets pursuant to the recommendations in the draft Guidelines and these comments may help actually foster increased cycling. But, there are many other initiatives that a jurisdiction can take or support that can further promote cycling that could be added into their general plan circulation element.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Add a narrative that discusses how increased cycling can help achieve community goals and state mandates.
- Include and/or reference specific incentives and other promotions for increasing cycling, such as:
  - Bike parking and showers at places of employment;
  - Participate in the federally-authorized program to reimburse employees for up to $20 a month in bicycle commuting costs;
  - Emergency assistance and rides home for cycling employees;
  - Other incentive programs for employees who commute by bike;
  - Bike to work and bike to school days and similar events and celebrations;
  - Bike parking at special events;
  - Advertising and promotional material encourage bike travel to sites and events;
  - Discounts to patrons who bike;
  - Bikes available to use when traveling on the job;
  - Bicycle buddy and mentor programs, especially for beginning cyclists;
  - Encouragement and patronage of bicycle delivery services;
  - Bike sharing programs;
  - Free or rental bikes at overnight accommodations, such as hotels and motels;
  - Free, discount or loan programs for obtaining bicycles and bicycle equipment;
  - Educational programs on the benefits of bicycle riding;
  - Bike education and safety programs in schools and for adults.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS:

5. RE p.12: The consideration of traffic calming measures (roundabouts, raised medians, etc.)

COMMENT: Traffic calming measures can benefit bicyclists and pedestrians as well as have other. However some traffic calming measures, such as bulb outs, can be inconvenient and unsafe for cyclists, if poorly designed. There are many examples of traffic calming measures designed to facilitate bicycle travel (e.g., separate cut-out for cyclists through a bulb-out).

SUGGESTED REVISION: The consideration of traffic calming measures (roundabouts, raised medians, etc.) designed to enhance, not inconvenience, bicyclist and pedestrian travel.

6. RE: Identify existing and proposed modes of transportation.

COMMENT: The statute already states that bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, users of public transportation, and seniors must be accommodated. There may be other modes that could be considered under this topic such as skateboarders, roller skaters, or equestrians. But, conversely it could be interpreted to mean that consideration of certain types of users on certain streets is discretionary.

SUGGESTED REVISION: Identify existing and proposed modes of transportation, including at a minimum those that serve bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, users of public transportation, and seniors.
7. RE: Project future modal split by estimating the percentage of trips by transit, passenger car, van pools, etc.

COMMENT: This is worthy in theory, but needs more detail to work in practice. My local city, county and region have had modal split goals for years, including increased bicycling percentages, that have never been achieved. Unfortunately, except for census data on travel to work, modal split data is often unavailable or expensive to obtain and hence it is difficult to know what goal to strive for and then if it is being achieved.

SUGGESTED REVISION: Project expected and desired future modal split by estimating the percentage of trips by transit, passenger car, van pools, etc. using census or other available data and periodically monitor progress toward modal split goals.

8. RE: Assess the adequacy of the existing streets, roads, and highway systems and the need for expansion, improvements, and/or transportation operations management as a result of traffic generated by planned land use changes. Consider that the need for expansion should recognize economic principles such as cost effectiveness and efficiency as well as environmental and social consequences.

COMMENT: Traffic can fluctuate even without any land use changes. (This is recognized by the third subsequent bulleted item.)

SUGGESTED REVISION: Assess the adequacy of the existing streets, roads, and highway systems and the need for expansion, improvements, and/or transportation operations management as a result of traffic generated by planned land use changes. Consider that the need for expansion should recognize economic principles such as cost effectiveness and efficiency as well as environmental and social consequences.

9. RE: Analyze existing performance and levels of service of existing streets, roads, and highways for all transportation modes. Compare projected with desired performance and level of service standards for all transportation modes. The development of performance and level of service standards for bicycle and pedestrian routes and intersections.

COMMENT: Although there are a few suggested methods for determining level of service for cycling, they are not in common usage and may be costly to ascertain. Except in a few instances, such as highly popular multi-use trails, level of service is not critical for cyclists. As long as facilities meet minimum standards (such as for the width of a bike lane), level of service is irrelevant.

SUGGESTED REVISION: Analyze existing performance and levels of service of existing streets, roads, and highways for all transportation modes. Compare projected with desired performance and level of service standards for all transportation modes. Similarly, analyze and compare how streets, roads and highways safely and conveniently do and can accommodate non-motorized transportation modes. The development of performance and level of service standards for bicycle and pedestrian routes and intersections.

10. RE pp. 13, 16: Analyze historical data and trends with regard to collisions involving all modes of travel. Identify problem locations by analyzing injury severity and determining collision frequency relative to exposure by conducting motor vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle counts. Assess historical data and trends with regard to vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian collisions.

COMMENT: Use of collision data is important, but only to some extent, especially with regard to cyclists, for at least three reasons. For one, many accidents involving cyclists do not get reported or tallied (there are some examples of cooperating hospitals making available cyclist injury data which may be more useful than police reports). On the other hand, the location of bicycle fatalities and serious injuries (which may not be numerous) may not necessarily correlate with the worse infrastructure conditions. And, bicycle travel may be low in potentially dangerous locations. In a few locations, observers have watched and video-taped bicyclists using the roadways to determine problematic locations.

SUGGESTED REVISION: Identify problem locations in part by analyzing injury severity and determining collision frequency relative to exposure by conducting motor vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle counts, in part by analyzing the condition of the infrastructure and, if feasible, in part by observing bicyclist and pedestrian behavior.

11. RE: The development and improvement of access to and from transit routes by walking and bicycling and by people with disabilities.

COMMENT: Many public bus systems already accommodate bicycles, usually in the form of mounted bike racks. Trains can accommodate bicycles inside and some bus routes, especially that cover longer distances and are not heavily used, can
also accommodate bicycles inside. Bus storage compartments and attached trailers may also be able to accommodate bikes. Assuming transit is broadly construed to include public and private shuttle buses, trains and similar modes there are expanded opportunities for all such vehicles to convey bicycles. This can boost transit ridership (a fairly high percentage of our local bus system consists of bicycle riders).

SUGGESTED REVISION: The development and improvement of access to and from transit routes by walking and bicycling and by people with disabilities and transit vehicle accommodation of bicycles on board. *

[1] (a) The estimated number of existing bicycle commuters in the plan area and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle commuters resulting from implementation of the plan.

(b) A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which shall include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.

(c) A map and description of existing and proposed bikeways.

(d) A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking at schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.

(e) A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.

(f) A map and description of existing and proposed facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment. These shall include, but not be limited to, locker, restroom, and shower facilities near bicycle parking facilities.

(g) A description of bicycle safety and education programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the Vehicle Code pertaining to bicycle operation, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicyclists.

(h) A description of the extent of citizen and community involvement in development of the plan, including, but not limited to, letters of support.

(i) A description of how the bicycle transportation plan has been coordinated and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, programs that provide incentives for bicycle commuting.

(j) A description of the projects proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation.

(k) A description of past expenditures for bicycle facilities and future financial needs for projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters in the plan area.

[1] (a) The estimated number of existing bicycle commuters in the plan area and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle commuters resulting from implementation of the plan.

(b) A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which shall include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.

(c) A map and description of existing and proposed bikeways.

(d) A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking at schools, shopping centers, public buildings, and major employment centers.

(e) A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These shall include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.

(f) A map and description of existing and proposed facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment. These shall include, but not be limited to, locker, restroom, and shower facilities near bicycle parking facilities.

(g) A description of bicycle safety and education programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the Vehicle Code pertaining to bicycle operation, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicyclists.

(h) A description of the extent of citizen and community involvement in development of the plan, including, but not limited to, letters of support.
(i) A description of how the bicycle transportation plan has been coordinated and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, programs that provide incentives for bicycle commuting.

(j) A description of the projects proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation.

(k) A description of past expenditures for bicycle facilities and future financial needs for projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters in the plan area.
AGENDA: December 2010

TO: Bicycle Committee
    Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

REGARDING: 2011 State and Federal Legislative Programs

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee and Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee:
1. Receive the 2011 State and Federal Legislative Programs (Attachments 1 & 2, respectively);
2. Inform staff throughout the year of any specific bills the RTC should consider monitoring.

BACKGROUND

Every year the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopts a legislative program to guide its support and opposition of state and federal legislative or administrative actions. Working with its legislative assistants and transportation entities statewide, the RTC develops and implements the RTC legislative program, notifying state representatives of the RTC's positions on key issues, and monitoring bills and other federal and state actions that could impact transportation in Santa Cruz County.

DISCUSSION

The adopted 2011 State and Federal Legislative Programs for the RTC are attached (Attachments 1 & 2, respectively). The legislative programs were modified to include input provided by members of the Commission's advisory committees. The 2011 Legislative Programs continue to focus on preserving and increasing funding for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County.

As they are introduced by the legislature, the RTC will monitor specific bills that may impact transportation in Santa Cruz County. Committee members are encouraged to inform staff throughout the year if there are any specific bills you believe the RTC should monitor.

SUMMARY

Attached are the RTC's 2011 State and Federal Legislative Programs which guide its support and opposition of state and federal legislative or administrative actions.

Attachments:
1. 2011 State Legislative Program
2. 2011 Federal Legislative Program
FOCUS AREAS FOR 2011:

1. **Funding Priority Projects**: Seek and preserve funding for priority transportation projects and programs in Santa Cruz County, including:
   - Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes
   - Highway 1 HOV Lanes
   - Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
   - Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District projects
   - Local Street and Roadway Preservation
   - Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities

2. **Expand revenue-raising opportunities** and innovative financing options beyond the traditional gas tax.

   - **Sponsor legislation** to authorize Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE), including the RTC, to increase SAFE vehicle registration fees by $1 in order to support motorist aid programs.

   - **Sponsor legislation** to expand the authority of the RTC and local jurisdictions to increase taxes and fees for transportation projects, including new vehicle registration fees.

3. **Address Air Quality/Climate Change**:
   - Support legislation to provide funding to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, including funds needed to implement SB375 and AB32.

4. **Protect and Augment Transportation Funding**: Pursue policy and/or legislative changes to restore, preserve and augment funding for all modes of transportation:
   - Support legislation and other efforts to provide stable funding for transit, local streets and roads, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects – especially in light of potential impacts of Proposition 22 (2010) and Proposition 26 (2010) on the “gas tax swap”. This may include reinstatement of the state sales tax on gasoline (Proposition 42, 2004).
   - Index the gas tax and other revenues to inflation.
   - Seek early allocation of Proposition 1B bonds for projects in Santa Cruz County.
   - Ensure STIP funds are programmed and allocated to regions based on SB 45 formulas and the region’s priorities. Ensure the State Budget allows flexibility to fund transit projects in the STIP.
   - Increase funding for state Safe Routes to Schools, Bicycle Transportation Account and other bicycle and pedestrian programs.
   - Support increased funding for local streets and roads, as highlighted in the statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment.
General Legislative Platform

1. Preserve Existing Transportation Funding and Formulas.
   Preserve and protect against deferral, borrowing or taking of state funding designated for the transportation system. Retain and enhance California’s funding formulas based on the increased costs to maintain and address deficiencies to the existing transportation system. Specifically:
   
a) Support legislation and other efforts to ensure stable funding for transit, local streets and roads, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects – especially in light of potential impacts of Proposition 22 (2010) and Proposition 26 (2010) on the “gas tax swap”. Could include reinstatement of the per gallon excise tax increase or state sales tax on gasoline (Proposition 42, 2004) dedicated to transportation. *(Focus area for 2011)*

b) Support early and timely sale of bonds for transportation, including allocation of Proposition 1B and Proposition 116 bond funds for projects in Santa Cruz County. Support extension of legislative deadlines previously established for bond programs to coincide with the state’s bonding ability. *(Focus area for 2011)*

c) Oppose proposals to shift transportation funds to non-transportation purposes and the State General Fund.
   - Protect existing highway and transit funds, including Highway Users Tax Revenue (gas tax), sales taxes for transportation, Public Transportation Account (PTA) and “spillover” revenues, against suspension, transfer or expenditure for non-transportation uses.
   - Support legislation that expedites repayment of transportation funds previously diverted to the State General Fund.

d) Support State Budget Reform that will bring fiscal discipline and predictability to the state budget.

e) Ensure that transportation planning funds are available to agencies throughout the year and are not withheld due to delays in enacting the state budget.

f) Support the continuation of state transportation funding programs dedicated to projects such as transit, Safe Routes to Schools, Bicycle Transportation Account, paratransit and Freeway Service Patrol.

g) STIP Modernization
   - Ensure State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds are equitably programmed and allocated to regions, based on SB 45 (1998) formulas and regions’ priorities, which may include local road rehabilitation and transit projects.
   - Ensure the State Budget and STIP Fund Estimate allow flexibility to fund all modes of projects in the STIP; increase flexibility for funding STIP projects, and allow STIP projects to access GARVEE bonds.
     - Ensure that transit projects remain eligible for regional STIP funds, even if the STIP does not include Public Transit Account funds.

2. Support New Transportation Funding. Support countywide and statewide efforts to raise needed funds to maintain and enhance the transportation system, including:

a) Increase and index state gas and fuel taxes and other sources of transportation revenues so that transportation revenues keep pace with inflation/increased cost. Dedicate revenues to transportation projects and programs.

b) Support efforts to address and expand revenue-raising opportunities and innovative financing options beyond the traditional gas tax, especially in recognition of the fact that vehicle miles traveled increasingly exceed fuel consumption. *(Focus area for 2011)*
c) Support the development of a steady stream of new transportation funds dedicated to local road rehabilitation and maintenance, especially for roadways utilized by bicyclists.

d) Support legislative efforts to expand the authority of the RTC and local jurisdictions to increase taxes and fees for transportation projects, including gas taxes and fees, vehicle registration fees, congestion pricing, and fees relating to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. (Focus area for 2011)
   - Seek amendment to SB 83 (2009) to ensure all regional transportation agencies, not just Congestion Management Agencies (CMA), are authorized to seek voter approval to increase vehicle registration fees by up to $10 to fund transportation programs and projects. (Focus area for 2011)
   - Support legislation that would allow the County of Santa Cruz to pursue a sales tax measure for transportation improvements.

e) Work with local elected officials, local agencies and interest groups to address continuing gaps in funding for local transportation projects and pursue new local funding sources.

f) Support legislation that lowers the voter threshold for local transportation funding measures, including lowering the voter threshold for local transportation sales tax ballot measures from the 2/3 supermajority to a simple majority, 55% or 60% majority vote.

g) Work to ensure that state transportation programs provide the maximum amount of revenues for the Santa Cruz County region. If special state funding programs are developed, support funding of projects in Santa Cruz County.

h) Advocate that any new state revenues created for transportation be locally controlled and include safeguards to prevent diversion to the State General Fund.


   a) Support organizational reform efforts that streamline and otherwise improve transportation funding, programming or project delivery processes and eliminate unnecessarily and/or duplicative requirements.

   b) Support greater flexibility in contracting methods.

   c) Support initiatives that increase opportunities to trade federal funds for state funds, as currently exists for Santa Cruz County’s share of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds.

   d) Grant preaward spending authority for transit projects, especially those funded by STIP.

   e) Support efforts to streamline Project Initiation Documents (PIDs) for projects on the State Route System in order to lower the overall cost of PID development. Oppose efforts to transfer the State costs of PID development and oversight to local entities that take the lead on highway projects. (Focus area for 2011)

   f) Oppose unfunded mandates on local and regional government.

4. Air Quality/Climate Change (Focus area for 2011)

   a) Support efforts to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and encourage smart-growth practices, which also preserve the authority and flexibility of local agencies. Ensure that the region’s needs are incorporated in emerging climate change and sustainability
programs, legislation, and regulations, including meeting the goals of AB 32 – the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, and SB 375.

b) Ensure adequate funding is made available to fulfill the requirements of AB 32 and SB 375, including funds for transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and other projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and resources to prepare plans in compliance with SB 375.

5. Specifics

a) Transit:
- Support efforts to restore, protect, and enhance funding for public transit, especially in light of A832 goals to reduce greenhouse gases (GHG).
- Support introduction and passage of legislation designed to preserve and enact additional sources of transit operating and capital assistance, including legislation aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
- Support funding programs that promote transit-oriented development and transit villages. Ensure that state-supported housing projects near transit facilities provide safe and convenient access for disabled persons to transit and are available to all regions.
- Support measures to allow the use of gas taxes for transit capital purposes, including purchase of rolling stock.
- Support development of the Coast Daylight Train and Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s CalTrain extension projects.
- Increase flexibility to use state transit funds on both operations and capital expenses.

b) Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities
- Support transportation programs that are beneficial to communities with limited means.
- Increase funding levels for elderly and disabled transportation, including operating and capital funds for ADA paratransit service and vehicles.
- Support continuation of a competitive process, rather than formula distribution, of FTA5310 funds.
- Support funding transportation to dialysis and other medically necessary appointments; support Medicaid funding for transit and paratransit and oppose reductions in Medi-Cal funding for transportation.
- Support funding to ensure universal access, including access for paratransit vehicles within new developments, fully accessible transit stops and safe travel paths (accessible pedestrian facilities, including audible pedestrian signals), especially between senior and/or disabled living areas, medical facilities, educational facilities, employment locations, and bus stops.

c) Bicycling & Walking
- Support legislative initiatives and modifications to the California Vehicle Code that would improve conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians, including safety and access.
  - Support legislation and local ordinances prohibiting parking in designated bicycle lanes, to allow law enforcement to ticket vehicles parked in bicycle lanes even if specific “no parking” signage is absent.
  - Support measures that would require bicycle and pedestrian facilities as a part of newly constructed roads and streets.
- Support increased funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs, including education and awareness programs, the Bicycle Transportation Account, Safe Routes to Schools, Complete Streets programs, audible pedestrian signals, and programs that educate enforcement personnel regarding best practices.
- Support the inclusion and expansion of bicycle education programs (e.g. helmet laws, how to ride safely, etc.) in public and private schools, including high schools.
- Support Incentive Programs for bicycle and pedestrian commuters. Support efforts to extend the transportation fringe benefits in the state tax code to bicycle and pedestrian commuters.

d) Transportation Demand Management/Carpooling:
- Oppose measures to remove existing or restrict future High Occupancy Vehicle lanes.
- Support legislation to provide incentives for both employers and employees, to encourage use of alternatives to driving alone, such as state tax incentives.
- Support efforts to secure new funding for regional rideshare programs.
- Support programs that would provide incentives for students to use transit and support revision of state laws that restrict Community Colleges’ ability to implement transportation fees for transit.

e) SAFE Callbox and Freeway Service Patrol
- Support proposals to increase state funding of Freeway Service Patrol programs.
- Support increased flexibility for compatible expenditures of SAFE funds.
- Seek authorization to increase SAFE vehicle registration fees by $1.00 to fund Freeway Service Patrol and other motorist aid programs. (*Focus area for 2011*)

f) Safety
- Support legislative initiatives to improve safety for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians.
  - Authorize local jurisdictions to reduce speed limits, based on what that jurisdiction determines is most appropriate for their facility.

6. Coordinate with Local, Regional and State Agencies and Organizations on legislative principles of mutual interest.

Please contact us at 831-460-3200 with any questions about the RTC Legislative Program.
Santa Cruz County
Regional Transportation Commission

2011 Federal Legislative Program

1. **Next Federal Transportation Act: (Focus Area for 2011)**
   The RTC will work with local entities, regional agencies, the State of California and the Federal Government to advance SCCRTC’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy priorities in development of the next Federal Transportation Act.
   
   a) Increase funding levels for all modes, as needed to bring transportation infrastructure up to a good state of repair and meet growing transportation needs in Santa Cruz County. Provide sufficient funds to allow agencies in Santa Cruz County to replace crumbling infrastructure, minimize traffic congestion, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve safety, and expand travel options available to citizens and visitors. Give top priority to preservation and maintenance of the existing system of roads, highways, bridges, sidewalks, and transit.
   
b) Ensure equitable distribution of funds to California and Santa Cruz County, which may include direct subventions to counties and Metropolitan Planning Organizations. Oppose proposals which restrict or otherwise disproportionately direct funds to large metropolitan areas or “megaregions”.
   
c) Support extension of the Small Transit Intensive Cities Program (STIC).
   
d) Support development of new funding mechanisms for transportation to ensure the financial integrity of the Highway Trust Fund and Mass Transportation Account. Given that current per-gallon gasoline fees are insufficient to address transportation infrastructure needs, this may include raising and indexing gas taxes and fees and collecting fees based on vehicle miles traveled.
   
e) Streamline project delivery. Support regulations to streamline federal project delivery requirements and integrate planning, project development, review, permitting, and environmental processes to reduce project costs and delays.
   
f) Provide procurement preference for building and paving materials that have a lower emissions footprint than conventional materials but demonstrate comparable performance.

2. **Maximize Funding for Local Area Projects.** Support increased revenues for transportation projects in the Santa Cruz County region. Oppose any efforts to reduce transportation funding to California or the region. Work with congressional representatives to obtain additional funding for Santa Cruz County highway projects, rail corridor, transit operations and capital projects, paratransit service, local streets and roads, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities and programs.
   
   a) Seek federal funds for high priority projects in Santa Cruz County through the next federal transportation authorization, annual appropriations, stimulus, or other special funding bills or programs. Priority projects include (not shown in priority order):
   
   - Projects on Highway 1
   - Infrastructure improvements to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
   - Local road repair and sidewalk projects
   - Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)/511 program
- Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District’s priority transit projects
- Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST)
- Watsonville/Pajaro Rail Station
- Projects otherwise delayed due to state funding shortfalls

b) Promote inclusion of funding for transportation infrastructure and transit operations in any new national funding programs, including climate change, cap and trade, economic stimulus, or infrastructure investment legislation. Ensure that those funds are available to deliver state, regional, and local projects. Ensure flexibility to use the funds to accelerate delivery of existing projects.

c) Support timely annual allocations at the maximum levels allowed for programs authorized by the federal transportation act in order to meet growing transportation needs for local streets and roads, improving transit, relieving traffic congestion, encouraging alternative modes of transportation, and meeting increased paratransit demands. Allow for flexibility to use Federal Transit Administration urban and non-urban funds for both capital and operations.

d) Oppose unfunded mandates on local and regional governments, in order to reduce project costs and maximize funding for infrastructure projects.

e) Oppose proposals that would combine Santa Cruz, Watsonville, and Salinas into one urbanized area, given that they are not one continuous urban area, but rather separated by large rural areas. This reclassification could otherwise significantly reduce funding available for transit in the region.

3. Air Quality and Climate Change:

a) Support federal action on climate change and energy policy and ensure that any legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions be structured in such a way as to assist the region and the state in achieving greenhouse gas reduction and mobility goals, not dilute state efforts. Ensure that any new environmental requirements are accompanied by additional funding necessary to implement those requirements.

b) Support research and development of renewable energy sources that reduce the amount of emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels and support the development of more fuel efficient vehicles.

c) Support a multi-pronged approach to addressing global warming, including carbon taxes or cap-and-trade systems and direct revenues to transportation projects that reduce reliance on automobiles, including but not limited to public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

4. Support Legislative and Administrative Proposals to Streamline the Process for Federally Funded Projects. Support regulations to streamline federal project delivery requirements (including cooperative agreements, pre-award audits, disadvantaged business enterprise regulations and duplicative federal environmental review laws) while maintaining the substance of environmental laws, either through regulatory or statutory changes. Support provisions that better integrate state and federal environmental laws.

5. Support Improved Elderly and Disabled Transportation.

a) Support increased funding for transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities, including those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and services beyond those required by ADA.
b) Support federal rule changes to reimburse non-emergency medical transportation through Medicare as a less costly alternative to ambulances and provide funding for medical dialysis transportation.

c) Require that all interstate transportation providers comply with ADA provisions, including wheelchair accessibility requirements.

6. Support Simplification and Expansion of Incentive Programs for Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Carpool Commuters and Funding for Improvements. In an effort to reduce congestion, pollution, and wear and tear on roads, expand grant programs to decrease single-occupancy vehicle trips; and expand and simplify transportation fringe benefits in the tax code (Commuter Choice Tax Benefit), including to permanently increase pre-tax transit benefits to at least the level allowed for parking expenses and make it easier for commuters to access the benefits.

7. Freight and Passenger Rail

a) Support measures that will provide sufficient funding for AMTRAK and facilitate the shared use of tracks by passenger and freight rail.

b) Support full funding for the combined Federal and State funding program for rail capital projects in which federal funds are used for 80% of the project's cost and state funds for the remaining 20%, as provided for highway capital projects.

c) Support federal funding for the California High Speed Rail project.

d) Support the ongoing extension of Section 45G Railroad Track Maintenance Credit that provides 50 percent tax credit to short line railroads conducting qualified railroad track maintenance.

e) Support funding and incentives for freight and passenger railroad capacity expansion and safety improvement projects.

Please contact us at 831-460-3200 with any questions about the RTC Legislative Program.
AGENDA: December 10, 2010

TO: Bicycle Committee
FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator
RE: Bike Parking Subsidy Program Application from Artspace Tannery Lofts

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee review the attached Bikes Secure applications from Staff of Life and Goodwill Industries and approve providing 14 inverted U bicycle racks and 6 inverted U racks, respectively.

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has been helping provide bicycle parking to private businesses, local jurisdictions, school districts and other public agencies in Santa Cruz County since 1994, thanks in a large part due to funding from the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District’s AB2766 program. While the third round of the Bikes Secure program was recently expended, the RTC was awarded a fourth round of funds in August, 2008 so that the bicycle parking subsidy program could continue.

The fourth Bikes Secure grant continues to help local entities in Santa Cruz County provide bicycle parking provided they agree to the grant requirements to install the bicycle parking facilities securely in a convenient location for use by patrons and/or employees. Applicants now need to provide the RTC with pre and post installation bicycle count data and photographs of the installed racks or lockers. The grant application stipulates that the RTC will provide a maximum of 8 inverted U bike racks or a maximum subsidy of $1,000 per approved applicant. For other racks, up to $35.00 per bicycle parking space will be provided through the grant (or $70.00 for a double unit rack). Applicants may choose from an approved list of rack designs or request that the Bicycle Committee approve an alternative model. In practice, most applicants choose the inverted U rack available through the RTC. Applicants requesting bike lockers are eligible to receive a subsidy of $250 per bike, or $500 per double occupancy locker. Applications are available online.

DISCUSSION

Grant guidelines indicate that the Bike Secure program targets “private businesses, local jurisdictions, school districts, and other public agencies”. Attached please find applications from Staff of Life in Santa Cruz for 14 inverted U racks and from Goodwill Industries in Capitola for 6 inverted U racks. Staff of Life’s request exceeds the 8 maximum allowable limit and the business has thus submitted a letter requesting the exemption.

The applications (Attachments 1 and 2) contain maps indicating placement location, agreement to install racks per SCCRTC specifications, as well as an agreement to provide pre and post installation bicycle counts and post installation photographs.

Staff recommends approving the maximum allowable limit of 8 racks for Staff of Life and the full
requested number of racks for Goodwill Industries.

SUMMARY

The Commission's Bikes Secure Parking Subsidy Program, funded by the MBUAPCD, provides racks and subsidized lockers for Santa Cruz County businesses, jurisdictions, school districts and other public agencies. Staff recommends approving the maximum allowable number of 8 racks for Staff of Life, despite a request for 14, and the full amount requested (6) for Goodwill Industries.

Attachment 1: Bikes Secure Application from Staff of Life
Attachment 2: Bikes Secure Application from Goodwill Industries
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Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Bikes Secure Parking Subsidy Program Application

Business/Agency Name: **Staff of Life**
Address: **1266 Soquel Avenue**
Contact Person: **Gary Bascou** Phone: **(831) 423-8632** Fax: **(831) 471-7140**
Nature of Business: **Natural Food Store**

If interested in bike racks, the RTC Bicycle Committee recommends the Inverted U rack illustrated above. It is available in surface mount and post hole mount styles with a black powder coat finish. If you are interested in a different rack type, please contact RTC staff. Please indicate rack type, mount style and number of racks desired. Please be prepared to be flexible on timing of rack availability as it depends upon what we have in stock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Rack / Locker</th>
<th>Mount Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Inverted U</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Specify Reason for Requesting this Bike Parking Subsidy:

**Staff of Life is already funding a bike bulletin board and an employee bike parking indoor room. We could use some support in providing excellent bike parking for the community.**

In addition to this page, to complete the application, ALL THREE of the following are required:

- Completed Agreement to Place and Maintain Bike Racks and Provide Pre and Post Bicycle Count Data and Photographs (following page);
- Site map with proposed bike parking locations in relation to buildings, auto parking, etc.; *(file too large for inclusion)*
- Documented property owner’s permission (a letter) or public permit, if necessary, to install bicycle racks

I certify that the owner of this property has granted permission to install bicycle racks at the location(s) above and the letter of permission or permit is included with this application. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the data and information included in this application is true and correct and I am authorized to file this application on behalf of the applicant.

Name and Title: **Gary Bascou, owner**
Signature: ___________________________ Date: **10/3/10**
The recipient further agrees that the RTC may exercise its option to repossess said bicycle parking devices, upon desertion of the present place of business by the business or upon removal of the rack(s) from the herein specified location(s).

Date: 10/24/10  By: Gary Bascou, owner
Name & Title
1266 Soquel Ave, Santa Cruz, CA 95062
Address, City

Date: Date: By: George Dondero, RTC Executive Director

Post-Installation Count (Date Expected: ________) Photographs Provided: ______
Date: ______ Time of day: ______ Weather condition: ______ Bicycles counted: ______
Bikes Secure Parking Subsidy Program

AGREEMENT TO PLACE AND MAINTAIN BICYCLE RACKS/LOCKERS and PROVIDE PRE AND POST INSTALLATION BICYCLE COUNT DATA AND PHOTOGRAPHS

The following is an agreement between the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the undersigned, hereinafter referred to as recipient.

The recipient agrees that after being awarded a bike parking subsidy and prior to the installation of the bicycle parking equipment the RTC will be provided with pre installation bicycle count data for the proposed installation site. Bicycle count surveys will count parked bikes within a 200 foot radius of the installation site during the period between 9 am and 11 am on a sunny Tuesday through Thursday, when school is in session. Applicants may provide the pre-installation count here:

Date: 10/21/14 Time of day: 9:57 Weather condition: Overcast Bicycles counted: 3

The recipient agrees that within one month of receipt of bike parking devices from the RTC or its contracted supplier, unless other arrangements have been made, to install (#) bicycle racks/lockers capable of holding (#) bicycles at the location described in the attached map. Said map is attached hereto as Exhibit A, and by this reference is incorporated as part of this Agreement.

Recipient will arrange for and pay for the installation of the following type of bike racks:

14 Inverted U Locks & Bike Room for Workers

The recipient agrees to attach said bike racks in a secure and theft-proof fashion following the appropriate standard outlined in the RTC's Bikes Secure Program Guidelines. Recipient also agrees to maintain the bicycle parking facilities and surrounding area for the life of the devices.

The recipient agrees to provide post installation bicycle counts and photographs of the installed bicycle parking equipment one year after installation of the bicycle parking devices. Surveys will count parked bikes within a 200 foot radius of the installed bicycle parking devices during the period between 9 and 11 a.m. on a sunny Tuesday through Thursday, when school is in session. The post installation survey will be conducted at the same location, during the same time period and month of the year as the pre installation survey.

The recipient agrees to exonerate, indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the RTC, its officers, agents, employees, and volunteers, from and against any and all claims, demands, losses, damages, defense costs, or liability of any kind or nature which the RTC may sustain or incur or which may be imposed upon it for injury to or death of persons, or damage of property as a result of, arising out of, or in any manner connected with the recipient's performance under the terms of this agreement, excepting any liability arising out of the sole negligence of the RTC. Such indemnification includes any damage to the person(s), or property(ies) of the recipient and third persons.
To the SCCRTC,

I am writing to request an exception within the bicycle rack subsidy program. Under normal circumstances, the program assists with the purchase of up to 9 racks. However, I would like help in purchasing 14 racks for installation at my store, Staff of Life. I recently submitted an application for the program.

Staff of Life is one of the largest locally owned grocers in the City of Santa Cruz, as well as a local leader in environmentally conscious development. As such, I feel that our store ought to be considered a model for future growth, which would benefit from ample supply of bike parking. I personally have already investigated significant money and thought into making our remodeled store as bicycle friendly as possible, including an parking facility and showers for employees and a bike bulletin board. In order to further this initiative, I would greatly appreciate extended support from the Regional Transportation Commission.

Sincerely,

Gary Bascom
Owner, Staff of Life
To the SCCRTC,

I am writing to grant permission to Staff of Life to construct bicycle parking facilities on their new site.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gary Basquou
Land Owner, Staff of Life site
Cory Caletti  
*Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator*  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Ave; Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Ms. Caletti:

Please find attached the applications for six (6) bicycle racks at Goodwill’s newly remodeled location at 1550 41st Ave, Capitola, CA 95010. This location is owned by Goodwill Industries of Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Luis Obispo Counties, a California not-for-profit corporation.

We appreciate being able to access the Bikes Secure Parking Subsidy Program which will allow us to obtain bike racks through the Santa Cruz County Transportation Commission. We look forward to having this parking resource for our customers, clients and students. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely yours,

John T. Collins, II, MPH

Senior Vice President
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Bikes Secure Parking Subsidy Program Application

Business/Agency Name: Goodwill Industries of Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Luis Obispo Co.
Address: 1550 41st Avenue, Capitola CA 95010
Contact Person: John T. Collins II Phone: (831)600-0223 Fax: (831) 423-8968
Nature of Business: Retail Store and School of Cosmetology

Refer to Architect Drawing

Inverted U

Other: draw or attach picture

If interested in bike racks, the RTC Bicycle Committee recommends the Inverted U rack illustrated above. It is available in surface mount and post hole mount styles with a black powder coat finish. If you are interested in a different rack type, please contact RTC staff. Please indicate rack type, mount style and number of racks desired. Please be prepared to be flexible on timing of rack availability as it depends upon what we have in stock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Rack / Locker</th>
<th>Mount Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>U Racks</td>
<td>Surface Mount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Specify Reason for Requesting this Bike Parking Subsidy:
We want to provide bike parking for our customers, students, and staff.

In addition to this page, to complete the application, ALL THREE of the following are required:

☑ Completed Agreement to Place and Maintain Bike Racks and Provide Pre and Post Bicycle Count Data and Photographs (following page);
☑ Site map with proposed bike parking locations in relation to buildings, auto parking, etc.;
☑ Documented property owner’s permission (a letter) or public permit, if necessary, to install bicycle racks

I certify that the owner of this property has granted permission to install bicycle racks at the location(s) above and the letter of permission or permit is included with this application. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the data and information included in this application is true and correct and I am authorized to file this application on behalf of the applicant.

Name and Title: John T. Collins, II, Senior Vice President
Signature:  
Date: 12/3/12
Bikes Secure Parking Subsidy Program

AGREEMENT TO PLACE AND MAINTAIN BICYCLE RACKS/LOCKERS and PROVIDE PRE AND POST INSTALLATION BICYCLE COUNT DATA AND PHOTOGRAPHS

The following is an agreement between the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the undersigned, hereinafter referred to as recipient.

The recipient agrees that after being awarded a bike parking subsidy and prior to the installation of the bicycle parking equipment the RTC will be provided with pre installation bicycle count data for the proposed installation site. Bicycle count surveys will count parked bikes within a 200 foot radius of the installation site during the period between 9 am and 11 am on a sunny Tuesday through Thursday, when school is in session. Applicants may provide the pre-installation count here:

Date: 11/30/10  Time of day: Morning  Weather condition: Clear  Bicycles counted: 3

The recipient agrees that within one month of receipt of bike parking devices from the RTC or its contracted supplier, unless other arrangements have been made, to install (#) 6 bicycle racks/lockers capable of holding (#) 12 bicycles at the location described in the attached map. Said map is attached hereto as Exhibit A, and by this reference is incorporated as part of this Agreement.

Recipient will arrange for and pay for the installation of the following type of bike racks:

Inverted U Racks

The recipient agrees to attach said bike racks in a secure and theft-proof fashion following the appropriate standard outlined in the RTC’s Bikes Secure Program Guidelines. Recipient also agrees to maintain the bicycle parking facilities and surrounding area for the life of the devices.

The recipient agrees to provide post installation bicycle counts and photographs of the installed bicycle parking equipment one year after installation of the bicycle parking devices. Surveys will count parked bikes within a 200 foot radius of the installed bicycle parking devices during the period between 9 and 11 a.m. on a sunny Tuesday through Thursday, when school is in session. The post installation survey will be conducted at the same location, during the same time period and month of the year as the pre installation survey.

The recipient agrees to exonerate, indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the RTC, its officers, agents, employees, and volunteers, from and against any and all claims, demands, losses, damages, defense costs, or liability of any kind or nature which the RTC may sustain or incur or which may be imposed upon it for injury to or death of persons, or damage of property as a result of, arising out of, or in any manner connected with the recipient’s performance under the terms of this agreement, excepting any liability arising out of the sole negligence of the RTC. Such indemnification includes any damage to the person(s), or property(ies) of the recipient and third persons.
The recipient further agrees that the RTC may exercise its option to repossess said bicycle parking devices, upon desertion of the present place of business by the business or upon removal of the rack(s) from the herein specified location(s).

Date: 12/3/10  By: John T. Collins, II, MPH Senior Vice President
Name & Title

350 Encinal Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Address, City

Date: _______  By: George Dondero, RTC Executive Director

Post-Installation Count (Date Expected: ________)  Photographs Provided?: ______

Date: _______ Time of day: _______ Weather condition: _______ Bicycles counted: _______
GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF SANTA CRUZ, MONTEREY & SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTIES
GOODWILL STORE & SCHOOL OF COSMETOLOGY
1550 41ST AVENUE, CAPITOLA

IRRIGATION PLAN
SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

Location of Bike Racks

Location of Bike Racks

Location of Bike Racks
## Draft

### SCCRTC Bicycle Committee

### 2011 Schedule of Meetings and Tentative Agenda Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 10</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| February 14| **Reschedule? February 14th is Valentine's Day**
Sierra Northern Railway Presentation; Review Cities of
Watsonville, Scotts Valley, Capitola and County of Santa
Cruz Bicycle Transportation Plans; Featured Jurisdictions:
CITY OF WATSONVILLE AND CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY |
| March 14   | Cancelled                                                                    |
| April 11   | CTSC & BTW funding requests. Committee Appointments. Officer Elections. Review Subcommittees |
| May 9      | Cancelled                                                                    |
| June 13    | Featured Jurisdiction: CHP.
Determine FY 11/12 schedule (monthly or bimonthly) |
| July 11    | Cancelled                                                                    |
| August 8   | Featured jurisdiction: TBD                                                  |
| Sept. 12   | **Cancel ? (depends on approval of FY 11/12 schedule);**
Featured jurisdiction: CITY OF SANTA CRUZ and CITY OF SANTA CRUZ RDA |
| October 10 | **Reschedule? October 10 is Columbus Day**
Featured jurisdiction: CITY OF CAPITOLA (meet there) |
| November 14| **Cancel ? (depends on approval of FY 11/12 schedule);**
Featured jurisdiction: COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ RDA |
| December 12| Draft 2012 SCCRTC Legislative Agenda                                         |

**Meeting Location:** Regional Transportation Commission Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. (Continue special meeting time of 6:30pm – 8:30pm??) One meeting to be held outside the City of Santa Cruz, at a location to be determined.

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission does not discriminate on the basis of disability. If you wish to attend this Bicycle Committee meeting and will require special assistance in order to participate, please contact the Secretary at 460-3200 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to make arrangements. As a courtesy to those persons affected, please attend the meeting smoke and scent free.
AGENDA: December 13, 2010

TO: Bicycle Committee
FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator
RE: Bicycle Observation Survey Results & Bicycle Injuries and Fatalities Data

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee review and discuss the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency’s Bicycle Safety Observation Study 2010 and the Bicyclist Injuries and Fatalities for Santa Cruz County 2009 Report.

DISCUSSION

The County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency (HSA) works to reduce bicycle-related injuries in Santa Cruz County. In May and June of 2010, health education staff and community volunteers conducted a countywide bicycle safety observation study to evaluate the impact of educational efforts on bicyclists' behavior. The data was then compared with similar studies done in 2003 and 2006-2009. Because Bicycle Committee members were among the community volunteers for the 2010 Bicycle Observation Survey, your feedback is solicited by County of Santa Cruz HSA as preparations begin for the 2011 survey.

For the past few years, Bike Committee members, HSA and RTC staff have been interested in conducting bicycle counts and incorporating such this collection effort into the RTC's ongoing Traffic Monitoring Program of vehicle traffic volume counts. Efforts to incorporate bicycle count data collection to the current program continue and it is hoped that as Transportation Development Act funds resuscitate funding will become available. Such data would complement safety observation data currently being compiled.

Additionally included in the HSA report for Bicycle Committee review is the Bicycle Injuries and Fatalities data from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) for 2009. 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.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee review and discuss the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency’s “Bicycle Safety Observation Study 2010” Report and the “Bicyclist Injuries and Fatalities for Santa Cruz County 2009”.

Attachments: 1: County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency’s Bicycle Safety Observation Study 2010
2: Bicyclist Injuries and Fatalities for Santa Cruz County 2009
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County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency

BICYCLE SAFETY OBSERVATION STUDY 2010

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency has been working over the years to reduce bicycle-related injuries in Santa Cruz County. During the months of May and June in 2010, Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention staff, members of the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC), members of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (SCCRTC) Bicycle Committee, and community volunteers conducted a countywide bicycle safety observation survey to inform bicycle safety education efforts. The 2010 data was then compared with the last five studies done in 2003, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009.

The purpose of this survey is to learn about bicycle safety from observing bicycle behavior. The survey is designed to observe what is generally considered safe and unsafe behavior when riding a bicycle. While some behaviors might be legal, such as those over the age of 18 years choosing not to wear a helmet while cycling, those same behaviors could increase the risk of injury or death and are therefore considered unsafe in this survey.

METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

A total of 28 staff and volunteers collected data at 41 locations throughout Santa Cruz County, 25 observation sites located in North County and 16 in South County. All of the observation locations for the 2010 survey were the same as used in previous observation surveys, except for three school sites added in 2009.

The survey included three types of locations: commuter, school, and weekend. The commuter sites were observed on weekdays from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm. School sites were observed for an hour before school started on a weekday morning. Weekend sites were observed from 11:00 am to 1:00 pm on a Saturday or Sunday. Each observer had a sheet to collect data that included approximate age, sex, wearing a helmet, riding with traffic, stopping at a stop sign/light, and riding on the sidewalk. Also recorded were date, day of the week, and weather conditions. Observers were given instructions and a data collection tool to ensure reliable results (See Attachments I and II).

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A total of 2,796 bicyclists were observed. Significant overall findings for 2010 include:

- 74% of cyclists were men, 26% were women
- Female cyclists had a helmet use rate of 54% compared to males at 42%
- South County cyclists wore helmets at a rate of 18% compared to 49% for North County cyclists
- 88% of cyclists rode with traffic on the right side of the road
- 68% of cyclists stopped at stop signs and lights
- 22% of cyclists rode on the sidewalk
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Tables 1, 2 and 3 summarize the results from the 2010 survey.

### Table 1: Santa Cruz County (All 41 sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Wore a Helmet</th>
<th>Rode with Traffic</th>
<th>Stopped at signs/ lights</th>
<th>Rode on sidewalk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Bicyclists</td>
<td>2796</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (0-12 yrs)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens (13-17 yrs)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults (18-24 yrs)</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (25+ yrs)</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: North County Sites (25 sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Wore a Helmet</th>
<th>Rode with Traffic</th>
<th>Stopped at signs/ lights</th>
<th>Rode on sidewalk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Bicyclists</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (0-12 yrs)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens (13-17 yrs)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults (18-24 yrs)</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (25+ yrs)</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: South County Sites (16 sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Wore a Helmet</th>
<th>Rode with Traffic</th>
<th>Stopped at signs/ lights</th>
<th>Rode on sidewalk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Bicyclists</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (0-12 yrs)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens (13-17 yrs)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adults (18-24 yrs)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (25+ yrs)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRENDS OVER TIME**

The tables below compare data over ten years for six observational surveys looking at helmet use, riding with traffic, stopping at stop signs/lights, and riding on the sidewalk by sex and age.
*Changes in Bicycle Helmet Use*

Overall helmet use for the county has been steadily increasing since 2006 and increased from 42% in 2009 to 45% in 2010. An increase in helmet use took place for males from 38% in 2009 to 42% in 2010. Although females observed wearing helmets dropped slightly this year to 54% from 57% in 2009, females have consistently worn helmets at a higher rate than males in all years surveyed.

The biggest increase in helmet use occurred this year among children from 46% in 2009 to 70% in 2010. Helmet use for children has been erratic compared to the other age groups over the years surveyed because the total number of children surveyed is low. Helmet use remained about the same among young adults and teens from 2009 to 2010, and adult helmet use increased from 47% in 2009 to 51% in 2010.

This year 18% of cyclists observed in Watsonville (South County) wore a helmet. Watsonville cyclists have had a lower helmet use rate each year the survey has been
conducted; however, the total number of cyclists observed riding in South County has always been much lower than those observed in North County.

*Whereas adults are not required to wear a helmet in California, the law requires persons under 18 years of age to wear an ASTM or CPSC approved, properly fitted and fastened helmet as an operator or a passenger when bicycling, skateboarding, roller-blading/skating or using a scooter.

**Changes in Riding with Traffic**

The number of cyclists riding in the same direction as traffic has been fairly consistent in all demographic groups over the years surveyed. Most age groups surveyed remained similar to last year in riding with traffic, except children and young adults. Children who were riding with traffic increased over the previous survey year from 49% in 2009 to 65% in 2010. There was also an increase in riding with traffic for young adults from 85% in 2009 to 90% in 2010.

**Changes in Stopping at Stop Signs/Lights**

The number of bicyclists who stopped at stop signs/lights increased slightly for most groups surveyed in 2010. A greater increase occurred for both children and teens, both increasing stopping at stop signs/lights by 11% each from 2009 to 2010. The two groups that saw a decline were females and young adults, with the greatest decline among young adults from 76% in 2009 to 68% in 2010.

**Changes in Sidewalk Riding**

Local ordinances exist in several jurisdictions in Santa Cruz County related to cycling on the sidewalk. In the cities of Watsonville and Capitola, sidewalk bicycle riding is illegal in all areas, while within the City of Santa Cruz, sidewalk riding is illegal only in commercial areas. The City of Scott's Valley and the unincorporated areas of the county do not have an ordinance in place.
Generally, bicycle riding on the sidewalk has been found to carry a greater risk of injury than riding on the roadway due to more opportunities for conflict with others traveling at varying speeds. While it is legal in some areas to ride a bicycle on the sidewalk, sidewalk riding is generally considered unsafe; however, there are some exceptions. Children often ride on the sidewalk until their skill and judgment levels develop enough to ride safely in the roadway. There are also some circumstances where riding on a segment of sidewalk is a safer choice than riding on the roadway, such as when riding up E. Cliff Drive before it becomes Murray Street in the City of Santa Cruz.

Sidewalk riding decreased for all cyclists observed from 30% in 2009 to 22% in 2010. All demographic groups surveyed this year showed a decrease in riding on the sidewalk, most notably males, females and young adults. Teens saw a slight increase of 1% from last year. Children and teens ride on the sidewalk more often than any other group observed over the years surveyed.

CONCLUSIONS

When comparing the 2010 bicycle observation data to the other years surveyed, there have been some areas of improvement. Overall helmet use has been steadily increasing since 2006. The number of those riding with traffic has remained fairly steady over the last five years surveyed, with a slight increase this year. Stopping at stop signs and lights has steadied over the past three years, while sidewalk riding decreased overall this year. Some other areas need improvement in certain demographic groups. Helmet use for children has been unsteady, and Watsonville helmet use remains low compared with North County. Young adults stopping at stop signs and lights and teens riding on the sidewalk are other areas in need of improvement this year.

HSA and CTSC affiliated partners have many programs in place to address bicycle safety in Santa Cruz County. The County of Santa Cruz HSA provides staff to the CTSC. CTSC programs include the Ride n' Stride bicycle and pedestrian education program reaching over 3,000 elementary and preschool students each year and the South County Bicycle and Pedestrian Work Group. HSA also administers a Bicycle Traffic School for bicyclists who receive a traffic violation. Detailed results of this survey are available by request to inform all bicycle safety efforts in Santa Cruz County.

Funding for this project was provided by a grant from the California Office of Traffic Safety, through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. 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.
COMMUNITY TRAFFIC SAFETY COALITION OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
Guidelines for Bicycle Safety Behavior Observation Study

1. Please review the guidelines, data collection form and examples in advance. If you have questions, call Theresia Rogerson at 454-4312, Mon – Fri, 9:00am – 5:00pm.

2. Choose a convenient date between May 24th and June 28th, 2010. Please note some sites need to be done early in the survey period, such as the schools. Day and time depends on the Site Type:
   - C = commuter site ➔ any weekday, 4:00 – 6:00 pm
   - W = weekend site ➔ Saturday or Sunday, 11:00 am – 1:00 pm
   - S = school site ➔ any weekday, 7:30 – 8:30 am

3. If you drive, sit in your car OR stand well off the road, on sidewalk if possible. Be sure to park your car or bike legally! The best choice is to use your bike or walk.

4. If you are working with a partner, clearly specify which bicyclists each observer will count to reduce chances of duplication or counting someone twice. For example, at an intersection, one partner counts all bicyclists entering the intersection from one street and the other observer counts all bicyclists entering from the other street.

5. Use one line per bicycle. Count only the bicycle driver, not passengers or 2nd person on a tandem bike. Do not count someone who is walking their bike.

6. Please circle only one letter in each column and do not leave blank unless not applicable (like there is no sidewalk). See the key at the bottom of the survey tool and special instructions below.

   **Age and Sex:** Make your best guess.

   **Wearing Helmet:** Mark yes only if helmet is on head and fastened. Use comments if position is incorrect (too far back on the head).

   **Riding with Traffic:** The bicyclist must be going the same direction as the flow of traffic, not against oncoming traffic. Even if bicyclist is on the sidewalk or a one-way street they should be riding with the flow of traffic.

   **Stopped at Stop Sign or Light:**

   1) Keep in mind that the bicyclist must obey the same traffic signs and signals as a motorist. However, for the purposes of this study, count “stopped” if the bicyclist makes a reasonable stop, even if he/she does not halt for three full seconds or put his/her foot on the ground.

   2) A green or new yellow light can be considered a “Legal Go,” so mark “L”

   3) For a one-way street, a bicyclist who is riding the wrong way (against traffic) will not have a stop sign/light at the intersection. However, record it as if they should stop. Mark “S” if they stop or “R” if they go through without stopping and write “one-way” in the Comments.

   4) Leave “Stop Sign/Light” blank if the bicyclist does not go through an intersection with a stop sign or light, such as when only a yield is required.

   **Riding on Sidewalk:** Leave “Riding on Sidewalk” blank if there is no sidewalk.

Please return all completed forms immediately after your observation! Mail, drop off or fax to: Theresia Rogerson, 1070 Emeline Ave. Building G, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 or Fax: 454-5048
### Community Traffic Safety Coalition of Santa Cruz County

Bicycle Safety Behavior Observation Study

**Site/Intersection:**

**Site #:**

**Site Type:**

**Observer Name:**

**Date:**

**Weather:**

**Day of the week:**

**Start Time:**

**End Time:**

---

**Approximate Age**

**Sex**

**Wearing Helmet**

**Riding w/ Traffic**

**Stopped at Sign or Light**

**Riding on Sidewalk**

**Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Wearing Helmet</th>
<th>Riding w/ Traffic</th>
<th>Stopped at Sign or Light</th>
<th>Riding on Sidewalk</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T YA A</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>S R L</td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- **C** = Child, age 0-12 years
- **T** = Teen, age 13-18 years
- **YA** = Young Adult, age 19-24
- **A** = Adult, age 25 and over

**Stopping at Stop Signs or Lights**

- **M** = Male
- **F** = Female
- **Y** = Yes
- **N** = No

- **S** = Stopped at stop signs or red light
- **R** = Ran stop sign or red light, no stop
- **L** = Legal to go through without stopping, green light (don't circle anything if no stop sign or light at site)

---
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Bicyclist Injuries and Fatalities for Santa Cruz County 2009

The Santa Cruz County bicyclist injury/fatality rate per 100,000 population for 2009 was 74, which is a slight decrease from the 2008 rate of 75. This rate was higher than the average injury/fatality rate of 64 for the county since the year 2001. The county bicyclist injury/fatality rate is still more than twice the state injury/fatality rate of 33 for 2009. (Note: As of 2009, the number of California bicyclists injured and killed is reported by federal fiscal year rather than calendar year by the state Office of Traffic Safety.)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.C. County Injuries+Fatalities</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>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, Santa Cruz County</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>
<td>256,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury/Fatality Rate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Injuries+Fatalities</td>
<td>11,528</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>
<td>12,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, California</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>35,553,215</td>
<td>36,756,868</td>
<td>36,981,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Injury/Fatality Rate</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>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of bicyclists injured and killed in Santa Cruz County dropped from 191 in 2008 to 189 in 2009. The number of bicyclists injured and killed decreased in Capitola and Santa Cruz while increasing in all other jurisdictions throughout the county. UC Santa Cruz is now listed as a jurisdiction in the collision data and had 12 reported bicyclist injuries in 2009. Bicyclist fatalities increased by one death from 2008 for a total of three fatalities in 2009, two in the unincorporated area of the county and one in Watsonville.

Bicyclists Injured and Killed 2001 - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injured</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</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>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</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>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</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>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</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>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</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>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Cruz</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. County Total</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>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C. County Total</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>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Preliminary Report as of December 6, 2010 until the 2009 OTS rankings are posted*
The number of bicyclist injuries/fatalities remained the same or increased in all age categories from 2008 to 2009, except for those in the 15 to 24 and 25 to 34 year age groups, which both saw a decline in 2009. The most significant rise in injuries from 2008 was in the 5 to 14 year age group, from 16 in 2008 to 21 in 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution of Bicyclists Injured and Killed 2002 - 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compared to other counties in California, Santa Cruz County typically has a high ranking for bicyclists injured and killed according to the California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS). OTS has not yet posted their rankings for 2009. Although Santa Cruz County tends to rank at the top for bicyclists injured and killed, the number of those bicycling in Santa Cruz is also known to be high. The U.S. Census Bureau's 2009 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates predict that 2.7% 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.

*Preliminary Report as of December 6, 2010 until the 2009 OTS rankings are posted *