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 December 13, 2010 Bicycle Committee meeting (pages 4 - 7)

7. Accept Hazard Reports (pages 8 - 11)

8. Accept Bicycle Committee Roster (page 12)

9. Accept letter to Caltrans regarding RTC certification of the 2011 City of Capitola Bicycle Transportation Plan (page 13)

10. Accept Bicycle Transportation Account grant application acceptance notice (page 14)
11. Accept Bikes Secure/Bicycle Parking Subside Program grant extension request letter to the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (page 15)

12. Accept miscellaneous correspondence regarding items of potential interest (pages 16 – 18)

13. Accept 2011 Bicycle Committee meeting schedule (page 19)

REGULAR AGENDA

14. Sierra Northern Railway’s preliminary plans for recreational rail service and bicycle accommodations - Oral Presentation from Cliff Walters (page 20)

15. Review the City of Scotts Valley Bicycle Transportation Plan’s project list - Majid Yamin, City Engineer (pages 21 – 25)

16. Update on City of Scotts Valley’s upcoming bicycle projects – Oral Presentation from Majid Yamin, City Engineer

17. Request for Letter of Support from the City of Capitola for a Bicycle Transportation Account Grant Application for $147,500 for Video Detection System and Bicycle Parking – Oral Presentation from Derek Johnson, City of Capitola Community Development Director

18. Draft Update to the Monterey Bay Public Participation Plan – Presentation from Cory Caletti, RTC Senior Transportation Planner (page 26 – 42)

19. Project Tracking/Subcommittee Tasks: Oral Reports (actions may be taken at the meeting)
   a. City of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Fieberling/Hyman/Garza
   b. City of Capitola Project Tracking: Kostelec/Ward
   c. City of Scotts Valley Project Tracking: Milburn/Lau
   d. City of Watsonville Project Tracking: Montague
   e. County of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Akol
   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

20. Adjourn

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 11th, 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
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax (831) 460-3215
email: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org

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

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

SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/TRANSLATION SERVICES
Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporde 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 antícpo al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis. Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance by calling (831) 460-3200.
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Minutes - Draft

Monday, December 13, 2010 6:30 p.m.

SCCRTC Office
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060

1. Call to Order – 6:38 pm

2. Introductions
   Members Present:
   Piet Canin, Bike to Work
   David Casterson, District 2, Vice Chair
   Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz
   Leo Jed, CTSC (Alt.)
   Brandon Kett, District 4
   Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola, Chair
   Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
   Lex Rau, Scotts Valley (Alt.)
   Peter Scott, District 3
   Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
   Staff:
   Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
   Vacancies:
   District 4 – Alternate
   District 5 – Alternate
   City of Watsonville – Alternate
   Bike to Work – Alternate
   Unexcused Absences:
   Bob Montague, City of Watsonville
   Excused Absences:
   Carlos Garza, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
   Rick Hyman, District 5
   Jim Langley, CTSC
   Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley
   Andy Ward, City of Capitola (Alt.)
   Kem Akol, District 1
   Eric Horton, District 2 (Alt.)
   Guests:
   Stephen All, Santa Cruz Resident
   Cathy Crowe, UC Santa Cruz
   Marvin Davis, Member of the Public
   Micah Posner, People Power
   Theresia Rogerson, Community Traffic Safety Coalition

3. Announcements - Cory Caletti announced that a very full agenda is scheduled for the February, 2011 Bicycle Committee meeting and thus, a special meeting may be called if all items can't be considered at the time. She announced that Cliff Walters from Sierra Northern, the company that currently operates freight service on the Union Pacific line, will present information regarding plans for future recreational rail service and bike carrying capabilities. Cory announced that two positions on the Bicycle Committee will expire in March of the coming year. She is working on re-appointments and soliciting applications for a few vacancies. She finally noted that elections for the Chair and Vice-Chair will take place in April. Chair Daniel Kostelec added that he won't be able to attend the February meeting and that this would be his last meeting due to retirement and his new part-time residence in Santa Fe. Members congratulated Daniel on his retirement and expressed gratitude for his exemplary service. Daniel requested that Vice-Chair David Casterson preside over the current meeting.
4. Oral Communications - Micah Posner announced that People Power is endorsing candidates David Casterson, Keresha Durham and John Howerton for the upcoming Sierra Club Executive Committee election. Peter Scott indicated that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) will act on the RTC's final rail acquisition funding allocation request at the January, 2011 meeting. Cory Caletti added the RTC had previously solicited letters of support for the funding request and mentioned that if members wished to send any additional letters, this would be an appropriate time. Micah Posner suggested that letters should focus on the rail acquisition and not the possibility of a bicycle/pedestrian trail adjacent to the rail line.

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – Item 12 Pulled

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion (Fieberling/Kostelec) to approve items 6 through 11 passed unanimously.

6. Approved draft minutes of the October 18, 2010 Bicycle Committee meeting
7. Accepted Hazard Reports
8. Accepted Bicycle Committee Roster
9. Accepted 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
10. Accepted 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
11. Accepted 2011 State and Federal Legislative Programs
12. Approve Bikes Secure Parking Subsidy Program applications and request from Staff of Life and Goodwill Industries – item was pulled

REGULAR AGENDA

Pulled Item #12 – Micah Posner requested that the Committee consider approving the full number of racks requested by Staff of Life even though the 14 racks requested exceed the maximum limit of 8. The Bicycle Committee has the authority to approve such requests. Staff of Life hired People Power to assist them with appropriately locating bicycle parking facilities and providing other bicycle amenities. The health food store is expected to have a very high bicycle ridership patronage. After some discussion about the Bike Secure Program and the nature of past exemptions a motion (Kostelec/Scott) to approve the application for 14 bicycle racks for Staff of Life passed unanimously. Another motion (Kostelec/Scott) to approve the application for 6 bicycle racks for Goodwill also passed unanimously.

13. Discuss and approve 2011 Bicycle Committee Calendar – Cory Caletti presented the draft 2011 Bicycle Committee Calendar. She explained that some meeting dates fall on special days or holidays and requested Committee feedback. Members discussed the two meeting dates in question, Monday, February 14th (Valentine's Day) and October 10th, 2011 (Columbus Day Holiday). Members agreed that the February meeting should be rescheduled to the special date of Tuesday, February 15th and that the October meeting should be rescheduled to the following Monday, October 17th and that the later meeting be held at the City of Capitol as has been the tradition.
14. Receive 2010 Bicycle Safety Observation Study and 2009 Bicyclist Injury and Fatality Report for Santa Cruz County – Theresia Rogerson, Health Services Agency staff, presented two reports regarding bicycle related injuries in Santa Cruz County and observed riding practices. In May and June of 2010, with the help of volunteers, the Community Traffic Safety Coalition of the HSA, conducted a county-wide bike-safety observation study to evaluate the impact of educational efforts on cyclist’s behavior. She compared data from this study with studies from previous years. Cory Caletti thanked Theresia for including data interpretation footnotes in the report as was previously requested by Bicycle Committee members. The 2009 Bicyclist Inquiry and Fatality Report was also discussed. The report presents data provide by the California Highway Patrol. Theresia explained the methodology by which counties are ranked and indicated that the report now includes UCSC as a separate jurisdiction. Members suggested that rankings of similarly sized cities with high bicycle ridership numbers (such as Berkeley, Palo Alto, and Davis) be included in the future for better contextual analysis.

15. Ecology Action’s Boltage Program – Piet Canin, Ecology Action Program Director, gave a presentation about the Boltage Program which uses a radio frequency identification reader that records children wearing tags as they pass through a detection area. The name of the child is recorded and associated trip length and bicycle or walking mode information is collected. The program is currently in place in 30 schools throughout the country. Locally, the program was kicked-off at Gault Elementary School in Santa Cruz as part of the Bike-to-Work/School Day event in October. The program is partially funded through the Monterey Bay Air Pollution Control District and supplemented through private sources. Piet presented the current statistics already recorded and the positive impact on the environment due to program participants. The Boltage program will expand to Starlight Elementary School in Watsonville in Spring 2011 with funding from the Pajaro Valley Community Trust, Specialized Bicycles and the Spokesman bicycle shop. Additional schools will be added as funding becomes available.

16. Project Tracking/Subcommittee Tasks: Oral Reports
   a. City of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Bill Fieberling indicated that the City of Santa Cruz’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee of the City Transportation and Public Works Commission have ceased meeting. He provided an update regarding the Arana Gulch Master Plan and tasks to be completed prior to the California Coastal Commission’s reconsideration; the planned Branciforte Creek underpass study to close the river way path gap at the Soquel bridge; and the U shape ramp planned to connect the Boardwalk to the west side of the San Lorenzo River.
   b. City of Capitola Project Tracking: Daniel Kostelec said that restriping of the City’s bike lanes began in the fall and that the project will include re-alignment of the centerline on Wharf Road. The Public Works Director also wanted to inform the Committee that parking will be removed on one side of 38th Avenue in order to provide a bicycle lane. Daniel said that work has slowed due to the acquisition of the right-of-way necessary to complete the project. Daniel informed members that he will not be working for the City of Capitola after 12/31/10 and will not reapply to serve on the Bicycle Committee. He thanked members saying that he enjoyed serving on the Committee.
   c. City of Scotts Valley Project Tracking: Lex Rau indicated that no new capital projects are underway in the City of Scotts Valley. The City’s draft Bicycle Plan is being updated and will be presented to the Committee in February, 2011.
   d. City of Watsonville Project Tracking: Brandon Kett announced that bicycle lanes were added back into the Manabe Ow project when it was approved by the City of Watsonville City Council.
e. County of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: No report was given.

f. Bike-to-Work Update: Piet Canin announced that the 24th annual spring Bike Week will be held May 9th to 15th, 2011.

g. CTSC and the South County Bike/Pedestrian Work Group Update: Theresia Rogerson said that CTSC along with the South County Bike/Pedestrian Work Group is working on developing an inexpensive media campaign designed for bicycle/pedestrian safety. She said that she is soliciting a volunteer or intern for digital media assistance from UCSC and Cabrillo. Theresia said that the Ride ‘n Stride education program has, thus far, provided 29 presentations at 13 schools, reaching 1000 children.

h. UCSC: Cathy Crowe reported that a bicycle ride was offered through UCSC’s recreation department to promote safe bike riding. Approximately 15 students participated despite rainy conditions. Another ride is scheduled for February. Piet Canin mentioned that Ecology Action, with assistance from the Transportation and Parking Services department, distributed 100 bicycle lights to students riding on the UCSC bike path prior to the end of daylight savings time.

i. Legislative Tracking: Leo Jed met with Andy Ward, Rachel Moriconi and Cory Caletti of the RTC to review the state and federal legislative agendas for 2011.

j. Sanctuary Scenic Trail: Cory indicated that the East Cliff Drive bike/pedestrian pathway project between 41st Avenue and 27th Avenue is due to go to construction in the Spring of 2011 and that the segment had been preliminarily identified as part of the core segment of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail.

k. Committee Effectiveness: The RTC started a quarterly Transportation Café program to be aired on Community TV in order to highlight Commission activities. Cory and Veronica Else, an Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee member, were interview recently regarding bicycle and pedestrian programs and projects. She will inform members when the program and future programs will air.

l. Technical Subcommittee: No report was given.

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

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

o. Safe Routes to School: Eric Horton, via an email to Cory Caletti, reported that bicycle parking facility improvements at Rio del Mar Elementary School are in process but that school administrators have not yet approved the concrete pad.

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

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for the Special Meeting Date of Tuesday, February 15, 2011 at the Special Meeting Time of 6:30 p.m. at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant II and Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Bicycle Hazard Report

This Hazard Reporting Form is available to all who wish to report a hazard affecting cyclists traveling on roadways 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:

1623 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 or fax to (831) 460-3215.

Location of Hazard: Sequel Dr
Please circle one: Northbound Southbound Eastbound Westbound
Cross Streets: Trout Gulch (North) Re Del Mol
City: Aptos

Please check all that apply:

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

Please indicate North by Arrow

Please show location of Hazard Re Del Mol (not to scale)

Other (please describe):

Please comment on how this hazard has impacted you.

Date: 12/18/10 Name: Leonard Moore
Phone/Fax Number or E-mail Address: Irmoore12@hotmail.com
Where did you obtain this form? Scite Site

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!
Sorry, I should have sent a larger photo. This is heading towards intersection of Center and Pacific Ave. from W. Cliff Drive where the roundabout construction is taking place. Moments before this photo I saw a pedestrian wondering for one side of the road to the other trying to find a safe way thru this no sidewalk zone.

Maybe close this section of road for vehicles? Motorists can still access the motel from the road under the bridge I believe.

On Feb 1, 2011, at 10:07 AM, Cory Caletti wrote:

Where is this?

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Piet Canin [mailto:pietcanin@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 01, 2011 10:01 AM
To: Cheryl Schmitt; Cory Caletti; jburr@cityofsantacruz.com
Cc: Piet Canin
Subject: Crash waiting to happen

Any way to more safely accommodate bike and peds?

Piet Canin
VP
Sustainable Transportation Group
Ecology Action

Ecology Action has moved!
Our address is:
877 Cedar Street, Suite 240
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Ph 831-515-1327
February 3, 2011

Santa Cruz Metro Transportation
Attention: Safety Supervisor

Subject: Near Miss Incident (Bus #2221 Route 35)

On February 2, 2011, I was cycling south bound on Highway 9 with three other cyclists in a single file formation. At 1:23 pm a Santa Cruz Metro Bus traveling south bound on Highway 9 (#2221, Route 35) passed all four of us on a very narrow section approximately 1 mile north of Ben Lomond. As the driver approached us from the rear, it was very obvious that this section of Highway 9 was not safe to pass 4 cyclists with oncoming traffic in the north bound lane. The driver was very motivated to pass us on this section of highway. This unsafe maneuver not only put our lives at risk, it also compromised the safety of the Metro passengers and the on-coming traffic. The bus came within inches of us as it passed on our left.

With 16 years of operating commercial Fire Crew Busses and Fire Engines, I understand that operating a commercial passenger vehicle is challenging on the tight roads of Santa Cruz County. However, a bicycle is considered a “vehicle” in the California vehicle code. The code states that if you can not safely pass a vehicle then you are to wait until the conditions improve. The driver simply could have maintained a safe distance and passed once the road widened just north of Ben Lomond. I understand that the drivers are on a time frame, however, I can only hope that safety comes first in your organization.

Once this incident has been reviewed by your organization, I would appreciate some feedback as to any safety measures that are put in place.

Sincerely,

Jake Hess
Battalion Chief
Safety & Training Officer
CAL-FIRE
San Mateo / Santa Cruz Unit
C-831-239-4004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Member Name/Contact Info</th>
<th>Appointment Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1 - Voting 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>District 2 - Voting Aptos, Corralitos, part of Capitola, Nisene Marks, Freedom, PaloDunes</td>
<td>David Casterson, Vice Chair dc <a href="mailto:casterson@comcast.net">casterson@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2005 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Eric Horton erichorton <a href="mailto:design@yahoo.com">design@yahoo.com</a> 419-7296</td>
<td>First Appointed: 3/09 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3 - Voting 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@cruzi0.com">menchine@cruzi0.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4 - Voting 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>District 5 - Voting 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>City of Capitola - Voting</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>City of Santa Cruz - Voting</td>
<td>Wilson Fieberling <a href="mailto:anfieb@yahoo.com">anfieb@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2/97 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Carlos Garza <a href="mailto:carlos@cruzi0.com">carlos@cruzi0.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley - Voting</td>
<td>Gary Milburn 427-3839 <a href="mailto:g.milburn@sbcglobal.net">g.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>City of Watsonville - Voting</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>Bike To Work -Voting</td>
<td>Piet Canin pc <a href="mailto:canin@ecoact.org">canin@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>Community Traffic Safety Coalition - Voting</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 leo <a href="mailto:jed@gmail.com">jed@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.
February 7, 2011

Ann Mahaney
Bicycle Transportation Account Program Coordinator
California Department of Transportation
Division of Local Assistance MS 1
Bicycle Facilities Unit
P.O. Box 942874
Sacramento, CA 94274-0001

RE: Certification of 2011 City of Capitola Bicycle Plan

Dear Ms. Mahaney:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Bicycle Committee received the 2011 City of Capitola Bicycle Transportation Plan on October 18, 2010 and offered significant feedback. RTC staff provided extensive review and hereby certifies the 2011 City of Capitola Bicycle Plan after finding it be in compliance with Section 891.2 of the California Streets and Highways Code (California Bicycle Transportation Act).

Additionally, staff finds the City of Capitola Bicycle Plan to be a model Bicycle Transportation Plan which outlines multiple strategies for making the City of Capitola a truly bicycle friendly community.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (831) 460-3201.

Sincerely,

Cory Caletti
Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

cc: Steve Jesberg, City of Capitola
Derek Johnson, City of Capitola
Regional Transportation Commission’ Bicycle Committee
December 16, 2010

Cory Caletti
Sr. Transportation Planner
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Ms. Caletti:

We are now accepting applications for the Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) Program for the Fiscal Year 2011/12.

The Bicycle Transportation Account provides State funds for city and county projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters.

To be eligible for BTA funds, you must prepare and adopt a Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) that complies with Streets and Highways Code, Section 891.2, items a. – k. The plan must be reviewed and approved by your regional transportation planning agency and must be adopted between January 1, 2006 and March 31, 2011.

Cities and counties with BTA projects subject to the provisions of a Cooperative Work Agreement (CWA) will not be eligible to compete for BTA funds until the CWA project is complete and closed out.

Applications are due to our office by March 18, 2011. In addition to the hard copy of the application, you will need to send an electronic copy to our HQs office (please see guidelines).

For more detailed information, please review the program guidelines. The BTA guidelines and an application form are available on the Local Programs website, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/

If you have any questions, please contact Mikie Wickersham, of my staff, at (805) 549-3074.

Sincerely,

Garin Schneider
District Local Assistance Engineer

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
January 18, 2011

Alan Romero, Air Quality/Transportation Planner
MBUAPCD
24580 Silver Cloud Court
Monterey, CA 93940

RE: Grant Agreement #09-39 for Bikes Secure Bicycle Parking Subsidy – Phase IV

Dear Mr. Alan Romero;

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) hereby requests an extension of the AB2766 Grant # 09-39 which awarded $30,000 for the Bikes Secure Phase IV program. We request an extension through January 31, 2012.

Staff is suffering set-backs in delivery of bicycle racks due to staffing shortages related to budget reductions, the difficulty in stockaving an adequate number of racks in our warehouse, and the limited availability of steel. The re-ordering process is thus a lengthy one causing a delay in the ability to deliver racks. Additionally, a concerted effort is being made to promote the program to schools and to areas from which we do not commonly receive applications such as the San Lorenzo Valley and South County. This adds additional time and effort.

The RTC has not yet sought reimbursement for ordered racks and bicycle locker subsidies paid out to applicants.

The Regional Transportation Commission highly values the Air District's ongoing support of this beneficial program. If you have any questions or comments, please call me at (831) 460-3201.

Sincerely,

Cory Caletti
Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator
Hi: As a long-time cyclist I request that you further revise Section 9B.04. This section is proposed for amendment and makes the End [Bike Lane] sign optional. I support the revision, but suggest that the option be expanded. Under the option, Guidance should be added suggesting that if the End [Bike Lane] R-81B(CA) sign is used, that it be accompanied by the “Bicycles May Use Full Lane” sign. The problem with posting the End Bike Lane sign by itself is that motorists may perceive that cyclists should stop riding on the street beyond that point and harass cyclists who merge out of the ending bike lane. Most experienced cyclists know that they can continue riding on the street, but novice cyclists may be confused and intimidated by the END sign if not accompanied by additional guidance. Thank you for your consideration.

Rick Hyman
Santa Cruz

RE: Section 9B.04 Bike Lane Signs and Plaques (R3-17, R3-17aP, R3-17bP)

Standard:
The Bike Lane (R3-17) sign and the R3-17aP and R3-17bP plaques (see Figure 9B-2) shall be used only in conjunction with marked bicycle lanes as described in Section 9C.04.

Guidance:
If used, Bike Lane signs and plaques should be used in advance of the upstream end of the bicycle lane, at the downstream end of the bicycle lane, and at periodic intervals along the bicycle lane as determined by engineering judgment based on prevailing speed of bicycle and other traffic, block length, distances from adjacent intersections, and other considerations.

Standard:
The Bike Lane (R81(CA)) sign shall be placed at the beginning of each designated Bike Lane and along each Bike Lane at all major changes in direction. The R81(CA) sign shall be used to regulate bicycle and motor vehicle traffic, in accordance with CVC Sections 21207, 21207.5, 21208, 21209 and 21717.

Guidance:
The Bike Lane (R81(CA)) sign should be placed at every arterial street and at 1/2 mile intervals of each designated Bike lane.

Option:
The BEGIN (R81A(CA)) and END (R81B(CA)) signs may be used below the R81(CA) sign to mark the beginning or end of a bike lane.

Support:
The R81(CA), R81A(CA) and R81B(CA) signs are shown in Figure 9B-2(CA).
Here's our campus policy, which despite the "title", actually allows parking inside in many cases. Many of our staff and faculty take advantage of this:

Section 7.09. Parking or Storing Inside Buildings Prohibited. No bicycle shall be parked, stored or left in any lobby, hallway or room of any building unless said area is specifically designated for bicycle parking. Designated areas must be in accordance with all Federal, State and local fire and safety regulations. This Section is not intended to prohibit the storing or parking of a bicycle in an area by any person to which the area or room has been assigned as that person's office or residence, e.g., a residence hall room or apartment. However, use of any assigned area for bicycle parking or storage may be restricted when, in the judgment of the person(s) responsible for the area, movement of the bicycle to or use of the assigned space for bicycle parking or storage interferes with the routine activities normally conducted in the area or creates other problems. A bicycle stored inside a building must not be positioned so as to impede exiting in the event of an emergency.

Hi all,

Our county currently has a policy against allowing bicycles in county buildings. The formal policy lists fire code as the reason for banning bikes, but staff also has maintenance concerns.

As I work on changing this policy, I'm also trying to work with our Property Services department to develop a procedure for allowing bikes in buildings – a procedure that they can live with given their concerns about building maintenance. Dealing with fire code seems less of a challenge and more of a matter of identifying locations for bike storage.
Dear Councilmembers: Regarding the proposed change to Ordinance section 10.68.110 for bicycle licenses, I would suggest making the licensing requirement optional. As long as the ordinance is being amended, it should be updated to reflect reality. There is no reason to require bicycles to be licensed. All the license consists of is a number anyone can obtain for $3 annually. The City doesn’t get rich on license fees. Anyone can obtain a license for a bike – probably even for a stolen one. No education or other requirement comes with bicycle licensing as it does for motor vehicle drivers’ licenses. Licensing has no role in recovering stolen bikes. The police ask for serial numbers, not licenses, if one reports a stolen bicycle.

Licensing is an obscure procedure, not well publicized – so, most likely, the vast majority of bicycles in the City are not licensed. Licensing is not uniformly required in California – so even though the ordinance accepts licenses from other jurisdictions, riders who reside elsewhere might not have licenses. Thus, if someone without a licensed bike wanted to legally ride in Santa Cruz City, whether from elsewhere in the County, State or world, they would need to obtain a bike license. This is absurd. What if I had a friend come to town to ride with me on the weekend whose bike wasn’t licensed because there was no requirement where he/she lived to have the bike licensed – or not even an optional way to have it licensed? The City offices where a license could be obtained are closed on the weekend. Did all the Amgen riders have licenses on their bikes?

The City of Santa Monica recently did away with mandatory bicycle licensing (please see http://smmirror.com/?ajax#mode=single&view=31644); so did the City of Los Angeles (please see http://www.contracostatimes.com/california/ci_12504086?nclick_check=1). If Santa Cruz truly wants to promote bicycle riding and tourism, this arcane requirement should be eliminated – please make it optional instead of mandatory. Thanks,

Rick Hyman
Draft
SCCRTC Bicycle Committee
2011 Schedule of Meetings and Tentative Agenda Items

January 10  Cancelled

February 15  Special Meeting Date
Sierra Northern Railway Presentation;
Review Cities of Scotts Valley Bicycle Transportation Plan Project List
Featured Jurisdictions: CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY

March 14  Cancelled

April 11  Community Traffic Safety Coalition, Ride 'n Stride & Bike to Work funding requests
Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project Prioritization
Committee Appointments & Officer Elections
Review Subcommittees

May 9  Cancelled

June 13  Determine FY 11/12 schedule (monthly or bimonthly)
Featured Jurisdiction: CHP

July 11  Cancelled (all RTC meetings are cancelled in July)

August 8  Review City of Watsonville Bicycle Plan;
Featured jurisdiction: CITY OF WATSONVILLE, SANTA CRUZ and CITY OF SANTA CRUZ RDA

Sept. 12  Cancel ? (depends on approval of FY 11/12 schedule)

October 17  Special Meeting Date
Featured jurisdiction: CITY OF CAPITOLA (meet there) and County of Santa Cruz RDA

November 14  Cancel ? (depends on approval of FY 11/12 schedule)

December 12  Draft 2012 SCCRTC Legislative Agenda; Bicycle Injury and Fatality Report & Bicycle Observation Study Report

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.
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AGENDA: February 15, 2011

TO: Bicycle Committee
FROM: Cory Caletti, RTC Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator
RE: Bicycle Accommodations for Sierra Northern Passenger Rail Services

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for your information.

DISCUSSION

On January 19, 2011 the RTC secured another monumental milestone toward the acquisition of the 32-mile transportation corridor when the California Transportation Commission approved the project and funding request. Although the sale will not be final until escrow closes, presumed to be sometime in the April/May timeframe, the RTC and operator Sierra Northern are proceeding with next steps for use of the corridor for recreational rail service.

A representative from Sierra Northern will attend the Bicycle Committee meeting to discuss preliminary plans for service including bicycle parking at the stations and transporting of bicycles on the rail cars.
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Agenda: February 15, 2011

To: Bicycle Committee

From: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

Re: City of Scotts Valley - Draft Bicycle Plan Project List

---

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee reviews the City of Scotts Valley Draft Bicycle Plan project list and provide feedback.

---

BACKGROUND

The Bicycle Committee reviews local jurisdictions’ Bicycle Plans and recommends changes and amendments based on discussions about priority projects, funding scenarios, and policy impacts.

Approved Bicycle Plans are needed for local jurisdictions to apply for Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) which provides funding for city and county projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters.

According to Caltrans, to be eligible for BTA funds, a city or county must prepare and adopt a Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) that complies with Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2. The following procedures must also be completed:

1. The governing body of a city or county must adopt the BTP by resolution.
2. The city or county must submit the BTP to the appropriate Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for review and approval for compliance with Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2 and the regional transportation plan (RTP).
3. Following regional approval, the city or county must submit the BTP, the resolution adopting the BTP, and the letter of approval from the RTPA to the Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit (BFU) for review and approval.
4. BTP adoption establishes eligibility for five consecutive BTA funding cycles.

Additionally, all bikeway projects shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the “Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000 Bikeway Planning and Design” and the Manual of Uniform Control Devices.

As the local Regional Transportation Planning Agency, the Regional Transportation Commission must certify the plan as being compliant with the pertinent section of the Streets and Highways Code. As the designated representative of the Regional Transportation Commission, the Bicycle Committee and RTC staff is responsible for verification of the plan. RTC staff recommends that Bicycle Committee reviews the draft plan and provide feedback.
DISCUSSION

The City of Scotts Valley submitted a Draft Bicycle Plan project list for Bicycle Committee review (Attachment 1). Committee members are asked to review the plan’s project list and provide input on prioritization, as well as brainstorm other proposals. The entire City of Scotts Valley Administrative Draft Bicycle Plan is currently being reviewed by RTC. The City of Scotts Valley is modeling their plan after the City of Capitola’s which received extensive Committee review. The Bicycle Committee may request to review the entire City of Scotts Valley Draft Bicycle Plan as it becomes available.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee reviews the City of Capitola Draft Bicycle Plan's project list and provide feedback.

Attachment 1: City of Capitola Draft Bicycle Plan project list
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# Appendix C | 2010 Proposed Projects List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Goal(s) Achieved</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
<th>Potential Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Glen Canyon Road, Class II, Phase I</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>− Narrow 2-lane road</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RTC/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Camp Evers Park to Green Hills)</td>
<td></td>
<td>− High speeds</td>
<td>Goal 2 - Increase Ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>− HWY 17 Overpass</td>
<td>Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Glen Canyon Road, Class II, Phase I</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>− Narrow 2-lane road</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>RTC/BTA/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Camp Evers Park to Green Hills)</td>
<td></td>
<td>− High speeds</td>
<td>Goal 2 - Increase Ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>− HWY 17 Overpass</td>
<td>Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Mount Hermon Road, Class II, Phase I</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>− High volume</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SR2S, Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HWY 17 to Skypark/Lockwood Ln.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>− High trucks</td>
<td>Goal 2 - Increase Ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>− HWY 17 Overpass</td>
<td>Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Mount Hermon Road, Class II</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>− High volume</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>BTA/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Skypark/Lockwood Ln. to Lockhart Gulch</td>
<td></td>
<td>− High trucks</td>
<td>Goal 2 - Increase Ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road)</td>
<td></td>
<td>− HWY 17 Overpass</td>
<td>Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Bethany Dr Class I (Scotts Valley Dr. to</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>− Narrow roadway</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>BTA/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany College)</td>
<td></td>
<td>− Residential</td>
<td>Goal 2 - Increase Ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>− High volumes during commute</td>
<td>Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Glenwood Drive, Class II, Phase I</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>− Businesses</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Scotts Valley Dr. To Casa Way)</td>
<td></td>
<td>− Residences</td>
<td>Goal 2 - Increase Ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>− High School</td>
<td>Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>− Some areas widened to 4 lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>Goal(s) Achieved</td>
<td>Projected Cost</td>
<td>Potential Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Glenwood Drive, Class II, Phase II (Casa Way to City Limit)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Narrow roadway&lt;br&gt;• Residences&lt;br&gt;• High School</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>BTA/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Scotts Valley Drive, Class II Mt. Hermon Rd to Glenwood Dr. to Tabor Dr.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• High speed&lt;br&gt;• High volume&lt;br&gt;• High trucks</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>BTA/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Granite Creek, Class II including Highway 17 overpass</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Narrow in places&lt;br&gt;• Residential&lt;br&gt;• High volumes during commute</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>BTA/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Kings Village Road, Class II</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Commercial Zone&lt;br&gt;• Sidewalks and bike lanes needed</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RTC/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Bluebonnet Lane, Class III</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Commercial zone, Include in Bluebonnet Lane Assessment District</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RTC/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Civic Center Drive, Class II</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Narrow road&lt;br&gt;• Sidewalks and bike lanes needed</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RTCA/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) North Navarra Dr. through Sucinto Drive, Class II</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>• Undeveloped area behind Borland</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>BTA/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>Goal(s) Achieved</td>
<td>Projected Cost</td>
<td>Potential Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Lockwood Lane, Class I Mt. Hermon Rd. to Whispering Pines Dr.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Narrow&lt;br&gt;• Medium traffic volumes</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>$200/sign</td>
<td>RTC/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Bean Creek Road, Class II, Scotts Valley Dr. to Bluebonnet</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Narrow&lt;br&gt;• Medium traffic volumes</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>BTA/RTC/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Hacienda Dr., Class II, Glenwood Dr. to Casa Way</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Narrow&lt;br&gt;• Medium traffic volumes</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>BTA/RTC/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Vine Hill School Road, Class II, Glenwood Dr. to Scotts Valley Dr.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Narrow&lt;br&gt;• Medium traffic volumes</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>BTA/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) El Rancho, Class II</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Narrow&lt;br&gt;• Medium traffic volumes</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local/BTA/Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Lockhart Gulch Road, Class II</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>• Narrow, No bike lane&lt;br&gt;• Primarily Residential</td>
<td>Goal 1 - Circulation, Connectivity and Access&lt;br&gt;Goal 2 - Increase Ridership&lt;br&gt;Goal 3 - Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local/BTA/Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Camp Evers Park, Carbonero Creek at Glen Canyon and Camp Evers Creek, bike rest stop</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal 2 - Increase Ridership</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>BTA/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Skypark, Bike rest stop</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal 2 - Increase Ridership</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>BTA/Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA:  February 15, 2011

TO:  Bicycle Committee
FROM:  Cory Caletti, RTC Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator
RE:  Draft Monterey Bay Area Public Participation Plan

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee review the Monterey Bay Public Participation Plan and provide comments to be forwarded to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments.

BACKGROUND

Periodically the agency designated as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) in our region, is required by state and federal requirements to update a Public Participation Plan. The Monterey Bay Public Participation Plan covers three counties: San Benito, Monterey and Santa Cruz.

DISCUSSION

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) staff has been working on the Draft Monterey Bay Public Participation Plan with the other counties and AMBAG. The Draft Plan was released at AMBAG’s February 9 board meeting and key sections are provided in Attachment 1. If members’ would like to review the entire plan, it may be located on AMBAG’s website: http://www.ambaq.org/programs/met_transp_plann/reports/draft_PPP%20update.pdf

There are 6 principals guiding the Public Participation Plan:
- Valuing public participation and promoting broad-based involvement by members of the community
- Providing varied opportunities for public review and input
- Treating all members of the public fairly, and respecting and considering all public input as and important component of the planning and participation process
- Promoting a culture of dialogue and partnership among residents, property owners, the businesses community, organizations, other interested citizens and public officials
- Involving existing community groups and organizations, as feasible
- Encouraging active participation in the initial stages of the process, as well as throughout the process
- Providing communications and agency reports that are clear, timely and broadly distributed

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee focus on the outreach strategies currently in use and potential new strategies which are outlined in Chapter 5. Also, the Committee may want to review the matrix of current participation practices used by the RTC contained in the appendix.

The Draft Monterey Bay Public Participation Plan will be circulated for a 45-day review period starting with the official release of the document at AMBAG's Board meeting on February 9. Comments are due before March 30. Staff recommends that the Committee review the document and provide comments as a committee.

Attachment 1: Excerpts from the Draft Monterey Bay Area Public Participation Plan
DRAFT
UPDATE TO THE
MONTEREY BAY AREA
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

Prepared by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, in cooperation with its collaborating agencies and the public. This plan was funded, in part, with funds from the U.S. Department of Transportation under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and reflects the positions and/or views of AMBAG and its collaborating agencies and not necessarily those of the U.S. DOT

A Guide to Engaging in Transportation Decision Making in the Monterey Bay Area
27 February 2011
1. Summary

This Monterey Bay Area Public Participation Plan has been prepared collaboratively with the Council of San Benito County Governments (SBCOG), Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST), Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD), and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), with additional input and review by the cities and counties in the region, and other parties with an interest in the planning programs and transportation policies of the Monterey Bay area.

This plan provides guidance in the structuring of regional transportation planning processes to ensure that, to the greatest extent possible, interagency consultation and public participation are an integral and continuing part of the regional transportation decision making process. The participation policies and procedures described in this plan are structured to comply with all applicable federal and state legislation, rules, and express the genuine regional value and interest for all residents to participate in the shaping and implementation of regional policies and decisions regarding the transportation system.

The Monterey Bay Area Public Participation Plan, originally adopted in June 2008 to comply with the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) legislation, has been updated pursuant to changes in the California Government Code 65080 that occurred with the passage of SB 375 (2008).

The Monterey Bay area covers the counties of Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito and all the cities within.

The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) serves as the regional forum for the study and discussion of regionally significant issues, including housing, transportation, energy, water, and environmental quality. Elected officials from the eighteen cities and the three counties form the AMBAG’s Board of Directors. AMBAG’s mission states:

“AMBAG provides strategic leadership and services to analyze, plan and implement regional policies for the benefit of the Counties and Cities of Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz, balancing local control with regional collaboration.”

In pursuing its mission, AMBAG strives to inform and involve its jurisdictions and the general public throughout its various programs, projects, and work activities conducted by the agency.

AMBAG and its regional planning partners seek the participation of a diverse set of communities with an interest in regional planning efforts, including lower income households, minority populations, persons with disabilities, representatives from community and service organizations, tribal organizations, and other public agencies.

AMBAG and its partner agencies perform a broad range
Figure 1. Planning areas covered by the AMBAG Metropolitan Planning Area Boundary.

Source: AMBAG 2011.

of regional planning activities, such as conducting public meetings, establishing standing and ad hoc committees, partnering on studies and projects, and providing education and informational programs in accordance with statutory and regulatory directives. All of these activities are open to public involvement and review.

AMBAG, and its partner agencies (TAMC, SBCOG, and RTC), have taken this opportunity to restructure the document itself to make it more useful for transportation decision making in the Monterey Bay Area. These changes have been approved by stakeholder groups and the AMBAG Board of Directors [pending April 2011 adoption].
5. Procedures & Strategies for Continued Consultation & Coordination

Providing public access to and participation in the planning processes of the Monterey Bay region is a responsibility shared between Caltrans, AMBAG, Council of San Benito County Governments (San Benito COG), Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST), San Benito County Local Transportation Authority, and Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD).

Each partner agency solicits public input to its planning, policy, and programming processes. Various methods are used to engage stakeholders, and provide affected agencies and interested parties with timely information and opportunities to participate in the transportation planning process.

Each federally funded transportation program or project conducted by a partner agency must have a specified public participation process that defines the avenues for reasonable involvement in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

The following slate of procedures and strategies represents a compilation of the public participation efforts and opportunities offered to residents in the Monterey Bay region. These procedures and strategies also provide guidance for realizing the desired outcome of a robust and informed level of broad-based citizen involvement in the development and implementation of plans, programs and projects in the region.

Additional information for how to engage in public participation opportunities for each county are summarized in Appendix A.

Required Procedures and Methods for Public Participation (based on state and federal laws)

The eight required public participation activities each transportation program must include are:

1. Define Purpose & Identify Stakeholders
2. Consultation & Coordination with Other Agencies
3. Consultation with Interested Parties (Boards of Directors & Advisory Committees)
4. Public Notice, Public Hearings, Comment Periods (utilizes the Brown Act)
5. Use of Media & Informational Materials, and Visualization Techniques
6. Encourage Bilingual Participation
7. Respond to Public Input
8. Distribution of Final Documents

These activities are further explained in the following text, followed by a special section pertaining to new requirements for the MTP/SCS development pursuant to SB 375.

1. Define Purpose & Identify Stakeholders

Prior to initiating public outreach on transportation plans, programs and projects, each partner agencies defines the purpose, objectives and stakeholders for public involvement. Individuals and groups that have an interest in transportation decisions may include, but are not limited to:

- Landowners
- Neighborhood and community groups
- Environmental advocates
- Affordable housing advocates
- Transportation advocates
- Home builder representatives
- Broad-based business organizations
- Commercial property interests

These groups can be represented through direct outreach, advisory committees, or other methods described in the following text. The partner agencies recognize that the public expects a clear understanding of their involvement and purpose throughout the transportation planning process.
2. Consultation & Coordination with Other Agencies

The public involvement processes of the partner agencies are coordinated with federal, state and local agencies and outreach processes to enhance public involvement in the issues, plans and programs. Appropriate consultation is undertaken with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the region, as well as state and federal resource management agencies. These agencies include but are not limited to:

- State & Federal Resource Agencies (water, fish & game, Coastal Commission, etc.)
- Local Tribal Governments
- Housing & Economic Development Agencies
- Airport Operations
- Goods Movement

Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy Coordination Group

The Monterey Bay region partner agencies participate in regular coordination group meetings to discuss preparation of transportation plan updates, policy issues and coordinate development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy for the region that is required by Senate Bill 375.

California Environmental Quality Act Consultation

The public participation process defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for environmental documents prepared for transportation plans and projects serves as the primary means for consultation to occur with federal, state and local resource management agencies.

3. Consultation with Interested Parties (Boards of Directors & Advisory Committees)

Each of the seven partner agencies holds regularly scheduled meetings that are open to the public and noticed per Brown Act requirements. General meeting notices, agendas and materials are posted at agency offices at least 72 hours before regular meetings and 24 hours before special meetings. Board meeting and some standing committee meeting notices are posted on agency websites. Some special meetings or hearings are also published in general circulation newspapers. Agendas and materials are published and made available in advance of meetings by regular mail, email or by links to the host agency website. Agendas are also posted at the offices of the partner agencies. Staff reports and studies are made available for examination at the offices of the partner agencies and local public libraries and are made available on request, sometimes at the cost of reproduction and mailing. The agenda of each meeting provides an opportunity for members of the general public to provide comment to the Board concerning matters within the agency’s purview.

In addition, public input to the transportation planning and programming process can include notification and early solicitation through each of the agency’s standing advisory committees and through project sponsors (i.e. city councils and city committees). Under the region’s Transportation Memorandum of Understanding, AMBAG and the region’s two public transit operators, also use the RTPA advisory committees to notify and solicit input on their planning and programming process. AMBAG passes through federal planning funds to both RTC and TAMC for their work on planning analysis and funding decisions incorporated in AMBAG’s metropolitan transportation planning responsibilities, including maintaining these advisory committees. All the standing advisory committees described below must meet the Brown Act public involvement and participation requests.

Technical Advisory Committees (TACs)

Each of the three Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) appoints a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) which meets regularly to help guide the technical development of transportation planning, project selection and programming in the region. The TAC members are usually planners and engineers representing affected agencies and jurisdictions in each county. Additional
agency representation on these committees includes some combination of the following: transit operators, regional agencies, Transportation Management Agencies, educational institutions, and redevelopment agencies. Recommendations of each committee are forwarded to the respective Board.

**Social Service Transportation Advisory Councils (SSTACs)**

As required by state statute, each Regional Transportation Planning Agency appoints a Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) to advise the agencies on specialized transportation and unmet transit needs. Candidates are recruited from a broad representation of social services, transportation providers, and the general public representing the elderly, the disabled, and persons of limited means. With respect to unmet transit needs, state law requires an annual unmet needs public hearing if Local Transportation Funds are to be used for local road projects. In Monterey and San Benito Counties, the primary purpose of each committee is to ensure that there are no unmet transit needs which are reasonable to meet in areas which use Local Transportation Funds for purposes other than transit. Santa Cruz County does not divert any Local Transportation Funds to road projects, but regularly conducts unmet needs process to understand priority transportation needs for seniors, people with disabilities and low income individuals.

In addition to the unmet needs activities of the SSTACs, the three agencies’ committees regularly review and comment on proposed planning documents and matters affecting the groups they represent. For instance, the public transit operators’ on-going compliance in meeting the complementary paratransit goal provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act is of interest to SSTAC members. As such, a transit operator representative will attend each SSTAC meeting to address complementary paratransit as well as other public transit issues of interest to the committee. SSTAC committee actions are reported to and considered by each Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

In Santa Cruz County, the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) serves as the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council. In addition to fulfilling the requirements of the SSTAC as required by California Code, the E&D TAC advises the RTC, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency, social service agencies and the local jurisdictions in Santa Cruz County on transportation issues, policies, plans, programs, and projects for the elderly, disabled and persons of limited means populations.

In Monterey County, the Transportation Agency’s Social Services Transportation Advisory Council and MST Mobility Advisory Committee advise the respective agencies on the transportation needs of the elderly, persons with disabilities and limited means populations. The Mobility Advisory Committee includes representatives from the County’s social service providers and MST RIDES paratransit program customers. The committee serves as an advisory body to MST regarding the delivery of coordinated transportation and mobility management services provided through MST’s Consolidated Transportation Services Agency.

The San Benito Council of Governments maintains its own SSTAC committee for the purposes described above.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees**

RTC appoints a Bicycle Committee. Both TAMC and San Benito COG appoint a Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee. These committees either meet every one or two months to review, discuss and make recommendations on bicycle and pedestrian related projects, plans and programming. Recommendations of each committee are forwarded to the respective Board of Directors or member jurisdictions. These committees are composed of citizen volunteers. In Santa Cruz County, accessible pedestrian issues are discussed by the E&D TAC (see above ‘Social Service Transportation Advisory Council’).

**Regional Rail Committee (RAC)**

RTC has a Rail Acquisition Committee (RAC) which meets monthly or as needed, to pursue purchase of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line from Union Pacific and provide guidance to the RTC. The TAMC Rail Policy Committee meets monthly to advise the Agency on plans and issues associated with commuter and passenger rail services being developed in Monterey County.

**Transit Citizens Advisory Committee**

Each member of the Santa Cruz Metro Board of Directors appoints one person to the Santa Cruz Metro Advisory Committee (MAC) for a two-year appointment. MAC provides advice to Santa Cruz Metro’s Board of Directors on matters of Santa Cruz Metro policy and operations referred to the Committee by the Board or Secretary/General Manager and to perform such additional duties as.
**Figure 3. The Building Blocks of Transportation Planning & Public Input.**

**Key:**
- 📗 - Public
- 👥 - Committees
- 📚 - Agencies & Staff
- 🗯️ - Governing Boards (Decision Makers)

**Final Plan (💰)**
- **What:** The Final Plan incorporates comments on the draft plan and is adopted by the governing board.
- **Input:** All board meetings are open to the public, per the Brown Act and there is always an opportunity to comment on items on the agenda, however substantive comments on the plan are more helpful when made earlier in the process.

**Draft Plan (กระบวนการที่ 2)**
- **What:** The draft plan combines the goals & policies, funding estimates, project lists and other relevant information into a cohesive short and long range transportation plan.
- **Input:** An extensive notification process is employed and a public hearing is held at this stage to solicit broad participation into the review of this plan.

**Project Lists (กระบวนการที่ 3)**
- **What:** Generally, projects are initiated by the entity that will construct, operate and/or own it, however the public can also nominate projects. The project list is then prioritized and placed into two priority tiers: one called Constrained which consists of projects that are within the projected revenues and that are highest priority, and Unconstrained projects for which no funding source is projected within the planning timeframe.
- **Input:** There is a high level of interest at this stage when decisions about which projects/programs will be included prioritized.

**Funding Estimates (การพยากรณ์การเงิน)**
- **What:** Planning agencies estimate the amount of federal, state and local transportation funding available for the next 25 years based on historical data, current trends and/or state and federal actions.
- **Input:** Partner agencies are involved in identifying and agreeing to the revenue projections.

**Goals & Policies (แผนยุทธศาสตร์)**
- **What:** Goals & Policies provide a consistency framework, and are used to determine project priorities.
- **Input:** This is a chance for the public to participate in in establishing a regional vision, defining tools to guide progress towards achieving this vision, and by which the expenditure of the projected funding will be consistent.
assigned by the Board. MAC also may address issues which members or the public raise with respect to the quantity and quality of services provided by Santa Cruz Metro and meets on the third Wednesday of each month.

In Monterey County, the MST Mobility Advisory Committee fulfills this role.

**Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee**

In order to ensure efficient and effective operations, the RTC’s Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee serves to review and monitor issues relating to the budget, work program, and other administrative functions of the RTC and makes recommendations to the RTC regarding such items. The Committee is also responsible for reviewing personnel matters and conducting the annual performance evaluation of the Executive Director. The Commission meets at least quarterly and more often as needed.

**Traffic Operations System (TOS) Oversight Committee**

RTC has a Traffic Operations System (TOS) Oversight Committee that includes representatives from Caltrans, the California Highway Patrol (CHP), local law enforcement, public works departments and the media. The purpose of the Committee is to identify opportunities to improve the efficiency and safety of the transportation system through implementing operational improvements including the integration of technology into the transportation’s infrastructure to detect road conditions, inform motorists of potential hazards or delays and increase motorist’s access to highway and emergency services using call boxes. In addition, the Committee identifies other strategies to improve operations such as deploying tow trucks during peak hours to remove hazards from the roadway. The Committee routinely reviews activations of the existing TOS system and responses to traffic incidents and discusses ways to improve communication among the various agencies and to enhance the existing TOS system. The Committee meets biannually and jointly with the Safe on 17 Task Force established by the CHP to discuss and develop safety improvements and programs for Highway 17.

**San Benito COG Regional Transportation Plan Advisory Committee**

San Benito COG established the Regional Transportation Plan Advisory Committee in (RTPAC) December 2010. It is a standing committee with members appointed by the COG Board of Directors. The purpose of the RTPAC is to review and provide input on the development of San Benito COG’s Regional Transportation Plan. The committee is made up of representatives of many community interests, including economic development, education, goods movement, public health, resource management, and underrepresented groups such as the elderly and disabled. The RTPAC meets quarterly with its meetings agendasized and open to the public in accordance with the Brown Act.

**Ad Hoc Committees**

All the standing advisory committees, like those noted above, must meet the Brown Act public involvement and participation requests. In addition to these standing committees, the partner agencies may appoint special ad-hoc committees for specific programs/plans. Although ad-hoc committees do not necessarily have to meet the Brown Act public involvement requirements, they typically do because political leaders and the communities in the region have a strong commitment to the public participation process (CA Government Code § 54952(b)). Therefore, additional public input and involvement occurs through these special ad-hoc committees. Several examples of recent committees and/or task forces include:

- **Forecast Technical Advisory Committee** – Designated by the AMBAG Board of Directors to provide public agency staff technical input in the update of Regional Population, Employment and Housing Forecast
- **Pedestrian Safety Work Group** - This subcommittee of the RTC’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee was formed to improve the safety and accessibility of pedestrian facilities in all
five jurisdictions of Santa Cruz County. The group has received a Caltrans Environmental Justice grant and has prioritized pedestrian improvements between activity centers and transit stops.

- **Bicycle Legislation Subcommittee** - This is one of many subcommittees of the RTC’s Bicycle Committee which analyzes existing, new and potential legislation to determine it’s impacts and benefits for local bicyclists.

### 4. Public Hearings

Public hearings are held prior to a decision point to gather comments for the public record, as well as input into the decision making process. The partner agencies hold public hearings prior to adoption of their major plans, programs and major service revisions (e.g. Metropolitan/Regional Transportation Plans, Transportation Improvement Programs, Short Range Transit Plans, Americans with Disabilities Act Complementary Paratransit Plans, Unmet Transit Needs, Transit Program of Projects, Service Revisions, etc.).

Santa Cruz Metro and MST hold public hearings when there is a service change greater than 25 percent, elimination of routes, fare changes, adoption of an ordinance, adoption of a resolution authorizing application for grant funding, adopting the annual budget, environmental documents, eminent domain resolutions, or short range transit plans. All Santa Cruz Metro public hearings are published as a legal notice in local newspapers. For adoption of an ordinance, a legal notice is published in both papers with notices posted at three public places, typically the transit centers.

In addition to the public hearings held above with respect to major plans and programs, AMBAG biennially holds a formal hearing to consider long-range plan assumptions and the long-range plan development process. For some agencies, public meetings are sometimes broadcast live on public access television. These meetings are generally rebroadcast, providing the public additional opportunities to view the proceedings.

### Public Hearing Notices

The partner agencies publish legal notices of public hearings in newspapers of general circulation citing the time, date and place of the hearings. For transportation matters of particular interest to the Latino community, public hearing notices are translated and run in Spanish language newspapers or radio. For items of wide public interest, public display advertisements instead of legal notices may be used. Unless indicated otherwise, public hearing notices are made available at least seven days in advance of a hearing. The partner agencies accept prepared comments (oral, written and emailed) from the public during the period between the notice and hearing date; all such comments are made part of the public record.

### Public Hearings

Public hearings are conducted by the respective Board of Directors of the regional planning and transit agencies in the Monterey Bay Area during their regular meetings or at special meetings scheduled to attract maximum community participation. Public hearings may also be conducted by each agency’s standing committees. Meetings are held in facilities that are accessible to people with disabilities.

As part of a public hearing, the policy board will generally receive a report from agency staff prior to opening the meeting for comments from the public. The hearing will be concluded when all members of the public wishing to speak have provided comments. Agency staffs may be requested to respond to comments provided at the hearing prior to the policy board taking action with respect to the subject of the hearing.

### Public Comment Period

The public comment period for adoption or revision of the Public Participation Plan, Transportation Plans, the Transportation Improvement Program and other key decision points must be “timely” and for the AMBAG region are as follows:

- Public Participation Plan: 45 Days
• Regional and Metropolitan Transportation Plans: 45 Days
• Approval of Transportation Improvement Programs an other plans: 30 days
• Formal Amendments to the MTIP: 2 weeks

Amendment or Modification to draft Plans (MTP/MTIP/PPP) or projects: If a draft plans or projects differ significantly from the initial draft which was made available for public comment and raises new issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts, an additional opportunity for public comment on the revised plans or other plans will be made available within schedule constraints. Minor changes in the draft plans or projects generally can be made after AMBAG/RTPAs/Transit Agencies has completed its public comment process without further opportunities for public involvement. AMBAG or respective agencies can define what is considered a minor change during the development of the public involvement process for the plan.

5. Use of Media & Informational Materials, and Visualization Techniques

Media notification is used by all the partner agencies to inform the public of upcoming decision points, decisions made and their potential ramifications regarding transportation planning, funding, project implementation and/or service provision. Media coverage can help deliver information regarding controversial issues or events. Projects should utilize at least one of the following methods to visualize the project and inform the public. The following information methods are employed in the Monterey Bay region:

• Web Sites – Each partner agency maintains a homepage on the internet that provides the public with information about the agency, its programs, and special projects. Project and program information - including reports, documents, plans, fact sheets, maps, graphs, charts and PowerPoint presentations - is posted on the web sites and made available to the public. Meeting notices and agendas/minutes for the agency, as well as their advisory committees, are also posted and available for downloading or review. TAMC also provides viewers the ability to watch their board meetings on demand on their website. Most of the partner agencies also have a “What’s New” section on their web page to provide reviewing parties a quick way to read more about the latest developments. Agency websites also provide a forum for graphic materials that assist viewers in visualizing programs and projects.

• News Releases - Partner agencies prepare and forward news releases to print and broadcast media of issues or events that affect the region, including proposed actions, notification of workshops, completion of major projects and legislative actions affecting the transportation planning and service providers. This is perhaps the most frequently used media outreach method. Board meeting highlights are also sent by one agency to media contacts as well as elected officials, advisory committees and a range of other interests in the county following each meeting.

• Articles in the weekly county business council distributions

• Press Conferences - Partner agencies hold press conferences to focus press attention on newsworthy special events and occasions.

• Radio and Television – RTC televisions and rebroadcasts Board meetings on community access television. TAMC also offers televised broadcasts of Board meetings. Several agencies work with stations, special programs, and/or Public Access Media to interview and/or film special segments with the media to spread word regarding their agency and/or programs. For example, TAMC and RTC broadcast radio and television segments on current transportation issues, programs and projects.

• Newsletters or Brochures - Partner agencies use newsletters and brochures to provide information on their transportation programs and particular project development. News releases are often sent via email to entities for inclusion in their electronic newsletters.

• Agency Reports – Several partner agencies prepare and distribute an annual agency report sent to a broad range of their constituents and planning partners. These reports serve to communicate to the public the agency’s accomplishments, revenue/ expenditures and future directions. Some agencies are now preparing and distributing fact sheets on various projects, programs and agency information. This is a way to provide the public with the most current information.

• Posters and Inserts – Posters and inserts are used by the partner agencies to focus attention on a particular program. Direct transmission of oral or written materials to the media (Board Agendas, Reports, etc.)

• Project Flyers and Folders – Several agencies develop and distribute information flyers and/or folders at public workshops, meetings, community events, and other significant events. In order to
reach out to a wider community many of the flyers and folders are printed in Spanish.

- **Advertising** – Many of the partner agencies use advertising means, such as display ads in newspapers, outdoor advertisements on the sides of buses, “car cards” inside the buses, and posters on A-frames placed in high-travel corridors to capture people’s attention.

- **Electronic Social Media** – The regional planning agencies distribute information on plans, programs and projects through popular online social media such as Facebook and Twitter.

6. **Bilingual Participation**

The Monterey Bay region is home to a significant Spanish speaking population; therefore, the partner agencies employ a number of bilingual outreach methods to include participation of the Spanish speaking community. These methods could include:

- Publishing printed information regarding services, projects, programs and meetings in Spanish.
- Including the Spanish media in the distribution of news releases.
- Advertising public hearings, meetings, projects and programs in the Spanish print, radio and television media.
- Providing simultaneous translation services at meetings.
- Producing Spanish language website content.

7. **Response to Public Input**

Timely response to public input is important to encourage public participation and ensure that agencies communicate that public input is valued. Public inquiries receive a response providing available information or advise if information exists.

Responses to public input are made directly when public input level permits, or a consolidated response is prepared for specific issues if the volume of public comment does not allow individual responses. Written responses to public or agency input are reported to the respective policy Board for information. In some cases, as with the transportation plans and Transportation Improvement Program, when significant written and oral comments are received on the draft plan or program as a result of the public involvement process, a summary analysis and report on the disposition of comments is made and reported to the Board of Directors of the agency that received the comments or is approving the document.

8. **Distribution of Final Documents**

Final documents are available on agency websites and are distributed to affected agencies and jurisdictions and individuals that provided significant comments during the public input process. Members of the public can request a copy of final documents from the appropriate agency (some may require a fee to reproduce a document). Written materials provided to a partner agency board of directors can be made available for review upon request. Documents are also available for review on agency websites or agency libraries.

**Senate Bill 375 and Sustainable Communities Strategy Outreach (5 new required activities)**

In addition to the required methods for public participation employed to seek public input on plans, programs and projects in the Monterey Bay Area, AMBAG is required to undertake outreach defined in Senate Bill 375. This legislation requires that the transportation plans prepared by AMBAG be consistent with a Sustainable Communities Strategy for achieving greenhouse gas emissions targets approved by the California Air Resources Board for the region. The partner agencies will coordinate to undertake the specific outreach identified below to prepare the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy.

1. **Consultation with Other Agencies**

In addition to the required consultation and coordination activities, AMBAG will convene a Planning Director Forum to serve as an advisory body at key decision points in development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

2. **Visualization Techniques and Web Distribution of Information**

AMBAG will utilize the internet to provide public resources for documents, graphic materials and public information related to development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Through the website will allow members of the public to submit a single request to receive notices, information and updates. Urban simulation computer modeling will be used to create visual representations of the different scenarios.

3. **Sustainable Communities Strategy Public Workshops**

Three public workshops will be convened throughout the three county Monterey Bay region to provide the public with an opportunity to participate in the development of
the Sustainable Communities Strategy and information and tools necessary to provide a clear understanding of the issues and policy choices. The workshops may include visual representations of the different scenarios developed through computer modeling. Public preferences on options for land use and transportation investments presented at the workshops will be considered and incorporated in the final strategy.

4. Elected Officials Workshops
Three workshops will be convened for elected officials in the Monterey Bay Region to discuss the Sustainable Communities Strategy, including the key land use and planning assumptions to the members of the board of supervisors and the city council members in each county and to solicit and consider their input and recommendations.

5. Public Hearings and Public Comment Period
A draft Sustainable Communities Strategy will be circulated for public review at least 55 days prior to approval of the document and the transportation plans developed consistent with the strategy. Three public hearings on the Draft Sustainable Communities Strategy will be held prior to adoption of the strategy and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan throughout the Monterey Bay region to maximize opportunities for public participation and consideration of the documents by elected officials.

The public outreach process for the Sustainable Communities Strategy may also employ optional methods for public participation used by the region’s partner planning agencies, described in the next section, Optional Methods for Public Participation.

Optional Methods for Public Participation
In addition to the required methods and procedures for engaging public participation, partner agencies in the Monterey Bay Region may utilize some or all of the following optional methods to seek public input on plans, programs, projects and the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy. Methods chosen will depend on the size of the project or the anticipated level of community interest expressed after the initial outreach purpose and list of stakeholders are identified.

Deliberative Polling
Deliberative Polling is engaging the public in meaningful deliberation on a specific issue that takes place through surveys and follow-up workshops. This method utilizes a scientific representative sampling approach that most general public participation methods do not achieve.

As part of the outreach and implementation strategies for the next update for the SCS/MTP, AMBAG has received grant funding to pursue a Deliberative Polling process.

If future grant opportunities exist, AMBAG would like to continue to engage in Deliberative Polling activities to continually engage the regional community in meaningful dialogue and deliberation on issues of regional importance.
Public Workshops and Public Meetings

The purpose of public workshops and public meetings is to present information and obtain input from the public, usually on specific issues, policies, programs, plans or projects. Such meetings are held throughout the planning process and are tailored to specific issues or geographic areas. The Brown Act governs the general conduct of all public meetings, including public workshops. For public workshops and meetings of particular interest to members of the community, email distributions of notices, agendas and materials are widely used. Also, display ads may be run in local newspapers.

Community Outreach Events & Strategies

Community activities are used to keep the public informed and interested in regional planning activities and goals. For example, several of the region’s rideshare providers work with the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District to promote the annual Rideshare Week and Clean Air Month. MST and rideshare agencies within the regional transportation agencies also attend community meetings, set up displays at Earth Day, at university/community college in-person registration periods, at transportation fairs at employers’ work sites and job fairs, at community events like First Night, and sponsor related events like Bike to Work Day. Other community outreach strategies include:

- Working with community-based organizations to enhance outreach, either through direct contact or possibly through release of a request for proposals as funding allows.
- More outreach through community workshops
- Incorporating visualization techniques into planning and programming processes
- Outreach through faith-based communities
- Use of health services programs to combine outreach efforts
- Work with leadership groups in each county to educate a broader audience of community leaders about transportation issues.
- Targeting large employers and schools (i.e. agricultural industry, UCSC, County governments)
- Holding public hearings and/or focus group meetings outside work hours
- Locating meetings in facilities such as senior centers and similar facilities to bring the message to already established activity centers.

Other Activities

The partner agencies also use other public involvement methods as appropriate, including:

- **Public Opinion Surveys** – Public opinion or attitude surveys are occasionally used to assess public attitudes or to obtain socioeconomic or demographic information for specific purposes. Electronic deliberative polling may be employed at meetings to provide instant feedback from the public regarding opinions and attitudes to proposed plans, policies and projects.
- **Stakeholder Groups Meetings** – In the development of special studies, partner agencies may hold meetings with affected stakeholders to gain their perspective and insights on the study subject.
- **Open Houses** - In an open house, one-to-one exchanges between the public and policy makers and/or staff are facilitated in an informal setting. Members of the public ask questions, express concerns, react to proposed plans and policies and make suggestions.
- **Conferences** – Some partner agencies have hosted conferences on transportation issues for educational purposes, soliciting media coverage, and/or soliciting input on specific funding topics.
- **Speaker’s Bureau** – Designed to have people on staff able to visit various community and interest groups, several agencies employ this method to discuss their agency, its purpose, and upcoming projects/programs/issues.
- **Expert Panels** - Individuals with specific expertise, with or without a stake in the outcome of the process, are invited to sit on expert panels to provide advice to staff on policy and technical issues in an informal, roundtable setting.
- **Focus Groups** – One agency conducts periodic Focus Groups to determine detailed public opinion on transportation topics in the county or reports written by the agency and transportation in the county.
- **Ribbon Cuttings & Ground Breakings** – Some agencies hold ceremonies to commemorate the opening of a new project or the beginning of construction. This provides a great opportunity to demonstrate to the public agency accomplishments.
Additional Strategies to Increase Involvement

After reviewing their own public participation methods and strategies, the partner agencies evaluated what they believe works best for them. Although the listing at the beginning of this section provides a summary of the procedures and methods currently used by the partner agencies to provide information on their transportation planning processes in the region, each of these methods has varying levels of success, depending on the agency and its constituents. Some of the methods the partner agencies felt were particularly successful in eliciting public participation into the transportation arena were:

- Agency web sites and web postings;
- Extensive email distribution lists;
- Flyers/inserts in paychecks;
- Collaborative outreach with other agencies;
- Surveys;
- Targeted focus group or community meetings; and
- Interviews on community TV and/or radio.

In addition to these particularly successful methods, the partner agencies provided input on what they believe would more successful to reach the broadest audience to both provide information and solicit feedback on their programs. The below list incorporates those methods the agencies will work to incorporate into their transportation planning, programming and service delivery projects.

Engagement of Low-income, Communities of Color, and Non-English speakers

- Increased publication of information in Spanish and other languages as necessary
- Establish special bilingual committees
- Increase outreach to Spanish-language media
- Assess of what is needed to expand cultural diversity at meetings

Marketing Strategies

- On-line publication and web-based comment of plans/programs, including increased use of photography and graphics
- Increased emphasis on public access television and radio
- Coordinated media stories between partner agencies and media outlets
- Prepare weekly or monthly transportation column in local newspapers

- Develop public service announcements for distribution
- Write articles for company newsletters and special interest publications
- Target marketing/notices highlighting how planning documents may impact them
- Broadcast hearings on the internet or use webcasts
- Distribute electronic neighborhood newsletters
- Use newspaper articles and active communication with published news sources
- “Word of mouth” is most effective, through direct phone calls and simple messages
- Use direct communication and website information

Contributing Agency Improved Coordination Strategies

- Better incorporation between transportation and land use programs and policies
- Establish special commissions/task forces to engage the public in a less formal setting on certain topics
- In order to involve other government agencies: notify especially smaller ones about what meetings are the highest priority to attend, especially if meetings are in the evening; combine with other topical meetings, rather than having a special meeting only for one transportation planning document
- Need to have thorough explanations of the proposals or project needs. Possibility have AMBAG look at projects that have had successful public participation and analyze what outreach methods worked best.

Feedback and Evaluation Strategies

- Constituent survey requesting feedback on their notification preferences
- Follow up contacts after the input is received assures participants that their efforts are meaningful.

These ideas are not an exclusive summary of what could be done in the Monterey Bay region, but a list of what the partner agencies believe could enhance outreach in the region. Since life is dynamic and so are the plans accompanying it, the Monterey Bay Region Public Participation Plan will be evaluated biennially to determine its effectiveness in meeting a full and open participation process in transportation planning, programming and service delivery need.
## Public Participation Practices

**Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)**

Website: [www.sccrtc.org](http://www.sccrtc.org)  
Phone: 831-460-3200  
Fax: 831-460-3215  
Email: info@sccrtc.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Web</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTC Meetings/ Packets</strong></td>
<td>1-2 times per month, second meeting in a workshop format</td>
<td>Posted 3-6 days prior to meeting</td>
<td>Notification sent to distribution list and interested parties (enews) when packet posted on web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTC Actions</strong></td>
<td>As needed for high profile program/project decisions</td>
<td>Press release posted</td>
<td>Notification to interested parties (enews), if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTC Highlights</strong></td>
<td>Following main monthly meeting</td>
<td>Posted days following meeting</td>
<td>Notification sent to all city council members, transit district board members, media, chambers of commerce and RTC committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Hearings</strong></td>
<td>As needed for high profile program/project decisions</td>
<td>Notice posted 1-2 weeks prior to hearing, materials posted with packet (at least 4 days prior)</td>
<td>Notification to interested parties (enews) and those who receive the RTC packets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correspondence from the Public</strong></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Entry included in correspondence log posted with packets</td>
<td>If correspondence received via email, it is acknowledged via email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTC Committees</strong></td>
<td>Every 1-2 months</td>
<td>Packets posted on web</td>
<td>Packets emailed, notification about packet availability emailed to interested parties (enews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved RTC plans, documents and/or project information</strong></td>
<td>As available (examples would be completed environmental analyses, RTPs, feasibility analyses, Traffic Monitoring Reports, etc)</td>
<td>Plans, documents, info posted on the web</td>
<td>Email to interested parties (enews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media</strong></td>
<td>Infrequent, greater use is planned in the future</td>
<td>Post videos, as available</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Assistance</strong></td>
<td>Alternate formats (Spanish, hearing or sight impaired, etc) as appropriate</td>
<td>New website will be fully accessible for disabled users and have Spanish translation options</td>
<td>Currently limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packet mailed to Commissioners and major libraries.</td>
<td>Main meeting is televised and rebroadcast on Community TV, media notified by email when packet is posted on web</td>
<td>Meetings are held throughout the County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None generally</td>
<td>Press release distributed before and after RTC action (meeting)</td>
<td>Notification included in committee packets as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>(see email)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see RTC packets)</td>
<td>Press release sent 1-2 weeks in advance, media advisory sent the day before if a public event, paid ads placed as appropriate 1-2 weeks in advance</td>
<td>Notification included in committee packets as appropriate, signs may also be placed on A-frame barricades on major throughfares.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Correspondence addressing specific RTC projects may be included with that item in the RTC meeting packets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packs mailed to committee members that request it</td>
<td>None, unless included in an important recommendation to the RTC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents mailed to major libraries, if public comment is solicited</td>
<td>Press release sent out when document available with information about the public hearing, if one planned</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently limited</td>
<td>Coordinate with Spanish language media, as appropriate.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>