1. Call to Order

2. Introductions

3. Oral communications

   The Committee will receive oral communications during this time on items not on today’s agenda. Presentations must be within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and may be limited in time at the discretion of the Chair. Committee members will not take action or respond immediately to any Oral Communications presented, but may choose to follow up at a later time, either individually, or on a subsequent Committee agenda.

4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

   CONSENT AGENDA

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

5. Approve Minutes of the February 18, 2016 ITAC meeting – Page 4

   REGULAR AGENDA

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

7. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for FFY 2016-17 to FFY 2019-20 -Page 9
   a. Memorandum and Presentation from Sasha Tepedelenova, AMBAG

8. Update on the METRO Comprehensive Operational Analysis Proposals -Page 11
   a. Staff Report
   b. Verbal Update from Barrow Emerson, METRO

   a. Staff Report, Karena Pushnik
b. TRIP Fact Sheet

10. 2011-2012 California Household Travel Survey Results for Santa Cruz County -Page 16
   a. Staff Report, Ginger Dykaar
   b. CHTS Statistics for Santa Cruz County

   a. Staff Report, Ginger Dykaar
   b. SHSP Fact Sheet

12. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Updates
   a. Verbal update on California Transportation Commission (CTC) Staff Recommendations for the 2016 STIP – if available (The CTC is required to publish its staff recommendations by April 22.)

13. Upcoming Funding Opportunities:
   i. 2016 RTC Call for Projects: Anticipated to be released on May 5, 2016 with applications due on July 10, 2016. $7-11 million Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds (formerly called “RSTP”) available.
   ii. Active Transportation Program (ATP): The Cycle 3 Call for Projects includes FY19/20 and 20/21 state funding years totaling approximately $240M. Applications due: June 15, 2016. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/cycle-3.html
   iii. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP): Applications expected to be due in July 2016. http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/apply_now.htm
   v. California Urban Rivers Grant Program. Final guidelines are expected to be released in Summer 2016. Applications are anticipated due Fall 2016. http://resources.ca.gov/bonds_and_grants/grant_programs/
   vi. FTA 5339(b) Bus and Bus Facilities grant. Applications due May 13, 2016 http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/view-opportunity.html?oppId=282624

14. Next Meeting Date Change - The next ITAC meeting will be held on May 26 at 1:00pm in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA. This is one week later than the regular schedule. The meeting will be followed by the 2016 RTC Call for Projects Application Workshop at 2:30pm.

15. Adjourn

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 Committee meeting agenda packets are posted on our website, please call (831) 460-3200 or email rmoriconi@sccrtc.org to subscribe.
ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES: The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission does not discriminate on the basis of disability and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs, or activities. This meeting location is an accessible facility. If you wish to attend this meeting and require special assistance in order to participate, please contact RTC staff at 460-3200 (CRS 800/735-2929) at least three working days in advance of this meeting to make arrangements. People with disabilities may request a copy of the agenda in an alternative format. As a courtesy to those person affected, please attend the meeting smoke and scent-free.

SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/TRANSLATION SERVICES: Si gusta estar presente o participar en juntas de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de anticipio 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.)

TITLE VI NOTICE: The RTC operates its programs and services without regard to race, color and national origin in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Any person believing to have been aggrieved by the RTC under Title VI may file a complaint with RTC by contacting the RTC at (831) 460-3212 or 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 or online at www.sccrtc.org. A complaint may also be filed directly with the Federal Transit Administration to the Office of Civil Rights, Attention: Title VI Program Coordinator, East Building, 5th Floor-TCR, 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE, Washington, DC 20590.
ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT
Teresa Buika, University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC)
Barrow Emerson, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
Claire Fliesler, Santa Cruz Planning
Murray Fontes, Watsonville Public Works and Planning Proxy
Erich Friedrich, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)
Scott Hamby, Scotts Valley Public Works and Planning Proxy
Steve Jesberg, Capitola Public Works and Planning Proxy
Kelly McClendon, Caltrans
Pete Rasmussen, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
Chris Schneiter, Santa Cruz Public Works
Steve Wiesner, County Public Works

STAFF PRESENT
Rachel Moriconi

OTHERS PRESENT
Tara Leonard, County Health Services Agency (HSA)
Theresa Rogerson, County HSA
Steve Piercy, Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)
Robert Gilbert, UCSC Student
Emma Lee, UCSC Student

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Wiesner called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. **Introductions:** Self introductions were made.

3. **Oral Communications:**
   - Rachel Moriconi announced that California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has released a set of revised California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines for analysis of transportation impacts of projects, in response to SB743. Comments are due to OPR on February 29, 2016.
   - Rachel Moriconi reminded local jurisdictions to complete the 2016 Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment survey accessible online at [www.SaveCaliforniaStreets.org](http://www.SaveCaliforniaStreets.org) by **Friday, March 18**.

4. **Additions/Changes to consent and regular agenda:** None.
CONSENT AGENDA

5. **Approved minutes** of the January 14, 2016 ITAC meeting. Fontes and Fleisler moved and seconded approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously by members present.

REGULAR AGENDA

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

Watsonville: Murray Fontes reported that the city is finishing curb ramp replacements near schools. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)-funded signal and pedestrian upgrades at various locations citywide are going to bid this spring. Environmental review of the Airport Blvd project has been completed, with the project scheduled to go to bid this summer. City staff will present information on the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Rail Trail in the city at the Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) April 7 meeting. The 13th annual Egg Drop Competition, hosted by Public Works, will be held on March 25.

SCCRTC: Rachel Moriconi reminded project sponsors to submit updated project lists for the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to Ginger Dykaar by April 1. Suggestions from the public on new project ideas will be sent shortly to jurisdictions for consideration. Rachel asked agencies to send transportation photos to Karena Pushnik. Steve Wiesner suggested that the ITAC provide input on details of the ballot measure.

Caltrans: Kelly McClendon reported the Highway 17 Access Management Plan (AMP) technical analysis is underway; Caltrans is considering public input and will present range of concepts for the highway to the public this spring. Caltrans is soliciting public input regarding Highway 17 access through an online survey. The Scott Creek Bridge Replacement feasibility study continues, with a field review done with partners this week. Project goals are to restore the lagoon and replace the bridge.

1:50pm – Teresa Buika arrived.

AMBAG: Erich Friedrich reported that AMBAG is updating the regional growth forecast and working on the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP); AMBAG offices have moved; and that AMBAG is also working on the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) implementation plan for rural transit.

Capitola: Steve Jesberg reported that the city will be going to bid to repave 38th Ave. and add bike lanes; the city hopes to also add sidewalks near Capitola Road. Capitola is also seeking Caltrans authorization to install green bicycle lanes at three Highway 1 crossings; the City is also evaluating design options for the Rail Trail, with environmental review and final design expected later this year.

Santa Cruz: Claire Fleisler reported the Santa Cruz corridors planning process is still underway, with open houses being hosted every 3rd Thursday. Chris Schneiter reported on the Segment 7 Open House and presenting alternative alignment ideas to the Council, looking at moving trail along Bay Street and that an award was received from League of Cities for their roundabout projects.
METRO: Barrow Emerson introduced METRO’s newest planner, Pete Rasmussen. METRO staff will schedule meetings with local jurisdictions to ensure consideration of bus network needs, including bus stop placement and design, are integrated into the planning process.

County: Steve Wiesner reported that the El Rancho Road storm damage and a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) project near Boulder Creek Elementary are going to bid soon. He also reported on the Old County Road bridge replacement and Redwood Lodge storm damage repairs and that the County will be seeking grants for Segment 9 of the Rail Trail.

7. Caltrans Transportation Concept Report Updates for State Route 1 (SR1)

Kelly McClendon reported that Caltrans is preparing a Transportation Concept Report (TCR) for State Route 1 (SR 1), a long-range plan (through 2040) for the corridor. The TCR will identify route-and mode-specific information and system management strategies. The TCR covers SR 1 from Santa Barbara County to the San Mateo County line and will consider the Tier 1 Highway 1 Corridor investment plan for Santa Cruz County. Members received traffic volume and performance information for SR 1. Caltrans will be providing updates on the TCR throughout the development process. TCR is focused on maintenance and preservation, though may include strategic capacity expansion in some areas. Caltrans is completing TCRs for all the highways in District 5. SR 9 and SR 152 TCRs will be prepared later this year.

Chris Schneiter requested that Caltrans consider the Highway 1/9 intersection, San Lorenzo River Bridge, and congestion on Mission Street. In response to questions from the committee, Mr. McClendon indicated that Average Daily Traffic (traffic volumes) will not be used as a specific prioritization tool. TCRs focus on reporting existing and forecasted conditions; performance methods are not specifically part of the report, but general strategies will be identified. He stated that programmed/planned projects in Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) will be listed. The TCR will identify improvement strategies for different types of roads, including “main street” sections of SR 1, including transit, bicycle, and pedestrian uses. Shoulder width standards will also be discussed.

Teresa Buika suggested Caltrans look at electric vehicle (EV) charging station access/network and possibly identify public lands/locations that could be good EV charging sites. Inclusion of this information could be beneficial for securing grants. Kelly McClendon noted Caltrans is also looking at Park and Ride system gaps. Kim Shultz noted that Watsonville has done some research on possible locations. Steve Wiesner encouraged Caltrans to ensure the TCR considers all of the planning efforts underway. Kelly reviewed the overall schedule, which includes developing specific concepts and strategies for the corridor this summer.

8. State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Update

Kelly McClendon provided information on programmed State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects through Fiscal Year (FY) 17/18 and new projects proposed for the 2016 SHOPP through FY 19/20. SHOPP is the state highway maintenance plan focused on safety and system preservation projects. Caltrans has shifted to include more complete streets components in projects, including bicycle and pedestrian components. At a future ITAC meeting Caltrans will present more information on incorporation of complete streets components and greenhouse gas reduction measures in SHOPP projects. The draft 2018 SHOPP candidate list will be distributed to ITAC soon. Committee members were asked to review and provide input on SHOPP projects to the Caltrans Project Managers. In response to a question from Steve Wiesner about how the SHOPP is funded and how the drop in the
price-based gas tax is impacting the SHOPP, it was noted that the SHOPP is funded with a combination of federal funds and the general state gas tax, so the priced-based excise tax makes up a relatively small portion of the SHOPP program. [Post meeting update: The 2016 SHOPP adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in March identifies $2.3 billion for SHOPP projects in FY16/17 only $42 million of those funds (less than 2% of revenues) are from the priced-based gas tax.]

9. **Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Information**

Tara Leonard and Theresia Rogerson from the County Health Service Agency (HSA) presented information on the 2015 Bicycle and Pedestrian Observation Studies, as well as bicycle and pedestrian collision information. The safety observation studies are used to evaluate the impact of educational efforts on the behavior of bicyclists and pedestrians. It was noted that collision information comes from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) and does not include incidents on trails. She provided highlights of trends found in the observation study and collision reports. Steve Piercy provided an overview of an online map he developed which shows locations of incidents. Ms. Rogerson noted that the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) has developed guidelines for bike/pedestrian safety during construction and that Caltrans is working on video about the issue. She will provide the video and guidelines to local jurisdictions to share with contractors.

10. **Revised 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Proposal**

Rachel Moriconi provided an update on State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding shortfalls. The RTC approved staff and project sponsor recommendations at its Transportation Policy Workshop (TPW) to delay some previously programmed STIP projects to later years. If the California Transportation Commission (CTC) decides to delete local projects from the STIP, the RTC agreed to substitute Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) for STIP funds. Based on input from ITAC members, the RTC will postpone a call for projects for RSTP funds at least until after CTC staff recommendations are released.

11. **Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC)**

Erich Friedrich, AMBAG, provided information on the Cap and Trade Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) grant program. Of the $400 million available statewide, 50% is designated for affordable housing projects; 50% of total grants must be near or in disadvantaged communities – of which only one area of Watsonville is eligible. AMBAG encourages everyone to submit applications, in order to demonstrate need, even though chances of being funded are low for projects in the Monterey Bay Area, especially because there is currently no Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or rail transit in Santa Cruz County. Because AMBAG’s region is not considered rural, projects in the Monterey Bay Area will be competing with major metropolitan areas. Mr. Friedrich indicated there may be opportunities to get funds for vanpools. Murray Fontes noted that if a project has not already completed environmental and right-of-way phases, they also cannot compete. Mr. Friedrich suggested agencies work with METRO if they do have a project within ½ mile of fixed route service.

12. **METRO Structural Deficit and Comprehensive Operation Analysis (COA)**

Barrow Emerson, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) provided information on the METRO Comprehensive Operation Analysis, structural deficit, and financial stabilization plan which includes service reductions. He shared the *Good Times* newspaper article which summarizes the issue. Metro is going to need to take at least $6.5 million out of its operating
budget. Options to reduce service hours include: reduce number of bus stops; reduce hours of bus service; or delete bus routes completely - which would have a significant impact on ParaCruz service area. METRO will ensure they are not disproportionately impacting low income or minority areas. METRO staff will present initial options on March 25; then will refine the service reductions and there will be a 30 day public comment period beginning in late April through to a public hearing on May 27. Based on public input, final service reductions recommendations will be voted on in June. Public outreach includes a website, meetings with community groups, “pop up” meetings targeting riders at transit centers, advertising in buses, and news media outreach. METRO staff is seeking strategic direction from local jurisdictions – identify priorities of roadways for transit. Attendees stated it is a horrible situation, suggested looking at current travel patterns, land use plans, and the circulation element of general plans for route restructuring; as well as establishing policies and standards for productivity and coverage.

13. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for March 17, 2016 at 1:30pm in the SCCRTC Conference Room.

*Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi*
MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, Interagency Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Sasha Tepedelenova, Associate Planner, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments

SUBJECT: Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for FFY 2016-17 to FFY 2019-20

MEETING DATE: April 21, 2016

In response to requirements pursuant to its designation as a Metropolitan Planning Organization, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) prepares transportation plans and programs for the Monterey Bay region consisting of Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz Counties. One of these documents is the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), a multi-million dollar, multi-year program of proposed projects for major highway, arterial, transit, and bikeway projects. Each MTIP covers four years of programming and is prepared in coordination with local, state and federal partner agencies. AMBAG updates the MTIP every two years and is currently accepting projects for inclusion at the MTIP for FFY 2016-17 to FFY 2019-20.

The federally required MTIP is a comprehensive listing of surface transportation improvement projects for the tri-county Monterey Bay Region that receive federal funds, are subject to a federally required action, and/or are regionally significant. The process AMBAG must follow when developing and adopting the MTIP is outlined at Federal statute 23 U.S.C. 450. After interagency consultation and public review/comments/hearing, the AMBAG Board of Directors adopts the MTIP. The document is then submitted to Caltrans, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for their approval and incorporation into the Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP).

Changes to the MTIP between two updates can be performed through formal amendments and administrative modifications. AMBAG processes formal amendments to the MTIP on a quarterly schedule or more often, if warranted by special circumstances. Administrative modifications are processed for minor program revisions on an as needed basis.
accordance with the current Federal regulations, the MTIP as well as any amendments to the adopted MTIP must meet the following general requirements for a project to be approved by the U.S. Department of Transportation as a part of the FSTIP:

1) Projects must be consistent with AMBAG’s adopted 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS);
2) Projects must be financially constrained to reasonably available resources; and
3) Projects must satisfy public review/comments requirements.

AMBAG works closely with the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission in the development of the MTIP. The schedule for the FFY 2016-17 to 2019-20 MTIP update is listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks / Phases</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 RTIP Development (STIP adoption expected on May 18-19, 2016)</td>
<td>5/19/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Program MTIP Projects into CTIPS</td>
<td>4/1/2016</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Review of Draft MTIP by RTPAs/Caltrans/Local Agencies</td>
<td>7/1/2016</td>
<td>7/11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Update Final Draft (MTIP) into CTIPS</td>
<td>7/12/2016</td>
<td>7/18/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Public Comment Period (Draft also forwarded to Caltrans)</td>
<td>7/21/2016</td>
<td>8/19/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Public Hearing: AMBAG Board Meeting</td>
<td>8/10/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Respond to Public Comments &amp; Finalize MTIP for Board Approval</td>
<td>8/22/2016</td>
<td>8/29/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Final MTIP Approval by AMBAG Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/14/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 MPO Submits Final FTIP to Caltrans</td>
<td>September 30, 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Caltrans submits FSTIP to FHWA/FTA</td>
<td>November 16, 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 FSTIP Approval by FHWA/FTA</td>
<td>December 16, 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

s:\itac\2016\april2016\mtip memo for itac-rtc.doc
**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) receive an update on the Santa Cruz METRO Comprehensive Operational Analysis and provide input on proposed bus service changes.

**BACKGROUND**

In 2014, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) identified a structural deficit resulting from recurring federal, state, and local revenue failing to keep pace with recurring expenses for public transit service in Santa Cruz County. METRO has used its operating and capital reserves year-after-year to balance the operating budget and forecasts the full depletion of the remaining reserves in Fiscal Year 2016-2017 (FY17). Through a combination of technical analysis and public input, METRO developed an initial service reduction proposal, which attempts to meet financial savings targets while still maintaining a viable fixed-route bus service network that provides community mobility and geographic coverage.

**DISCUSSION**

The proposed fixed-route service network changes target a $6.5 million reduction in operating costs for FY17. METRO is proposes to reduce bus service by changing one or more of the following for several routes:

- Frequency (more time between buses)
- Span of service (starting service later in the morning and ending earlier)
- Fewer days of the week (elimination of Saturday and/or Sunday service); and/or
- Elimination of routes (in some cases other routes may be re-routed to cover some of the lost service areas)

METRO staff will present the latest draft proposed service changes at this month’s Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting. METRO is currently seeking public input on draft service reduction proposals. Information is online: [http://scmetroforward.com/study-documents/](http://scmetroforward.com/study-documents/). **RTC staff recommends that the ITAC provide input on potential METRO service reductions.**

**SUMMARY**

Santa Cruz METRO has a structural deficit and is seeking input on possible service reductions.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) brainstorm outreach ideas regarding the 2016 Transportation Improvement Plan (TRIP).

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s adopted 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) shows that state, federal, and local revenues make up less than half of the amount of transportation funding needed to operate, maintain, and improve Santa Cruz County’s multimodal transportation system. The RTP identified a $2.9 billion funding shortfall. Based on evaluation measures derived from sustainability metrics, projects were prioritized to meet the diverse needs of the people in Santa Cruz County. The approved 2014 Regional Transportation Plan included direction to pursue additional revenues to fund these priority transportation projects and programs.

Since adoption of the 2014 RTP, the RTC has been diligently working with advisory committees, stakeholders and community interests to develop a package of projects to be included in a November 2016 ballot measure to raise local, secure funding that can be used to leverage additional state and federal revenues for transportation improvements throughout Santa Cruz County.

DISCUSSION

The RTC board adopted a Transportation Improvement Plan (TRIP) at their December 2015 meeting (Attachment 1). The TRIP would be supported through a ½ cent sales tax, should voters approve a ballot measure in November 2016. Included in the plan are five inclusive categories of transportation projects:

- **Neighborhood Projects** – Preserve existing infrastructure and improve neighborhoods by funding to every city and county to repave streets, fill potholes; provide safe routes to school; and other safety improvement projects. Also projects in the San Lorenzo Valley along its main street – Highway 9; and the Highway 17 Wildlife Undercrossing to improve safety for wildlife and motorists.
- **Highway Corridors** – Funding for three auxiliary lane projects on Highway 1 to improve traffic flow and reduce neighborhood cut through traffic (41st Ave to Soquel Dr, Bay/Porter to Park Ave, and Park Ave to State Park); two bicycle/pedestrian crossings; traveler information including real-time traffic
conditions and helping people join carpool; safety programs for Highway 17 and tow trucks to help remove obstacles, reduce congestion and collisions.

- **Mobility Access** – Specialized transit service for the area’s aging and disabled populations, including Santa Cruz METRO’s paratransit and Community Bridges Lift Line transportation service.
- **Coastal Rail Trail** – Funding to construct, operate and maintain the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail.
- **Rail Corridor** – Funding for property management, repair and maintenance of this transportation corridor for current and future uses (such as bike, pedestrian, rail and transit) including drainage improvements and vegetation/graffiti/trash control; environmental analysis of potential public transit uses; contribution toward Pajaro Valley train station that would connect residents to other parts of California; railroad crossing signals; and utility connections. (Note: No new rail service is included).

*Overall, the Transportation Improvement Plan is expected to fund $120 million in local street and road, safe routes to schools and neighborhood projects over 30 years.*

Since the RTC’s adoption of the Transportation Improvement Plan, many entities -- such as Visit Santa Cruz County, Friends of the Rail & Trail, Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce, Business Council and Ecology Action -- have adopted positions of support for the TRIP.

The RTC and other entities are interested in sharing information about the TRIP with as many groups, organizations, and individuals as possible. The Interagency Technical Advisory Committee’s (ITAC) outreach ideas are welcome and encouraged.

**RTC staff requests that the ITAC provide outreach ideas to help the community know more about the Transportation Improvement Plan.**

**SUMMARY**

The 2016 Transportation Improvement Plan (TRIP) provides a vision to improve, operate and maintain Santa Cruz County’s transportation network. The plan includes improvements to local streets and roads, bike lanes and sidewalks in addition to the Coastal Rail Trail, auxiliary lanes on Highway 1, transit, and safety projects. RTC staff seeks public outreach ideas from the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) for the Transportation Improvement Plan.

Attachment 1: Transportation Improvement Plan Fact Sheet
Overview

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Transportation Improvement Plan provides a vision to improve, operate and maintain Santa Cruz County’s transportation network. The 30-year plan will benefit all residents, as well as visitors, through a balanced mix of projects across transportation modes and geographic areas of Santa Cruz County.

The plan will provide traffic congestion relief; support and expand active transportation options; protect transportation for seniors, veterans and people with disabilities; preserve critical existing infrastructure; reduce reliance on Sacramento and Washington for transportation funds; and create jobs.

The Transportation Improvement Plan would be supported through a ½ cent sales tax, should voters approve a proposed ballot measure in November 2016. The plan has been approved by the RTC, as well as endorsed by local organizations such as Ecology Action and the Santa Cruz County Business Council.

Summary of Benefits

- **Local street repair**: Improved neighborhoods and increased safety for cyclists and pedestrians by repairing local streets and roads countywide.

- **New bridges for cyclists and pedestrians**: Cyclist- and pedestrian-only bridges to be built over Highway 1 at Chanticleer St. and Mar Vista Dr.

- **Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail**: Expansion of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail for cyclists and pedestrians along the coastal rail corridor in Watsonville, Santa Cruz and Capitola, and connecting to Monterey County.

- **Preservation of rail transit as a future option**: Holding open the option of transit in the future by maintaining the tracks in the coastal rail corridor and researching future technologies; the plan doesn’t include funding for any new rail service.

- **Improvements to Highways 1, 9 and 17**:
  - **HWY 1**: Traffic relief for South County and Mid-County commuters, small businesses, transit buses and first responders through the addition of auxiliary lanes.
  - **HWY 17**: Protection for wildlife by building an undercrossing at Laurel Curve and funding the Safe-on-17 Freeway Service Patrol.
  - **HWY 9**: Safety improvements in the San Lorenzo Valley.

- **Safety for kids**: New funding for Safe Routes to Schools.

- **Help for seniors, veterans and residents with disabilities**: Sustain an effective paratransit system.
## Summary of Proposed Investments

Transportation Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTMENT CATEGORY</th>
<th>Percent of Funds</th>
<th>Estimated Fund Allocation ($ millions)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Projects</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible neighborhood projects include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Street/Road - Maintenance and Repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Traffic Safety Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bike and Pedestrian Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Neighborhood Safety (reduce speeding and cut-through traffic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operational Improvements (signal timing, intersections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SLV/Highway 9 Corridor Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wildlife Undercrossing on Hwy 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Corridors</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 Auxiliary Lane projects: 41st Ave-Soquel Dr; Bay/Porter-Park; Park-State Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 Bicycle/Pedestrian over-crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safe on 17 Program and Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Access</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly/Disabled/Veterans Paratransit Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (Rail Trail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property Management, Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental analysis of rail transit options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Watsonville Junction/Pajaro Train Station (contribution)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduit for internet and/or utility lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Dollar amounts shown in millions reflect amount from a ½ cent sales tax generating an estimated $15M/year for 30 years; while percent per category would not change, actual amount generated by a local sales tax per year may fluctuate based on inflation and local retail sales.*
RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

Caltrans conducts the California Household Travel Survey (CHTS) every ten years to obtain detailed information about household socioeconomic characteristics and travel behaviors statewide. The most recent CHTS was performed in 2011-2012. Travel Demand Models use the household travel behavior data collected in the CHTS as a base to forecast future travel behavior and transportation system needs. The Statewide Travel Demand Model, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) Regional Travel Demand Model, and the Santa Cruz County Travel Demand Model (SCCModel) have all utilized this data for assessing travel behavior in the region of interest.

DISCUSSION

During development of the SCCModel, Fehr & Peers provided the 2011-2012 CHTS dataset to RTC staff that was weighted and expanded for the AMBAG region for greater ease of use and for providing origin and destination data. RTC staff has been analyzing this data set to determine travel behavior statistics for our county such as origin and destination, mode share, and travel length statistics (Attachment 1). Agencies interested in using the CHTS data for their own analysis, should contact Ginger Dykaar to coordinate a time to discuss details regarding this data.

RTC staff will provide information about the 2011-2012 California Household Travel Survey for Santa Cruz County at this meeting.

SUMMARY

Caltrans conducts the CHTS every ten years to identify travel behavior statewide. During development of the SCCModel, Fehr & Peers provided the weighted and expanded CHTS results for the AMBAG region including Santa Cruz County. This data set can provide origin and destination data, mode share data for all trips, trip length statistics and more.

Attachment 1: CHTS Statistics for Santa Cruz County
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2011-2012 California Household Travel Survey Results
Santa Cruz County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Santa Cruz County Mode Share*</th>
<th>Average Trip Length* (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Weighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ride</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Santa Cruz County Trip Lengths* (weighted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 miles or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 10 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes all trips with either origin OR destination in Santa Cruz County
### Count of tripwght-allwk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Amesti</th>
<th>Aptos Hills-Larkin Valley</th>
<th>Ben Lomond</th>
<th>Bonny Doon</th>
<th>Boulder Creek</th>
<th>Capitola</th>
<th>Day Valley</th>
<th>Felton</th>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>Interlake n</th>
<th>La Selva</th>
<th>Live Oak</th>
<th>Pleasure Point</th>
<th>Rio del Mar</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
<th>Scotts Valley</th>
<th>Seacliff</th>
<th>Soquel</th>
<th>Twin Lakes</th>
<th>Unincorporated Santa Cruz</th>
<th>Watsonville</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amesti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptos Hills-Larkin Valley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Lomond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonny Doon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlaken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Selva Beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Point</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio del Mar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacliff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Lakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Santa Cruz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Santa Cruz County**  
Origin and Destination Data from 2011-2012 California Household Travel Survey - All Week Travel RAW Person Trips
## Origin and Destination Data from 2011-2012 California Household Travel Survey - All Week Travel Weighted and Expanded Person Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Amesti</th>
<th>Aptos Hills-Larkin Valley</th>
<th>Ben Lomond</th>
<th>Bonny Doon</th>
<th>Boulder Creek</th>
<th>Capitola</th>
<th>Day Valley</th>
<th>Felton</th>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>Interlaken</th>
<th>La Selva Beach</th>
<th>Live Oak</th>
<th>Pleasure Point</th>
<th>Rio del Mar</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
<th>Scotts Valley</th>
<th>Seacliff</th>
<th>Soquel</th>
<th>Twin Lakes</th>
<th>Unincorporated Santa Cruz</th>
<th>Watsonville</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amesti</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2458</td>
<td></td>
<td>4479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Lomond</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonny Doon</td>
<td>4395</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>5376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Creek</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>6912</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>32680</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>6349</td>
<td>4779</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>8151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3302</td>
<td></td>
<td>69017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Valley</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felton</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5657</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>11397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlaken</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4508</td>
<td></td>
<td>6878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Selva Beach</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1258</td>
<td></td>
<td>7135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>6927</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9330</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>13168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td>43445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure Point</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio del Mar</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>3722</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10102</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4142</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>13529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>3421</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>238507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacliff</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td>3872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td>60845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Lakes</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Santa Cruz</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>5060</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>4608</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td>13657</td>
<td>15101</td>
<td>12509</td>
<td>14537</td>
<td>66955</td>
<td>4250</td>
<td>33480</td>
<td>3032</td>
<td>6892</td>
<td>7165</td>
<td>44237</td>
<td>12775</td>
<td>31033</td>
<td>237499</td>
<td>53779</td>
<td>4120</td>
<td>60204</td>
<td>14104</td>
<td>23109</td>
<td>71969</td>
<td>734860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)  
FROM: Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner  

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) receive information about the CA Strategic Highway Safety Plan 2015-2019 – Implementation Plan.

BACKGROUND

The Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) is a statewide, coordinated safety plan that provides a comprehensive framework for reducing highway fatalities and severe injuries on all public roads. It identifies key safety needs and guides investment decisions towards strategies and countermeasures with the highest potential to save lives and prevent injuries. In coordination with federal, state, local and private sector safety stakeholders, the SHSP establishes goals, objectives, and emphasis (or challenge) areas. It is data-driven and results are measured. The SHSP was updated in 2015. The SHSP Implementation Plan is a companion document to the SHSP.

DISCUSSION

A regional transportation safety summit was held at various locations throughout California over the last couple of months to discuss the SHSP Implementation Plan. The implementation plan identifies actions associated with each challenge area, and what agency or organization will lead the effort. The plan follows the 4E’s of safety – education, engineering, enforcement, and emergency services. Challenge areas related to engineering include: Intersections, Interchanges, and Other Roadway Access; Pedestrians; Bicycling; and Work Zones. The information in these plans are useful for determining best practices for reducing transportation-related fatalities and injuries – especially for bicyclists and pedestrians given the high number of bike and pedestrian collisions in Santa Cruz County.

RTC staff recommends that local agencies become familiar with the SHSP and the SHSP Implementation Plan and when submitting grant applications for safety related projects, refer to these plans and how your project will support the actions identified under the challenge areas.
The California local Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds local highway safety improvement projects. Caltrans plans to issue a call for projects for the next round of funds this month (April, 2016). There is approximately $150M available for this round and the maximum amount of funds per project is $10M. The grant applications are expected to be due in July, 2016.

**SUMMARY**

The CA Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) is a statewide, coordinated safety plan for reducing fatalities and severe injuries on CA roadways. The SHSP was updated in 2015 and the SHSP Implementation Plan is a companion document to the SHSP. The 2015 SHSP and SHSP Implementation Plan identify strategies and actions associated with challenge areas for improving safety. A call for projects will likely be issued from the local Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) in April 2016 for funding local highway safety improvement projects.
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Strategic Highway Safety Plan: 2015 Update

California’s Highway Safety Coalition launches second phase to further reduce roadway fatalities and severe injuries

What is the Strategic Highway Safety Plan?
The Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) is a statewide, coordinated safety plan that provides a comprehensive framework for reducing fatalities and severe injuries to motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists on all public roads. SHSP goals and objectives are data-driven and results are measured. Actions designed to achieve the objectives are developed by hundreds of safety stakeholders from the four E's of highway safety: engineering, education, enforcement and emergency medical services.

Why does the SHSP matter?
Traffic crashes impact drivers, passengers, cyclists, pedestrians, highway workers, emergency responders, and families who are left to cope when a loved one is killed or severely injured. The lives lost and severe injuries cause lasting pain, hardship, lost wages, and cost Californian's billions of dollars every year.

Who participates in the SHSP?
The time and expertise of more than 900 safety stakeholders from 170 public agencies and private organizations contributed to developing the strategic actions of California’s original SHSP. They include:
- Federal, State and Local Agencies
- Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
- Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advocates
- Emergency Medical Services
- Private Citizens
- Metropolitan Planning Organizations
- Tribal Governments
- First Responders
- Business Leaders

Results: Lives Saved, Injuries Prevented, Costs Reduced
Collision data show that a collaborative, government-led approach can save lives and reduce serious injuries:

In 2010, California’s traffic fatalities reached their lowest level since 1975, when the federal government began recording traffic fatalities.

Under California’s SHSP from 2006 to 2012:
Fatalities fell 30.4%, severe injuries fell 17.5%.

California achieved its goal of reducing the Mileage Death Rate below one death per every 100,000 vehicle miles traveled in 2009 and every year since.

Trend analysis suggests that nearly 3,000 fatalities did not occur, and nearly 9,000 severe injuries did not occur compared to the numbers expected if collision rates before the previous SHSP had continued.

The reduction in crash fatalities and severe injuries resulted in a total cost savings of more than $13 billion.

The Centers for Disease Control called the drop in traffic fatalities and injuries across the country as “one of the 10 major public health successes in the U.S.” during 2001-2010.
Moving Forward: An Updated SHSP

Our work is not done as long as people are still being killed and severe injuries are causing lasting pain and economic loss. Despite California's progress, nearly 3,000 people die and more than 10,000 are severely injured on our roadways each year. Traffic crashes cost California more than $22 billion every year – which equals $608 for each man, woman and child, according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

SHSP Update

California updated the SHSP in 2015 to create new solutions that continue reducing traffic-related fatalities and severe injuries. The updated SHSP is the result of extensive outreach, engagement, and strategy meetings with stakeholders, including individual presentations to more than 50 agencies and organizations, dozens of action planning meetings, a review of other state and regional transportation plans to determine alignment with the SHSP, two statewide summits with 400+ participants and six webinars on traffic safety.

The 2015 SHSP Update is guided by federal guidelines that capitalize on successes achieved to date and continue to create even greater improvements. It also addresses goals established by Congress and the President by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21).

What's New in the Updated SHSP:

- Increases the focus on reducing the number of severe injuries and the rate at which severe injuries occur in each 100 million vehicle miles travelled
- Measures the cost effectiveness of improvements
- Develops strategies and actions to address the more difficult problems:
  - Repeat DUI offenders
  - Breath test refusals
  - Drug-impaired driving
- Identifies the locations of fatalities and severe injuries
- Identifies areas with high-risk factors for potential crashes
- Includes tribal roads
- Creates improvements to rail-highway crossings
- Involves even more safety stakeholders from across the state
- Involves the public to create a culture of traffic safety
- Coordinates with other safety statewide plans, including California Transportation Plan, California Freight Plan and Highway Safety Plan
- Improves the speed of data results

Help Spread the Word and Save Lives

Help spread the word about the SHSP and save lives. The more people and organizations that are informed and involved in the SHSP, the more successful it will be. There is a need for more regional and local participation for maximum impact. Will you share this information with other safety organizations and stakeholders in your network?

Traffic safety is improved with involvement at all levels. SHSP leadership is actively seeking additional participants. There are opportunities to be a part of a Challenge Area team, which develops actions, manages implementation and tracks results. To volunteer, email: SHSP@dot.ca.gov.

SHSP Leadership

The lead SHSP agencies are: California Department of Transportation, California Office of Traffic Safety, California Highway Patrol, California Department of Public Health, California Department of Motor Vehicles, California Emergency Medical Services Authority, California Department of Alcohol Beverage Control, California State Association of Counties, and County Engineers Association of California.