Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s

BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Special Meeting

AGENDA

Monday, October 8, 2018

6:00 pm to 8:30 pm

RTC Office
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grace Voss</td>
<td>Janneke Strause</td>
<td>District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea Johnson</td>
<td>Casey Beyer</td>
<td>District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Scott</td>
<td>Will Menchine</td>
<td>District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>District 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Hyman</td>
<td>Theresia Rogerson</td>
<td>District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Moore</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Masoner</td>
<td>Jo Fleming</td>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Fontes</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Conlen, Chair</td>
<td>Kira Ticus</td>
<td>Ecology Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the Committee constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business.

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Announcements – RTC staff
4. Oral communications – members and public

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 September 10, 2018 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Approve staff recommendation for new Bicycle Advisory Committee nomination

8. Approve calendar of meetings for 2019

9. Approve City of Santa Cruz Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Requests

10. Accept summary of hazard reports

11. Accept correspondence from the Bicycle Advisory Committee to the County and the Cities of Capitola, Scotts Valley and Watsonville

REGULAR AGENDA

12. Background on the function and role of the Committee – Anais Schenk, RTC Transportation Planner

13. Unified Corridor Investment Study–Draft Step 2 Scenario Analysis - Ginger Dykaar and Grace Blakeslee, Senior Transportation Planners, RTC

14. Updates related to Committee functions – Committee members (oral updates)

15. Adjourn

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for December 10, 2018 from 6:00pm to 8:30pm at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Ave, 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) 460-3209 or email aschenk@sccrtc.org to subscribe.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission does not discriminate on the basis of disability and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs, or activities. This meeting location is an accessible facility. If you wish to attend this meeting and require special assistance in order to participate, please contact RTC staff at 460-3200 (CRS 800/735-2929) at least three working days in advance of this meeting to make arrangements. People with disabilities may request a copy of the agenda in an alternative format. As a courtesy to those person affected, Please attend the meeting smoke and scent-free.
SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/TRANSLATION SERVICES
Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de anticip 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.

TILE 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.
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1. Call to Order: Chair, Amelia Conlen called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
- Amelia Conlen, Bike-to-Work, Chair
- Grace Voss, District 1
- Janneke Strause, District 1 (Alt)
- Casey Beyer, District 2 (Alt.)
- Peter Scott, District 3
- Theresia Rogerson, District 5 (Alt.)
- Michael Moore, City of Capitola
- Kelly Bond, City of Santa Cruz
- Richard Masoner, City of Scotts Valley
- Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville
- Leo Jed, CTSC

**Unexcused Absences:**
- Shea Johnson, District 2
- Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
- Rick Hyman, District 5
- Jo Fleming, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)
- Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)
- Kira Ticus, Bike-to-Work (Alt.)

**Excused Absences:**
- Shea Johnson, District 2
- Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
- Rick Hyman, District 5
- Jo Fleming, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)
- Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)
- Kira Ticus, Bike-to-Work (Alt.)

**Vacancies:**
- District 4 – Voting and Alternate
- City of Santa Cruz – Alternate
- City of Capitola – Alternate
- City of Watsonville – Alternate

**Staff:**
- Anais Schenk, Transportation Planner
- Rachel Moriconi, Sr. Transportation Planner
- Brianna Goodman, Transportation Planner
- Tommy Travers, Transportation Planning Technician

**Guests:**
- Claire Fliesler, City of Santa Cruz
- Jesse Frey, Current eBikes
- Anna Kammer, nomination pending
- Patrick McDermott
- Matt Miller, Ecology Action
- Dimitry Struve, MBOSC
- Drew Rogers, Member of the public

3. Announcements – None
4. Oral communications – Janneke Strause announced that SafeTREC is developing a tool for the public to record accidents/incidents involving bicycles, and the RTC should consider incorporating it into its Hazard Report for tracking. Grace Voss announced that the Santa Cruz County Cycling Club held a very successful event that raised funds to provide grants for educational programs. Leo Jed discussed recent improvements to Branciforte Drive. Murray Fontes announced a number of recent outreach efforts that the City of Watsonville has been conducting for various projects including the Downtown Complete Streets program, the Safe Routes to School plan, a Draft Vision Zero Action Plan, the Freedom Blvd Plan Line Study. He also announced that the city applied for an Active Transportation Program grant for a pedestrian and bicycle freeway overcrossing at Pajaro Valley High School and other neighborhood improvements. Peter Scott announced that the Committee should consider requesting improved signage/markings along the East Cliff path in Pleasure Point. Theresia announced that the CTSC is working on a Vision Zero effort for all jurisdictions; having helped the City of Watsonville they are now discussing the possibility of a program with the City of Santa Cruz.

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – Replacement pages were provided for item 8: summary of Hazard Reports. The order of items 14 and 15 on the Regular Agenda were changed so that item 15 was before item 14.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A motion (Jed/Moore) was made to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with members Conlen, Voss, Beyer, Scott, Rogerson, Bond, Masoner, Jed, Moore and Fontes, voting in favor.

6. Approve draft minutes of the June 11, 2018 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Approve staff recommendation for new Bicycle Advisory Committee nominations

8. Accept summary of Hazard Reports

9. Accept correspondence from the public and Bicycle Advisory Committee member Peter Scott

10. Accept correspondence with the City of Scotts Valley on Green Hills/Glen Canyon Road Repaving Project

11. Information Only: RTC recent letters of support for grant applications


**REGULAR AGENDA**

13. Presentation on JUMP Bike Share – Claire Fliesler, Transportation Planner for the City of Santa Cruz provided background, usage statistics, average service response, and possible future changes/extension of the new bike share program. The Committee asked questions about youth, safety, parking and riding behavior, helmet usage, scooter share, and expansion into other jurisdictions. A motion was made (Jed/Bond)
directing staff to compose a letter requesting the county and other cities to implement bike share, preferably with JUMP for integration with Santa Cruz’s system. The motion passed unanimously with members Conlen, Voss, Beyer, Scott, Rogerson, Moore, Masoner, Fontes, Jed and Bond voting in favor.

15. Presentation on “Every Day is Bike to Work Day” program report – Matt Miller, Planner with Ecology Action provided information about the workplace bike challenge program, Cycle September. He demonstrated use of the web interface and reported participation statistics, including increased ridership of new cyclists. The Committee asked questions about the participating organizations and about integration with mobile apps.

14. Presentation on Ecology Action’s Safe Routes to School planning grants – Amelia Conlen, Planner with Ecology Action provided information about the youth education safety programs Bike Smart and Walk Smart, including participation rates and results. She also provided an update on the countywide Safe Routes to School planning effort for Watsonville and the unincorporated county, including the goals of the plans and a description of the process and upcoming public input events.

16. Update on Highway 9 / San Lorenzo Valley Corridor Plan – Brianna Goodman, RTC Transportation Planner provided an update on the San Lorenzo Valley Complete Streets Corridor Plan. Staff received high rates of public participation and they expect to complete the plan this year. She discussed grants, goals, and priority projects for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and safety improvements including access to schools. The Committee asked questions about bicycle infrastructure details and timelines.

17. Update on Senate Bill (SB) 1 / Proposition (Prop) 6 (oral report) – Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner discussed the county’s backlog of transportation repair needs and the funding of current and future projects being provided by SB1. She also described the funding programs that rely on SB1 funds. The Committee discussed public awareness of SB1 funding and Prop 6.

18. Update on Caltrans District 5 Bicycle Plan (oral report) – Anais Schenk, RTC Transportation Planner informed the Committee that Caltrans is developing a Bicycle Plan for each of the Districts in the state and that she has requested they come to the Committee for input.

19. Update on Bicycle Committee Orientation Day (oral report) – Anais Schenk, RTC Transportation Planner reported that she is planning an orientation session for Committee members to discuss the role of the committee.

20. Updates related to Committee functions – Theresia Rogerson discussed the design of a “bike box” in Scotts Valley. Kelly Bond raised the issue of the signage on Branciforte Drive. A motion was made (Scott/Voss) directing staff to compose a letter to the County of Santa Cruz requesting the replacement of “Share the Road” signs on Branciforte Drive with “Bikes May Use Full Lane” and to add sharrows. The motion passed unanimously with members Conlen, Voss, Rogerson, Moore, Bond, Fontes, and Scott voting in favor. Amelia Conlen stated that she and staff are considering proposing a change of the Committee’s regularly scheduled meeting time and/or day which would be discussed at the upcoming orientation session.
21. Adjourn – 8:25 pm

**NEXT MEETING:** The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for October 15, 2018 from 6:00pm to 8:30pm at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:
Tommy Travers, Transportation Planning Technician
AGENDA: October 8, 2018

TO: Bicycle Advisory Committee
FROM: Anais Schenk, Transportation Planner
RE: Bicycle Advisory Committee Pending New Member Nomination

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Advisory Committee:

1. Receive the following report regarding the nomination made by Commissioner Coffman-Gomez for the City of Watsonville alternate seat; and
2. Recommend to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approval of the nomination of Drew Rogers for the City of Watsonville alternate seat.

BACKGROUND

Representation on the RTC’s Bicycle Advisory Committee (Committee) corresponds to City and Supervisorial District seats on the RTC. Each Commissioner nominates individuals to represent their respective jurisdiction for Committee consideration and RTC approval. Two additional seats for Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition also exist. Appointments are made by the respective agency for these seats. Every seat on the Committee is a three-year term. In March 2018, new appointments were made for District 2 and reappointments were made for the City of Santa Cruz and Community Traffic Safety Coalition. In June 2018, Commissioners nominated individuals for the following seats: District 5 alternate, the City of Capitola primary, the City of Santa Cruz primary and the City of Scotts Valley primary and alternate. In August 2018 those nominations were approved by the RTC.

The Bicycle Advisory Committee’s description, role and membership are in the 2017 RTC Rules and Regulations available on the RTC website: https://sccrtc.org/meetings/bike-committee/.

DISCUSSION

The alternate seat for the City of Watsonville has been vacant for a number of years along with a number of other seats for south county representation. In March 2018 staff began an open recruitment process to fill vacancies on the Committee. The recruitment process has consisted of advertising on social media, our website, on the radio and at outreach events. Due to the large number of vacancies, appointments are being made on a rolling basis. Appointments for a number of vacancies have been made over the last six months. In September an application was received for the City of Watsonville alternate seat which was forwarded to Commissioner Coffman-Gomez. Commissioner Coffman-Gomez has nominated Andrew (Drew) Rogers to fill the District 4 primary-City of Watsonville alternate seat. Attachment 1 includes his application.
SUMMARY

There were a number of vacancies for south county on the RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee. Vacancies affect the ability of the Committee to provide equal geographic representation so that all the jurisdictions have an opportunity to weigh in on projects and programs that affect cyclists in Santa Cruz County. Applications have been received and nominations have been made for north and mid-county seats. Staff recommends the Committee consider this nomination for the City of Watsonville alternate seat and recommend to the RTC appointment of Drew Rogers.

Attachment:
   1. Application for pending Committee member nomination
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) Bicycle Advisory Committee

The Bicycle Advisory Committee consists of eleven seats: one for each city within Santa Cruz County, one for each of the county districts, one representing the Bike to Work program and one representing the Community Traffic Safety Coalition. Each of the seats has an alternate member appointed in the case that the primary member is unable to attend a meeting.

Meetings are currently held the second Monday of even numbered months at 6:00 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. Please refer to the Committee description and bylaws for more information: https://sccrtc.org/meetings/bike-committee/.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, we recommend reviewing the by-laws and attending a meeting to familiarize yourself with the committee process. After doing so please complete this application and email a scanned signed copy to aschenk@sccrtc.org or return a signed copy to the RTC office.

Name: Drew Rogers    Home address: [redacted]
Mailing address (if different): [redacted] Phone: (business/message/mobile) [redacted]
E-mail: rendez.drew@gmail.com

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: formerly 8 years (UCSC grad); just moved back 6/18 and bought a place, wahoo!

I am applying to represent the following vacant position (circle one):

City of Capitola - Alternate City of Santa Cruz - Alternate City of Watsonville - Alternate County District 4 - Alternate

I would consider a different position - either a different location or alternate versus primary (circle one): Yes / No

my picks: A)County 4 or B) Watsonville

Previous experience on a government commission or committee: (Please describe the committee/commission's purpose and your role.) No committee involvement per se.

I’ve worked on various bike projects as active volunteer for over two decades with San Francisco Bike Coalition, including years of service helping photo-document and drive Uhauls for BIKE TO WORK DAY to energy stations to drop off and set up at 5 am; mailings, deliveries, and canvassing by tandem bike; donated and sold various art pieces for bike festival fundraising; canvassed SF for various street plans and safety plans; worked on newsletters, suggested editing work, staff volunteer photographer for various reasons/meetings.

Other Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFBC</td>
<td>market street, Sa Francisco</td>
<td>volunteer; photogr.</td>
<td>1995-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Qualifications: Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

Certification: I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

Signature ___________________________ (John Andrew Rogers)

Return Application to:

Questions or Comments:
fax: (831) 460-3215 or email: aschenk@scrc.org
Contact Anais Schenk at (831) 460-3209 or by email at aschenk@scrc.org.

Though I haven’t sat on any boards, I have attended many meetings, fundraisers, and action-based events to know what it takes to see a project thru, despite the odds. I feel qualified to represent the SCCRTC as either County district 4 or Watsonville as an alternate on the Bicycle Advisory Committee for a few reasons: namely that my interest in promoting bicycle alternatives to cars and even buses send the message clearly to any community-town-city that the best way to stay healthy and connected is by rel-calming the roads with safety so that families and citizens can ride to their schools and work without fear of getting hurt (AND to promote a healthy lifestyle). As I mentioned before, I’m poly-lingual and not shy about speaking Spanish, even if it’s not perfect!

Also, in a city that is experiencing a significant surge in inhabitants—and cars—and just beginning to implement possible cycling infrastructures to balance the short trips, moving from car to bike for soccer practice, riding bikes home or to schools—or shopping within a mile of your house—are all very possible—all of which I already practice most every day for years. I’d like to spur that idea proposed by the current SCCRTC plans.

I use my car as infrequently as possible, so I walk or ride a bike for all errands. I still find it hard to get around the big streets without having to resort to riding on sidewalks—trucks intimidate me still, so I get why so many choose not to ride bikes. The upcoming outreach programs at the Middle and Elementary schools are really important.

Mapping Watsonville and District 4, they comprise both long two-lane roads in the agricultural areas as well as one-occupant truck-heavy suburban lanes that beg for more bikes for short trips.

My vision is to see that statistic diminish and bikes flourish here.

Thanks,
Drew Rogers

Cell: ___________________________
AGENDA: October 8, 2018

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Anais Schenk, Transportation Planner

RE: Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule for 2019

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Advisory Committee (Committee) approve the proposed 2019 meeting schedule.

BACKGROUND

Every year the Committee approves the schedule of meetings for the following year. Six meetings are currently scheduled.

DISCUSSION

RTC meetings are generally held on the second Monday of the month. Due to holidays, there is one meeting scheduled for a different time of the month as noted with an asterisk.

The proposed Committee meeting schedule for 2019 is as follows:

- February 11
- April 8
- June 10
- August 12
- October 7*
- December 9

All Committee meetings start at 6:00 p.m. and are held at the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission office, 1523 Pacific Avenue in Santa Cruz unless otherwise noticed. Agenda packets are posted on the RTC website https://sccrtc.org/meetings/bike-committee/agendas/ five days prior to the meeting.

Staff recommends that the Committee approve the proposed meeting schedule.
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**AGENDA:** October 8, 2018

**TO:** Bicycle Advisory Committee

**FROM:** Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner

**RE:** City of Santa Cruz Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Requests

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Advisory Committee:

1. Recommend to the Regional Transportation Commission approval of the City of Santa Cruz’s Article 8 FY 18/19 Transportation Development Act allocation claims for the following projects:
   - Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements ($40,000);
   - West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 3 ($200,000); and
   - San Lorenzo River Parkway Phase III/Trestle Trail ($200,000).

2. Recommend to the Regional Transportation Commission approval of the City’s request to return unspent funding to the unallocated balance including $43,688 from the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow Bike Lane and $2,522.59 from the Bike Parking Program.

---

**BACKGROUND**

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission allocates Article 8 Transportation Development Account (TDA) funds to local jurisdictions for bikeway and pedestrian projects. TDA funds allocated to a local jurisdiction may be rolled over from one fiscal year to the next. TDA claims with bicycle amenities must be reviewed by the Bicycle Advisory Committee and those with pedestrian components must be reviewed by Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee prior to approval by the Regional Transportation Commission.

**DISCUSSION**

The City of Santa Cruz submitted a letter (Attachment 1) requesting $40,000 for Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements, $200,000 for West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 3, and $200,000 for the San Lorenzo River Parkway Phase III/Trestle Trail. Annual re-striping of the City’s 30 miles of bikeways, maintenance and minor improvements in high use areas within the public right-of-way are supported with TDA funds. TDA claim forms (Attachment 2) were submitted, as per RTC requirements, for the three requests. Additionally, the City of Santa Cruz is requesting that the unspent balance of $43,688 from the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow Bike Lane project be returned to the unallocated budget, and that $2,522.59 from the Bike Parking Program also be returned to the unallocated budget.

The City’s Bikeway Striping request is higher than in years past due to the increase in the number of green bike lanes. The West Cliff Drive paving project will rehabilitate the section of the path between David Way and Swanton Blvd. The San Lorenzo River Parkway Phase...
The III/Trestle Trail project will replace the existing walkway with a 10-foot wide trail for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Staff recommends that the Bicycle Advisory Committee recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the City of Santa Cruz's allocation requests and request to return unspent balances, as identified above, to the unallocated fund. The projects are consistent with the City’s Active Transportation Plan and the RTC’s Regional Transportation Plan.

**SUMMARY**

The City of Santa Cruz is requesting a TDA Article 8 allocation for Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements ($40,000), West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 3 ($200,000), and the San Lorenzo River Parkway Phase III/Trestle Trail ($200,000). Additionally, the City of Santa Cruz is requesting that the unspent balance of $43,688 from the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow Bike Lane project be returned to the unallocated budget, and that $2,522.59 from the Bike Parking Program also be returned to the unallocated budget. Staff recommends that the Bicycle Advisory Committee recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the City of Santa Cruz's allocation and return of unspent balances requests.

**Attachments:**

1. City of Santa Cruz Article 8 TDA Allocation Request Letter for FY 18/19
2. TDA Claim Form for Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements
3. TDA Claim Form for West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 3
4. TDA Claim Form for San Lorenzo River Parkway Phase III/Trestle Trail Widening
September 28, 2018

Mr. George Dondoro
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: City of Santa Cruz – FY 2018-19 TDA Article 8 Allocation Request

Dear Mr. Dondoro:

Please accept this letter as a FY 2018-19 TDA Article 8 allocation request for the following projects:

1. **Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements ($40,000):** This project provides for the annual re-striping of the City’s 30 miles of bikeways, maintenance of bikeways and minor bikeway improvements. The higher allocation request (from previous years) results from the increasing number of green lanes. This project is entirely supported with TDA funds. The City’s pavement program also expends funds for bike lane striping through Measures H and D, and SB 1.

2. **West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 3 ($200,000):** This project provides for the rehabilitation of the path surface and edges between David Way and Swanton Blvd. TDA funds were allocated for the previously completed two phases and is the primary source of funding for the project.

3. **San Lorenzo River Parkway Phase III/Trestle Trail ($200,000):** This project replaces the narrow walkway on the San Lorenzo River Railroad Trestle with a 10-foot wide trail for pedestrians and bicyclists. This funding is in addition to the Measure D and State Natural Resource Agency funding and will assist with anticipated cost increases due to the current construction environment.
In addition, please return all allocated balances from the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow Bike Lane project as it is complete and $2,522.59 from the Bike Parking Program which is adequately funded. The City’s remaining unallocated balance will be used to match grant applications, under-funded projects, and future bikeway striping and parking projects.

As with all City claims, the City will commit to maintain any facilities provided with these funds for 20 years and will prepare all necessary environmental review for these projects. All of the projects above are consistent with the City’s Active Transportation Plan and the RTC’s Regional Transportation Plan.

Please call me at 420-5422 if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Christophe J. Schnetter
Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer

Attachments: Claim Forms
cc: Transportation Manager (JB)
     Finance Department (CF)
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Ped Projects

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

Project Information

1. Project Title: Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements
2. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz
3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant:
4. TDA funding requested this claim: $40,000
5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 2018/2019
6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims: Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility
7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Chris Schneider
   Telephone Number: 831-420-5422       E-mail: cschneider@cityofsantacruz.com
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): James Burr
   Telephone Number: 831-420-5426       E-mail: jbur@cityofsantacruz.com
8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks):

    Annual restriping and resigning of the City’s 30 plus miles of bikeways and minor bikeway improvements.

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program:

    Current bikeway and roadway users.

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

    Projects are citywide and as needed based on existing conditions and public requests.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community):

    Maintain transportation infrastructure, and to encourage traffic safety and safe bike use.

12. Consistency and relationship with the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy:
Project: SC-P75 Lump Sum Bike Projects
Plan Goal: 1A, 1Dii, 1F, 2A, 3B.

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:

Traffic safety and public comments.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed): NA

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule:

**Project Start Date: FY2018-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr) Completion Date /</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other *</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Requested (this claim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior TDA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in “Other”:

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

17. TDA Eligibility:

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

All Claims
   X  A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
   X  Resolution from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities. Previously submitted.

Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims
   X  Evidence of environmental review for capital projects
   Projects are exempt.

Local Agency Certification:

I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature  [Signature]  Title:  [Title]  Date:  10/1/18

This TDA Claim Form has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC's Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html).
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Ped Projects

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

**Project Information**

1. Project Title: West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 3
2. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz
3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant:
4. TDA funding requested this claim: $200,000
5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 2018/2019
6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims: Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility
7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Chris Schneiter, Assistant Director/City Engineer
   Telephone Number: 831-420-5422  E-mail: cschneiter@cityofsantacruz.com
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Joshua Spangrud, Senior Engineer
   Telephone Number: 831-420-5178  E-mail: js pangrud@ cityofsantacruz.com
8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks):
   Paving and minor widening of the multi-use path including repainting “Keep Right”.
9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program:
   The current path is heavily used, especially during the summer months. There are numerous complaints of insufficient width and poor pavement conditions for cyclists and pedestrians. Construction is planned to avoid the summer months.
10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):
    West Cliff Drive, between David Way and Swanton.
11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community):
    The repaved and slightly widened facility will allow safer and more convenient access for pedestrian
and cyclists. It is highly desirable to the community based on the input staff have received.

12. Consistency and relationship with the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy:

Project: SC-P83, City of Santa Cruz West Cliff Path Minor Widening
Plan Goals and Targets: 1A, 1C, 1Dii, 1F, 3B,

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:

Bike and pedestrian counts before and after project installation will be used to measure change in ridership. Interviews will measure acceptance of the new facility.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):

NA.

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule:

*Capital Projects – OR ATTACH PROJECT BUDGET*

**Project Start Date: September 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion Date /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in “Other”:

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

100% after completion
17. TDA Eligibility:

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

**Documentation to Include with Your Claim:**

**All Claims**

- X A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- X Resolution from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

**Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims**

- X Evidence of environmental review for capital projects: Exempt

---

**Local Agency Certification:**

I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature ___________________________ Title: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

This TDA Claim Form has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC's Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html).
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Ped Projects

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

Project Information

1. Project Title: San Lorenzo River Parkway Phase III/Trestle Trail Widening

2. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz

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

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $200,000

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 2018/2019

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims: Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Chris Schneiter, Assistant Director/City Engineer
   Telephone Number: 831-420-5422  E-mail: cschneiter@cityofsantacruz.com
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Joshua Spangrud, Senior Engineer
   Telephone Number: 831-420-5178  E-mail: jspangrud@cityofsantacruz.com

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks):

   Reconstruction of the San Lorenzo River Railroad Trestle walkway to increase the width from 4 feet to 10 feet and add new safety railing. The Eastern landing will be reconstructed to improve the transition to and from the new wider path.

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program:

   The current path is heavily used, especially during the summer months. There are numerous complaints of insufficient width and joint separation on portions of the wood deck that impact cyclists and pedestrians. Construction is planned to avoid the summer months.

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

    San Lorenzo River Railroad Trestle, between Beach and East Cliff.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community):
The widened facility will allow safer and more convenient access for pedestrian and cyclists. It is highly desirable to the community based on the input staff have received over the years and the support received during the environmental phase.

12. Consistency and relationship with the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy:

Project: TRL 8a, City of Santa Cruz SLR Bike/Ped Trail at RR Bridge
Plan Goals and Targets: 1A, 1Bi, 1Bii, 1C, 1Dii, 1F, 3B,

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:

Bike and pedestrian counts before and after project installation will be used to measure change in ridership. A new counter will be installed.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):

NA.

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule:

**Capital Projects – OR ATTACH PROJECT BUDGET**

**Project Start Date: November 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr) Completion Date /</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/ Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$TDA Requested (this claim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior TDA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 1: Measure D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 2: State Natural Resource Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in “Other”:

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

17. TDA Eligibility:

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

**Documentation to Include with Your Claim:**

**All Claims**
- X A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- X Resolution from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

**Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims**
- X Evidence of environmental review for capital projects: IS/MND

---

**Local Agency Certification:**

I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature: [Signature] Title: [Title] Date: 10/1/18

*This TDA Claim Form has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC's Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook ([http://www.dot.ca.gov/hr/MassTrans/State-TDA.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hr/MassTrans/State-TDA.html)).*
This page left blank intentionally.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Reported Hazards</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
<th>Forwarded To</th>
<th>Forwarded Date</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/19/18</td>
<td>Bonita Dr</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Bike: Debris on shoulder or bikeway</td>
<td>Someone dumped their kitchen cabinet and other debris on the shoulder of the road. The debris is on a curve of the road at the crest of the hill, and motorized traffic speeds in excess of 40mph. Although the route is along the Pacific Coast Bike Route, it has no bike lane nor any sharrow nor “Bikes May Use Full Lane” signage. The infrastructure is bad. And now cyclists must dodge roadside debris.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>09/20/18</td>
<td>9/24/18 Misty Dawn Scott: Good morning Peter. I am in receipt of your issue on Bonita Drive. I will be forwarding your report out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/18</td>
<td>731 Clubhouse Dr</td>
<td>Between Cuesta and St Andrews</td>
<td>Bike: Plant overgrowth or interference</td>
<td>Vegetation growing over the bike lane forces cyclists (and pedestrians) into the traffic lane. This would be on the south side of Clubhouse.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>09/07/18</td>
<td>9/7/18 Misty Dawn Scott: Good afternoon Todd, I am in receipt of your overgrowth issue on Clubhouse Drive. I will be forwarding your report out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/18</td>
<td>San Andreas Rd</td>
<td>Buena Vista Rd</td>
<td>Bike: Rough pavement or potholes</td>
<td>On northbound San Andreas just before the road to the dump there is a ledge pothole close to the right side of the roadway.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>09/07/18</td>
<td>9/7/18 Misty Dawn Scott: Good afternoon Harold, I am in receipt of your issue on San Andreas Road. I will be forwarding your report out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>310 Broadway</td>
<td>Between Roberts and Clay</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Bike: Debris on shoulder or bikeway</td>
<td>Jim Burr</td>
<td>9/6/18 (9/1-9/4 was a holiday weekend)</td>
<td>9/6/18 <a href="mailto:support@socialbicycles.com">support@socialbicycles.com</a>: Thank you for contacting JUMP. Your request (#63464) has been received and is being reviewed by our support staff. We will be getting back to you shortly. To add additional comments, reply to this email or click the link below: <a href="https://help.jumpbikes.com/hc/support/requests/63464">https://help.jumpbikes.com/hc/support/requests/63464</a> 9/6/18 Claire Fliesher: Thank you for your email. Santa Cruz Municipal Code section 10.68.050 outlines where you are allowed to park bicycles and other personal transportation devices (PTDs). If no bicycle racks are available within 50 feet, bicycles or PTDs may be locked on the sidewalk within 24 inches of the curb. This includes being able to lock to street signs and other similar assets. Bikes and PTDs may not be locked to street trees or others planted areas, and may not block the main traveled portion of the sidewalk. Please be considerate of others when locking bicycles and lock towards the outside edge of a sidewalk if possible. Relevant code sections are included below: 10.68.050 PARKING. No person shall park, stand, or chain any bicycle or PTD against windows, street trees, planter boxes, shrubs or planted areas, or on the main traveled portion of any sidewalk or public way, nor in such manner as to constitute a hazard to pedestrians, vehicular traffic, or property. If no bicycle racks or other facilities intended to be used for bicycle or PTD parking are available within 50 feet, bicycles or PTDs may be parked on the sidewalk and locked to a parking meter pole, in an upright position parallel to and within twenty-four inches of the street curb. (Ord. 2001-05 § 6, 2001: Ord. 76-15 § 1 (part), 1976). Best, Claire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/31/18</td>
<td>1116 King Street</td>
<td>Laurent St</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Jump Bike parked on sidewalk</td>
<td>Claire Fliesher, <a href="mailto:support@jumpbikes.com">support@jumpbikes.com</a></td>
<td>9/6/18 (9/1-9/4 was a holiday weekend)</td>
<td>9/6/18 <a href="mailto:support@socialbicycles.com">support@socialbicycles.com</a>: Thank you for contacting JUMP. Your request (#63464) has been received and is being reviewed by our support staff. We will be getting back to you shortly. To add additional comments, reply to this email or click the link below: <a href="https://help.jumpbikes.com/hc/support/requests/63464">https://help.jumpbikes.com/hc/support/requests/63464</a> 9/6/18 Claire Fliesher: Thank you for your email. Santa Cruz Municipal Code section 10.68.050 outlines where you are allowed to park bicycles and other personal transportation devices (PTDs). If no bicycle racks are available within 50 feet, bicycles or PTDs may be locked on the sidewalk within 24 inches of the curb. This includes being able to lock to street signs and other similar assets. Bikes and PTDs may not be locked to street trees or others planted areas, and may not block the main traveled portion of the sidewalk. Please be considerate of others when locking bicycles and lock towards the outside edge of a sidewalk if possible. Relevant code sections are included below: 10.68.050 PARKING. No person shall park, stand, or chain any bicycle or PTD against windows, street trees, planter boxes, shrubs or planted areas, or on the main traveled portion of any sidewalk or public way, nor in such manner as to constitute a hazard to pedestrians, vehicular traffic, or property. If no bicycle racks or other facilities intended to be used for bicycle or PTD parking are available within 50 feet, bicycles or PTDs may be parked on the sidewalk and locked to a parking meter pole, in an upright position parallel to and within twenty-four inches of the street curb. (Ord. 2001-05 § 6, 2001: Ord. 76-15 § 1 (part), 1976). Best, Claire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/29/18</td>
<td>404 Soquel Ave</td>
<td>Ocean St</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Bike: Rough pavement or potholes</td>
<td>Jim Burr</td>
<td>08/29/18</td>
<td>8/29/18 Jim Burr: This is now forwarded to the appropriate City crew for action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Reported Hazards</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>Forwarded To</td>
<td>Forwarded Date</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/18</td>
<td>11 San Andreas Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Bike: Debris in bike lane</td>
<td>San Andreas Road bike lane has multiple areas where sand and gravel has made the bike lane impassible. 3 locations: 1) southbound lane just past the bridge over a drainage of Struve Slough, 2) southbound at Beach Street intersection, 3) northbound lane just past KOA Campground</td>
<td>County DPW</td>
<td>08/29/18</td>
<td>8/31/18 Misty Dawn Scott: Good morning Peter, I am in receipt of your issues San Andreas Road. I will be forwarding your report out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/26/18</td>
<td>1401 Soquel Ave</td>
<td>Morrissey</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Bike: Debris in bike lane</td>
<td>Dark broken glass in bike lane right at traffic light going straight down Soquel ave.</td>
<td>Jim Burr</td>
<td>08/27/18</td>
<td>8/27/18 Jim Burr: The report has been forwarded to the correct City crew for work response. Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/23/18</td>
<td>Freedom Blvd</td>
<td>Corralitos Rd to Hames Rd</td>
<td>Corralitos</td>
<td>Bike: Debris in bike lane</td>
<td>The bike lane on Freedom Blvd. from Corralitos Rd. to Hames road needs clearing. There are parts completely blocked and a location where property owner has left his debris from arewood tree they trimmed blocking part of the lane. This is a major route for bikes to travel and is dangerous with the high speeds car drive. The bike has been this way for sometime and needs to be addressed.</td>
<td>County DPW</td>
<td>08/24/18</td>
<td>8/24/18 Misty Dawn Scott: Good afternoon Lindsey, I am in receipt of your issue on Freedom Blvd. I will be forwarding your report out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/18</td>
<td>7th Ave</td>
<td>East Cliff Dr</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Bike: bikeway not clearly marked</td>
<td>This is a reconstructed location. When they did the reconstruction they introduced an island between the car lane making a left and the traffic proceeding onto 7th. This made the bike lane narrower. The island forces cars to stay to the right squeezing into the bike lane. The new bike lane was recently striped and was painted smaller than it was before and it was made significantly smaller than the recommended width identified by the 2011 Santa Cruz County Bike plan. This bike path has been identified by the county as a Class II bikeway and should have a 5&quot; bike lane. Since this new construction I have had multiple incidents of cars driving into the bike lane while making their right hand turn. I was hit once. (Mirror slapped my handle bar). The bike lane coming up to the intersection (traveling west) was not entirely repainted, only the portion at the intersection. Either the lane needs to be widened or some protection afforded the bikers (e.g. those white flex posts). I commute daily on my bike and this is a daily hazard.</td>
<td>County DPW</td>
<td>08/16/18</td>
<td>8/16/18 Misty Dawn Scott: Good morning Bob, I am in receipt of your issues on East Cliff Drive. I will be forwarding your report of bike lane hazard to our Traffic Division and the divisions regarding the new construction of the Twin Lakes project of Public Works for their review and reply. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/18</td>
<td>Park Ave</td>
<td>Soquel Drive</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Bike: Rough pavement or potholes</td>
<td>There is a big hole in the bike lane at the right turn from Park Ave onto Soquel Drive. Would be easy to patch.</td>
<td>County DPW</td>
<td>08/13/18</td>
<td>8/13/18 Jana Vargas: Good afternoon, I am in receipt of your issue at 6000 Soquel Drive in Aptos. I will be forwarding your report out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/18</td>
<td>Park Ave</td>
<td>Highway 1 undercrossing</td>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>Bike: Rough pavement or potholes</td>
<td>The pavement around the drain grate takes up all the bike lane and is cracked, broken and uneven. This has the effect of pushing bikes into the travel lane to avoid the hazard at this tricky freeway under crossing and off-ramp intersection area.</td>
<td>Steve Jesberg</td>
<td>08/13/18</td>
<td>8/13/18 Steve Jesberg: The report has been forwarded to the correct City crew for work response. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/18</td>
<td>Eastbound / Southbound 498 Mt Hermon Rd</td>
<td>between Glen Canyon Road &amp; La Cuesta Dr</td>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Bike: Vegetation in bike lane</td>
<td>Short video of the brush growing into the bike lane. It's blocking signs, too. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yZCC7COG0Bs">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yZCC7COG0Bs</a></td>
<td>Trish McGrath, Frank Alvarez, Jessica Kahn</td>
<td>08/08/18</td>
<td>8/9/18 Jessica Kahn: Mr. Masoner, Our crew was able to go and trim back these areas this afternoon. Please let me know if any hazardous areas remain. Thanks, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Reported Hazards</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>Forwarded To</td>
<td>Forwarded Date</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/18</td>
<td>Smith Grade</td>
<td>Empire Grade</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Bike: Rough pavement or potholes</td>
<td>Large hole on Smith grade, heading towards empire grade, near the bottom of the hill on the big right hand turn. Could you at least Mark it as I couldn't see it and almost crashed when I hit it. I think it's less than a mile from empire grade, on Smith grade southbound.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>08/08/18</td>
<td>8/28/18 Misty Dawn Scott: Good morning Larry, I am in receipt of your issue on Smith Grade. I will be forwarding your report out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/18</td>
<td>Trout Gulch</td>
<td>Valencia St to Cathedral Dr</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Bike: Uneven pavement/potholes hazard for motorists and bicyclists</td>
<td>There are multiple sunken trenches in the paving on Trout Gulch Road, both on the vehicle lanes and bike lanes from utility work associated with the Aptos Village Project. There are steel plates in both the northbound and southbound bike lanes, elevated 2&quot;-3&quot; above the pavement grade, transitioned with loose asphaltic cold patch. There are no flashing barricades to alert night time cyclists of the hazards. The construction crew repaired the trench failures in May, 2018, but the work has failed again, creating hazardous conditions for bicyclists and motorists alike.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>08/05/18</td>
<td>8/6/18 Jana Vargas (DPW): Good morning, I am in receipt of your issue at 16–36 Airport Blvd, Watsonville. I will be forwarding your report to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/18</td>
<td>8140 Soquel Dr</td>
<td>Trout Gulch</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Bike: Construction hazard in bike lane</td>
<td>There is a portable work light trailer completely blocking the eastbound bike lane of Soquel Drive and a similar trailer partially blocks the westbound bike lane. There are no flashing lights to alert cyclists or motorists of the hazard. Cyclists must veer abruptly into the traffic lane to pass through the area. The portable light trailers are from construction work associated with the Aptos Village Project and planned Parade Street intersection at Soquel Drive. No work has been done making use of the lighting trailers for two weeks, but they remain on Soquel Drive, creating hazards for cyclists. Also, the drain grate at the Trout Gulch Road and Soquel Drive intersection is directly adjacent to the westbound bike lane edge and is recessed by 6&quot;-8&quot;, surrounded by loose baserock, and is without warning to cyclists regarding the hazard. Motorized vehicles regularly drive into the baserock and spin rocks into the bike lane adjacent.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>08/05/18</td>
<td>8/6/18 Jana Vargas (DPW): Good morning, I am in receipt of your issue at 16–36 Airport Blvd, Watsonville. I will be forwarding your report to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/18</td>
<td>16-36 Airport Blvd</td>
<td>Pajaro Lane to East Lake/152</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Bike: Debris in bike lane</td>
<td>Ag mud and stones on bike shoulder from Pajaro Ln to East Lake ave - South side. County road. 4th SUPT District</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>08/04/18</td>
<td>8/6/18 Jana Vargas (DPW): Good morning, I am in receipt of your issue at 16–36 Airport Blvd, Watsonville. I will be forwarding your report to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/15/18</td>
<td>4000 Freedom Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Debris on shoulder or bikeway</td>
<td>Westbound side of Freedom Blvd. A large pile of dirt is blocking the bike lane on an inside curve. The dirt has been there for 1.5 years. I would have thought that it would have been cleared when the dirt was softer after some rain. Now it will almost take dynamite to get the dirt out of this spot. On another note, thank you very much for the &quot;weed whacking&quot; on Freedom. Especially for clearing further back from the road and the overarching branches.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>07/16/18</td>
<td>07/16/18, Misty Dawn Scott, I am in receipt of your issue on Freedom Blvd. I will be forwarding your report out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/18</td>
<td>130 Peach Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Abandoned non-functional Jump bike</td>
<td>Who do I notify so the City can come recover &quot;Jump&quot; bike #00963? This afternoon I witnessed the residents of 106 Peach Terrace hauled this non-functional &quot;Jump&quot; bike out of their Unit and left it on the sidewalk outside 130 Peach Terrace. The display reads &quot;IN REPAIR&quot;.</td>
<td>Claire Fliesler</td>
<td>07/12/18</td>
<td>07/16/18, Claire Fliesler: All bikes are equipped with a GPS, so the vendor can find them in real time. Since the bike was marked &quot;repair&quot; the vendor knows to come collect it. This should happen within 24 hours. In the future, you can notify JUMP directly by sending an email to <a href="mailto:support@jumpnikes.com">support@jumpnikes.com</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Reported Hazards</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>Forwarded To</td>
<td>Forwarded Date</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/18</td>
<td>1849 Soquel Dr</td>
<td>exit of Garden Deli and Liquor</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Rough pavement or potholes</td>
<td>There is a large pothole at the exit of Garden Deli and Liquor parking lot that is causing a hazard for northbound bicycle traffic. 1849 Soquel Dr., Santa Cruz, CA 95066</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>07/12/18</td>
<td>07/10/18, Claire Fliesler: Thanks for taking the time to write in. We've been really excited to see the great use that JUMP bikes are getting, but as you've noted there have also been growing pains. For the most part, people are respectful and conscientious when finishing their rides and locking a bike, but there are times when this is not the case and people park blocking the walkway. We strive to minimize this as much as possible, and... it helps when people report this so that we can contact the last user and let them know how to park a bike in the future. After they are contacted, if they repeat this in the future, they will be assessed a $25 fine by JUMP. We are actively working to let people know how to best lock bikes, but if you see one that is parked incorrectly there's a quick and easy way to report bikes that are “free locked” (locked to themselves) or locked and blocking sidewalk access. The best way to report them is via email to <a href="mailto:support@jumpbikes.com">support@jumpbikes.com</a> and include the location, time, and bike number located on the back of the bike. That allows the team to locate the bikes and also to contact the last users and let them know the rules so that they can do it right in the future. The JUMP website and the City website both ask users to park bikes respectfully...If bikes are locked to a street sign or other object and NOT blocking access, our Muni Code allows that under section 10.68.050 and 10.68.060. This is important for use in areas that don't have bike parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/10/18</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Bricks Shares Cause</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Pedestrian Hazard and are not ADA Compliant</td>
<td>Our city sidewalks are no longer available for people in wheelchairs, for people pushing strollers and small children riding bikes. The sidewalks have been taken over by the Red Bikes. When a Red Bike is locked to a street sign, there is not enough room for passage for wheelchairs, strollers and children's bikes. The Red Bikes are heavy. Too heavy to try to move around and out of the way. At times, there are so many Red Bikes at one location on a sidewalk, not even a pedestrian can get by them. There is no room on the sidewalk. Are wheelchairs, strollers, small children on bikes, and pedestrians supposed to go into the street to continue on their way? If they don't feel safe in the street, are they supposed to turn around and go back? Did these bikes just appear, or did you vote yes to allow these Red Bikes in our city? Now that they are here and creating havoc on our sidewalks, what are you going to do about it? If you don't do something about this problem, you are saying to all of us you don't care about us. If you don't do something about this, you are saying that a company and its profits are more important to you than the citizens of this city.</td>
<td>Claire Fliesler</td>
<td>07/10/18</td>
<td>07/10/18, Claire Fliesler: Thanks for taking the time to write in. We've been really excited to see the great use that JUMP bikes are getting, but as you've noted there have also been growing pains. For the most part, people are respectful and conscientious when finishing their rides and locking a bike, but there are times when this is not the case and people park blocking the walkway. We strive to minimize this as much as possible, and... it helps when people report this so that we can contact the last user and let them know how to park a bike in the future. After they are contacted, if they repeat this in the future, they will be assessed a $25 fine by JUMP. We are actively working to let people know how to best lock bikes, but if you see one that is parked incorrectly there’s a quick and easy way to report bikes that are “free locked” (locked to themselves) or locked and blocking sidewalk access. The best way to report them is via email to <a href="mailto:support@jumpbikes.com">support@jumpbikes.com</a> and include the location, time, and bike number located on the back of the bike. That allows the team to locate the bikes and also to contact the last users and let them know the rules so that they can do it right in the future. The JUMP website and the City website both ask users to park bikes respectfully...If bikes are locked to a street sign or other object and NOT blocking access, our Muni Code allows that under section 10.68.050 and 10.68.060. This is important for use in areas that don't have bike parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/18</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>lighting problem, traffic signal</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>problem</td>
<td>Flashing school zone speeding signs. It is summer recess and they are still on. No wonder nobody pays attention to them. Actually, they are not necessary when students are in the school. Any way the signs could be controlled by the school office? That way the signs would only be operational when students are really present. Minor note: I do not need some of them to tell me that I am doing 17 MPH on my bike - I have a bike computer for that.</td>
<td>James Burr</td>
<td>07/12/18</td>
<td>07/09/18, Claire Fliesler: Thanks for taking the time to write in. We've been really excited to see the great use that JUMP bikes are getting, but as you've noted there have also been growing pains. For the most part, people are respectful and conscientious when finishing their rides and locking a bike, but there are times when this is not the case and people park blocking the walkway. We strive to minimize this as much as possible, and... it helps when people report this so that we can contact the last user and let them know how to park a bike in the future. After they are contacted, if they repeat this in the future, they will be assessed a $25 fine by JUMP. We are actively working to let people know how to best lock bikes, but if you see one that is parked incorrectly there’s a quick and easy way to report bikes that are “free locked” (locked to themselves) or locked and blocking sidewalk access. The best way to report them is via email to <a href="mailto:support@jumpbikes.com">support@jumpbikes.com</a> and include the location, time, and bike number located on the back of the bike. That allows the team to locate the bikes and also to contact the last users and let them know the rules so that they can do it right in the future. The JUMP website and the City website both ask users to park bikes respectfully...If bikes are locked to a street sign or other object and NOT blocking access, our Muni Code allows that under section 10.68.050 and 10.68.060. This is important for use in areas that don't have bike parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/18</td>
<td>Capitola, Santa Cruz,</td>
<td>Other; fog lines in inside curves</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>lines in inside curves. There are a number of places where the county has quit painting fog lines in inside curves because they just get worn off. Couple of examples are Valencia &amp; Trout Gulch and Freedom Blvd. For bicyclists the line at least give some indication where the cars should not go. Not great, but every little bit helps. Do NOT do what Capitola has done of Wharf Road and glued pylons to mark the bike lane on inside curves. Particularly north bound just past Woolsey Circle where bicycles are at speed going down hill. The city had to grind down the road edge and it is far from smooth. Also, street sweepers cannot clean the bike lane.</td>
<td>Fog lines in inside curves. There are a number of places where the county has quit painting fog lines in inside curves because they just get worn off. Couple of examples are Valencia &amp; Trout Gulch and Freedom Blvd. For bicyclists the line at least give some indication where the cars should not go. Not great, but every little bit helps. Do NOT do what Capitola has done of Wharf Road and glued pylons to mark the bike lane on inside curves. Particularly north bound just past Woolsey Circle where bicycles are at speed going down hill. The city had to grind down the road edge and it is far from smooth. Also, street sweepers cannot clean the bike lane.</td>
<td>DPW, Steve Jesberg</td>
<td>07/12/18</td>
<td>07/09/18, Claire Fliesler: Thanks for taking the time to write in. We've been really excited to see the great use that JUMP bikes are getting, but as you've noted there have also been growing pains. For the most part, people are respectful and conscientious when finishing their rides and locking a bike, but there are times when this is not the case and people park blocking the walkway. We strive to minimize this as much as possible, and... it helps when people report this so that we can contact the last user and let them know how to park a bike in the future. After they are contacted, if they repeat this in the future, they will be assessed a $25 fine by JUMP. We are actively working to let people know how to best lock bikes, but if you see one that is parked incorrectly there’s a quick and easy way to report bikes that are “free locked” (locked to themselves) or locked and blocking sidewalk access. The best way to report them is via email to <a href="mailto:support@jumpbikes.com">support@jumpbikes.com</a> and include the location, time, and bike number located on the back of the bike. That allows the team to locate the bikes and also to contact the last users and let them know the rules so that they can do it right in the future. The JUMP website and the City website both ask users to park bikes respectfully...If bikes are locked to a street sign or other object and NOT blocking access, our Muni Code allows that under section 10.68.050 and 10.68.060. This is important for use in areas that don't have bike parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Reported Hazards</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>Forwarded To</td>
<td>Forwarded Date</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/21/18</td>
<td>170 Bean Creek Rd</td>
<td>Christel Oaks</td>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Plant overgrowth or interference of Bean Creek and Cristel Oaks has shrubs that have overgrown the entirety of the bike lane on Bean Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scotts Valley Public Works</td>
<td>06/22/18</td>
<td>&quot;The City of Scotts Valley’s Maintenance Department removed the brush today, 6/22/18.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/18</td>
<td>9802 Soquel Drive</td>
<td>Jaunell Rd</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Plant overgrowth or interference, Vehicles or objects blocking sidewalk</td>
<td>Tree overgrown into bike lane</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>06/20/18</td>
<td>On 6/20/2018 DPW replied: I will forward this tour Road Crews and Encroachment Division for their review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/18</td>
<td>41st Ave</td>
<td>(outskirts)Capitola</td>
<td>Soquel</td>
<td>Turning Hazard</td>
<td>motor vehicle lane which allows Left and Through movements – plus the presence of an existing bicycle lane adjacent to the left &amp; through lane.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>06/12/18</td>
<td>On 6/13/2018 DPW replied: I am in receipt of your issue of glass in the McGregor Drive. I will be sending this out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue. Anais replied: Thank you for your thoughtful comments. This information will be forwarded to the Transportation/Traffic engineering division of Public Works for their reply. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/09/18</td>
<td>McGregor Drive</td>
<td>Perch</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Debris on Shoulder or bikeway</td>
<td>Broken glass in bike lane, northbound on McGregor Drive</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>06/11/18</td>
<td>On 6/13/2018 DPW replied: I am in receipt of your issue of glass in the McGregor Drive. I will be sending this out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue. Anais replied: Thank you for your thoughtful comments. This information will be forwarded to the Transportation/Traffic engineering division of Public Works for their reply. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/18</td>
<td>Freedom Blvd</td>
<td>Soquel</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Rough Pavements or Potholes</td>
<td>Freedom Boulevard Bike Lanes The bike lanes along both sides of Freedom Boulevard are overgrown and have eroded material restricting the lane of bike travel. These two hazards force cyclists into the busy roadway and create especially dangerous conditions for any night-time cyclists unfamiliar with the route.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>06/08/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Reported Hazards</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>Forwarded To</td>
<td>Forwarded Date</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/18</td>
<td>Trout Gulch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apos</td>
<td>Swenson crews have trenched into the roadway and the repairs are failing, leaving sunken surfaces at the trench cuts. There are also steel plates in this area of Trout Gulch Road that have little or no paving to transition to paving grade levels. This all makes for hazardous bicycling surfaces, and there are NO flashing light barricades to warn un-knowing cyclists of the hazards at night. Swenson has no encroachment permits with County Public Works for any of the work being done in the Aptos Village Project area public roadways, so any accidents or damages are the liability of the</td>
<td>Soquel Drive between Trout Gulch Road and Aptos Creek Road New trenching work by Santa Cruz Underground Paving (SCUP) in this area of Soquel Drive has created hazardous conditions for cyclists and pedestrians. Steel plates and loose paving material are in the bike lane and roadway without any flashing light barricades to warn night time riders of the hazards. Pedestrians in the area have been forced to walk along the railroad tracks since the end of March when the Aptos Village Project developers barricaded the legal thoroughfare connecting Trout Gulch Road to Aptos Creek Road that provided a safe pedestrian access route in the area. Soquel Drive has no sidewalks in the area for pedestrian travel. New Trout Gulch Road Intersection Railroad Crossing Sidewalk The new railroad crossing sidewalk at Trout Gulch and Soquel is hazardous for sight-impaired and people in self-propelled wheel chairs. There is a very wide gap between the metal rail and the sidewalk edge that is a trip hazard and will make mobility to the new inbound #71 Metro bus stop difficult to access. The access slope to the new bus stop is steep (5%) and there are no handrails or resting pads.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>06/08/18</td>
<td>On 6/8/2018 DPW Replied: Good afternoon Becky, I am in receipt of your issue on Trout Gulch Road. I will be sending this to Public Works Construction engineering division and Public Works Design engineering division for their reply. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/18</td>
<td>407 Fairmount Ave</td>
<td>407 Fairmount Ave</td>
<td>Morrissey</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Problem</td>
<td>Loop detector in bike lane isn’t working.</td>
<td>Jim Burr</td>
<td>06/06/18</td>
<td>Jburr reported said to report to CalTrans/ and VV reported it both online and by email to CalTrans Staff 6/7/2018 6/7/2018 CalTrans replied: Thank you for your inquiry. The engineer who oversees lights along our State Highways will look into whether this concern is within our right-of-way and will respond accordingly on 6/8/2018 Julie Biro at CalTrans replied: emails not captured in RTC correspondence log.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/18</td>
<td>600 Trout Gulch</td>
<td>Quail</td>
<td>Apos</td>
<td>Debris in bike path</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>06/05/18</td>
<td>On 06/05/18 DPW replied: I am in receipt of your issues for the bike lane on Trout Gulch Road. I will be forwarding your report to out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/04/18</td>
<td>169 Capitola Rd</td>
<td>Harbor View Ct.</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Rough pavement or Potholes</td>
<td>Water gathers in a low spot and the concrete is getting really bad. There’s a hole developing and lots of cracks that are getting deeper.</td>
<td>DPW/Jburr</td>
<td>06/05/18</td>
<td>On 06/05/18 DPW replied: I am in receipt of your issues for the bike lane on Capitola Road. I will be forwarding your report to out to our Brommer maintenance yard Thank you for taking the time to report this issue. And JBURR replied: with this email, I am forwarding your report to the appropriate City crew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/18</td>
<td>636 Bonita Drive</td>
<td>Freedom Blvd</td>
<td>Apos</td>
<td>Rough pavement or potholes</td>
<td>Large pothole that swallows a bicycle tire. This is especially dangerous because it is on a downhill, and just beyond a speed bump that impairs visibility. The speed bump also has poor visibility, as the white markings are faded.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>06/04/18</td>
<td>On 06/04/18 DPW replied:I am in receipt of your issues for the bike lane on Bonita Drive. I will be forwarding your report to out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/31/18</td>
<td>Bay St Escalona Drive</td>
<td>Bay St Escalona Drive</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Plant overgrowth or interference</td>
<td>Tons of overgrown plants in the bike lane on Bay St. going south in the area north of Escalona Dr. Interferes with using the full extent of the lane (to a pretty extreme degree).</td>
<td>Jim Burr</td>
<td>06/01/18</td>
<td>6/1/2018 Jim Burr Replied: Tom, With this email I am notifying the appropriate staff to correct this issue. Thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Reported Hazards</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>Forwarded To</td>
<td>Forwarded Date</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/31/18</td>
<td>Ocean Street</td>
<td>Hwy 1</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Rough pavement or potholes, Hazardous drain grate</td>
<td>There are two hazards in the bike lanes on Ocean Street around the junction with Highway 1 (and to be frank, the whole area feels very dangerous as a bicyclist) In the southbound lane, there is a depression/pothole in the street directly in the path of the bike lane in front of the offramp. Frequently it requires swerving into the traffic lane to avoid, because cars creep around the corner from the offramp. In the northbound lane in between the two overpasses, there is a hazardous drain grate in the bike lane. The paved part of the bike lane is already extremely narrow, but I have had a number of close calls with this drain gate. Truthfully, this entire stretch of Ocean feels pretty dangerous. (Finally, there is a trash can that is in the bike lane ALL THE TIME on the northbound side. Is this an appropriate place to report it? I have a few places where this is a habitual issue...)</td>
<td>Jim Burr</td>
<td>06/01/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/31/18</td>
<td>Freedom Blvd and Hwy 1</td>
<td>Hwy 1</td>
<td>Freedom/Watsonville</td>
<td>&quot;other&quot;</td>
<td>This intersection was designed in the late 1960's and built in the early 1970's when bicycling wasn't even a consideration. So Freedom Blvd was constructed as wide as Highway 1 and the on-ramps to Highway 1 were constructed to allow motor vehicles to easily access the highway with minimal reduction in speed with a wide and sweeping curve to the on-ramp. The Caltrans Safe Intersections Guidelines now suggests that such intersections be made a sharp right angles to induce reduction in motor vehicle speed. The problem that I am reporting is that the &quot;green lane&quot; is nearly 180 feet long as it passes the conspicuously wide freeway on-ramp. The &quot;green lane&quot; is on a uphill slope (which can't be helped) that slow the forward progress of cyclists. And all cyclists using the Pacific Coast Bike Route must cross this area. Freedom Blvd is posted 45mph and the motor vehicles don't reduce their speed when a cyclists is in the bike lane. The Freedom Blvd roadbed has a excessively wide paved area on the right hand side marked with white to indicated to motorists that the area is NOT a lane. Motorists, upon seeing a cyclists laboring uphill in the &quot;green lane&quot; will simply drive into the right hand paved area to continue onto the on-ramp so they won't have to reduce speed or wait for the cyclists to clear the access to the on-ramp. For cyclists, this creates the unnerving experience of cars passing at 45mph on the left to get to the on-ramp AND cars passing at 45mph to the right to get to the on-ramp. The wide paved area to the right of the motor vehicle lane that currently only has white paint to deter this driving behavior needs to have additional deterrents, such as white bots or the pavement grinding to alert the motorists that it is not part of the motor vehicle lane. Better yet, the freeway should have been constructed using the criteria of the Caltrans Safe Intersection guidelines booklet.</td>
<td>CalTrans &amp;DPW</td>
<td>05/31/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/29/18</td>
<td>Highland Avenue</td>
<td>High St</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Plant Overgrowth</td>
<td>): Location Concrete stairs and path leading from Highland Avenue, Santa Cruz 95060 (before the switch back) to Highland Avenue after the road switch back. Many walkers and bikers use this path which has been there for over 40 years. The neighbors next to the path DO NOT keep rose bushes, trees, and other plants from growing over the path.</td>
<td>Jim Burr</td>
<td>05/29/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Hazard Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Reported Hazards</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
<th>Forwarded To</th>
<th>Forwarded Date</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/25/18</td>
<td>Soquel Drive</td>
<td>Trout Gulch</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Debris on shoulder or bikeway, Bikeway not clearly marked</td>
<td>The storms that famously caused the collapse of Trout Gulch Road at Valencia Creek and other storm related havoc around Santa Cruz County in 2016-2017 also caused the hillside adjacent to the bend in the road of Soquel Drive to partially collapse into the bike lane and eastbound traffic lane of Soquel Drive. Public Works cleared the eastbound motorized traffic lane within weeks of the storms and placed a series of traffic warning sawhorses in the bike lane on this bend in the road. As weeks turned to months, the traffic sawhorses got hit and destroyed by motorized traffic and Public Works eventually removed their mangled twisted wood and metal remains. The bike lane remained obstructed with dirt and vegetation from the hillside as Public Works was too busy with whatever else they felt was more urgent than the safety of bicyclist using this area of roadway. Another year has passed and the painted white line that delineated the motorized traffic from the bike lane became more and more obscured as motorists would curve around this bend in the roadway. Eventually the white line that delineated the bike lane was a mere shadow. This month Public Works was on the scene!!! They meticulously repainted the white line that delineated the bike lane from the area east of the railroad trestle over-crossing of Soquel Drive just east of Aptos Village all the way to this bend in the roadway. At the bend of the road itself, they painted NOTHING AT ALL. The result is that the bike lane ends just before this blind curve, and commences again about 75 yards again to the east where Soquel Drive straightens-out again. So, as currently exists, there is no bike lane, no sign that the bike lane ends, no sharrows, no “share the road” signage. The motorized traffic rarely travels the posted 25mph speed limit as it zooms around this blind curve . . . . and sometimes suddenly comes-up upon a bicyclist.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>05/25/18</td>
<td>5/31/2018 AS: Thank you for submitting a hazard report and bringing this issue to our attention. County Public Works will respond as well, however I wanted to address your questions at the end of the report. The primary purpose of the Bicycle Advisory Committee is to advise the RTC on bicycle projects, programs and plans. While it is not their primary function on the committee, when advisory members see major maintenance issues that have already been reported to the jurisdiction but remain unaddressed then they may bring it to the committee’s attention, particularly if the maintenance issue is affecting the basic function of a bicycle facility. As with any issue that is within the purview of another jurisdiction or agency we like to offer that agency or jurisdiction an opportunity to address the issue. We will track this report accordingly. I suggest that you also submit hazard reports for the other issues that you raised with Casey in order to provide county an opportunity to address those as well. 5/31/2018 DPW wrote: I am in receipt of your issues for the bike lane on Soquel Drive. I will be forwarding your report to out to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999 and our Road Operations division of Public Works for their review and reply. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/25/18</td>
<td>1100 Green Hills Rd</td>
<td>Falcon Ridge Rd</td>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Potholes</td>
<td></td>
<td>DPW/Scotts Valley</td>
<td>05/25/18</td>
<td>5/15/2018 DPW replied: I am in receipt of your traffic signal issue at Dominican Hospital and Soquel Drive. I will be forwarding your request to Road Traffic / Transportation engineers for their attention and reply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/13/18</td>
<td>Hospital Dr</td>
<td>Soquel Drive</td>
<td>Soquel</td>
<td>Traffic Signal problem</td>
<td>the traffic signal at the exit of Dominican Hospital to travel onto Soquel Ave, does not change for bicycles. I reported this problem almost 2 years ago, and it has not been fixed yet.</td>
<td>County DPW</td>
<td>05/14/18</td>
<td>5/15/2018 DPW replied: I am in receipt of your issue of broken glass in the bikeway at 4343 Soquel Drive. I will be forwarding your request for work to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/18</td>
<td>4343 Soquel Ave</td>
<td>Soquel</td>
<td>Debris on shoulder or bikeway</td>
<td>Small pieces of broken glass in bike lane</td>
<td>County DPW</td>
<td>05/14/18</td>
<td>5/15/2018 DPW replied: I am in receipt of your issue of broken glass in the bikeway at 4343 Soquel Drive. I will be forwarding your request for work to our Brommer maintenance yard (831) 477-3999. Thank you for taking the time to report this issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/07/18</td>
<td>Soquel Ave</td>
<td>Trout Gulch</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Debris on shoulder</td>
<td>The Aptos Village project appears to be creating a lot of debris along Trout Gulch and Soquel. The Contractor should clear the bike land/ shoulder of debris weekly at minimum as part of BMPs. In addition, a lot of debris (glass, gravel, etc.) has built up along Soquel Drive along entire north bound commute length (Aptos to Santa Cruz) and needs to be street swept, the traffic signal at the exit of Dominican Hospital to travel onto Soquel Ave, does not change for bicycles. I reported this problem almost 2 years ago, and it has not been fixed yet.</td>
<td>County DPW</td>
<td>05/07/18</td>
<td>5/7/2018 DPW replied: I am in receipt of your issue debris at Trout Gulch part of the Aptos Village Improvements Project. I will be forwarding this request to our Construction division and Design division engineers of Public Works . I will also be forwarding your request for sweeping the bike lanes on Soquel Drive to our Brommer maintenance yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/04/18</td>
<td>Bean Creek Rd</td>
<td>Soquel Valley Drive</td>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>overgrowth or interference, bikeway not clearly marked</td>
<td>Bushes are overgrown into the entirety of the bike lane forcing bikes into a 30mph lane of traffic while pedaling uphill.</td>
<td>Scotts Valley Public Works</td>
<td>05/07/18</td>
<td>5/7/2018 DPW replied: I am in receipt of your issue debris at Trout Gulch part of the Aptos Village Improvements Project. I will be forwarding this request to our Construction division and Design division engineers of Public Works . I will also be forwarding your request for sweeping the bike lanes on Soquel Drive to our Brommer maintenance yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Reported Hazards</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>Forwarded To</td>
<td>Forwarded Date</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/04/18</td>
<td>Scotts Valley Drive</td>
<td>Bean Creek</td>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Debris on shoulder</td>
<td>The bike lanes on Scotts valley drive are covered with gravel, broken glass, and construction detritus. The construction companies do a very poor job of cleaning up their mess and creates a constant flat tire hazard</td>
<td>Scotts Valley Public Works</td>
<td>05/07/18</td>
<td>5/7/2018: Jessica Kahn stated: Mr. Cramer, Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The street sweeper is being scheduled this week for service the entirety of Scotts Valley Drive. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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September 19, 2018

Matt Machado  
County of Santa Cruz  
Director of Public Works  
701 Ocean Street, Room 410  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Mr. Machado:

The Bicycle Advisory Committee of the Regional Transportation Commission would like to express its support for a countywide bikeshare system. In the City of Santa Cruz there has been fast and enthusiastic adoption of the system. In June alone over 33,000 miles were logged on JUMP bikes and there were almost 6 trips made on each bike per day in the city.

Electrified bikeshare makes the otherwise challenging topography of Santa Cruz County a nonissue for new bicycle riders and removes a common hurdle to bicycling that people experience here locally. Bikeshare also eliminates concerns about bike theft and removes responsibility for bike repair, maintenance and storage from the user. JUMP bikes have the potential to get people who would otherwise not bike to work or school to use a bikeshare system and allows visitors to use bikes for short trips that would otherwise be taken by car. We have seen anecdotal evidence of a desire for JUMP bikes in other parts of the county as evidenced by bikes parked as far south as Aptos and as far north as Scotts Valley.

While there have been some concerns regarding safety there have been no reported incidents in all of the JUMP bikeshare system. JUMP has been very responsive to concerns and issues that do arise with an average response time of 4 hours. JUMP also actively discourages users from blocking sidewalks with parked bikes. When an issue is reported, they will give the user a warning and eventually cancel their membership if the problem persists.

We believe that communities throughout Santa Cruz County would realize health, access and mobility benefits from a countywide bikeshare system, and that cyclists countywide would benefit from the increased visibility and popularity of bicycling. We urge you to work with the City of Santa Cruz and the Regional Transportation Commission to implement, support and promote a countywide bikeshare system.

Sincerely,

Amelia Conlen  
Chair, Bicycle Advisory Committee

cc:  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
September 19, 2018

Steve Jesberg  
City of Capitola  
Public Works Director  
420 Capitola Ave  
Capitola, CA 95010

Dear Mr. Jesberg:

The Bicycle Advisory Committee of the Regional Transportation Commission would like to express its support for a countywide bikeshare system. In the City of Santa Cruz there has been fast and enthusiastic adoption of the system. In June alone over 33,000 miles were logged on JUMP bikes and there were almost 6 trips made on each bike per day in the city.

Electrified bikeshare makes the otherwise challenging topography of Santa Cruz County a nonissue for new bicycle riders and removes a common hurdle to bicycling that people experience here locally. Bikeshare also eliminates concerns about bike theft and removes responsibility for bike repair, maintenance and storage from the user. JUMP bikes have the potential to get people who would otherwise not bike to work or school to use a bikeshare system and allows visitors to use bikes for short trips that would otherwise be taken by car. We have seen anecdotal evidence of a desire for JUMP bikes in other parts of the county as evidenced by bikes parked as far south as Aptos and as far north as Scotts Valley.

While there have been some concerns regarding safety there have been no reported incidents in all of the JUMP bikeshare system. JUMP has been very responsive to concerns and issues that do arise with an average response time of 4 hours. JUMP also actively discourages users from blocking sidewalks with parked bikes. When an issue is reported, they will give the user a warning and eventually cancel their membership if the problem persists.

We believe that communities throughout Santa Cruz County would realize health, access and mobility benefits from a countywide bikeshare system, and that cyclists countywide would benefit from the increased visibility and popularity of bicycling. We urge you to work with the City of Santa Cruz and the Regional Transportation Commission to implement, support and promote a countywide bikeshare system.

Sincerely,

Amelia Conlen  
Chair, Bicycle Advisory Committee

cc:  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
September 19, 2018

Steve Hammack
City of Scotts Valley
Interim Public Works Director
701 Lundy Lane
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

Dear Mr. Hammack:

The Bicycle Advisory Committee of the Regional Transportation Commission would like to express its support for a countywide bikeshare system. In the City of Santa Cruz there has been fast and enthusiastic adoption of the system. In June alone over 33,000 miles were logged on JUMP bikes and there were almost 6 trips made on each bike per day in the city.

Electrified bikeshare makes the otherwise challenging topography of Santa Cruz County a nonissue for new bicycle riders and removes a common hurdle to bicycling that people experience here locally. Bikeshare also eliminates concerns about bike theft and removes responsibility for bike repair, maintenance and storage from the user. JUMP bikes have the potential to get people who would otherwise not bike to work or school to use a bikeshare system and allows visitors to use bikes for short trips that would otherwise be taken by car. We have seen anecdotal evidence of a desire for JUMP bikes in other parts of the county as evidenced by bikes parked as far south as Aptos and as far north as Scotts Valley.

While there have been some concerns regarding safety there have been no reported incidents in all of the JUMP bikeshare system. JUMP has been very responsive to concerns and issues that do arise with an average response time of 4 hours. JUMP also actively discourages users from blocking sidewalks with parked bikes. When an issue is reported, they will give the user a warning and eventually cancel their membership if the problem persists.

We believe that communities throughout Santa Cruz County would realize health, access and mobility benefits from a countywide bikeshare system, and that cyclists countywide would benefit from the increased visibility and popularity of bicycling. We urge you to work with the City of Santa Cruz and the Regional Transportation Commission to implement, support and promote a countywide bikeshare system.

Sincerely,

Amelia Conlen
Chair, Bicycle Advisory Committee

cc:
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
September 19, 2018

Steve Palmisano
City of Watsonville
Director of Public Works and Utilities
250 Main Street
Watsonville, CA 95076

Dear Mr. Palmisano:

The Bicycle Advisory Committee of the Regional Transportation Commission would like to express its support for a countywide bikeshare system. In the City of Santa Cruz there has been fast and enthusiastic adoption of the system. In June alone over 33,000 miles were logged on JUMP bikes and there were almost 6 trips made on each bike per day in the city.

Electrified bikeshare makes the otherwise challenging topography of Santa Cruz County a nonissue for new bicycle riders and removes a common hurdle to bicycling that people experience here locally. Bikeshare also eliminates concerns about bike theft and removes responsibility for bike repair, maintenance and storage from the user. JUMP bikes have the potential to get people who would otherwise not bike to work or school to use a bikeshare system and allows visitors to use bikes for short trips that would otherwise be taken by car. We have seen anecdotal evidence of a desire for JUMP bikes in other parts of the county as evidenced by bikes parked as far south as Aptos and as far north as Scotts Valley.

While there have been some concerns regarding safety there have been no reported incidents in all of the JUMP bikeshare system. JUMP has been very responsive to concerns and issues that do arise with an average response time of 4 hours. JUMP also actively discourages users from blocking sidewalks with parked bikes. When an issue is reported, they will give the user a warning and eventually cancel their membership if the problem persists.

We believe that communities throughout Santa Cruz County would realize health, access and mobility benefits from a countywide bikeshare system, and that cyclists countywide would benefit from the increased visibility and popularity of bicycling. We urge you to work with the City of Santa Cruz and the Regional Transportation Commission to implement, support and promote a countywide bikeshare system.

Sincerely,

Amelia Conlen
Chair, Bicycle Advisory Committee

cc:
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
CREATION OF COMMITTEES

As needs arise, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (Commission) can establish working Committees to serve as advisory bodies to the Commission for any designated length of time. Such Committees will adopt the bylaws below, as approved by the Commission, for rules and procedures.

PURPOSES, POWERS AND DUTIES

A separate attachment describing the purpose, membership, quorum and meeting frequency and location of each authorized Committee is included with these bylaws.

MEMBERSHIP

The Commission shall designate the number of members and affiliations to serve on each Committee at the Commission's pleasure. Committees may include Commissioners and non-Commission members, representatives from other agencies and jurisdictions, and members of the general public as deemed appropriate by the Commission, state statute, or local ordinance. For each committee, an individual may be appointed to one membership seat only, as either member or alternate.

APPOINTMENTS

Commissioner appointments to Committees with RTC board member membership are made by the Commission Chair with the concurrence of the Commission. The Chair shall ensure fair Committee representation by the entities represented on the Commission itself. Non-Commissioner appointments to agency membership slots for Committees are made by the represented agency. Each represented agency shall inform the Commission in writing of its appointment. Appointments of members of the general public to Committees are made by the Commission based on an open application process. Each of the cities and each member of the Board of Supervisors are encouraged to nominate members to the Bicycle Advisory Committee and the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee. The nominations are limited to representation for the appointing entity’s jurisdiction. The nominations will be considered along with any other applications for the seats to be filled. Current membership lists shall be maintained by the Commission's Executive Director.

Commissioner appointments to committees shall be made annually at the March Commission meeting by the Chair with concurrence of the Commission. When a Commissioner vacancy on a Committee is created, the Commission Chair shall make an interim appointment with concurrence of the Commission at the next meeting.
ALTERNATES

Commissioners' designated alternates shall serve as their alternates on Committees. Alternates for non-Commissioner committee member seats shall be appointed in the same manner as appointments to the corresponding regular membership slot.

VACANCIES

A vacancy may be created when an appointed member of the Committee misses three consecutive regular meetings without good cause so entered in the minutes. A vacancy shall be created when due to death, disability, or extenuating circumstances, an appointed member can no longer carry out responsibilities; when an appointed member resigns as a Committee member; or when a Commissioner appointed to a Committee resigns from the Commission. Vacancies are to be filled in the same manner as the original appointments were made.

Commission staff shall notify Committee members when they have missed two consecutive meetings without good cause so entered in the minutes, in order to inform them of the potential creation of a vacancy.

For membership slots filled by members of the public, Commission staff shall advertise the opening on the Commission website and in other manners as to notify the public of the membership opportunity.

The membership structure, including alternates and ex-officio members, of each Committee is included as separate attachments to these bylaws.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ATTENDANCE RESPONSIBILITIES

A Committee Member on a given Committee shall be responsible for contacting his or her Alternate in the event the Committee Member cannot attend a scheduled meeting.

A Committee Member or Alternate on a given Committee shall be responsible for notifying staff 24 hours prior to the meeting that the Alternate will be serving as the representative to that Committee on behalf of the Committee Member or that neither the member nor alternate will be in attendance.

Should a Committee Member comply with the above (contacting the Alternate and notifying staff), in the event the Alternate does not attend the meeting, it will be noted in the minutes that the Committee Member is excused.

Should a Committee Member fail to notify staff that his or her Alternate will be serving as the representative to the Committee, and should the Alternate not be in attendance at the meeting, the Committee Member shall be entered in the minutes as absent without cause and subject to the Vacancies requirement.
ALTERNATES ATTENDANCE RESPONSIBILITIES

An Alternate shall be required to attend Committee meetings only in the event that his or her Committee Member is unable to attend; however, the Alternate may attend and may participate as a member of the public (but may not vote) at Committee meetings even if the Committee Member is present.

TERMS OF OFFICE

Commissioners appointed to Committees shall serve a term of one year, and continue to serve until a new appointment is made. Non-Commissioner members of Committees shall serve three year terms. Alternates shall serve a term that coincides with the term of the committee member for whom they are an alternate. Terms of office for all Committee members are renewable by the Commission. At its discretion the Commission may review and change Committee appointments at any time.

OFFICERS

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

COMMITTEE STAFF

The Executive Director of the Commission shall appoint a staff member to serve as the primary staff to each Committee.

ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES

a) Meetings. Committee meetings are to be open and public in compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act (Government Code Section 54950 et seq.). The meetings are to be held in a freely accessible location in order to facilitate the attendance of disabled members of the Committee and community in general. The scheduled meeting time for each committee is listed on the separate attachments but may be changed at the decision of a quorum of the Committee. The date, time and place of the meeting may also occasionally be changed due to availability of members or timeliness of agenda items.

b) Quorum. A majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. No official action shall be taken during any Committee meeting at which a quorum is not present. No act of a Committee shall be valid unless a majority of the members present concur therein.
c) **Voting.** Voting on all matters shall be on a voice vote unless a roll call vote is requested by any member in attendance. Ex officio members of the Committee shall not be eligible to vote although they may participate freely in any and all discussions of the Committee.

d) **Agenda.** Except as otherwise specified, all Committees shall comply with the notice and agenda requirements applicable to the Commission. All issues requiring a vote or Committee discussion must be included on the meeting’s agenda. Written materials concerning these items must be included in the agenda packet of the meeting for which that item is scheduled for discussion. A Committee member may request that an issue not on the agenda be put on the next meeting's agenda for discussion and/or vote. By majority vote, the Committee may approve continuation of an agendized item to the next meeting.

Members who wish to place items on the agenda shall notify commission staff and provide appropriate documentation to staff at least two weeks prior to the meeting except for emergency items considered pursuant to requirements of the Brown Act.

e) **Limitation of Discussion.** Discussion on any particular matter by either Committee members or by any member of the general public may be limited, at the discretion of the Chairperson, to such length of time as the Chairperson may deem reasonable under the circumstances.

f) **Conduct of Meetings.** The meetings are to be conducted in accordance with the principles of Rosenberg's Rules of Order (see Exhibit 11).

g) **Minutes.** Official minutes recording the members and visitors present, motions entertained, actions taken, and the votes cast at each Committee meeting, shall be prepared by staff and submitted to the Committee for approval and to the Commission for its acceptance.

h) **Oral Communications.** A time for Oral Communications will be included on all agendas to hear comments from non-committee members on items not on the Committee agenda but within the jurisdiction of the Committee’s business. Permission to address the Committee must first be secured from the Presiding Officer. The general time limit is three minutes, unless more time is granted by the presiding officer. Matters raised during oral communications, or at other times, which require further information or investigation can be referred by the Committee to staff, and if action is required, placed on a future agenda.

i) **Bylaws.** The information set forth herein shall be deemed sufficient to serve as the bylaws for the Commission's Committees subject to approval by the Commission. The committee descriptions included in the Commission’s Rules and Regulations can be amended by a majority vote of the subject committee’s members with approval by the Commission.
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

A member of the Commission or its committees is prohibited from participating in a governmental decision, including, but not limited to the making of a contract, in which he or she has a financial interest.
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TO: RTC Advisory Committees

FROM: Ginger Dykaar and Grace Blakeslee, Sr. Transportation Planners

RE: Unified Corridor Investment Study – Draft Step 2 Scenario Analysis

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Advisory Committees:

1. Review and provide input on the draft Step 2 scenario analysis of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. *(A performance dashboard of the results of the scenario analysis is provided as Attachment 1. The full document is available at [https://sccrtc.org/ucs-results](https://sccrtc.org/ucs-results)).* and,

2. Provide input on a preferred scenario to inform future transportation investments in the study area.

BACKGROUND

The objective of the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) is to identify multimodal transportation investments that provide the most effective use of Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Soquel Drive/Freedom Blvd, and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line while serving the community’s transportation needs *(Attachment 2).* Goals for the UCS focus on a triple bottom line approach to developing a sustainable transportation system which seeks to maximize benefits in terms of efficient mobility, health and equity, the natural environment, and economic vitality. The Unified Corridor Investment Study is evaluating transportation improvements using performance-based planning and a scenario analysis consistent with guidance and policy for evaluating future investment decisions of state and federal transportation discretionary funds.

The RTC has approved the following components of the analysis:

- Goals, criteria, performance measures *(Attachment 3)* - May 4, 2017
- Project list – May 4, 2017
- Scenarios to be evaluated in the Step 1 analysis – June 15, 2017
- Step 1 Analysis *(Attachment 4)* – December 7, 2017
- Scenarios to be evaluated in Step 2 Analysis *(Attachment 5)* - December 7, 2017

Input from the public, stakeholders, and RTC advisory committees has been solicited at key milestones of project development.
DISCUSSION

The draft Step 2 scenario analysis of the Unified Corridor Investment Study is available for review and input. The report has been developed by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. and Strategic Economics, Inc. with input from RTC staff. This planning effort is funded through a Caltrans’ Sustainable Communities Transportation Planning Grant (FTA 5304) and local voter-approved Measure D funds. The report is primarily organized into two sections:

- the baseline information which presents the existing conditions of the transportation system as evaluated through the performance measures, and
- the scenario analysis which presents the forecast of the performance measure for a 2035 horizon year for all of the scenarios being evaluated.

An introduction is included in the report and provides background information and a description of the UCS, the goals, performance measures and scenarios evaluated. The draft Step 2 scenario analysis of the Unified Corridor Investment Study is available on the RTC website (https://sccrtc.org/ucs-results). A performance dashboard has also been developed to provide a graphical representation of the draft results of the Step 2 analysis and is provided in Attachment 1.

Outreach

Input on the draft Step 2 scenario analysis and a preferred scenario for the Unified Corridor Investment Study will be sought from members of the public, stakeholders, community organizations, city councils and RTC advisory committees. Public Workshops will be held in both Watsonville and Live Oak. The Live Oak Public Workshop will be held at the Live Oak Elementary School Multi-Purpose Room at 1916 Capitola Road, Live Oak, on October 15 from 6:00 PM to 7:30 PM. The Watsonville Public Workshop will be held in the Civic Plaza Community Room, 4th floor, 275 Main St., Watsonville, on October 16, from 6:00 PM to 7:30 PM. A stakeholder meeting of partner agencies will be held on October 9, 2018. Focus Group meetings will be held for community organizations on October 17, 2018. Presentations on the draft Step 2 analysis will be given to the Scotts Valley, Watsonville, Capitola and City of Santa Cruz City Councils during the month of October and early November, 2018. Comments can also be submitted to ucs@sccrtc.org.

A second draft of Step 2 scenario analysis of the Unified Corridor Investment Study will consider the input received and include a staff recommendation for a preferred scenario. The second draft will be presented to the RTC at an evening meeting on November 15, 2018. The meeting will be held starting at 6:00 PM at the City of Watsonville Council Chambers, 275 Main St, 4th floor. A public hearing will begin at 6:30 PM to receive input from members of the public. A notice will be distributed via email, newspapers and online news and provided on the SCCRTC website. No action from the commission will be requested from staff at this meeting.
A final draft of the Unified Corridor Investment Study will consider the comments received at the November 15, 2018 and any other comments received by 5:00 PM on November 20, 2018. The final draft of the Unified Corridor Investment Study will be presented to the RTC at the December 6, 2018 RTC meeting to be held at 9:00 AM at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., 5th floor. Staff will be requesting approval of the final draft report and the preferred scenario.

**RTC staff recommends that the RTC Advisory Committee’s review and provide input on the draft Step 2 scenario analysis of the Unified Corridor Investment Study (Attachment 1) and provide input on a preferred scenario to inform future transportation investments in the study area.**

**Timeline**

October 15, 2018: Public Workshop – Live Oak Elementary School Multi-Purpose Rm, 1916 Capitola Road, Live Oak, 6:00 – 7:30 PM

October 16, 2018: Public Workshop – Civic Plaza Community Rm, 4th floor, 275 Main St, Watsonville 6:00-7:30 PM

October 17, 2018: Focus Group Meetings for Community Organizations

October, 2018: RTC Advisory Committee Meetings

October and November, 2018: Scotts Valley, Watsonville, Capitola, and City of Santa Cruz City Council Meetings

November 15, 2018: Second draft of UCS including staff recommendation of preferred scenario presented at the RTC Transportation Policy Workshop, Public Hearing, No action taken, Watsonville Chambers, 275 Main St, 4th floor, 6:00 PM

December 6, 2018: Final draft Unified Corridor Investment Study, Commission Action Requested on Preferred Scenario, County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St, 5th floor, 9:00 AM

**SUMMARY**

The draft Unified Corridor Investment Study uses a performance-based planning and scenario analysis approach to evaluate the transportation investments on Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Soquel Drive/Freedom Blvd, and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line and their ability to advance sustainability goals. **RTC staff recommends that the RTC Advisory Committees review and provide input on the draft Step 2 scenario analysis of the Unified Corridor Investment Study (Attachment 1) and provide input on a preferred scenario to inform future transportation investments in the study area.**

Attachments:

1. Draft Step 2 Scenario Analysis of the Unified Corridor Investment Study - Performance Dashboard *(Full report is available at https://sccrtc.org/projects/multi-modal/unified-corridor-study/. A printed copy will be provided to the Commissioners at the meeting.)*
2. Unified Corridor Study Project Area Map
3. UCS Goals, Criteria and Performance Measures
4. UCS Step 1 Analysis - (Step 1 of the Scenario Analysis is available at https://sccrtc.org/projects/multi-modal/unified-corridor-study/)
5. UCS Step 2 Project List and Scenarios Evaluated
Unified Corridor Investment Study

Performance Dashboard

Step 2 Analysis Results
Project Description

Three parallel routes - Highway 1, Soquel/Freedom and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line - link the communities along the Santa Cruz County coast from Davenport through Watsonville. The Unified Corridor Study examines how well complimentary transportation improvements on all three routes - when designed to function together as a single unified corridor – perform to meet the community’s transportation needs.

The Unified Corridor Study performance dashboard presents the result of the second, in a two step analysis, which compares how each of the scenarios address the study goals of Safety, Efficiency, Economics, Environmental Sustainability, and Social Equity by 2035.

The evaluation of 16 performance measures for each of the scenarios and a comparison to a no build and baseline conditions is designed to increase understanding of transportation project benefits by transparently evaluating their impacts and lead to effective investments in the corridor.
## Step 2 Scenarios for Analysis

Approved by RTC on December 7, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway 1 Projects</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Scenario E</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buses on shoulders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV) and increased transit frequency</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary lanes to extend merging distance IN ADDITION TO MEASURE D</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metering of on-ramps</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional lanes on bridge over San Lorenzo River</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission St intersection improvements</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soquel Avenue/Drive and Freedom Blvd</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Scenario E</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRT lite (faster boarding, transit signal priority and queue jumps)</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased frequency of transit with express services</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffered/protected bike lanes</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection improvements for auto</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection improvements for bikes/pedestrians</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rail Corridor</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Scenario E</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike and pedestrian trail</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local rail transit with interregional connections</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus rapid transit</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td>![Bus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight service on rail</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>Only Watsonville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Project Area/Connections between Routes</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Scenario E</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved bike/pedestrian facilities throughout urban area closing gaps in network</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional transit connections</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike share, bike amenities, transit amenities, park and ride lots</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td>![Bike]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal transportation hubs</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated vehicles/connected vehicles</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These projects will be evaluated in all scenarios.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Demand and System Management</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Scenario E</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers and residences - incentive programs</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and enforcement - electric vehicle, motorist safety, and bike safety</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td>![Train]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These projects will be evaluated in all scenarios.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Scenario A**

Step 2 Performance Measures

**PM: Total Collisions**
(Fatal, Injury, and Property Damage Only per year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Baseline, 2916</th>
<th>No Build, 3265</th>
<th>Scenario A, 3017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highway 1 Projects**

- HOV and auxiliary lanes, ramp meters, San Lorenzo bridge widening, multimodal intersection improvements

**Soquel / Freedom**

- BRT Lite with increased transit frequency, multimodal intersection improvements

**Rail ROW**

- Bike and pedestrian trail

---

Goal 1 Safer transportation for all modes.

**PM: Countywide Mean Auto Speed** (mph)

- AM Peak Period (6:00 - 9:00 AM)
  - Baseline: 40.5
  - No Build: 40.6
  - Scenario A: 39.4

- PM Peak Period (4:00 - 7:00 PM)
  - Baseline: 34.4
  - No Build: 34.7
  - Scenario A: 32.8

---

Goal 2 Reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people and facilitate the transport of goods.
PM: Person trips across N-S Screenline 4:00-6:00 PM
(In thousands)

Seabright Avenue
Scenario A: 33
No Build: 31
Baseline: 28

41st Ave
Scenario A: 37
No Build: 31
Baseline: 27

San Andreas/Freedom
Scenario A: 22
No Build: 18
Baseline: 16

Goal 3 Develop a well-integrated transportation system that supports economic vitality.

PM: Level Of Public Investment
(In millions)

Annual Cost for O&M $20
Scenario A: $7
Capital Costs $899
New Public Investment Needed $520
Funding Potential $379

PM: Visitor Tax Revenues
(per year in millions)

Total
Baseline: $29
Scenario A: $40
No Build: $39

Transient Occupancy Tax
Baseline: $18
Scenario A: $28
No Build: $27

Visitor Related Sales Tax
Baseline: $10
Scenario A: $12
No Build: $12

Seabright Avenue 41st Ave San Andreas/Freedom
PM: Cost Associated with Collisions
(per year)

Cost per $224 K Collision \times No Build 3,265 Collisions = No Build $730 M Collision Cost

Cost per $224 K Collision \times Scenario A 3,017 Collisions = Scenario A $675 M Collision Cost \rightarrow Cost -$56 M Savings

PM: Automobile Vehicle Miles Traveled
(Countywide VMT per day in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>VMT (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035 No Build</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Baseline</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PM: Total Criteria Pollutants
(metric tons per day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>26.98</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 4
Minimize environmental concerns and reduce adverse health impacts.
PM: Greenhouse Gas Emissions
CO₂e Emissions (metric tons per day) and Percentage Reduction from 2015 Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂e Emissions</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Reduction</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PM: Environmentally Sensitive Areas
(# linear miles along 3 routes)
36.5  2nd lowest score

Goal 5 Accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all users.

PM: Transit Vehicle Miles Traveled
(per year in millions)

- Scenario A: 5.74
- 2035 No Build: 3.61
- 2015 Baseline: 3.33
**PM: Household Transportation Cost**

**Percentage of Income Spent on Transportation**
(by median income households per year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1 Vehicle Household</th>
<th>2 Vehicle Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Build 18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline 16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Daily Costs for 2-Vehicle Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Baseline 2015</th>
<th>No Build 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$48.64</td>
<td>$46.63 ▼ $2.01</td>
<td>$50.14 ▲ $1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PM: Share of Investment Benefit for Transportation Disadvantaged Population**

- **24.0%**
- 13.7% of the population is transportation disadvantaged
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Scenario B
Step 2 Performance Measures

PM: Total Collisions
(Fatal, Injury, and Property Damage Only per year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highway 1 Projects
- Bus on shoulder, ramp metering, Mission St. intersection improvements

Soquel / Freedom
- BRT Lite with increased transit frequency, buffered/protected bike lanes, bike/ped intersection improvements

Rail ROW
- Bike and pedestrian trail, rail transit

Goal 1 Safer transportation for all modes.

Goal 2 Reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people and facilitate the transport of goods.
Goal 3 Develop a well-integrated transportation system that supports economic vitality.

PM: Person trips across N-S Screenline 4:00-6:00 PM
(In thousands)

- Scenario B: Seabright Avenue 32, 41st Ave 33, San Andreas/Freedom 19
- No Build: Seabright Avenue 31, 41st Ave 31, San Andreas/Freedom 18
- Baseline: Seabright Avenue 28, 41st Ave 27, San Andreas/Freedom 16

PM: Level Of Public Investment
(In millions)

- Annual Cost for O&M:
  - Scenario B: $35
  - No Build: $44
- New Public Investment Needed:
  - Scenario B: $9
- Funding Potential:
  - Scenario B: $455
- Capital Costs:
  - Scenario B: $379
  - Total: $833

PM: Visitor Tax Revenues
(per year in millions)

- Baseline: $18, $28, $27
- Scenario B: $29, $28, $39
- No Build: $10, $12, $12

13 - 16
PM: Cost Associated with Collisions
(per year)

Goal 4 Minimize environmental concerns and reduce adverse health impacts.

PM: Automobile Vehicle Miles Traveled
(Countywide VMT per day in millions)

PM: Total Criteria Pollutants
(metric tons per day)
PM: Greenhouse Gas Emissions
CO₂e Emissions (metric tons per day) and Percentage Reduction from 2015 Baseline

Baseline

No Build

Scenario B

PM: Environmentally Sensitive Areas
(# linear miles along 3 routes)

38.3 2nd highest score

PM: Transit Vehicle Miles Traveled
(per year in millions)

Scenario B

2035 No Build

2015 Baseline

6.65

3.61

3.33

Goal 5 Accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all users.
PM: Household Transportation Cost

Percentage of Income Spent on Transportation (by median income households per year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1 Vehicle Household</th>
<th>2 Vehicle Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Build 2015</td>
<td>Baseline 16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Build 2035</td>
<td>Baseline 24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daily Costs for 2-Vehicle Households

- **Scenario B**
  - $48.48

- **2015 Baseline**
  - $46.63 ($1.85 lower)

- **2035 No Build**
  - $50.14 ($1.66 higher)

PM: Share of Investment Benefit for Transportation Disadvantaged Population

- **Scenario B**
  - 25.2%

13.7% of population is transportation disadvantaged
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### Scenario C

#### Step 2 Performance Measures

**PM: Total Collisions**
(Fatal, Injury, and Property Damage Only per year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Baseline, 2916</th>
<th>No Build, 3265</th>
<th>Scenario C, 3013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 1 Safer transportation for all modes.

#### Highway 1 Projects
- Bus on shoulders, auxiliary lanes

#### Soquel / Freedom
- BRT Lite with increased transit frequency, multimodal intersection improvements

#### Rail ROW
- Bike and pedestrian trail, bus rapid transit, freight service (in Watsonville)

### PM: Countywide Mean Auto Speed (mph)

**AM Peak Period**
6:00 - 9:00 AM

- Baseline: 40.5
- No Build: 39.4
- Scenario C: 34.4

**PM Peak Period**
4:00 - 7:00 PM

- Baseline: 32.8
- No Build: 32.8
- Scenario C: 34.4

Goal 2 Reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people and facilitate the transport of goods.
PM: Person trips across N-S Screenline 4:00-6:00 PM
(In thousands)

Scenarios:
- Scenario C
- No Build
- Baseline

Seabright Avenue:
- Scenario C: 32
- No Build: 31
- Baseline: 28

41st Ave:
- Scenario C: 32
- No Build: 31
- Baseline: 27

San Andreas/Freedom:
- Scenario C: 19
- No Build: 18
- Baseline: 16

Goal 3 Develop a well-integrated transportation system that supports economic vitality.

PM: Level Of Public Investment
(In millions)

- Annual Cost for O&M: $28
- New Public Investment Needed: $22
- Funding Potential: $455
- Capital Costs: $285
- Total: $740

PM: Visitor Tax Revenues
(per year in millions)

- Total
- Transient Occupancy Tax
- Visitor Related Sales Tax

Baseline:
- Total: $29
- Transient Occupancy Tax: $18
- Visitor Related Sales Tax: $12

Scenario C:
- Total: $40
- Transient Occupancy Tax: $28
- Visitor Related Sales Tax: $12

No Build:
- Total: $39
- Transient Occupancy Tax: $27
- Visitor Related Sales Tax: $12

Range: 13 - 22
PM: Cost Associated with Collisions (per year)

Goal 4 Minimize environmental concerns and reduce adverse health impacts.

PM: Automobile Vehicle Miles Traveled (Countywide VMT per day in millions)

PM: Total Criteria Pollutants (metric tons per day)
PM: Greenhouse Gas Emissions
CO₂e Emissions (metric tons per day) and Percentage Reduction from 2015 Baseline

Baseline: 2,617
No Build: 1,915
Scenario C: 1,899

PM: Environmentally Sensitive Areas
(# linear miles along 3 routes)
Lowest score: 36.0

Goal 5 Accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all users.

PM: Transit Vehicle Miles Traveled
(per year in millions)
Scenario C: 6.11
2035 No Build: 3.61
2015 Baseline: 3.33
PM: Household Transportation Cost

Percentage of Income Spent on Transportation
(by median income households per year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Vehicle Household</th>
<th>2 Vehicle Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Costs for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Baseline</td>
<td>$46.63 ▼ $2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035 No Build</td>
<td>$50.14 ▲ $1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PM: Share of Investment Benefit for Transportation Disadvantaged Population

- 25.2%
- 13.7% of population is transportation disadvantaged
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Scenario E
Step 2 Performance Measures

PM: Total Collisions
(Fatal, Injury, and Property Damage Only per year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Baseline, 2916</th>
<th>No Build, 3265</th>
<th>Scenario E, 3008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highway 1 Projects
- HOV and auxiliary lanes, ramp meters

Soquel / Freedom
- Buffered/protected bike lanes, bike/pedestrian intersection improvements

Rail ROW
- Bike and pedestrian trail, rail transit, freight service

Goal 1 Safer transportation for all modes.

PM: Countywide Mean Auto Speed (mph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>AM Peak Period 6:00 - 9:00 AM</th>
<th>PM Peak Period 4:00 - 7:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario E</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 2 Reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people and facilitate the transport of goods.

13 - 27
PM: Person trips across N-S Screenline 4:00-6:00 PM
(In thousands)

Scenario E
No Build
Baseline
Seabright Avenue
41st Ave
San Andreas/Freedom

PM: Level Of Public Investment
(In millions)

Goal 3 Develop a well-integrated transportation system that supports economic vitality.

PM: Visitor Tax Revenues
(per year in millions)

Baseline
Scenario E
No Build

Total
Transient Occupancy Tax
Visitor Related Sales Tax

$29
$18
$10
$12
$28
$27
$12
$29
$18
$10
$12
$28
$27
$12

$1
$32
$1
$32
$1
$32

$794
$453
$1,247

$40
$39
$13 - 28
PM: Cost Associated with Collisions

(per year)

Cost per $224 K Collision \times No Build 3,265 Collisions = No Build $730 M Collision Cost

Cost per $224 K Collision \times Scenario E 3,008 Collisions = Scenario E $673 M Collision Cost → Cost $-58 M Savings

Goal 4 Minimize environmental concerns and reduce adverse health impacts.

PM: Automobile Vehicle Miles Traveled

(Countywide VMT per day in millions)

- Scenario E: 6.10
- 2035 No Build: 5.98
- 2015 Baseline: 5.48

PM: Total Criteria Pollutants

(metric tons per day)

- Baseline: 26.98
- No Build: 6.21
- Scenario E: 6.23
PM: Greenhouse Gas Emissions

CO₂e Emissions (metric tons per day) and Percentage Reduction from 2015 Baseline

Baseline: 2,617
No Build: 1,915 (27% reduction)
Scenario E: 1,928 (26% reduction)

PM: Environmentally Sensitive Areas
(# linear miles along 3 routes)

Highest score: 40.7

Goal 5
Accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all users.

PM: Transit Vehicle Miles Traveled
(per year in millions)

Scenario E: 5.23
2035 No Build: 3.61
2015 Baseline: 3.33
**PM: Household Transportation Cost**

Percentage of Income Spent on Transportation (by median income households per year)

- **Baseline**: 24%
- **No Build**: 26%

Daily Costs for 2-Vehicle Households

- **Scenario E**: $48.52
  - **2015 Baseline**: $46.63 \(\downarrow\) $1.89
  - **2035 No Build**: $50.14 \(\uparrow\) $1.62

**PM: Share of Investment Benefit for Transportation Disadvantaged Population**

- **Scenario E**: 23.5%
- **13.7% of population is transportation disadvantaged**
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All Scenarios Comparison

GOAL 1 Safer transportation for all modes.

PM: Total Annual Collisions
Fatal, Injury, and Property Damage Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Baseline, 2916</th>
<th>No Build, 3265</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A, 3017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B, 2899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C, 3013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario E, 3008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL 2 Reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people and facilitate the transport of goods.

Countywide Mean Auto Speed (MPH)
AM Peak Period (6:00 - 9:00 AM)

- Scenario A: Baseline 40.6, No Build 40.5
- Scenario B: Baseline 39.4, No Build 39.4
- Scenario C: Baseline 39.4, No Build 39.4
- Scenario E: Baseline 39.4, No Build 39.4

Countywide Mean Auto Speed (MPH)
PM Peak Period (4:00-7:00 PM)

- Scenario A: Baseline 34.7, No Build 34.4
- Scenario B: Baseline 32.9, No Build 32.8
- Scenario C: Baseline 32.8, No Build 32.8
- Scenario E: Baseline 34.4, No Build 34.4
GOAL 2 Reliability and Efficiency (continued)

Scenario A Mode Share

- Drive Alone: 42.8%
- Carpool: 37.8%
- Walk: 10.9%
- Bike: 4.3%
- Transit: 4.1%

Scenario B Mode Share

- Drive Alone: 42.4%
- Carpool: 36.5%
- Walk: 10.7%
- Bike: 4.4%
- Transit: 6.0%

Scenario C Mode Share

- Drive Alone: 43.1%
- Carpool: 37.1%
- Walk: 10.8%
- Bike: 4.2%
- Transit: 4.8%

Scenario E Mode Share

- Drive Alone: 42.3%
- Carpool: 37.3%
- Walk: 10.7%
- Bike: 4.4%
- Transit: 5.3%

2035 Person Trips (4-6pm)

Screenline # 4 at 41st Ave

- Baseline: 27
- No Build: 31
- Scenario A: 37
- Scenario B: 33
- Scenario C: 32
- Scenario E: 38

In thousands

Screenline # 9 at San Andreas/Freedom

- Baseline: 16
- No Build: 18
- Scenario A: 22
- Scenario B: 19
- Scenario C: 19
- Scenario E: 22

In thousands
GOAL 3 Develop a well-integrated transportation system that supports economic vitality.

Level of Public Investment
Capital Costs and Funding Potential Estimates (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>New Public Investments Needed</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Funding Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>$794</td>
<td>$379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$379</td>
<td>$1,247</td>
<td>$455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$740</td>
<td>$455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>$740</td>
<td>$1,247</td>
<td>$453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Cost for Operations & Maintenance
(in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>New Public Investments Needed</th>
<th>O&amp;M Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Potential
New Public Investments Needed
GOAL 3 Economic Vitality (continued)

Visitor Tax Revenues (per year) (in million $)

- **Total**
- **Transient Occupancy Tax**
- **Visitor Related Sales Tax**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transient Occupancy Tax</th>
<th>Visitor Related Sales Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario E</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>$39</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Associated with Collisions (in millions/year)

- **Scenario A**: $675 - $56
- **Scenario B**: $649 - $82
- **Scenario C**: $674 - $56
- **Scenario E**: $673 - $58

- **Collision Cost**
- **Savings**
GOAL 4 Minimize environmental concerns and reduce adverse health impacts.

**Countywide Vehicle Miles Traveled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmentally Sensitive Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario E</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Criteria Pollutants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>26.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario E</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pollutants**
- CO
- SOX
- PM10
- PM2.5
- ROG
- NOX
GOAL 4 Environment (continued)

**CO₂ₑ Emissions (metric tons/day) and % Reduction from 2015 Baseline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>CO₂ₑ (mtpd)</th>
<th>% Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>-27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>-27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario E</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL 5 Accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all users.

**Annual Transit Vehicle Miles Traveled (in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Miles Traveled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario E</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035 No Build</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Baseline</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 5 Equity (continued)

**Household Transportation Cost**

(\% of Median Income)

- **No Build 26\%**
- **Baseline 24\%**
- **25\%**
- **23.5\%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>1 Vehicle Household</th>
<th>2 Vehicle Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>Baseline 16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B</td>
<td>No Build 18%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C</td>
<td>Baseline 24%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario E</td>
<td>No Build 26%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Share of Investment Benefit for Transportation Disadvantaged Population**

- **24.0\%**
- **25.2\%**
- **25.2\%**
- **23.5\%**

13.7\% of population is transportation disadvantaged
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Unified Corridor Investment Study
Highway 1, Soquel Ave/Drive & Freedom Blvd, and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line

Goals, Criteria and Performance Measures
*(RTC Approved - May 4, 2017)*

The goals, criteria and performance measures below support a vision for an integrated, multimodal transportation network based on a triple bottom line approach that maximizes the environmental, economic and equity benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Step 1 Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote feasible solutions that address transportation challenges.</td>
<td>Community support and coordination/consistency with local, regional, state and federal plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to address transportation challenges and advance environmental, economic and equity goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compatibility with regulatory requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of public investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right of way and constructability constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technological feasibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Step 2 Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safer transportation for all modes</td>
<td>Injury and fatal collisions by mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people and facilitate the transport of goods</td>
<td>Peak period mean automobile travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak period mean transit travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak period travel time reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person trips across N-S screenline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a well-integrated transportation system that supports economic vitality</td>
<td>Level of public investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor tax revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost associated with fatalities and injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize environmental concerns and reduce adverse health impacts</td>
<td>Automobile vehicle miles traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmentally sensitive areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria pollutants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse gas emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all users</td>
<td>Transit Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household transportation costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits and impacts to transportation disadvantaged communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Unified Corridor Investment Study - Step 2 Scenarios for Analysis
*(Approved by RTC on December 7, 2017 *)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway 1 Projects</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Scenario E</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buses on shoulders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV) and increased transit frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auxiliary lanes to extend merging distance IN ADDITION TO MEASURE D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metering of on-ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional lanes on bridge over San Lorenzo River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission St intersection improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soquel Avenue/Drive and Freedom Blvd</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Scenario E</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bus rapid transit lite (faster boarding, transit signal priority and queue jumps)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased frequency of transit with express services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buffered/protected bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intersection improvements for auto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intersection improvements for bikes/pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rail Corridor</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Scenario E</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bike and pedestrian trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local rail transit with interregional connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bus rapid transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freight service on rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Project Area/Connections between Routes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improved bike/pedestrian facilities throughout urban area closing gaps in network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional transit connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bike share, bike amenities, transit amenities, park and ride lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multimodal transportation hubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>automated vehicles/connected vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Demand and System Management</th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Scenario E</th>
<th>No Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>employers and residences - incentive programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education and enforcement - electric vehicle, motorist safety, and bike safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scenarios D and F were eliminated from evaluation in Step 2*

**These projects will be evaluated in all scenarios.**