Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

AGENDA

Thursday, December 5, 2013
9:00 a.m.

NOTE
See the last page for details about access for people with disabilities and meeting broadcasts.

En Español
Para información sobre servicios de traducción al español, diríjase a la última página.

AGENDAS ONLINE
To receive email notification when the RTC meeting agenda packet is posted on our website, please call (831) 460-3200 or email info@sccrtc.org to subscribe.

COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Caltrans (ex-officio) Tim Gubbins
City of Capitola Dennis Norton
City of Santa Cruz Don Lane
City of Scotts Valley Randy Johnson
City of Watsonville Eduardo Montesino
County of Santa Cruz Greg Caput
County of Santa Cruz Neal Coonerty
County of Santa Cruz Zach Friend
County of Santa Cruz John Leopold
County of Santa Cruz Bruce McPherson
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Dene Bustichi
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Ron Graves
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Lynn Robinson

The majority of the Commission constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business.
Article 8 Transportation Development Act Claims – only City and County representatives vote
Article 4 Transportation Development Act Claims, Policy Issues, and SAFE – all 12 members vote
1. Roll call

2. Oral communications

   *Any member of the public may address the Commission for a period not to exceed three minutes on any item within the jurisdiction of the Commission that is not already on the agenda. The Commission will listen to all communication, but in compliance with State law, may not take action on items that are not on the agenda.*

   *Speakers are requested to sign the sign-in sheet so that their names can be accurately recorded in the minutes of the meeting.*

3. 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 RTC or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members of the Commission 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 Commissioner objects to the change.*

   **MINUTES**

   4. Approve draft minutes of the November 7, 2013 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

   5. Approve draft minutes of the November 21, 2013 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

   6. Accept draft minutes of the November 18, 2013 Bicycle Committee meeting

   7. Accept draft minutes of the November 21, 2013 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting

   **POLICY ITEMS**

   *No consent items*

   **PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS**

   8. Approve appointment of alternate member to Bicycle Committee

   9. Approve development of a Draft Implementation Plan for the County-wide Bicycle Route Network Signage program
10. Accept information item on implementation and private funding plan development for Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network

**BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS**

11. Accept status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues

**ADMINISTRATION ITEMS**

No consent items

**INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS**

12. Accept monthly meeting schedule
13. Accept correspondence log
14. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies - *none*
15. Accept miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues
16. Accept information items
   a. Memorandum from Transportation California and California Alliance for Jobs regarding *Decision to Request the Attorney General of California draft "Title and Summary" for a new "California Road Repairs Act”*

**REGULAR AGENDA**

17. Commissioner reports – oral reports
18. Director’s report – oral report  
   *(George Dondero, Executive Director)*
19. Election of 2014 RTC chair and vice-chair  
   *(Neal Coonerty, RTC Chair)*
20. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. District Director’s report
   b. Construction projects update
21. Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane project update  
   *(Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner)*
   a. Staff report
   b. Caltrans letter regarding supplemental drainage work, dated 11/13/13
22. **9:30 a.m. Public Hearing** - Adoption of the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)  
(Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)

a. Staff report  
b. Resolution Adopting the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)  
c. Recommendations for STIP and RSTP  
d. Recommendations for MBSST Funds  
e. Amendments to previously approved projects  
f. Map of proposed projects  
g. Public comments – Comments received as of November 26, 2013 are included in the packet  
h. Summary of bicycle safety programs  
i. Letter from Supervisors Friend and McPherson regarding broadband infrastructure

23. **511 Traveler Information Service**  
(Tegan Speiser, Senior Transportation Planner and Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner)  

a. Staff report  
b. Resolution on implementing 511 in Santa Cruz County

24. Adjourn to special meeting of the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies  

*No agenda items this month*

25. Next meetings  

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 9, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. at the Santa Cruz City Council Chambers, 809 Center Street, Santa Cruz, CA.  

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 20, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

**HOW TO REACH US**

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax (831) 460-3215

Watsonville Office  
275 Main Street, Suite 450, Watsonville, CA 95076  
(831) 768-8012  
email: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org
HOW TO STAY INFORMED ABOUT RTC MEETINGS, AGENDAS & NEWS

**Broadcasts:** Many of the meetings are broadcast live. Meetings are cablecast by Community Television of Santa Cruz. Community TV’s channels and schedule can be found online (www.communitytv.org) or by calling (831) 425-8848.

**Agenda packets:** Complete agenda packets are available at the RTC office, on the RTC website (www.sccrtc.org), and at the following public libraries:

- Aptos Library
- Branciforte Library
- Santa Cruz Downtown Library
- Garfield Park Library
- Live Oak Library
- Watsonville Main Library
- Boulder Creek Library
- Capitola Library
- Felton Library
- La Selva Beach Library
- Scotts Valley Library

For information regarding library locations and hours, please check online at www.santacruzpl.org or www.watsonville.lib.ca.us.

**On-line viewing:** The SCCRTC encourages the reduction of paper waste and therefore makes meeting materials available online. Those receiving paper agendas may sign up to receive email notification when complete agenda packet materials are posted to our website by sending a request to info@sccrtc.org. Agendas are typically posted 5 days prior to each meeting.

**Newsletters:** To sign up for E-News updates on specific SCCRTC projects, go to www.sccrtc.org/enews.

HOW TO REQUEST

❖ 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 anticipó 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.
1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

Members present:
Colin Jones (ex-officio)   Dennis Norton
Don Lane                 Randy Johnson
Eduardo Montesino        Greg Caput
Neal Coonerty            Zach Friend
John Leopold             Bruce McPherson
Dene Bustichi            Ron Graves
Lynn Robinson            Virginia Johnson (alt.)
Daniel Dodge (alt.)      Patrick Mulhearn (alt.)

Staff present:
George Dondero           Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra            Jason Laning
Cory Caletti             Rachel Moriconi
Kim Shultz               Ginger Dykaar
Karena Pushnik

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson, Santa Cruz resident, discussed the film, “Thin Ice: The Inside Story of Climate Science” and related it to transportation decisions of the RTC.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

A handout for Item 20, add-on pages for Item 22, and the staff report for Item 25 were distributed.

Commissioner Bustichi asked to pull Item 9 from the consent agenda. Item 9 was moved to the beginning of the regular agenda.
CONSENT AGENDA
(Norton, Leopold) Unanimous

MINUTES

4. Approved draft minutes of the October 3, 2013 Regional Transportation Commission meeting
5. Accepted final minutes of the September 23, 2013 Bicycle Committee meeting
6. Accepted draft minutes of the October 21, 2013 Bicycle Committee meeting
7. Accepted draft minutes of the October 17, 2013 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting
8. Accepted draft minutes of the October 22, 2013 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

POLICY ITEMS

9. Approved recommendation to consider adoption of parliamentary procedures in update of the RTC Rules and Regulations – moved to regular agenda and became Item 18.1.

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

10. Approved alternate position to the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee representing persons of limited means

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

11. Accepted status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues
13. Approved FY2014 Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds for Santa Cruz METRO (Resolution 11-14)

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

No consent items

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

14. Accepted monthly meeting schedule
15. Accepted correspondence log

16. Letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies - none

17. Accepted miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues

18. Accepted information items
   b. October 4, 2013 letter from the U.S. 101 Central Coast Coalition to California Transportation Commission (CTC) Chair James C. Ghielmetti thanking the CTC for holding a town hall meeting in Paso Robles on September 13, 2013.

REGULAR AGENDA

18.1 Approve recommendation to consider adoption of parliamentary procedures in update of the RTC Rules and Regulations – formerly on consent agenda

Commissioners discussed the process for adopting parliamentary procedures, and some of the differences between The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure and Robert’s Rules of Order.

Commissioner Lane moved, and Commissioner Leopold seconded, to consider the adoption of parliamentary procedures through the process to update the RTC’s Rules and Regulations. The motion passed unanimously.

19. Commissioner reports – oral reports

Commissioner Leopold thanked those who participated in a recently held meeting between RTC staff, Caltrans, County Department of Public Works staff, and residents of the Laurel Road community, to discuss concerns relating to Laurel Curve on Highway 17.

20. Director’s report – oral report

Executive Director George Dondero discussed his report, which was distributed as a handout.

Commissioners discussed proposed signage for the rail corridor and the upcoming Train to Christmastown service.

Brian Peoples, Aptos resident, said that the RTC has a responsibility to clean up the rail corridor.
Ron Goodman, organizer of Run by the Sea, asked about proposed signage along the rail corridor near Wilder Ranch. Chair Coonerty responded that exact placement of signage has not yet been decided.

21. Caltrans report and consider action items

Colin Jones, Caltrans, presented the District 5 Director’s Report for Santa Cruz County, and announced that upcoming roadwork would require closures on Highway 17 during the weekend of November 16-18, 2013.

Commissioners thanked Caltrans for its work on alleviating traffic incidents and recent highway projects.

22. 9:15 a.m. Public Hearing - Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and Adoption of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network Master Plan

Senior Transportation Planner Cory Caletti presented her report on the MBSST FEIR and Master Plan. Megan Jones, Rincon Consultants, discussed the process involved in creating the FEIR and presented an overview of the document. Mike Sherrod, RRM Design Group, presented an overview of the MBSST final Master Plan. Ms. Caletti then discussed implementation of the project, and the language added to the final Master Plan to establish a joint planning and implementation task force for Segment 17 to include representation from adjacent property owners recommended by the County Farm Bureau.

Commissioner McPherson left the meeting and Commission Alternate Virginia Johnson took his seat.

Commissioners discussed: possible effects of the trail on agricultural property owners; whether the documents require approval by the California Coastal Commission; and coordination with local jurisdictions regarding maintenance of the trail.

The meeting was recessed at 10:45 a.m. and resumed at 10:55 a.m.

Commissioner Graves left the meeting and Commission Alternate Daniel Dodge took his seat.

A public hearing was held beginning at 10:55 a.m. to receive comments on the MBSST final Master Plan and FEIR.

Steven Dobler, a farmer in Watsonville along the proposed trail, said that his concerns regarding Segment 17 had not been adequately addressed. He suggested that the path of Segment 17 be realigned to go around agricultural land instead of directly through it.
Steve Bontadelli, Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau, expressed concern regarding proposed Segment 17 in Watsonville, and said that it would have negative impacts on farmers along that segment. He said that realignment of Segment 17 is the best solution.

Amelia Conlen, People Power, urged the Commission to act according to staff’s recommendation, and said that people want the trail to be built.

Lee Otter, California Coastal Commission, said that the Coastal Commission recommends adoption of the master plan and is very supportive of the MBSST project.

Ron Goodman, organizer of Run by the Sea, said that the MBSST project has the potential to benefit the region economically, and recommended increased communication with local farmers in order to mitigate any potential negative impacts.

Micah Posner, Santa Cruz City Councilmember, described the MBSST FEIR and Master Plan as among the best documents of their kind that he has seen. He expressed support for the project and said he is ready to work with the Commission to fully fund the project.

Mary Lou Nicoletti, Santa Cruz County Agricultural Commissioner, discussed buffer zones required for agricultural fumigation.

Peter Navarro, Navarro Farms, said that fencing along Segment 17 would restrict movement of machinery and workers, and that food safety is a high concern. He said that proposed solutions are inadequate and invited Commissioners and staff to walk Segment 17 in order to better understand potential impacts on local farmers.

Brian Peoples, Aptos resident, said that the cost of putting a trail next to the rail tracks greatly increases costs such that the project will never be fully realized. He suggested following the example of Kirkland, Washington, where rail tracks are being removed in order to build a trail in its place.

Bob Colbertson, Watsonville Wetlands Watch, offered support for the trail, and said that the prioritization matrix needs to be updated for segments in Watsonville to reflect construction projects planned for the area. He said that some South County needs are being undervalued.

Lisa Uttal, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS), commended the RTC for the MBSST master plan, and said that MBNMS staff is concerned about the heavy emphasis on following the rail corridor instead of a more coastal route for the trail. She said that MBNMS staff would also like to see more interpretive enhancements along the trail.
David Willoughby, Willoughby Farms in Watsonville, said he is concerned about potential impacts on food safety for farmland along proposed Segment 17. He said that food contamination by trail users and their pets will cost farmers thousands of dollars, and that a minimum buffer will be needed for food safety requirements.

Teresa Knox, LMC Properties and Struve Ranch, said that she did not receive written notification about the deadline for public comments. She said that the RTC needs to listen to the farmers about the trail’s potential impacts on agriculture, and that the only viable option for Segment 17 is an alternate route outside the agricultural area.

Maura Noel, Santa Cruz County Cycling Club, said that the trail would be a wonderful way to get people to work and school because it will separate cyclists from cars.

Commissioner Friend left the meeting and Commission Alternate Patrick Mulhearn took his seat.

Jack Nelson, Santa Cruz resident, said that Segment 17 issues could be addressed later during the implementation stage of the project. He said that the trail would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by providing a transportation alternative to motor vehicles.

Piet Canin, Ecology Action, offered support for staff’s recommendation, encouraged adoption of the MBSST master plan, and said the trail would have a positive impact on the environment, the local economy, and quality of life. He said there is lots of community support for the project.

Pam Silkwood, an attorney from Horan Lloyd representing LMC Properties and Struve Ranch, said that her clients are concerned about the impact that the proposed Segment 17 trail would have on farming activities. She proposed three solutions: remove Segment 17 from the master plan; work on a realignment of the trail for Segment 17; or establish a 200-foot buffer.

Stephanie Harlan, Mayor of Capitola, said that she would like the trail to focus more on the coast and include more interpretive signage. She thanked staff and consultants for their work on the project.

Mark Ansler, Scotts Valley resident, said that he supports building the trail, but is concerned about the costs. He suggested removing the rail tracks in order to build the trail in its place.

Paul Schoellhamer, a South County farmer, commended the master plan and urged adoption according to staff’s recommendation. He said there is no need to re-route the trail away from the rail corridor in Segment 17, and that concerns about Segment 17 could be resolved in the same way that concerns were addressed for farmers along the northern coast.
Commissioners discussed: the concerns voiced by farmers regarding Segment 17; the possibility of creating a supplemental EIR; and whether adoption of the master plan precludes later realignment of trail segments.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Norton seconded to:

1. Adopt the Findings of the EIR and adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;

2. Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan as compliant with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);

3. Adopt the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Final Master Plan with changes noted in Attachment 3, including language to establish a joint planning and implementation task force for Segment 17; and

4. Request that local jurisdictions also consider adopting the Master Plan.

Commissioner Robinson proposed an amendment to the motion to direct RTC staff to work with the city and county staffs on the MOU’s to determine responsibility for planning, funding, permitting, maintenance, security and liability with the intent of sharing responsibility. The amendment was accepted by Commissioners Leopold and Norton.

Commission Alternate Mulhearn proposed an amendment to the motion to remove Segment 17 from the FEIR and Final Master Plan. Commissioners Leopold and Norton rejected the amendment.

Commission Alternate Mulhearn moved and Commissioner Bustichi seconded to remove Segment 17 from the FEIR and Final Master Plan. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion failed to pass, with Commissioners R. Johnson, Caput, Mulhearn, and Bustichi voting “aye,” and Commissioners Norton, Lane, Montesino, Coonerty, Leopold, V. Johnson, Dodge, and Robinson voting “no.”

A roll call vote was then taken on the original motion moved by Commissioner Leopold and seconded by Commissioner Norton, as amended by Commissioner Robinson. The motion passed (Resolution 12-14) with Commissioners Norton, Lane, Montesino, Caput, Coonerty, Leopold, V. Johnson, Dodge, and Robinson voting “aye,” and Commissioners R. Johnson, Mulhearn, and Bustichi voting “no.”
23. Appoint nominating committee for RTC Chair and Vice-chair

Chair Coonerty recommended appointing Dennis Norton, Lynn Robinson, and himself to the nominating committee to nominate the RTC Chair and Vice Chair for 2014 at the RTC’s December 5, 2013 meeting.

Commissioner Caput moved and Commissioner Leopold seconded to appoint the nominating committee according to Chair Coonerty’s recommendations. The motion passed unanimously.

24. Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane project update

Senior Transportation Planner Kim Shultz presented his report.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Caput seconded to receive the report. The motion passed unanimously.

25. Right of entry for Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Bridge Rehabilitation

Deputy Director Luis Pavel Mendez presented his report, which was distributed as a handout.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Robinson seconded to approve improvements shown on Exhibit 1 that were requested by the La Selva Beach Improvement Association (LSBIA) and that extend into the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way to provide access to Stacy and Witbeck for rehabilitation of the La Selva Beach railroad trestle. The motion passed, with Commissioner Bustichi voting “no.”

26. Adjourn to special meeting of the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

No agenda items this month

27. Next meetings – adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 5, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean Street, 5th Floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 21, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.
Respectfully submitted,

Jason Laning, Staff

Attendees:
Jack Nelson          Santa Cruz Resident
Brian Peoples       Aptos Resident
Les White           Santa Cruz Metro
Megan Jones          Rincon Consultants
Stephen Svetel      Rincon Consultants
Steve Bontadelli    SCC Farm Bureau
Steven Dobler       Dobler & SCNS, LLC
Pam Silkwood        Horan Lloyd
Peter Navarro       Navarro Farms
Teresa Knox          LMC Properties/Struve Ranch
Julie C. Sauve      LMC Properties/Struve Ranch
Amelia Conlen       People Power
Bob Colbertson      Watsonville Wetlands Watch
Lisa Uttal           NOAA-MBNMS
Ron Goodman         Run by the Sea
Piet Canin          Ecology Action
Gene Fischer        Local Resident
Lee Otter           California Coastal Commission
Stephanie Aarlan    S.C. Interagency Task Force
Mary Lou Nicoletti  Santa Cruz County agricultural commissioner
Micah Posner        Santa Cruz City Councilmember
David Willoughby    Willoughby Farms
Maura Noel          Santa Cruz County Cycling Club
Stephanie Harlan    Mayor of Capitola
Mark Ansler         Scotts Valley resident
Paul Schoellhamer   South County resident
Minutes

Thursday, November 21, 2013
9:00 a.m.

SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA

1. Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.

Members present:
John Olejnik (ex-officio) Dennis Norton
Don Lane Randy Johnson
Eduardo Montesino Greg Caput
Neal Coonerty Zach Friend
Dave Reid (alt.) Virginia Johnson (alt.)
Dene Bustichi Ron Graves
Lynn Robinson

Staff present:
George Dondero Luis Mendez
Jason Laning Yesenia Parra
Rachel Moriconi Cory Caletti
Karena Pushnik Kim Shultz

2. Oral communications - none

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas - none

CONSENT AGENDA

No consent items

REGULAR AGENDA

4. Draft 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program - Preliminary Staff Recommendations
Senior Transportation Planner Rachel Moriconi presented her report.

Commissioners discussed several projects listed on staff’s preliminary recommendations for the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and whether it is possible to bank funds for future projects.

Commissioner Bustichi asked staff to provide information at the next meeting regarding what the Ride ‘n Stride program does and how much funding it has received.

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner Montesino seconded to direct staff to revise their preliminary recommendations to distribute the $5.3 million in funds designated for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) as follows:

1. $4.06 million for Segment 7 in Santa Cruz from Natural Bridges to Pacific Avenue;

2. $1.04 million for the segment in Watsonville near Lee Road, 4,000 feet east to City Slough Trail connection, and remove the condition requiring City/Land Trust/County to secure funds for connections on Lee road; and

3. $200,000 for Twin Lakes Beachfront Project, providing bike and pedestrian facilities.

Commission Alternate Virginia Johnson proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to direct staff to work to increase their recommended funding for the Mt. Hermon Rd./Scotts Valley Dr./Whispering Pines Dr. intersection operations improvement project. The friendly amendment was accepted by the mover and seconder of the motion.

Commission Alternate Reid asked staff to include at the following meeting the cost per foot for MBSST segment funding recommendations.

David Casterson, chair of the RTC Bike Committee, said that increasing funding for MBSST Segment 7 in Santa Cruz will provide greater connectivity to other trails.

Daniel Dodge, Watsonville City Councilmember and RTC Commission Alternate, asked for support for item 17 of staff’s recommendations, Airport Boulevard improvements in Watsonville.

A vote was taken on the motion moved by Commissioner Coonerty and seconded by Commissioner Montesino, as amended by Commission Alternate Virginia Johnson, and the motion passed unanimously.
5. **Review of items to be discussed in closed session**

Chair Montesino said that issues related to anticipated litigation would be discussed in closed session.

Commissioners adjourned to closed session at 10:14 a.m.

**CLOSED SESSION**

6. **Conference with legal counsel—anticipated litigation.** Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 for one potential case

**OPEN SESSION**

7. **Report on closed session**

Commissioners reconvened to open session at 10:44 a.m. and there was no closed session report.

8. **The meeting adjourned at 10:44 a.m. Next meetings**

The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 5, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. at the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean Street, 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, December 19, 2013 at 9:00 am at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Laning, Staff

**Attendees**

Les White  
Santa Cruz METRO

Piet Canin  
Ecology Action

Mark Dettle  
City of Santa Cruz Public Works

Rahn Garcia  
County Counsel

Paul Schoellhamer  
Resident

Daniel Dodge  
Watsonville City Councilmember

David Casterson  
RTC Bicycle Committee
1. Call to Order
2. Introductions

Members Present:
Kem Akol, District 1
David Casterson, District 2, Chair
Peter Scott, District 3
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
Amelia Conlen, District 4
Rick Hyman, District 5
Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz
Andy Ward, City of Capitola, Vice-Chair
Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)
Myrna Sherman, City of Watsonville
Rob Straka, Ecology Action/Bike to Work
Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work (Alt.)
Leo Jed, CTSC
JIm Langley, CTSC (Alt.)

Staff:
Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Rachel Moriconi, Sr. Transportation Planner

Unexcused Absences:

Excused Absences:
Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
Carlos Garza, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
Lex Rau, City of Scotts Valley
Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola (Alt.)

Guests:
Steve All, Citizen, State of CA
Jim Cook, District 2 resident
Bryan Largay, District 5 resident
Claire Fiesler, SCMTD
Elliott Crowder, La Selva Beach resident

Vacancies:
District 2, 4 and 5 – Alternates
City of Watsonville – Alternate

3. Announcements – Cory Caletti, RTC staff, announced that guest Jim Cook has been nominated by Commissioner Friend to serve as the District 2 alternate representative on the Bicycle Committee.

4. Oral communications – Steve All provided a CD of CycleNet version 1.4. Piet Canin provided a short recap of the November California Bicycle Coalition’s Bicycle Summit and the Coalition’s goals.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion (Jed/Fieberling) to approve the consent agenda as amended passed unanimously.
6. Accepted final minutes of the September 23, 2013 Bicycle Committee meeting
7. Approved draft minutes of the October 21, 2013 Bicycle Committee
8. Accepted summary of Bicycle Hazard Reports
9. Accepted resignation correspondence from Bicycle Committee District 2 alternate Eric Horton
10. Accepted follow-up email to Caltrans regarding bicycle improvement needs on Caltrans right-of-way that were addressed at the September 23, 2013 meeting and further discussed at the October 21, 2013 meeting
11. Accepted follow-up information from Committee member Rick Hyman on Caltrans’ Complete Streets policies discussed at a previous meeting

REGULAR AGENDA

12. Draft 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, including funding recommendations for State Transportation Improvement Program, Regional Surface Transportation Program and Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSSST) Network - Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, summarized the preliminary staff recommendations for the 2014 RTIP. Members discussed the MBSSST projects for which applications were submitted and moved (Akol/Fieberling) to support the preliminary staff recommendation, including $200,000 for the County of Santa Cruz Twin Lakes Beachfront project, with the following changes: 1) provide $4,060,000 in funding for the City of Santa Cruz’s project; 2) not fund the City of Watsonville’s “Rail Trail Construction – Walker Street” project; 3) remove the requirement for the City of Watsonville to secure funds for connections over Lee Road prior to release of construction funds for the “Rail Trail: Lee Road, 400 feet” project and provide $1,040,000 for that project. The motion passed unanimously. While not recommending funding for the segment from 7th Avenue to El Dorado, some Committee members expressed support and hope that the County will pursue that project in the future in coordination with State Parks.

After discussion about State Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Surface Transportation Program funding applications, members elected to offer recommendations on projects of unanimous support rather than recommendations on specific projects to not fund. A motion (Hyman/Scott) was made to recommend providing $400,000 to the City of Santa Cruz for the Branciforte Bike/Pedestrian Bridge, by not funding other longer term projects; $150,000 to the Broadway-Brommer/Arana Gulch Path; and $30,000 to Ecology Action for the South County Youth Bike Safety Training program. The motion passed unanimously with direction to the Chair to attend the December 5th meeting and speak to the importance of closing critical gaps in the bike/pedestrian network which funding the recommended projects will enable.

13. Santa Cruz METRO’s Pacific Station redesign plans, partnership with the City of Santa Cruz, and timeline were summarized by Claire Fleisler, METRO Junior Transportation Planner. Committee members made suggestions including, but not limited, to the following: show connectivity to transit routes and centers outside Santa Cruz through maps; encourage bicycle use by providing racks and lockers in clusters and throughout; encourage installation of bicycle friendly amenities like bicycle showers and/or bicycle station; include way finding signage; provide wi-fi; consider reservations for bike spots on buses and providing bike stations next to buses in the event racks are full and a bike needs to be left behind; and provide overflow designs for bikes inside buses.
14. Member update related to Committee functions – Kem Akol indicated that he met with fellow Harbor bike connection improvement ad-hoc committee members to tour the area, identify drainage problems, key gaps, and brainstorm recommendations. Cory Caletti indicated that the City of Santa Cruz will be attending a future meeting to provide information on the Harbor bridge retrofit project and address bicycle connectivity needs.

15. Adjourned: 8:20 PM

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 9, from the special time of 6:00pm to 8:30pm at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner

S:\Bike\Committee\BC2013\BCNov13\BCMinutes_Draft_November18-2013.docx
1. Call to Order – Chair Chris Schneiter called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Introductions – Self introductions were made.

3. Oral communications – Grace Blakeslee appreciated agencies for attending the Complete Streets Workshop on November 13, noting that all of the planning and public works departments in Santa Cruz County sent representatives.

4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – Staff distributed a handout with updated staff recommendations for Item 8.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Approved minutes of the October 17, 2013 ITAC meeting, with one minor change to show UCSC smart bike lockers were installed at 24 locations (Buika/Wiesner).
REGULAR AGENDA

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

Scotts Valley: Majid Yamin reported that the RSTP-funded Scotts Valley Drive rehabilitation project is done.

SC METRO: Erich Friedrich reported that METRO has been working to redesign Pacific Station and has received 700-800 comments from the public through a variety of outreach methods. Construction of the operations building continues.

RTC: Rachel Moriconi reported that the RTC adopted the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Master Plan on November 7.

County: Steve Wiesner reported that the Graham Hill Road project was completed and storm damaged Paulsen Road and Smith Grade are now open.

Watsonville: Murray Fontes reported that the citywide street slurry seal projects are finishing up. The Airport Blvd project from Highway 1 to Ramport is under construction. The city is going out to bid to construct a roundabout at the Clifford/Pennsylvania intersection.

Santa Cruz: Chris Schneiter reported that construction has started for the Broadway-Brommer/Arana Gulch multiuse path. Construction of the Soquel Ave-Park Way traffic signal project, which includes adding left turn lanes, will begin in mid-December.

AMBAG – Paul Hierling reported that that modeling work for the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)/Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) continues.

Caltrans: Mark McCumsey (via phone) announced that the Caltrans discretionary planning grant applications and guidelines are now available, with applications due February 3, 2014.

7. Santa Cruz METRO Short Range Transit Plan Presentation

Erich Friedrich reported that the METRO draft Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) will be available online very soon. It is a 5-year plan that includes recommendations for paratransit, marketing, capital/financial, policy, and service. Key policy recommendations include setting policies for evaluating new service; establishing Transit Emphasis Corridors that include high quality, frequent service, and some roadway infrastructure modifications; formal standards for evaluating productivity and efficiency of routes; standards for deviating routes if needed; and modification to spacing between bus stops. He reported recommendations for modifying some specific routes and marketing to “choice” riders are also included in the plan. Meeting attendees made suggestions for Transit Emphasis Corridors, reducing trip travel times, providing information to riders via smart phones, ensuring route changes still serve major origins.
and destinations, and including driver bilingual and sensitivity training. It is anticipated that the draft plan will be released in mid-December for a 45-60 day review period. RTC staff recommended that local jurisdictions review and provide feedback to METRO staff on infrastructure modifications proposed for Transit Emphasis Corridors.

8. Recommendations for the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

Rachel Moriconi presented staff recommendations for programming approximately $5.9 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), $3.5 million Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), and $5.3 million in Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) funds. She commended project sponsors for their work on the applications. She distributed revised recommendations for Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) funds based on RTC direction at the Transportation Policy Workshop, as well as preliminary recommendations regarding which funding source to program to each project. She noted that based on board direction at the TPW and discussions with City of Scotts Valley staff, that RTC staff would be recommending an additional $46,000 for the Mt. Hermon Road/Scotts Valley Drive intersection, by reducing funds slightly to other projects.

ITAC members expressed general support for the preliminary staff recommendations, but suggested increasing or decreasing funds to some projects. Chris Schneiter stated that the Highway 1 San Lorenzo River bridge project is important and needs funds to start environmental review. He stated that the bridge is more vulnerable to the environment than other Highway 1 facilities and is important to the University. Murray Fontes noted he was satisfied with the preliminary staff recommendations, but concerned about revised recommendations which eliminate funding for Watsonville’s Walker Street section of the MBSST. Steve Wiesner expressed concern that more funding was not recommended for County projects, though recognized other needs in the region. He expressed concern at funding non-road projects with STIP and RSTP and suggested increasing funds for the Casserly Road bridge by $150,000. Majid Yamin noted that while the City of Scotts Valley could increase its match by $46,000 for the intersection project, he suggested increasing the amount programmed by $92,000.

The committee unanimously approved a motion (Dettle/Yamin) recommending that the RTC approve the revised staff recommendations (including TPW direction for the MBSST funds) with the following changes:

- Reduce the reserve of STIP funds for the Highway 1 41st-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes from $2 million to $1.5 million;
- Add $454,000 for Highway 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge environmental review;
- Add $46,000 for the Scotts Valley Dr/ Mt Hermon Road intersection.

9. The meeting adjourned at 3:15pm. The next meeting of the ITAC is scheduled for December 19, 2013 at 1:30 PM at the RTC Conference Room in Santa Cruz.
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission appoint Jim Cook to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee to represent District 2 as an alternate member.

BACKGROUND

Seats on the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee correspond to City and Supervisorial District seats on the Regional Transportation Commission. Commissioners may nominate individuals for Commission consideration. Two additional seats for Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition also exist and appointments are made by the respective agency. Seats for three-year terms on the Bicycle Committee expire on a rotating basis so not all positions expire at one time.

The Bicycle Committee’s description, role and membership are shown on the 2004 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Rules and Regulations.

DISCUSSION

District 2 currently has a vacancy for the alternate seat on the Bicycle Committee. An Aptos resident, Jim Cook, submitted an application on October 28th, 2013 for appointment. RTC staff forwarded a nomination request letter and the application (Attachment 1 with private information redacted from the application) to Commissioner Friend for consideration. Commissioner Friend nominated Jim Cook to serve as the alternate member representing District 2 (Attachment 2).

A draft roster is also included as Attachment 3.

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission appoint Jim Cook to represent the District 2 as the alternate member on the RTC’s Bicycle Committee as nominated by Commissioner Friend.

Bicycle Committee Vacancies

Bicycle Committee vacancies currently exist for District 5 (alternate), District 4 (alternate) and for the City of Watsonville (alternate). Staff is working to fill vacancies and welcomes any suggestions or referrals to interested parties.
SUMMARY

Staff received, and forwarded to Commissioner Friend, an application and appointment request from Aptos resident Jim Cook to serve as the alternate member representing District 2. Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission appoint Mr. Cook to serve on the RTC Bicycle Committee as nominated by Commissioner Friend.

Attachment 1: Nomination request and application
Attachment 2: Appointment letter from Commissioner Friend
Attachment 3: Draft Bicycle Committee roster
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November 14, 2013

Zach Friend, District 2 Supervisor/RTC Commissioner
Board of Supervisors
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: Appointment to the RTC Bicycle Committee

Dear Commissioner Friend:

Attached please find an appointment request to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee from Jim Cook for the alternate seat. Jim Cook has over 29 years of experience working in the public sector and has vast experience with the public policy process.

The current process for Bicycle Committee nominations is as follows:
- Committee nomination is made by appropriate Commissioner
- RTC receives the nomination and considers action
- Bicycle Committee receives information regarding appointments

As of this time, RTC staff has not received any other applications.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter. Please do not hesitate to call me at 460-3201 if you have any questions or require additional background materials.

Sincerely,

Cory Caletti
Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

Enclosure

cc: RTC
RTC Bicycle Committee
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COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Bicycle Committee

Meetings are currently held the second Monday of every other month at 6:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year will be scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

Please type or print clearly

Name: Jim Cook

Home address: [redacted]

Mailing address (if different): [redacted]

Phone: (home) [redacted] (business/message/mobile) [redacted]

E-mail: WOOL4U@Comcast.net

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 29 Years

Position(s) I am applying for: ☐ Any appropriate position
☐ Alternate Bicycle Committee

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

I worked for Monterey County for over 29 years. During my tenure, I chaired the LACCO Commission, the Fort Ord Subcommittee of the Board of Supervisors, the Housing Advisory Committee and the County-wide Economic Development Committee. I was also a member of the FORA Administrative Committee and served as an alternate to the Supervisors on the FORA Board.

RECEIVED
OCT 29 2013
SCCRTC
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County</td>
<td>Salinas, CA.</td>
<td>Director of Economic Development</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County</td>
<td>Salinas, CA.</td>
<td>Director of Housing + Redevelopment</td>
<td>1994-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County</td>
<td>Salinas, CA.</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td>1987-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County</td>
<td>Salinas, CA.</td>
<td>Senior Budget Analyst</td>
<td>1985-87</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.

See Attached

### 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: [Signature]

Date: October 28, 2013

### Return Application to:

SCCRTC  
Bicycle Committee  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
fax: (831) 460-3215 or email: ccaletti@sccrtc.org

### Questions or Comments:

Call Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org
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Jim Cook

Statement of Qualifications

Santa Cruz County has an established reputation as a bicycle friendly community. I believe we have tremendous opportunity to build upon this asset in promoting broad-based community enhancement. Properly implemented, bicycle programs can engage broad segments of our community in ways that build strong partnerships, create economic opportunity through tourism promotion, reduce crime by engaging the youth in active recreation, and create greater pride in our local community through the improvement of our local bicycle circulation network.

I have lived and actively bicycled in Santa Cruz County for over 29 years. Appointment to the alternate position on the SCORTC Bicycle Committee could provide a great opportunity which builds upon my employment experience in developing public policy analysis and helping community groups capitalize on existing social and economic assets with local bicycling opportunities in Santa Cruz County.
Dear Cory:

Thank you for reaching out to my office regarding the recent resignation of Eric Horton from the RTC’s Bicycle Advisory Committee and the request of Jim Cook to fill this alternate seat for my district. We have spoken with multiple people that are interested in this position, however, we believe that Mr. Cook will serve the RTC and the 2nd District well.

As such, I’d like to formally nominate Jim Cook to fill the alternate opening to the Bicycle Advisory Committee. Please let me know if you need anything additional from my office.

Sincerely,
Zach Friend
County Supervisor – 2nd District
RTC Commissioner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Member Name/Contact Info</th>
<th>Appointment Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 1 - Voting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Soquel, Live Oak, part of Capitola</td>
<td>Kem Akol&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:kemakol@msn.com">kemakol@msn.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 1993&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Holly M. Tyler&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:holly.m.tyler@comcast.net">holly.m.tyler@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2010&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 2 - Voting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Aptos, Corralitos, part of Capitola, Nisene Marks, Freedom, PajDunes</td>
<td>David Casterson, Chair&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:dbcasterson@gmail.com">dbcasterson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2005&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Jim Cook&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:wookiv@comcast.net">wookiv@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 12/13&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 3 - Voting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Big Basin, Davenport, Bonny Doon, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Peter Scott&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:drip@ucsc.edu">drip@ucsc.edu</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2007&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>William Menchine (Will)&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:menchine@cruzio.com">menchine@cruzio.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 4 - Voting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Watsonville, part of Corralitos</td>
<td>Amelia Conlen&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:director@peoplepowersc.org">director@peoplepowersc.org</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 5/13&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Term Expire: 3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 5 - Voting</strong>&lt;br&gt;SL Valley, Summit, Scotts Valley, part of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Rick Hyman&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:bikerick@att.net">bikerick@att.net</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 1989&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Capitola - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Andy Ward, Vice Chair&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:Andrew.ward@plantronics.com">Andrew.ward@plantronics.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2005&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Daniel Kostelec&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:dnlkostelec@yahoo.com">dnlkostelec@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2/97&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Santa Cruz - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Wilson Fieberling&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:anbfieb@yahoo.com">anbfieb@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2/97&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Carlos Garza&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:carlos@cruzio.com">carlos@cruzio.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Scotts Valley - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Lex Rau&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:lexrau@sbcglobal.net">lexrau@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 5/13&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Gary Milburn&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:g.milburn@sbcglobal.net">g.milburn@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 5/13&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Watsonville - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Myrna Sherman&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:calgary1947@gmail.com">calgary1947@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike To Work - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Rob Straka&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:rob@ecoact.org">rob@ecoact.org</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 5/13&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Piet Canin&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:pccanin@ecoact.org">pccanin@ecoact.org</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Traffic Safety Coalition - Voting</strong></td>
<td>Leo Jed&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:leo.jed@gmail.com">leo.jed@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 3/09&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Jim Langley&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:jim@jimlangley.net">jim@jimlangley.net</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02&lt;br&gt;Term Expire: 3/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All phone numbers have the (831) area code unless otherwise noted.
TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: County-wide Bicycle Route Network Signage – Preliminary Draft Implementation Plan

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Accept this status report on the County-wide Bicycle Route Network Signage program;
2. Accept the Preliminary Draft Implementation Plan (Attachment 1);
3. Direct staff to develop the draft Bicycle Route Network Signage Program to be used for soliciting public input.

BACKGROUND

At its June 2009 meeting, the RTC considered an application for $300,000 for development of a County-wide Bike Route Signage Program. The funding amount requested was determined after researching the cost of developing such a program in other areas; identifying preliminary estimates for the number of routes and signs needed; maintenance requirements; and staff time needed to adequately coordinate sign and route development with all local jurisdictions. At that meeting, the RTC approved $100,000 of funding for the Bike Route Signage Program.

Immediately following funding approval for the County-wide Bike Route Signage program, staff began preliminary discussions with local jurisdictions regarding a reasonable time frame for initiating the project. While all local jurisdictions reported interest in the development of this very valuable project, the following two significant constraints were reported regarding an immediate start time: 1) staffing reductions and furloughs faced by all jurisdictions due to the economic downturn at that time which necessitated careful workload prioritization, and 2) delivery of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) projects which had strict and unbendable project delivery dates. The highest priority for local jurisdictions was avoiding losing funding for many deferred maintenance and project delivery needs in Santa Cruz County. RTC staff time has been similarly constrained due to funding challenges and more recently, due to the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report documents delivery and funding allocation obligations.

DISCUSSION

While limitations in staff time has resulted in delayed implementation of the project, RTC staff has worked over time to identify all the elements needed for coordination of a route signage program and developed a Preliminary Draft Implementation Plan (Attachment 1). The Preliminary Draft Implementation Plan encapsulates extensive research conducted over time and covers the following topic areas needed for a successful program that is responsive to current conditions and considers changing climates and resources:
1. goals and objectives
2. existing conditions and sign types currently in use
3. funding availability and needs
4. administration scenarios for collaboration with local jurisdictions
5. route selection, possible destinations, and pilot route recommendations
6. public involvement and field surveying
7. types of signs and their pros and cons, and preliminary sign type recommendations
8. production, installation and maintenance

Sign development and type considerations

Staff has been researching sign options and their limitations in order to provide the desired information to the public without an excessive proliferation of signs due to the many sign and route development efforts underway. A number of complications exist.

Coordinating with all jurisdictions regarding sign design.
The California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) dictates the types of signs to be placed on state and local roadways. Some local advocates are interested in utilizing unique signs as other regions in the state have done with successful results. If and how this could be done in Santa Cruz County, needs further investigation given that Caltrans is one of the agencies that would have to approve signs. Caltrans does not allow use of non-MUTCD approved signs without an extensive and cumbersome exemption process.

Coordination of current and future signs and routes
Coordination of signs with other current and future way-finding signs needs to be worked out in order to avoid proliferation of signs. Sign clutter is unsafe and undesirable. A number of signs are currently placed on County roadways and bikeways.

- The California Coastal Trail, the Pacific Coast Route, as well as standard bike lane and bike route signs are peppered throughout the county. The California Coastal Trail and the Pacific Coast Route networks are very likely to overlap with the County-wide Bike Route. Careful planning is needed.

- The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network Master Plan designates a 50 mile network of bike/pedestrian facilities with the 32 mile rail right-of-way acting as the systems spine and spur trails connecting to activity centers and coastal access points. The MBSST will be signed with unique signs developed specifically for that project and used by the Transportation Agency for Monterey County for the two-county project. The Coastal Rail Trail spine will have its own unique sign type that will conform to the style of the MBSST image. Also, given that the MBSST Network will act as the California Coastal Trail, the CCT emblem will need to be included in some fashion.

- Finally, two state and national initiatives complicate matters further. A program sponsored by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials is requesting that local jurisdictions designate and sign routes of national significance. A California initiative resulting out of the passage of AB1464 is requesting the same thing. Both programs have unique signs.

Given the high profile of the County's coast line and the high likelihood of frequent overlaps, the route selection has to be determined with solid input and review. After that time, sign selection will have to also be carefully considered.
Additionally and most importantly, RTC staff does not have a maintenance crew nor any public works capabilities. Contracting with local jurisdictions or actual implementation by local jurisdictions with funding provided through agreements by the RTC will be needed. Coordination will also be needed to establish procedures that may vary by jurisdiction.

**Budget**

To date, $39,094.47 has been spent on research, planning activities, communications with local jurisdictions and preparation of a preliminary draft for the County-wide Bike Route Signage program. Additionally, staff has spent much time responding to public comments and channeling interest into an appropriate planning process. Currently, $81,024 is budgeted in FY 2013/14 for completion of the plan and expenditures associated with implementation of the plan on a limited basis.

**Timeframe and planning process**

Planned activities include the following:
- meetings with local jurisdictions to solicit input into the Preliminary Draft Implementation Plan and to select preferred a sign type and administration process
- updates to the Preliminary Plan to reflect local jurisdiction and RTC preferences
- release of an official draft
- review of the official draft by the RTC’s Bicycle Advisory Committee and the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee along with input from the public, cycling organizations and other interested parties;
- presentation to the RTC of the draft plan along with committee and public recommendations; and
- establishment of implementation agreements and maintenance protocols (including sign production, and mapping plans).

It is anticipated that RTC staff availability will enable work to continue on this project throughout the 2014 calendar year with implementation to begin towards the end of 2014. Staff estimates a Draft Plan will be brought to the RTC with a full presentation that would include committee and public recommendations in the mid-year timeframe.

**SUMMARY**

While limited RTC and local jurisdiction staffing resources has delayed work on the County-wide Bike Route Program, a Preliminary Draft Implementation Plan (Attachment 1) has been produced. RTC staff recommends developing a draft, circulating it for review by advisory committees and interested community members, and bringing a presentation to the RTC with implementation recommendations.

**Attachment:**

1. Preliminary Draft Implementation Plan
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Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program

PRELIMINARY DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Prepared by the
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz, CA

December 5, 2013

Cathy DeLuca, RTC Intern
Cory Caletti, RTC Staff
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CHAPTER 1

In an effort to further increase bike ridership and provide a viable transportation alternative, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is in the process of developing a Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program. This Implementation Plan is intended to set goals, suggest signage protocols, identify lessons learned by other agencies that have instituted similar programs, suggest a process for sign selection, and offer administrative scenarios to choose from.

Background

The need for a bicycle route signage system was identified many years ago by community members and transportation professionals, and more recently elected officials, in order to increase the number of bicyclists on the road, as well as improve bicyclists’ visibility and safety. The project gained significant momentum after two recent bicyclist fatalities on Mission Street (state Highway 1). Many other areas across the United States with significant bicycle ridership have implemented similar systems, including Santa Barbara, Berkeley, and Oakland in California; Portland, Oregon; Seattle, Washington; and Chicago, Illinois, among many others.

In June 2009 the RTC programmed $100,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program funding for the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program. Immediately following this funding approval, staff began preliminary discussions with local jurisdictions regarding a reasonable timeframe for initiating the project. Since that time, staff has considered and researched implementation avenues, has monitored state and national bicycle signage route initiatives, and has engaged in preliminarily discussions with local jurisdictions.

Research of Existing Sign Systems

The RTC began the development of this Implementation Plan in the summer of 2010, when extensive research was conducted by Cathy DeLuca, a Masters student interning at the RTC. Her research included extensive review of other jurisdictions’ implementation plans, interviews with other jurisdictions, and examination of possible sign types. Through the information assembled, RTC staff is putting forth recommendations, outlining considerations and issues to be resolved, and suggesting a process by which to do that. (See the appendices for the results of the research not directly contained within this Plan.)

Goals and Objectives

A bicycle route signage program in Santa Cruz County will assist in directing cyclists to preferred and more convenient bicycle facilities when navigating through the county's roadways. Directing cyclists to safer routes will increase traffic safety for all street users and will encourage bicycling in Santa Cruz County. Increasing the bicycling mode share, a goal of the Regional Transportation Plan, will maximize the existing transportation network, promote non-emission generating trips by converting short distance automobile trips to bicycling trips, and improve our community members’ health and well-being. A bicycle route signage system will also serve the area’s many visitors and will further promote Santa Cruz as a tourist destination for the increasing number of eco-tourists.
In short, the goals of the program are to:

1) Use signs to identify and guide cyclists onto streets better suited for bicycles.
2) Promote bicycle use by making the public more aware of the bicycle as a viable and sustainable transportation mode.
3) Remind motorists that they are sharing the road with cyclists who are traveling on official bicycle routes.
4) Increase bicycle ridership by attracting new bicycle riders who may be intimidated by traffic and other safety considerations or constraints.
5) Make it easier for bicyclists to find common destinations, and reach them safely, while being informed about trip length.

Implementation goals include working in collaboration with local jurisdictions and interested organizations to:

1) Achieve consensus on the set of signs to be used.
2) Organize the existing bikeway system to provide a framework of logical and useful routes for bicyclists in the county.
3) Select bike routes that provide convenient access to a variety of major destinations and neighborhood destinations such as parks, beaches, shopping areas, schools, work, and scenic areas.
4) Select routes well-suited to a variety of riders such as commuters, tourists, families, fitness riders, and recreational riders.
5) Eliminate and consolidate unnecessary existing bikeway signs to “declutter” area streets and bikeways.
6) Develop a bike route signage program that can be implemented in phases as funding permits, and that provides clear directions to signing future bikeways in the same manner.

Audience

While the main focus of the program is bicyclists, the population to be served includes all Santa Cruz County residents and visitors. As discussed above, one goal of the sign system is to increase the number of bicyclists on the road. Increased bicycle ridership benefits all members of the community, since it promotes human-scale environments, traffic calming, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and a healthier population. Increased bicycle ridership means higher visibility which heightens safety and provides an inviting atmosphere to timid or novice riders.

Of course, bicyclists will be the main benefactors of the program, and the bike route signs will guide riders of all persuasions — commuters, families, recreational riders, tourists, and infrequent riders. According to the American Community Survey’s 2008 One-Year Survey, a program of the U.S. Census, there are 5,083 bicycle commuters in Santa Cruz County. While the sign program will clearly serve these commuters, commute trips account for just 30% of all trips, so a far larger number of Santa Cruz County residents who bicycle will benefit. Additionally, community members who want to travel by bicycle but have safety concerns may
be encouraged by the designation of specific routes better suited to bicycling. Finally, Santa Cruz visitors will be served from improved guidance while traveling through the county on touring trips or navigating around town by bicycle.

While the bike route signs will be useful to pedestrians, the system will not be specifically designed to support pedestrian travel because design considerations differ for each mode. Pedestrian wayfinding signage is generally focused on a finer level of detail, supporting shorter trips and more local destinations. A bicycle signage system needs to support longer trips and the signs need to be designed and located to accommodate users traveling at speeds in the range of ten to fifteen miles per hour, or possibly higher.

**Funding**

In June 2009, the RTC programmed $100,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding for the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program. The RTC initially considered an application for $300,000 for development of this program. The requested amount was determined after researching the cost of developing such programs in other areas; identifying preliminary estimates for the number of routes and signs needed; considering maintenance requirements; and estimating the staff time needed to adequately coordinate sign and route development with all local jurisdictions. In response to the application for $300,000, the RTC approved a reduced amount of $100,000 in RSTP funding.

When the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) was amended by the RTC in June 2009, a total of $500,000 was estimated for development of a robust and comprehensive countywide signage program. This figure was derived from a reevaluation of the possible number of routes to be developed in the county based on roadway miles, planned bikeway miles, and an appropriate geographic distribution.

Given the limited funding currently available, a program of very limited scope will have to be initially developed. RTC staff spent considerable planning time to produce this Implementation Plan in order to provide local jurisdictions and interested parties adequate information to lay the groundwork for long-term implementation. It is anticipated that once the Implementation Plan is reviewed and revised, a course of action will be adopted and a pilot program can be instituted using approved funds.

To attain funding beyond the $100,000 currently available, it is instructive to look at how existing signage programs have been funded. Other jurisdictions have financed their programs through the following funding mechanisms: Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), Transportation Development Act (TDA), Proposition 116, Transportation Enhancement Act (TEA), local maintenance funds, and various tax measures, among others. Many of these funding sources could be pursued to acquire additional funds for the county's program. For example, individual jurisdictions could include the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program in their Bicycle Plan updates and then apply for BTA funds to help fund their jurisdiction's portion of the sign program.

**Existing Conditions**

As of the end of 2009, there were 215 bikeway miles in Santa Cruz County, consisting of 190 miles of Class II striped bike lanes on a street or highway and 25 miles of Class I separated paths designated exclusively for bicycle travel. Class III bicycle routes, facilities not striped for
bicycle travel but rather shared with pedestrian or motor vehicle travel, were not factored into the total since RTC staff has not conducted an analysis of the number of Class III miles existing in the county. Bikeway miles are expected to grow significantly in the coming years due to a number of multi-use trail projects programmed for construction. The RTC’s Regional Transportation Plan as well as the local jurisdictions’ Bicycle Transportation Plans address planned bicycle projects.

While the county is currently served by a wide variety of bicycle facilities, the majority of the area lacks a clear, comprehensive, and consistent sign system that provides bicycle users with directional information and information about mileage to destinations and points of interest. Two different sign systems already exist, namely the Pacific Coast Bike Route and the California Coastal Trail, but they do not provide destination nor mileage-to-destination information. Additionally, many Pacific Coast Bike Route signs are in need of maintenance, and gaps in the sign system need closing. The Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program provides an opportunity to connect routes, make improvements, and integrate the entire bicycle network.
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Administration Scenarios

As a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), the RTC is in a unique position to implement a countywide bike route signage program. The RTC does not have general construction authority, so the RTC will have to work closely with all local jurisdictions through which routes will traverse (the Cities of Watsonville, Scotts Valley, Capitola, and Santa Cruz, the County of Santa Cruz, and possibly Caltrans for state highway facilities).

Several options for administration of the program exist. In all scenarios, the RTC programs initial funding for the project and drafts an Implementation Plan. These two steps have already occurred. Then, the RTC convenes meetings with the local jurisdictions to determine an administration process, out of the options listed below. Next, the RTC, local jurisdictions, and other interested parties select sign types and routes. After this, administration of the program can take one of three possible paths:

1) The RTC arranges for a lead jurisdiction to determine specific sign placement, manufacture signs, and install signs for all jurisdictions in the county, on a first-come, first-served basis, while program funds are available.

2) Individual jurisdictions determine sign placement, manufacture signs, and install signs based on routes selected. Jurisdictions request funding from the RTC on a first-come, first-served basis. After considering requests, with equitable geographic distribution in mind, the RTC provides funding for sign production and installation. Funds will be available on a first-come first-served basis.

3) The RTC contracts with a vendor to determine sign placement, manufacture signs, and install signs.

A combination of the above options is also possible.

In all scenarios above, after the RTC provides for the cost of initial sign production, installation, and a limited number of replacement signs, individual jurisdictions will be responsible for ongoing sign maintenance, including manufacture of replacement signs, installation, and all associated costs. If program funds remain or additional funding is identified, the RTC will strive to cover on-going sign replacement as possible.

Because the RTC does not have a licensed traffic engineer on staff, and sign placement will be dependent on engineering evaluations after consideration of line of sight, traffic volume, lane numbers, and other factors, RTC staff recommends Option 1 or 2. Option 3 was recommended by one jurisdiction and an advocacy organization but has significant implementation obstacles.

For a visual representation of the three possible administration options, see Figure 1 below.
Figure 1: Possible Administration Models for the Bicycle Route Signage Program

- RTC programs funds
- RTC creates Preliminary Draft Implementation Plan
- RTC holds meetings with jurisdictions to determine administration process
- RTC holds meetings with jurisdictions and other interested parties to choose sign types and routes
  - RTC arranges for a lead jurisdiction to determine sign placement, manufacture signs, install signs
  - Individual jurisdictions determine sign placement, manufacture signs, and install signs
  - RTC contracts with vendor(s) to determine sign placement, manufacture signs, install signs

Note: In considering possible administration paths, the RTC was especially interested in how other county-level agencies had administered bike route sign programs. While no RTPAs were found to have administered sign programs, several county governments in California have been involved in such programs. Appendix A compares the administration paths taken in Marin County and Santa Barbara County for their respective countywide bike route sign programs.

**Timeframe**

Of the existing sign systems researched, most took a minimum of three years from planning to implementation. Complete implementation also spanned many years as most programs were executed in phases. Interviewed jurisdictions advised the RTC not to underestimate the time needed for planning and pilot testing of the program. With this timeframe in mind, initial routes in
the County could be signed by 2013/2014.

**Public Involvement**

Involving the public in the development of the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program is essential to the success of the project. The majority of jurisdictions with existing sign programs collaborated with their Bicycle Committees or local bicycle advocacy groups on some aspect of route selection and/or sign selection. Some jurisdictions surveyed for this Plan held public meetings, while others felt that input from their bicycle advisory and advocacy groups provided enough information.

For route selection, the RTC recommends getting input from the community via an online survey, as has been done in another region. An online survey would require little staff time and would have a wide reach. Questions could include frequency of bike use, type of bike use, popular destinations and routes on neighborhood and countywide scales, locations that feel unsafe, locations where existing signage could be improved, and conditions or facilities that would lead cyclists to bike more frequently. The route selection process would also benefit from consultation with the RTC’s Bike Committee and/or local bike advocacy and recreational groups (e.g., People Power, Ecology Action, Santa Cruz County Cycling Club, Jovenes Sanos and the South County Bicycle/Pedestrian Workgroup of the Community Traffic Safety Coalition.)

For sign selection, RTC staff does not recommend a public outreach process beyond collaboration with members of the RTC’s Interagency Technical Advisory Committee and the Bike Committee and/or local bike advocacy and recreational groups.

**Collaboration with Local Jurisdictions**

Because bikeways often cross multiple jurisdictions, routes selected will have to be coordinated between various jurisdictions. Other jurisdictions surveyed collaborated widely, reaching and adhering to verbal agreements regarding areas of responsibility or appropriate sign placement for a reasonable and user-friendly bikeway network. Seldom did other jurisdictions enter into written agreements, considering the administrative burden of formal contracts or Memorandums of Understanding.

Coordinating routes is critical and the success of the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program hinges on successful partnerships. The RTC will provide as much assistance, direction, and guidance as possible, but local agencies’ participation is paramount, and creative streamlining, such as waiving encroachment permits, will provide for significant time and cost savings.

Coordination with Caltrans may require more administration, however, as it has been found that Caltrans is reluctant to allow local bike route signs on state facilities. Even when willing, Caltrans did not waive encroachment permit requirements and the process was generally lengthy.
CHAPTER 3

Route Selection

The route selection process should be undertaken in collaboration with all public works departments in the county, as many routes will cross multiple jurisdictions. Chosen routes should include the most direct and least hilly routes between major destinations, with safety as a major consideration. Other factors to be considered when choosing routes include scenic attributes, traffic volume, existing bicycle facilities, proximity to transit stops and/or desirable destinations, network connectivity, popular destinations, and “bike friendliness.” The routes should prioritize commute or utility routes, yet aim to avoid busy streets and hazardous intersections. A hierarchy of routes could be designated early in the process so that routes expected to have the greatest utility can be prioritized as the planning process proceeds.

It is important that chosen routes are equitably distributed throughout the county. Other considerations include overlap of the bike routes with existing and future bike routes and bike facilities. Table 1 shows existing signed routes/bike facilities in Santa Cruz County:

Table 1: Signed Routes/Bike Facilities in Santa Cruz County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast Bike Route</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Coastal Trail</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz Wayfinding Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I bike facilities with “bike path” signs</td>
<td>U.S. Bike Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II bike facilities with “bike lane” signs</td>
<td>Routes resulting from AB 1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III bike facilities with “bike route” signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overlap of the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Network with these routes is discussed in more detail in the next chapter. In general, this program should try to utilize the existing Pacific Coast Bike Route network and other signed bike routes as appropriate to avoid sign clutter and to connect gaps in the current signed network. The Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program should avoid, however, possible segments of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network when possible. When overlap is unavoidable, the signs should be integrated in some creative fashion so that both systems are represented. The Trail Network has specific wayfinding sign mandates that will be adhered to, so attempting to add some bike route information to these signs is the most likely scenario.

RTC’s Santa Cruz County Bike Map and local jurisdictions’ Bicycle Plans containing proposed bicycle improvement projects should also be referenced when selecting routes.

Choosing Destinations

It is recommended that the following hierarchy of routes be established for the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program:

1) Cross-county routes
1) Routes within cities
2) Routes to/between neighborhood destinations (e.g., schools, parks)

The City of Oakland utilizes a hierarchy based on destinations and mileage. This system can also be considered. In Oakland’s hierarchy, primary destinations are the downtown area and adjoining jurisdictions and are signed at distances of up to five miles. Secondary destinations are transit stations and districts and are signed at distances of up to two miles. Tertiary destinations are parks, landmarks, colleges, hospitals, and high schools and are generally signed at distances up to one mile.

Through the research conducted, advice from other jurisdictions regarding route selection was collected. The following list identifies some of the more significant suggestions:

- Designate destinations and organize them into a hierarchy before beginning design. This is a crucial step in developing a system unique to each municipality. It will also give you a sense of the scale of the project: the more destinations, the more signs and greater cost.
- Identify destinations that are on the route only. This will limit the number of additional signs that must be installed to get people to destinations off the route.
- Produce a master destination map. This will make the design process much easier. Place destination points on routes and label them in GIS.
- Use colloquial names for routes and destinations.
- Be careful of including specific commercial destinations such as the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk as you may end up with other commercial operations wanting their business on the signs. Stay generic if possible or make reference to districts or civic destinations instead.

**Possible Routes: Santa Cruz County**

The routes identified below were suggested by several local jurisdictions’ representatives as well as by other bicycle advocacy/advisory organizations’ representatives. Routes are categorized by primary jurisdiction but often traverse multiple areas.

**Cross-county:**
- Downtown Santa Cruz to and from Soquel Village, Cabrillo, and Aptos
- Downtown Santa Cruz to and from City of Scotts Valley (via Glen Canyon or La Madrona)
- Downtown Watsonville/Civic Plaza to and from Aptos and Cabrillo

**City of Capitola:**
- Capitola Village to and from Jade Street Park
- Various streets to Capitola Village
- Various streets to Capitola Mall / 41st Ave

**City of Scotts Valley:**
- Kings Village Shopping Center to and from Civic Center
- City of Scotts Valley to and from Felton (via Mt. Hermon Road)
City of Santa Cruz:
- UCSC to and from Downtown
- Westside to and from Downtown
- Eastside to and from Downtown
- Downtown to and from Natural Bridges
- Downtown to and from Harvey West

City of Watsonville:
- Downtown/Civic Plaza to and from Ramsey Park
- Downtown/Civic Plaza to and from Pinto Lake
- On-street connections to Slough Trails
- Green Valley commercial area to and from Downtown/Civic Plaza

Neighborhoods/Local:
- Cabrillo to and from Aptos
- Aptos to and from Corralitos

The routes identified above are provided only as examples of possible routes. They are not official recommendations.

**Pilot Route**

Several cities with existing sign systems recommended that new sign programs begin with a pilot route. Beginning with a pilot route has also been requested by the City of Santa Cruz’s Transportation/Public Works Commission. The sign program can begin with three pilot routes – one in North County, one in mid-County, and one in South County.

To help work out inevitable issues with the sign placement protocol, the first route should be fairly complicated in terms of jurisdictional boundaries and coordinating agencies. If additional pilot routes are possible, it would be useful to choose routes with different features than the first, in order to expose as many challenges as possible early in the process. These pilot routes will provide the jurisdictions and the RTC with the opportunity to check the effectiveness of the sign designs and refine the location and messaging of the signage.

Starting with a few routes not only allows important revisions to the system, but it also helps garner public support for the sign system. Pilot routes provide avenues for public recognition through ribbon cutting events, media coverage, small-scale rides, or larger parades. Once successful routes have been signed, the public will likely want additional routes. Such support could help facilitate acquisition of funds for future routes.

**Public Involvement**

Of the jurisdictions surveyed, some held public meetings about route selection and some did not; however, all jurisdictions involved their Bike Committee or bike advocates in the selection of bike routes.

For the county’s bike route sign program, the public could be involved with route selection via a survey, with additional guidance coming from RTC’s advisory bodies, such as the Bicycle Committee, and/or local bike advocates. Targeted public involvement through groups identified
above is recommended in the development of Santa Cruz County’s bike signage program.

Field Survey

It is recommended that each route in the network be reviewed in the field prior to sign installation to ensure that directional guides are logical, comprehensive, and streamlined. On-bike field surveys conducted by other jurisdictions led to discussions and decisions about sign messages, locations, and design types. They were also able to identify problems such as gaps in the network, hazardous intersections, one-way streets, and turn restrictions that were resolved on the front end rather than after signs were installed. Issues such as visibility, advance directions, size and location of signs, and pavement markings were also analyzed and solutions were recommended.

Additionally, a post-installation field review would also be advisable to confirm network connectivity and functionality. Members of the public and/or advocacy organizations could be invited to assist in this effort.

Liability

Liability questions have been raised locally by the members of the RTC. In reviewing other jurisdictions’ assessments, RTC staff does not foresee that liability will be a strong consideration when choosing routes for the Bicycle Route Signage Program. Other jurisdictions determined that improvements associated with the bike route system (i.e., improved road conditions, increased motorist awareness) could themselves reduce liability concerns. Additionally, the recent “Complete Streets” approach to transportation projects, which aims to address the safety and mobility needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users in all projects, is a goal of this improvement project as well.

Complying or closely aligning with sign standards set in the National or California Manuals of Uniform Traffic Control Devices will also provide assurances that sound engineering judgment is being adhered to. Signs will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4

Types of Signs

Many different bike route signs are used in the United States and in California. The most commonly used signs are from the Federal Highway Administration’s Manual of Traffic Safety Control Devices (MUTCD), as national compliance provides liability protection. The California MUTCD is the most commonly used signage guide in this state and contains most of the signs in the national version, along with a few state-specific additions and modifications.

The MUTCD has two different options for bike route signs:

1) M1-8 / CA SG45 for numbered bike routes (SG45 is CA designation)

2) D11-1 / D11-1c for destination-based routes (D11-1c is in the national MUTCD, but not in the CA MUTCD)

Some jurisdictions use signs that are either approved or similar to MUTCD signs, with slight modifications that customize the signs for that particular jurisdiction. Some have moved from one type of sign (generally M1-8/SG45) to another (D11-1/D11-1c). Finally, some jurisdictions have created completely unique bike route signs.

Appendix B contains an assessment of various bike route sign systems, including the two MUTCD sign systems, as well as systems from different jurisdictions that use standard signs, modified signs, and non-standard signs. The assessment includes the pros and cons of each sign or sign system based on reports from jurisdictions using them or other evaluations. The survey is not comprehensive.

Recommended Signs

After weighing the pros and cons of the different sign systems, the RTC is recommending the use of standard MUTCD bike route signs. Of the two MUTCD systems – route numbers and
destinations – the RTC considers the destination-based signs to be most useful and informative. Reasons include the following:

- The route number system necessitates use of a map, which complicates the system. Best practices guidelines have identified the fact that route numbering systems may not be intuitive without a map or directory.
- Users familiar with different sign types find a greater utility in destination based signs containing distance to destination information. Signs containing destinations, mileage and route numbers have been used but the limited width of signs can make extraneous information difficult to read.

Many jurisdictions are moving toward including destinations on bike route signs. Oakland recently concluded that its cyclists were not happy with its route number system; because of this and several other factors, the City is in the process of changing to a destination-based bike sign system. San Francisco and San Jose, cities that use the route number signs, are both moving toward systematically including destination information with their signs.

The destination-based sign system recommended here follows the look and feel of standard highway guide signs, with the addition of a bicycle graphic that makes it clear that the signs are designed for bicyclists. By using standard signage from the MUTCD, the RTC builds upon readily recognizable imagery and encourages consistency with existing “Bike Route” signs. It should be noted, however, that “Bicycle Route” signs are not being recommended due to the fact that officially, the word “route” references a Class III facility. Existing “Bike Route” signs on Class I and II facilities in the county should be replaced as they deteriorate.

The recommended sign system will provide bicyclists with direction, destination, and distance information along established bicycle routes. To assist the bicyclist, the recommended system will provide two general kinds of guidance:

1. Decision Signs: located at decision points/intersections, to help guide bicyclists along routes
2. Confirmation Signs: located after decision points/intersections, to confirm route choice

In order to give jurisdictions as much flexibility as possible while maintaining a uniform look across the county, the RTC recommends that jurisdictions utilize the signs identified in Figure 2 below in a modular fashion, choosing the most appropriate signs based on circumstances and need.
**Figure 2: Recommended Bike Route Signs for Santa Cruz County**

**Decision Signs:**
- To be used before major intersections/decision points

**Option 1**
- D11-1, modified ("Bike Route" removed)
- Size: 24" x 18"

**Option 2 (for single destination)**
- D11-1c
- Size: 24" x 18"

**Option 3**
- D1-1a: Single Destination
- D1-2a: Two Destinations
- D1-3a: Three Destinations
- Size: Height varies based on number of destinations; width varies, but could limit to 24" to match width of D11-1
- **Note:** The two signs for Option 1 can be mounted on single plate

**Confirmation Sign:**
- To be used after major intersections/decision points
- To be used on long, uninterrupted stretches

**D11-1c**
- Size: 24" x 18"
**Coordination with Existing and Future Sign Systems**

As mentioned previously, coordination of signs with other current and future wayfinding signs needs to be carefully considered to avoid proliferation of signs, as sign clutter is unsafe and undesirable. Existing signs for the California Coastal Trail, the Pacific Coast Bike Route, as well as standard bike path, bike lane, and bike route signs are peppered throughout the county (see Figure 3). The California Coastal Trail and the Pacific Coast Bike Route networks are very likely to overlap with the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route system, so careful planning is needed. Some additional signs may be needed, and some existing signs may be removed or relocated. It will also be important to consider ways to integrate existing “Bike Route” signs into the new network.

**Figure 3: Existing Bike and Trail Signs in Santa Cruz County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California Coastal Trail</th>
<th>Pacific Coast Bike Route</th>
<th>Class I Bike Path</th>
<th>Class II Bike Lane</th>
<th>Class III Bike Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="California Coastal Trail Sign" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Pacific Coast Bike Route Sign" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Class I Bike Path Sign" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Class II Bike Lane Sign" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Class III Bike Route Sign" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Signs**

In addition to existing signs, a number of additional sign systems are expected to be installed on county roadways in the near future. Coordinating the bike route signs with signs for the following projects will be imperative:

- The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network will be a continuous network of bicycle and pedestrian trails that spans the Monterey Bay coast in both Monterey and Santa Cruz counties. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County has already completed a Master Plan for the Monterey County portion of the trail network and has begun design and construction. The RTC will begin the Master Planning process for the Santa Cruz County portion in Spring, 2011 and the Master Plan should be completed within 2 years. Once constructed, routes will be identified with unique wayfinding signs that have already been developed for the project. The spine of the Santa Cruz County portion of the MBSST Network may run adjacent to the rail line, and spur trails may connect to coastal access, commercial destinations, and other points of interest. As route planning for the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program is undertaken, it will be important to coordinate with MBSST planning so that routes, and therefore sign types, do not overlap. Already, the MBSST Network will have to be signed with unique signs as well as California Coastal Trail signs (see Figures 3 and 4). Creative solutions, discussed below, will have to be considered to combine the MBSST and California Coastal Trail signs; therefore, a third sign type (bike route system) should not be added.
- City of Santa Cruz wayfinding signs are being redesigned by the City of Santa Cruz Redevelopment Agency and are estimated to be installed within the next two years. The wayfinding signs will lead visitors to major commercial destinations, urban centers, parks, coastal access, and other points of interest within the City of Santa Cruz. The bike route signs will likely overlap with many of these new wayfinding signs, so coordination or overlaps may be worthy of consideration.

- Finally, two initiatives – one state and one national – could result in new bike signs in the county. The U.S. Bike Route initiative, a program sponsored by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and the American Cycling Association, is requesting that local jurisdictions designate and sign bike routes of national significance. A California initiative resulting from the passage of AB 1464 is requesting the same thing. Both programs have unique signs. At this time, RTC staff is recommending that the Pacific Coast Bike Route network be used for both programs and that no new signs be installed, in order to avoid confusion and sign proliferation.

Figure 4 shows the signs known to date for the future sign systems described above:

**Figure 4: Future Bike/Trail/Wayfinding Signs in Santa Cruz County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</th>
<th>City of Santa Cruz Wayfinding</th>
<th>Possible US Bike Route</th>
<th>AB 1464 State Route Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image not yet determined</td>
<td>Image not yet determined</td>
<td>Image not yet determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integrating Sign Types: Examples From Other Jurisdictions**

While coordinating different sign systems can be a challenge, both San Jose and Oakland have created successful models for integrating their bike route signs with other wayfinding signs and systems.

The City of San Jose has a different bike route signage system for on-street bike routes and off-street multi-use trails. The on-street bike route signs have this design:
Where the on-street routes go off-street, the off-street trail sign is used as the base sign, with an image of the on-street sign incorporated into it, as follows:

![Image of sign coordination example](source)

Source: City of San Jose – Trail Signage Guidelines

Oakland has a different system for integrating different bike signs, but it is still very effective. Oakland’s on-street bike routes use the standard Bike Route signs, along with directional information:

![Image of sign coordination example](source)

Unlike San Jose, when Oakland bike routes overlap with off-street trails, the bike route signs are used along the trail. In place of the “Bike Route” language, though, the trail name and trail logo appear on the sign. For example:

![Image of sign coordination example](source)

These examples of sign coordination indicate how creative solutions can satisfy multiple functions or programs, yet not create sign clutter issues.
Sign Selection: Public Involvement

Of the jurisdictions surveyed, many chose the sign type to be used internally within planning or public works departments, with some input from their Bicycle Committee or local bike advocacy groups. A few involved the general public in the sign selection process, through workshops or public review of their sign system plan.

As previously outlined, the RTC has researched and analyzed possible sign systems and recommends the system shown above. The next step in the sign selection process is to distribute this Plan to jurisdictions, the RTC’s Interagency Technical Advisory Committee and the Bike Committee, and/or local bike advocacy and recreational groups. The RTC will facilitate meetings with these groups to reach a consensus on the specific signs that will be used in the county. The RTC expects that the input of the advisory committees and bike advocates will be sufficient to create an effective sign program. Furthermore, funding does not exist for a public outreach process at this time; thus, RTC staff does not recommend holding public meetings for sign selection at this time.

Sign Placement

Once a sign system is decided upon, effective placement of signs along the routes is crucial to the functioning of the system. While jurisdictions with existing bike route sign systems vary in their specific standards for sign placement, the majority of jurisdictions place signs at the following locations:

- Before major intersections or decision points
- After major intersections or decision points, to assure bicyclists they are on the correct route

In addition to the general guidelines above, some jurisdictions have very detailed guidelines for sign placement, including exactly how many feet before an intersection a sign should be placed, and how many signs should be installed per mile. Other cities do not have strict guidelines, but rather evaluate each route individually to determine the most effective location for signs.

At this point in the planning process, it is too early to determine sign placement guidelines for Santa Cruz County’s bike route sign system. If detailed sign placement guidelines are created as the planning process continues, review of other jurisdictions’ guidelines will serve as a useful starting point. To this end, appendix C includes detailed sign placement guidelines from four jurisdictions. With or without detailed guidelines, exact sign placement should be evaluated through a field review and through an analysis of all decision-making points on the routes themselves and on route approaches.

Sign Production and Installation

Production

Given the uncertainty of the sign program administration at the current time, the RTC does not have any recommendations for sign production that have not been laid out previously.

That being said, a survey of other jurisdictions resulted in the following insights about sign
production:

- Most jurisdictions produced their signs in-house.
- Producing the entire inventory of signs for a bike route network was more than most in-house sign shops could manage. Solutions included doing the project in phases, so as not to overwhelm the sign shop, or hiring a vendor to produce the signs.

**Mileage Information on Signs**

Bicycle advocates have requested that mileage information be included on selected signs. Indicating mileage allows bicyclists to plan for energy needs and to better time bicycle trips. As evidenced above, RTC staff recommends sign types that include mileage information.

To shorten the width of bike route signs, mileage information is usually expressed as a number without the abbreviation “mi” to indicate mileage. Other jurisdictions determined that adding “mi” would require wider signs or smaller characters without providing a commensurate benefit, as “mi” is implicit (and could, further, be misconstrued for “minutes”). When jurisdictions have placed both mileage and minutes-to-destination information, the abbreviations “mi” and “min” have both been used.

On bicycle routes, distances are typically measured from the center of intersections to the geographical or business center of urban nodes. When the distance is less than one mile, the mileage number is expressed as a decimal, with a zero placed before the decimal (e.g., “0.5”). Fractions have also been used on bike route signs for distances less than one mile, although much less frequently.

**Sign Assemblies: Separate Signs versus Single Plate**

A sign assembly is the group of signs that are placed at one location. For instance, an assembly could include a main “Bike Route” sign plus a second sign mounted below it that contains destination and distance information. In unison, they contain the necessary information at that location.

The RTC recommends that each sign be produced separately, rather than putting all the signs for a given sign assembly on a single plate. Separate signs will ease replacement of individual units. Using a single plate for each sign assembly is possible, though, and has been done by various jurisdictions.

**Production and Installation Costs**

A major expense in the sign program is the cost of manufacturing the bike route signs and installing them.

In the original grant application for this program, sign production/installation costs were estimated at $175 per sign. This amount is consistent with other local jurisdictions who have installed bike route sign systems. As Table 2 shows, San Jose spent $100 for the production and installation of each sign assembly while Marin County spent $175.
Table 2: Costs of Sign Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin County</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: All work done in-house

As the table shows, Oakland paid substantially more for sign production/installation than San Jose or Marin County. This may be due to differences in signs used. Both San Jose and Marin use SG45 as the main sign for their bike routes, which is 12” wide by 18” tall. Additional plaques used are only 12” wide, to match the main sign. Oakland, on the other hand, uses a standard D11-1 Bike Route sign for their base sign, which is 24” wide by 18” tall. Additional plaques match the 24” width of the base sign, making Oakland’s signs much larger than those used by San Jose and Marin County. This may explain Oakland’s greater sign costs, although many other factors may also have played a part.

Specific sign production and installation costs will have to be carefully determined after a sign type is selected and an administrative process, including sign production method, is agreed upon. The wide cost variances discussed above should act as a reminder that sign cost estimates need to be diligently calculated prior to sign production so that funds are not expended before a full route is signed.

**Number of Signs Per Mile**

Overall program costs are determined by the number of signs per mile. This figure, however, is difficult to estimate. One way of determining the number of signs needed for bike routes is to determine the average number of signs used per bi-directional, to two-way, mile. Then, once the number of miles on a given route is known, or the number of miles on an entire bike route system is calculated, the number of signs needed can be calculated. When conceptualizing the project, RTC staff originally estimated the system would contain 8 signs per bi-directional mile (4 in each direction) based on averages from the Pacific Coast Bike Route signs originally installed in Santa Cruz County.

A review of signs per mile in existing systems did not reveal much useful data, as most jurisdictions did not tally their signs in this manner. Only two jurisdictions surveyed had such data, and their numbers varied greatly: Oakland has an average of 14 sign assemblies per bi-directional mile. San Jose, on the other hand, has between 2 and 3, although they anticipate possibly doubling this amount on future routes. Alameda County has a proposed bike route signage program in their 2006 Bicycle Plan; their proposal anticipates 10 signs per bi-directional mile.

In the end, every route is different and every block on each route is different. Some routes might be more rural, and have very few decision points, meaning fewer signs are needed. More urban routes will need more signs, since decision points are abundant. Therefore, it is extremely hard to determine an average number of sign assemblies per mile. A better system might be to look at the number of intersections on a given route, since the majority of signs are placed before and after intersections.
**Installation**

The survey of other jurisdictions revealed several considerations regarding sign installation:

- Installation of signs can overwhelm Traffic Sign Departments. To help ease the burden, some jurisdictions phased programs or used additional staffing resources.
- To save money, most jurisdictions installed bike route signs on existing poles and light posts when possible.
- It is extremely important that sign installation occurs in logical increments to avoid confusion of bicyclists during the installation phase. One jurisdiction recommended that if installation needs to occur in increments, sign locations and content should be tracked in GIS in order to facilitate filling in missing pieces of the network.

**Sign Database**

The RTC recommends that each jurisdiction keep a database of final signs installed in their jurisdiction. Doing so will ease maintenance efforts when signs need to be replaced, which will help maintain the integrity of the sign system.

**Maintenance**

Sign maintenance is crucial to the success of the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program. Missing, damaged, or vandalized signs in any link in a route could render that route incomplete or unusable.

Under the proposed plan, once a route is signed it will be the responsibility of each jurisdiction to maintain the bike route signs within its boundaries. This includes getting new signs produced, when necessary, and installing those signs. The RTC may be able to provide an initial stock of replacement signs (assuming they are standardized, versus custom) if funding is available.

As mentioned above, the RTC recommends that each jurisdiction maintain a database of signs located in their segments of the bike route network. Such a resource will facilitate quick replacement of needed signs.
CHAPTER 5

Promotion

The Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program could be promoted through public officials’ endorsement at a ribbon cutting, media coverage in local publications, route maps posted on public bulletin boards and on the RTC website, and through partnering organizations such as Ecology Action and its Bike to Work program. The City of San Francisco took a photo of the City’s Mayor in front of the Golden Gate Bridge on a bike looking at the bike route map and distributed the photo to the media, garnering much attention.

At the current time, funding is not available for any specific promotional campaign, so no-cost avenues will have to be employed.

Evaluation

Initially, RTC staff envisioned evaluating the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program by conducting bicycle ridership counts before and after sign installation. Given that the funding received was significantly less than the amount requested, no funding is currently available for this task. However, the research conducted revealed that only one jurisdiction evaluated their bike route signage program, and they did so through a survey. Most jurisdictions reported that they did not conduct any bicycle counts specific to the routes; this is because so many variables impact a bicyclist’s route choice that it would be hard to correlate the ridership numbers to the designation of signed bicycle routes.

Summary

The RTC is committed to promoting sustainable transportation options, including bicycle use. Commuters, recreational cyclists, families with children, and tourists would all benefit from a Santa Cruz County Bicycle Route Signage Program. Because the RTC is a Regional Transportation Planning Agency, not a public works department with construction authority, coordinating with local jurisdictions to implement such a program is vital to its success.

This Implementation Plan is intended to provide information to determine an implementation process best suited for Santa Cruz County. After extensive research and careful analysis of future conditions and signage needs, RTC staff proposes that the following actions are taken:

- The Implementation Plan is reviewed and revised as necessary.
- Local jurisdictions and the RTC select an administrative process that defines agencies’ responsibilities in regards to sign placement, production, installation, and maintenance.
- Local jurisdictions and the RTC select a sign system.
- Local jurisdictions and the RTC select routes and a hierarchy of destinations.
- A pilot program of one to three routes is initiated. Ideally one route would be located in North County, one in mid-County, and one in South County and the route(s) would traverse two jurisdictions. No cross-county routes are proposed for the pilot installation as kinks would be better worked out on a smaller scale.
• The program is promoted utilizing existing outreach avenues requiring no additional funding.

• Additional funding is sought for an ongoing bike route signage program to provide for replacement needs and for future signs as additional facilities are built.

• RTC staff should report observations and/or conclusions to the RTC board, and other governing bodies if interested, as notable information is amassed.
## Appendix A: A Comparison of the Administration Paths of Two Countywide Bike Route Sign Programs

### August 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marin County</th>
<th>County of Santa Barbara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jurisdictions</strong></td>
<td>11 cities/towns + Marin County</td>
<td>2 (City of Santa Barbara &amp; County of Santa Barbara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Agency</strong></td>
<td>Marin County (Idea was raised through the Marin Public Works Association [MPWA], which is the public works director from each of the public agencies in the county, including some special districts, as well as the transportation authority/CMA and Caltrans.)</td>
<td>Joint effort between City &amp; County (although City took lead in administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Route Selection</strong></td>
<td>County coordinated with city representatives and advocacy groups on identifying potential routes. No public meetings.</td>
<td>Hired consultant to help with route selection and route naming. Also had public meeting to get community's input on routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All but two jurisdictions had Bike Plans, so the Plans helped guide the route selection process.</td>
<td>(A vast bikeway system existed b/f sign program. Consultant helped organize the existing routes into a hierarchy and identified gaps in system.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign Selection</strong></td>
<td>SG45: Route number system (MUTCD approved)</td>
<td>Non-MUTCD approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPWA dictated use of SG45</td>
<td>City/County hired consultant to design unique sign. Bike Coalition had input on design. Public workshop was held to get public’s input as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign Placement</strong></td>
<td>Determined on a case-by-case basis, either by the individual jurisdictions (often with help of bike advocates), or by the County at the jurisdictions’ request</td>
<td>Determined by consultant. City/County engineers signed off on final placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreements with Jurisdictions</strong></td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>City and County were the only two jurisdictions, and they had a shared contract for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign Production</strong></td>
<td>County had signs made through the County sign shop. County paid for signs. Delivered to jurisdictions.</td>
<td>City/County hired vendor to manufacture signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign Installation</strong></td>
<td>Responsibility of individual jurisdiction (including cost). (County agreed to do this for some of the smaller jurisdictions at no cost. Those jurisdictions waived encroachment permits.)</td>
<td>City/County hired vendor to install signs (including providing poles when necessary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>Responsibility of individual jurisdiction (including getting replacement signs made, paying for them, and installing them)</td>
<td>Responsibility of individual jurisdiction (including getting replacement signs made, paying for them, and installing them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most jurisdictions will probably contract with County for replacement signs, although they can produce them on their own.</td>
<td>Four jurisdictions currently use the initial bike route sign system: the City, the County, Goleta (now incorporated), and Carpinteria (which put up signs after the original project). The County now has its own sign shop, so they produce their own replacement signs. Goleta and Carpinteria usually contract with the County sign shop for replacements. The City has done the same thing in the past. Any new signs that go up (whether they are additions to existing routes or completely new routes in new jurisdictions) are the responsibility of the implementing jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caltrans</strong></td>
<td>Same agreement as with the jurisdictions: Marin County provided initial signs; Caltrans had to install at own expense and maintain at own expense.</td>
<td>[Don’t know.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>BTA &amp; local sales tax funds</td>
<td>ISTEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix B: Survey of Bike Route Sign Types**

*August 2010*

NOTE: Pros and cons include experiences of implementing agencies who have deliberated over signage systems.

### Approved Bike Route Signs: MUTCD Manuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUTCD Sign Designation</th>
<th>Sign Image</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA MUTCD D11-1</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Best used with D1-1, D1-2, D1-3 and D1-1a, D1-2a, D1-3a</td>
<td>Can produce large quantity (more cost-effective)</td>
<td>“BIKE ROUTE” language makes an additional route/destination sign necessary (less efficient use of space; more sign clutter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA MUTCD D11-1a</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>For use on off-road shared-use paths</td>
<td>Can produce large quantity (more cost-effective)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA MUTCD D11-1c</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Best used with M5 and M6 arrow series, if necessary</td>
<td>Can change wording, so versatile</td>
<td>Expensive because of customizable lettering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can use on streets with bike lanes or on paths</td>
<td>Since used alone, eliminates sign clutter that would come from BIKE ROUTE + destination signs</td>
<td>No room for mileage information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUTCD Sign Designation</td>
<td>Sign Image</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA MUTCD D1-1, D1-2, D1-3</td>
<td>[Images of signs]</td>
<td>Since no bike image, more room for destination names</td>
<td>Without number, gives no sense of distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA MUTCD D1-1a; D1-2a; D1-3a</td>
<td>[Images of signs]</td>
<td>Since no bike image, more room for destination names</td>
<td>Numbers could be read as miles or minutes (decimal or fraction would help indicate distance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUTCD Sign Designation</td>
<td>Sign Image</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA MUTCD D1-1b; D1-2b; D1-3b</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Sign Image" /></td>
<td>Best used as stand-alone sign because of bike symbol (bike symbol also makes sign too long to fit with D11-1, D11-1a, D11-1c)</td>
<td>Can use alone, which reduces sign clutter</td>
<td>Without number, gives no sense of distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA MUTCD D1-1c; D1-2c; D1-3c</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Sign Image" /></td>
<td>Best used as stand-alone sign because of bike symbol (bike symbol also makes sign too long to fit with D11-1, D11-1a, D11-1c)</td>
<td>Can use alone, which reduces sign clutter</td>
<td>Numbers could be read as miles or minutes (decimal or fraction would help indicate distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA MUTCD M5-1, M5-2</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Sign Image" /></td>
<td>Directional signs with mileage and bike symbol can get very wide and therefore are subject to being hit by trucks, depending on placement. Could become an added maintenance liability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUTCD Sign Designation</td>
<td>Sign Image</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA MUTCD M6-1 through M6-7</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Sign Image" /></td>
<td>(City of Oakland Bicycle Master Plan 2007 has very detailed pros and cons for this sign. See pp 61–62.)</td>
<td>Jurisdiction logo at top allows customization and a sense of place while the overall sign maintains a standard look across jurisdictions</td>
<td>Narrow, so not as likely to be hit by trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA MUTCD M1-8a; CA MUTCD SG45</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Sign Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MUTCD-Approved Bike Route Signs: In Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>MUTCD Sign Designation</th>
<th>Sign Image</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chicago | FHWA MUTCD D11-1c | ![Sign Image](image1.png) | Sign types are used separately  
Note use of fraction for distances (fractions used by MUTCD for highway signs) | MUTCD approved  
Since signs are used alone, reduces sign clutter (e.g., BIKE ROUTE + Destination signs) | D11-1c does not include mileage information  
Directional signs with mileage and bike symbol (D1-1c) can get very wide and therefore are subject to being hit by trucks, depending on placement. Could become a maintenance liability. |
<p>| | FHWA MUTCD D1-1c | <img src="image2.png" alt="Sign Image" /> | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>MUTCD Sign Designation</th>
<th>Sign Image</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>FHWA MUTCD M1-8a; CA MUTCD SG45</td>
<td>![Sign Image]</td>
<td>Some of SF’s signs contain destinations and arrows, although this hasn’t been done systematically. Are considering systematically adding destination information to signs throughout system. Looking at adding distance and time as well. No definite plan or staff/funding (as of August 2010). If happens, wouldn’t be for 3-5 years from 2010.</td>
<td>MUTCD approved (main sign) Narrow, so not as likely to be hit by trucks</td>
<td>Not intuitive: Need map to identify route number Narrow width of SG45 signs limits size and therefore legibility of supplemental destination text (Marin’s destinations are more legible) Narrow width of SG45 leaves no room for distance Route numbering system is based on east/west and north/south routes, so not ideal for areas whose roads follow a different pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>MUTCD Sign Designation</td>
<td>Sign Image</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>FHWA MUTCD M1-8a; CA MUTCD SG45</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Sign Image" /></td>
<td>San Jose plans to use standard-sized destination signs with SG45, which means they will be wider than the SG45 sign</td>
<td>MUTCD approved Narro, so not as likely to be hit by trucks</td>
<td>Not intuitive: Need map to identify route number Route numbering system is based on east/west and north/south routes, so not ideal for areas whose roads follow a different pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>MUTCD Sign Designation</td>
<td>Sign Image</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin County</td>
<td>FHWA MUTCD M1-8a; CA MUTCD SG45</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Left image: Current multiple plate" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="Right image: Original single plate" /></td>
<td>MUTCD approved (main sign)</td>
<td>Narrow, so not as likely to be hit by trucks</td>
<td>Not intuitive: Need map to identify route number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow width of SG45 signs limits size and therefore legibility of destination text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow width of SG45 leaves no room for distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route numbering system is based on east/west and north/south routes, so not ideal for areas whose roads follow a different pattern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bike Route Signs Similar to MUTCD-Approved Signs: In Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>MUTCD Sign Designation</th>
<th>Sign Image</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>FHWA MUTCD D11-1; D2-1 series; D1-1 series; M5/M6 series</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Sign Image" /></td>
<td>Note use of decimal for distances</td>
<td>Except for tree logo, MUTCD approved</td>
<td>Designates bike lanes or paths as &quot;routes&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Sign Image" /></td>
<td>Distance sign: Number with decimal clearly indicates mileage, not time</td>
<td>Use of &quot;BIKE ROUTE&quot; wording necessitates additional signs that specify destination, which means more sign clutter and less efficient use of space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Sign types used separately</td>
<td>Non-standard cyclist image is clear in meaning and is visually appealing – focus on person rather than device</td>
<td>Cyclist image used on all three signs is not MUTCD approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptations of FHWA MUTCD D11-1c; D1-1c; M1-8a</td>
<td>Although signs use non-standard cyclist image, sign types are based on MUTCD-approved signs</td>
<td>Since signs are used alone, eliminates sign clutter (e.g., BIKE ROUTE + destination signs)</td>
<td>Modification of M1-8a is not MUTCD approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11-1c (modified)</td>
<td>Similar to Chicago system, except Chicago uses authorized signs and does not use regional route sign</td>
<td></td>
<td>Directional signs with mileage and bike symbol (D1-1c) can get very wide and therefore are subject to being hit by trucks. Could become a maintenance liability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unique Bike Route Signs: In Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Sign Image</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Berkeley</strong></td>
<td><img src="BerkeleySigns.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has character, is attractive, all-in-one allows easier installation, numbers clearly designated as miles</td>
<td>Not MUTCD approved, all-in-one more expensive due to customization of each sign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Images from City of Oakland Bicycle Wayfinding Guidelines: Survey and Comparison of Other Cities*

<p>| Gresham, OR     | <img src="GreshamSigns.png" alt="Image" /> | Using “mi” for “miles” is clear when you also have “min”; “mi” alone could be confused for either | All-in-one allows easier installation, includes time and distance info, not MUTCD approved, but very close in style | Not MUTCD approved, all-in-one more expensive due to customization of each sign, time and distance info is small / hard to read |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Sign Image</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Using “mi” for “miles” is clear when you also have “min”; “mi” alone could be confused for either</td>
<td>All-in-one allows easier installation</td>
<td>Not MUTCD approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>All-in-one allows easier installation</td>
<td>Includes time and distance info</td>
<td>All-in-one more expensive due to customization of each sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>All-in-one allows easier installation</td>
<td>Bike image and colors are consistent with MUTCD standards</td>
<td>Time and distance info is small / hard to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara County</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Signs are green, despite blue appearance of second image in column to the left</td>
<td>Has character</td>
<td>Not MUTCD approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Has character</td>
<td>Is attractive</td>
<td>Unique shape of sign increases cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C:
Sign Placement Guidelines from Other Jurisdictions

C.1 Chicago

Bikeways Signage Series V Destination Guidelines

- Three destination categories:
  - Primary
  - Secondary
  - Tertiary
- Destination is required to be on given route.
  - For example, a bicyclist traveling southbound on California at Logan would have a destination of Humboldt Park, not Downtown.
  - Exceptions to this requirement would be those routes whose implicit destination is beyond that route. For example, a bicyclist traveling southbound on Lincoln at Halsted may be guided to Downtown, not Lincoln Park.
- Community Groups and Areas were excluded due to the high number of possibilities and the political ramifications from picking only a few communities to use as destinations.
- The downtown area will not normally be signed. Downtown will be defined as the area bordered by the Chicago River to the north and west, Congress Parkway to the south, and Michigan Avenue to the east.
- Destinations named in this project will be kept to a minimum in order to avoid confusion.
- The number of destinations provided on a given sign array are not to exceed four and the number of signs on a given array pointing in the same direction are not to exceed two.
- Wording of Signs:
  - D11-1 – These signs will state “[Direction] to [Destination].” For example, “North to Evanston” or “West to Humboldt Park”
  - D1-1b – These signs should state the destination and mileage. The bike symbol and directional arrow should also be on the sign.
- There will be exceptions to these guidelines.

Placement Guidelines
D11-1

• Signs typically are placed:
  o approximately every 0.25 mile
  o after every turn in a route, unless the next turn is 0.125 mile away or less
  o after all signalized intersections
• Attempt to place within 160 feet after an intersection
• Attempt to place on existing poles

D1-1b

• Non-Channelized
  o Place 40 feet before the intersection
  o Ensure sign is at least 20 feet, preferably 30 to 40 feet from the stop sign or stop light.
  o Ensure sign is not blocking the stop sign or stop light.
• Channelized
  o Sign is placed based on engineering judgment
  o Place between taper and bay
  o Ensure sign cannot be misinterpreted (e.g. turn into alley)
• Specific
  o 4 signs max on one pole
  o No more than 2 signs in one direction

Signed Route – A route with D11-1 signs placed every 0.25 mile.
Unsigned Route – A route that is recommended for bicycling, yet no D11-1 signs are present.
Chicago Sign Placement: Signed Route Crossing a Signed Route
Chicago Sign Placement: Signed Route Crossing an Unsigned Route

[Note: Detailed sign design specifications can be found in Chicago’s report, which is named below.]

Information in this section comes from Chicago Department of Transportation’s “Bikeways Signage Series V Destination Guidelines”
C.2 Oakland

Sign Types

The system is composed of three sign types:

Confirmation sign

Confirmation signs confirm that a cyclist is on a designated bikeway. Each confirmation sign includes a Bicycle Route Guide Sign (D11-1) and a Destination Supplemental Sign (D1-1b). Confirmation signs are located mid-block or on the far-side of intersections. Confirmation signs include destinations and their associated distances, but not directional arrows.

Turn sign

Turn signs indicate where a bikeway turns from one street onto another street. (They are not used at the junction of intersecting bikeways.) Turn signs are located on the near-side of intersections. Each turn sign includes a Bicycle Route Guide Sign (D11-1) and the appropriate Direction Arrow Supplemental Sign (M7-1 to M7-7).

Decision signs

Decision signs mark the junction of two or more bikeways. Decision signs are comprised of a Bicycle Route Guide Sign (D11-1) and a Destination Supplemental Sign (D1-1b). Decision signs are located on the near-side of intersections. They include destinations and their associated directional arrows, but not distances.

Sign Placement Principles

The following principles inform the placement of individual signs:

1. A confirmation sign will be located at the beginning of each bikeway.
2. When a bikeway turns, a turn sign will be located in advance of the turn (e.g., near-side of the intersection).
3. When bikeways intersect, a decision sign will be located on the near-side of each intersection approach.
4. To allow adequate notification of left turns, the decision or turn sign should be placed a distance before the intersection based on the number of lanes the bicyclist must merge across in order to make a legal left turn:
   a) Zero lane merge: 25’
   b) One lane merge: 100’
c) Two lane merge: 200’

The decision or turn sign should always be located in the block immediately preceding the junction or turn.

5. Confirmation signs will be located at intervals of one-half mile to one mile, based on the density of streets and intersecting bikeways (e.g., downtown versus the Oakland Hills). It is desirable for confirmation signs to be located following decision signs on the far-side of intersections at the first convenient installation location.

6. Confirmation signs should be located immediately following bikeway junctions on streets that do not have bicycle lanes or sharrows (e.g., in the Oakland Hills).

Sign Layout Principles

The following principles determine the layout of individual signs. Turn signs follow the details and dimensions specified in the MUTCD.

1. The Bicycle Route Guide Sign (D11-1) is 24” wide and 18” tall.
2. The Destination Supplemental Signs (D1-1b) are 24” wide with the height determined by the number of destinations.
3. No more than three destinations are included on any single sign pole.
4. Destinations shall use mixed case letters (e.g. upper case and lower case).
5. The Destination Supplemental Signs (D1-1b) shall use the FHWA 2000 C series font with 2” cap height.
6. For long destination names that do not fit on one line, these approaches are used in the following order of preference:
   a) For destination names slightly longer than one line, compress the font horizontally to no less than 90% of its standard size.
   b) Use intuitive abbreviations in the destination name.
   c) Use a two-line entry for the destination name.
7. On decision signs, the straight destination shall be listed on top, the left destination in the middle, and the right destination on the bottom.
8. On decision signs, the straight arrow shall be placed to the left of a destination, the left arrow to the left of a destination, and the right arrow to the right of a destination.
9. On decision signs, straight destinations shall be left-justified, left destinations shall be left-justified, and right destinations shall be right-justified. The straight arrow shall be centered over the left arrow.
10. On confirmation signs, the closest destination shall be listed on top and the furthest destination shall be listed on the bottom.
11. If a bikeway ends in a location where there is no obvious destination, use the closest major destination on an intersecting bikeway. If there is no intuitive destination, the name of the intersecting street where the bikeway ends may be used as the destination.
12. The bikeway’s endpoint should be included on confirmation signs along the length of the route, irrespective of the distance associated with its designation as a primary, secondary, or tertiary destination.
13. Avoid the use of diagonal arrows on turn signs and decision signs wherever possible.
14. Do not use periods in the abbreviation of destination names (e.g. “Piedmont Ave” and “Jack London Sq”).

15. Common symbols are used to convey destination information in a space-efficient manner. The symbols shown below are used for “BART”, “hospital”, “East Bay Regional Park”, and “Amtrak”. The symbol shall precede the destination name (e.g. “[symbol] MacArthur” and “[symbol] Kaiser”).

Logos/symbols used on decision/confirmation signs

Installation Specifications

The standard pole for bikeway guide signs is a 2” square perforated unistrut pole. The pole should be placed 18” to 24” in the ground, depending upon the overall weight of the signs and the soil/pavement conditions. Heavy sign installations may require poles up to 36” into the ground. Poles of 12’ in length are generally adequate to accommodate a D11-1 with a supplementary D1-1b sign. Longer poles are needed if additional signs will share the same pole. The D11-1 should be installed at 10’ in height as measured from the top edge of the sign. This height will allow for the installation of supplementary signs while maintaining a minimum 7’ clearance to the bottom edge of the bottom sign. When a D11-1 is mounted on a pole with an existing parking restriction sign, the D11-1 and any supplementary sign should be located above the parking restriction sign. Signs shall not be mounted to utility poles or traffic signal mast arms. Existing poles should be used wherever practical.

[Note: Detailed sign design specifications can be found in Oakland’s report, which is named below.]

C.3 Seattle, Washington

Design Guidelines per Sign Types:

Directional Signs (D1-1c)

Sign includes direction, destination and distance information. Placed 30-100' before routes intersect.

Maximum characters per directional sign (mileage numbers not counted): 18

Directional sign organization at a given decision point will be based on the following guidelines:

1. Directional blades should be placed at decision points where signed routes intersect and where routes lead directly to the intended destination. Placing signs at these locations reinforces the use of designated routes. The bicycle route system has been designed to connect urban villages, schools and other important locations that in many cases fall directly on designated routes.

2. The number of destinations provided on a given post is not to exceed three. This allows for the proper vertical clearance to be maintained.

3. The number of signs on a given post pointing in the same direction is not to exceed two. Limiting destinations to two in one direction is necessary to provide space for destinations in other directions as this sign type will occur at intersecting routes.

4. The sign with the nearest destination should go at the top of the assembly with the most distant destination at the bottom. If destinations are equal in distance, the sign with an up arrow should be placed on top. This arrangement allows for the nearest destination to "fall off" the top of the sign and subsequent destinations to move-up as the bicyclists approaches.

5. When directional blades are placed on regional routes or they direct users directly to regional routes, regional route signs (M1-8a and auxiliary blades) may be placed on the same sign post below the blades. Placing multiple sign types on one post will reduce the number of posts used as well as provide all necessary information for bicyclists in one location.

6. Destinations are ranked:
• Primary: Mixed-Use Paths, Downtown, Urban Villages, Regional Parks, Bridges
• Secondary: Institutions, Transit Stations, Other Municipalities
• Tertiary Destinations: Other public institutions/facilities, Stadiums, Airport, Designated Bicycle Streets

A list of all destinations in the hierarchy can be provided by SDOT.

Distances are measured along bicycle routes to the geographical center or business center of urban villages based on city of Seattle Urban Village Map. See Appendix F for an example.

**Directional Spot Signs (D1-1b)**

Spot signs are similar to directional signs but provide direction and destination information only. They are used when a destination is off the signed route or when getting to the route requires additional wayfinding. They should not be installed on the same posts as directional signs. Spot signs may include the words "To" and "Via" where necessary and may vary in width to accommodate limited space in the right of way. Spot signs do not need to be followed by a confirmation sign.

Spot signs may be used where:

1. Guidance to signed bicycle routes from adjacent roadways, side paths etc. or access to important facilities such as bridges is needed.

2. Guidance from signed bicycle routes when important destinations are a short distance off the signed route, e.g. UW from the University Bridge. In such cases a directional sign may indicate the best access point from the signed route to the destination. Additional spot signs can be used to guide bicyclists to that destination.

**Regional Route Signs (M1-8a)**

Regional route signs will be placed along named regional on-road routes and trails to assist users in wayfinding along the route or to confirm that the user is on the desired route. The signs also
include auxiliary signs such as directional arrows (M7 series) and the words “To”, “End”, “Begin”, etc. (M4 series) see Appendix A.

On-trail the regional route signs will be used:
- 30’-50’ after every intersection or street crossing; or
- Every ¼ mile where there is a gap in signage
- At transitional locations (such as trail-to-road transitions) or in cases where bicyclists will be transitioning to sidewalks
- At trail entrances and exits “Begin” and “End” auxiliary signs should be used above the regional route sign

On-street the regional route signs will be placed:
- 30’-100’ before a turn (with an auxiliary arrow)
- 30’-60’ after the turn to confirm the path
- At decision points where needed
- Within proximity to regional route (within a few blocks), similar to a spot sign. Can be used in conjunction with an auxiliary sign such as an arrow or “To”. When farther than a few blocks directional signs are used to direct users to regional routes.

Organization of signs on posts:
- Regional route signs can be mounted on the same post, below regulatory, warning or destination signs.
- Regional route signs may be placed back-to-back or back-to-back with regulatory or warning signs.
- When multiple regional route signs are placed on the same post, they can be stacked depending on height and visibility. The current route should be the top sign. See Appendix C for system layout examples.

Confirmation Signs (D11-1c)

These signs confirm a route selection after a decision has been made following the directions indicated by directional signs. Confirmation signs will include destination information generally with the text “To” the location indicated on the directional blade. In cases where a confirmation sign is found on a regional route and the route must be confirmed after a turn has been made, a regional route sign may be placed below the confirmation sign.
Maximum characters per confirmation sign: 22.

Confirmations signs should be placed:
1. 30'-60' after decision points (preferably within sight of Directional Sign)
2. 30'-60' after major intersections
3. Or after every ¼ mile of unsigned segment along designated on-street routes.

General-

Sign Post Location:

- If possible, place sign on an existing post to minimize visual clutter and reduce costs.

*However, please note:*

- Wooden Utility Poles- bicycle wayfinding signs *cannot* be placed on wooden utility poles. Sign posts must be at least 5’ from wooden utility poles to allow for climbing of wooden utility pole.

- Metal Utility Poles- bicycle wayfinding signs can be placed on metal utility poles, light poles and strain poles.

[Note: Detailed sign design specifications can be found in Seattle’s report, which is named below.]

*Information in this section comes from Seattle Department of Transportation’s “Seattle Bicycle Route Sign Guidelines.”*
C.4 East King County, Washington

General guidelines, applicable to all signs.

- The sign family proposed in this document is based on the D1 series of guide signs and plaques for bicycle facilities in Section 9B-20 of the 2009 MUTCD. This signing system is proposed because of more efficient use of space and elimination of redundant elements as compared to the older D11-1 “Bike Route” sign. This sign family includes “regional route” signs and “trail name” signs (see Section 9B-20 of the 2009 MUTCD).

- If any part of a sign assembly is within three feet of the travel way, a minimum 8’ vertical clearance will be maintained. For sign assemblies outside the 3’ buffer, minimum vertical clearances will follow AASHTO guidelines for shared use paths.

- Sign font and colors will adhere to current MUTCD guidelines for informational signs.

- Sign sheeting reflectivity and post placement will adhere to respective municipal standards.

- Distances to destinations are usually measured from the centers of intersections, and use a decimal format. When the distance is less than one mile, a zero is placed before the decimal (i.e. “0.5”).

- Sign text does not include periods (with the exception of the distance figure).

- New sign support installations will follow the standards of the city in which the support is located.

- The order in which signs are placed on the post is based on distance; the nearest destination has its sign at the top of the assembly and the most distant destination is at the bottom. If destinations are equal in distance, the sign with an up arrow should be placed on top; if neither sign has an up arrow the order is determined alphabetically.

Directional signs (D13c).

Indicate the way to destinations with an arrow and distance figure, accompanied by a bicycle symbol.

Directional signs are placed on bicycle wayfinding routes at the approaches to decision points in the block immediately preceding the intersection.

[Length varies depending on text]” x 6” in size. Max 36” wide. (MUTCD, table 9B-1). While the MUTCD allows bicycle wayfinding sign widths to vary depending on the amount of text, a standard width of 36” size is recommended here so that the edges of multiple signs on a post align with each other, including signs that may be changed or added in the future.
• The distance between a decision point and a directional sign assembly should be determined based on intersection geometrics, number of lanes, sight distance, and professional judgment. Suggested distance for zero lane merge: 30'; one or more lane merges: 100’. These distances are based on the experiences of the Chicago and Seattle departments of transportation.

• Strive for no more than 3 directional signs per post. This helps achieve the required vertical clearance and reduces sign clutter. On posts that include a Regional Route sign, the number of directional signs is usually limited to two.

• When used in combination with other sign types, the directional signs are usually placed on top.

• The number of signs on a given post that point in the same direction should not usually exceed two. This is necessary to provide room on the post for signs that reference destinations in other directions.

• When directional blades are placed on regional routes or they direct users directly to regional routes, regional route signs (M1-8a and auxiliary plaques) may be placed on the same sign post below D1-1c.

Confirmation signs (D111c).

![Confirmation Sign](image)

Confirmation Sign

• Confirm to the user that they are on their intended route, or used to signal a jog in a route when used in combination with an auxiliary arrow.

• Sign size is 24” x 18”

• If used, they are usually placed 30’-60’ after decision points and major intersections—preferably within sight of a preceding directional sign. May be placed after every half mile of unsigned segment along designated onstreet routes.

• If more than one destination was indicated at the previous decision point, the confirmation sign should include two lines – one for each destination (max 2, with the closer destination on top). The bicycle symbol is reduced in size to accommodate the extra text, which remains 2” tall.

• In the case of a jog in the route, a confirmation sign and auxiliary arrow sign (see Appendix B, M7 series) are usually placed in advance of the turn, using the D1-1c spacing rule. An additional confirmation sign is usually placed on the far side of the turn.
Directional spot signs (D12b).

- Direct users to destinations that are adjacent to a wayfinding route or within a short distance—about ½ mile or less (e.g. Bellevue College from the I-90 Trail). Can also be used to sign difficult connections between wayfinding routes, or between wayfinding routes and important facilities like bridges.

- [Length varies depending on text] x 6” in size. Max 36” wide. If more than one directional spot sign is on one post they should be the same length.

- Do not need to be followed by a confirmation sign.

Regional Route signs (M18)

- Inform users that they are on a named, regional-class trail or on-road route. Also can be paired with auxiliary plaques (directional arrows, M5 and M6 series) and the words “To,” “End,” or “Begin” (M4 series) to guide users to the regional route from a nearby corridor or signal the beginning or end of a regional route.

- 12” x 18” in size (2009 MUTCD Table 9B-1).

- Where regional routes are on a trail, signs will usually be located 30’-60’ after every significant intersection or street crossing together with a confirmation sign, up to every half mile where there is a gap in signage, or at transitional locations (such as trail-to-road transitions) with a confirmation sign. They may also be used at locations where bicyclists will be transitioning to sidewalks.

- Where regional routes are on-street, signs will usually be placed 30’-100’ before a turn (with an auxiliary arrow), 30’-60’ after the turn to confirm the route, every half mile where there is a gap in signage and at decision points where needed.
In cases where a confirmation sign is found on a regional route and the route must be confirmed after a turn has been made, a regional route sign is placed below the confirmation sign.

Trail signs (Street Name Signs).

![Trail Sign]

Trail Sign

- Inform bicyclists and motorists of the presence of multiuse paths (like standard street name signs).
- [Length varies depending on text]” x up to 9” in size.
- Sign text is mixed case, max 6”-tall lettering.
- Placed at intersections of city streets and multiuse paths.
- Bike and pedestrian icons included for shared facilities (i.e. multiuse path). Trail signs can be used to indicate pedestrian facilities like footpaths or staircases; in this case the bicycle symbol is omitted.

*Information in this section comes from “East King County Bicycle Wayfinding Practice Guide,” January 2010. [Document acquired from City of Bellevue, WA, staff.]*
TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network – Implementation and private funding plan development

RECOMMENDATION

For information only.

BACKGROUND

At the November 7th, 2013 meeting, the RTC adopted the Master Plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network and certified the Final Environmental Impact Report. The Master Plan defines the “rail trail,” a proposed bicycle and pedestrian trail adjacent to the 32 mile Santa Cruz Branch rail line right-of-way, as the spine of a broader network of trails that will provide connections to activity centers, coastal access points and other key destinations. Following that meeting, RTC staff received a request letter (Attachment 1) from Commissioner Zach Friend for a legal and policy framework that will fulfill the goal of developing the trail network by creating a process for interested parties to raise private funds and for accepting volunteer labor power for working on the trail network as laid out in the adopted Master Plan.

DISCUSSION

Interest and enthusiasm in contributing private funds and/or labor power to building segments or partial segments of the MBSST Network, particularly the rail trail spine, have been widely expressed. Staff has been in multiple communications with potential private donors and has been in discussions regarding possible funding partnership arrangements. Staff has begun investigating means by which to receive private dollars as well as provide guidance to private sector efforts so that coordination is ensured and over commitments are not made. Many public agencies, including local jurisdictions, receive private dollars and various mechanisms exist that will be presented to the Commission in detail once a report can be adequately compiled.

Staff has also received questions regarding using volunteer labor to build segments of the trail. Federal, local and state restrictions exist which pose challenges towards that end. Projects need to go through competitive bid processes; use licensed and bonded contractors, skilled and properly trained workers, equipment and licensed operators; pay prevailing wages; have liability and worker’s compensation coverage; and adhere to local, state and federal construction standards and procedures. The possibility of ancillary volunteer work, like planting, painting, clean-up and patrols exist and will be explored further.

RTC staff is also moving forward with drafting implementation responsibilities as outlined in the Master Plan and will be developing Memoranda of Understanding with local jurisdictions to delineate role assignments as segments are funded and move towards design, permitting,
environmental analysis and construction. Staff will bring all information to the RTC for consideration as it is developed.

**SUMMARY**

Commissioner Zach Friend requested that staff bring a report to the RTC regarding establishing a legal and policy framework that will fulfill the goal of developing the trail network by creating a process for interested parties to raise private funds and to volunteer manual labor to work on the trail network as laid out in the adopted Master Plan. RTC staff will conduct the necessary research and bring information to the RTC as it is developed.

Attachment 1: Letter from Commissioner Zach Friend, dated November 13, 2013
November 13, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Dondero:

As the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) moves toward funding of the initial segment(s) of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (Trail Network), one thing has become clear: the interest in construction of the Trail Network greatly outweighs the available funding. The Trail Network provides a unique opportunity for recreation and transportation not seen in the county in quite some time. However, many segments, including nearly all within my Supervisory district, are too expensive to complete at this time.

In fact, many segments, often due to the topographic complexity or limited urban density, will not realistically be funded by the RTC for quite some time. For example, one segment goes through Seacliff in the State Park Drive corridor. Given the planned development of the Aptos Village, improvements to the State Park entrance, and changes along the Soquel corridor, it is expected this area will greatly need new multi-modal outlets. I’ve been approached by many in the community who are interested in helping fund and/or build segments or partial segments along the corridor and I imagine this situation is not unique to my district.

To that end, I would like the RTC to draft a legal and policy framework that will accommodate the ultimate goal of a fully-functional, coastal, multi-use trail by creating a process whereby interested parties may leverage private money and manpower to work on the trail designs laid out in the Trail Master Plan.

I would like to ask the Commission to include this request as part of the trail segments being considered at the December 5, 2013, RTC meeting.  

Sincerely,

ZACH FRIEND, Supervisor
Second District

ZF:ted
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### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### TDA REVENUE REPORT
### FY 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY12-13 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY13 - 14 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY13 - 14 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>533,900</td>
<td>560,595</td>
<td>556,100</td>
<td>-4,495</td>
<td>-0.80%</td>
<td>99.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>711,800</td>
<td>747,390</td>
<td>741,500</td>
<td>-5,890</td>
<td>-0.79%</td>
<td>99.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>718,257</td>
<td>754,170</td>
<td>818,354</td>
<td>64,184</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>102.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>556,500</td>
<td>584,325</td>
<td>596,900</td>
<td>12,575</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>102.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>742,000</td>
<td>779,100</td>
<td>795,900</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>102.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>733,930</td>
<td>770,626</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>534,300</td>
<td>561,015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>712,400</td>
<td>749,739</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>632,278</td>
<td>689,732</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>475,600</td>
<td>486,487</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>634,100</td>
<td>648,649</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>759,038</td>
<td>834,025</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7,744,102</td>
<td>8,165,853</td>
<td>3,508,754</td>
<td>83,174</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
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### Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

**THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE**

**December 2013 Through February 2014**

*All meetings are subject to cancellation when there are no action items to be considered by the board or committee. Please visit our website for meeting agendas and locations [www.sccrtc.org/meetings/](http://www.sccrtc.org/meetings/)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Day</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Meeting Time</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/5/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/13</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee - CANCELED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/13</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/14</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission (note special date)</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Santa Cruz City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/14</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee – CANCELED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16/14</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop - CANCELED due to holiday schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16/14</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6/14</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/14</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee (note special time)</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/11/14</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/14</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/14</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/14</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Commission Offices -1523 Pacific Ave- Santa Cruz, CA*

*RTC Watsonville Offices-275 Main St Ste 450-Watsonville, CA*

*Board of Supervisors Chambers/CAO/RDA Conference room-701 Ocean St-5th floor-Santa Cruz, CA*

*City of Capitola-Council Chambers-420 Capitola Ave-Capitola, CA*

*City of Santa Cruz-Council Chambers-809 Center St-Santa Cruz, CA*

*City of Scotts Valley-Council Chamber-1 Civic Center Dr-Scotts Valley, CA*

*City of Watsonville-Council Chambers-275 Main St Ste 400-Watsonville, CA*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>FROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/07/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Greg Caput</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tyler Monson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RM 10/27/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Liz Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL 10/30/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pamela H Silkwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 10/30/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kate Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 10/30/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dusten Dennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 10/30/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Donna Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Golden</td>
<td>Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Spear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Harrold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Moore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Correspondence Log

**December 5, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Barsamian</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Scenic Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Levoy</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Seales</td>
<td>Plan Adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nana</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Lukasiewicz</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Guvener</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/13 Email</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Geri</td>
<td>Lieby</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/13 Email</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Lieby</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/13 Email</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Horton</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail Master Plan &amp; EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/13 Email</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>Kluge</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/13 Email</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/13 Email</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Rebbie</td>
<td>Higgins</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/13 Email</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Hooper</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>11/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Zweig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>11/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barnaby</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>11/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>11/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Corser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBSSST Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>11/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Ott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt Master Plan and EIR for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>11/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Thomsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>11/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Batya</td>
<td>Kagan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monterey Scenic Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>11/4/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>Multer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Mark McCumsey</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Contract No. 74A0141 Monterey Bay Area Travel Information System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 11/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Barrett Heffington</td>
<td>UC Santa Cruz</td>
<td>MB Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Neal Coonerty</td>
<td>SCCRTC Chair</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan (Agenda Item #22 SCCRTC Public Hearing of November 7, 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 11/5/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 11/05/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>Capuldio</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 11/05/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail Master Plan &amp; EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response Date</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>TO Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>FROM Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC 11/05/13</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau’s Comment on MBSST Network Master Plan and EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 11/22/13</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Sosbee</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metro-link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 11/05/13</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Aux Update - Sept 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 11/05/13</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Pomerantz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item #22: Certification of the FEIR and Adoption of the MBSST Network Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Salois</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Salois &amp; Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Wener vs Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/06/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 11/06/13</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Geddes</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments about MBSCTN Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Lieby</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>SCCRTC Rail Freight Service and Bicycle-Pedestrian Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Countywide Network of Trolleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Jewell</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Jewell</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Downing</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Downing</td>
<td>Planting Vines n the Rail Line to Reduce Graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pamela H</td>
<td>Silkwood</td>
<td>Horan Lloyd</td>
<td>Pamela H</td>
<td>Silkwood</td>
<td>Notice of Intent to File CEQA Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Appointment to the RTC Bicycle Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Coonerty</td>
<td>SCCRTC, Chair</td>
<td>Murry</td>
<td>Schekman</td>
<td>Pajaro Valley Unified School District Application for Funds to Construct the Rail-Trail-Lee Road Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Coonerty</td>
<td>SCCRTC, Chair</td>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>Hurst</td>
<td>City of Watsonville Application for Funds to Construct the Rail-Trail-Lee Road Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryann</td>
<td>Campbell-Smith</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC Indirect Cost Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Coonerty</td>
<td>SCCRTC, Chair</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Osmer</td>
<td>Central Coast Energy Services Application for Funds to Construct the Rail-Trail-Lee Road Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Business Council Completion of Highway 1 Improvements - Morrissey Boulevard to Soquel Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Coonerty</td>
<td>SCCRTC, Chair</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Ecology Action Application for Funds to Construct the Rail-Trail-Lee Road Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Coonerty</td>
<td>SCCRTC, Chair</td>
<td>Willy</td>
<td>Elliott-McCrea</td>
<td>Second Harvest Food Bank Santa Cruz County Application for Funds to Construct the Rail-Trail-Lee Road Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>11/19/13</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jane Parks-Mckay</td>
<td>Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Aux: Night Work Rescheduled - Nov 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Coonert</td>
<td>SCCRTC, Chair</td>
<td>Michelle Templeton</td>
<td>Application for Funds to Construct the Rail-Trail-Lee Road Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>Bruce Friend McPherson</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Inclusion of Requirements for the Placement of Broadband Infrastructure With All Trail Segment Construction Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I just want to say "thank you" for making sure someone came to weed whack the center divide on the Morrissey overpass. Now with the new landscaping and wood chips, the entire area looks great!

The only thing remaining is about 2 cubic yards of left over dead ice plant pulled up by tractors that is piled up by the underpass of the intersection. Maybe a worker with a truck who is in the area could load it up and take it away.

I'll try to do my part keeping litter under control on the walkways where students bike and walk to and from DeLaveaga Elementary and Branciforte Middle School. I can clearly see what a difference having the sidewalks and crossing guards has made in getting lots of families out of their cars in the mornings and in the afternoons. So friendly and healthy! And good for the environment.

Thanks for everything.
Laura

Hi Laura —
Thank you for the positive feedback and again for your volunteer work to help keep the area clean. We're happy to hear that the results are noticeable from the combined efforts of not only components of the Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project, but also Safe Routes to School, Boltage, and Commute Solutions.

I will be talking to Caltrans staff today and can relay your request to dispose the (dead ice plant) debris. Also, I've copied Santiago Garcia, Caltrans staff, who is overseeing landscaping in this area.

- Karen Pushnik, RTC

I think the work has been done beautifully, and especially appreciate the lights along the length of the La Fonda St. bridge.

Many high school students use that route to Harbor High during early morning and evenings. When winter brings short days, it will be safer for the students to have the bridge lit. It may not rival the Bay Bridge, but it's still nice.

Before the landscapers leave, could they possibly spend a little time weed whacking the median strip on the southbound Morrissey Blvd. exit? I'm a neighborhood volunteer who picks up litter and tries to keep the sidewalk clean on the overpass, but I do not think it would be safe for me to stand out in the middle of that busy overpass pulling up weeds.

Thanks.
Laura Caldwell
**On Wed, Sep 18, 2013 at 6:16 PM, Laura Caldwell wrote:**
Oops! My Mistake. I was referring to the weeds on the median strip of the Northbound Morrissey exit that leaves Hwy 1 just beyond the La Fonda St. bridge. Thanks! - Laura

**On Wed, Sep 18, 2013 at 3:55 PM, Karena Pushnik <kpushnik@seccrc.org> wrote:**

Hello Laura Caldwell —
Thank you for your comments on the La Fonda Bridge. We’re glad to hear that the design is working well for the neighborhood.

Regarding the Median Strip on the southbound Morrissey exit, I’ll forward your comment to Caltrans who is overseeing the landscape contract for that portion of the highway which was part of the Highway 1/17 Interchange Merge Lanes project. The landscape contractor is the same for both highway projects.

Thanks also for your volunteer work to keep our community clean!

* * * * *
Karena Pushnik, RTC | 831.460.3210
This Contact Request Form has been submitted by a member of the public to http://sccrtc.org/contact-us/.

Name
LYNDA SHEPHERD

Email
LRSHEPHERD@SBCGLOBAL.NET

Subject
COUNTYWIDE NETWORK OF "TROLLEYS"

Your Message
I'm formerly from the East Coast where the use of trolleys and light rails really allow an alternative to car traffic. Has there been any discussion about installing these quiet "trains" along the old rail lines from Watsonville to downtown SC? The large, mostly empty buses go through every neighborhood (of course) which in SC consists of winding streets and stop signs and takes nearly an hour from Aptos to the Capitola mall. Light rail seems so feasible since we're looking to create "an active transportation system."

I haven't seen any mention of using the tracks year round for light rail instead of those noisy Holiday trains to nowhere. Anything going on???

11/22/13

Hello Lynda Shepherd –
Your email regarding the local use of trolleys or light rail was received and will be made available to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) for their consideration.

The RTC purchased the 32-mile rail corridor between Pajaro/Watsonville and Davenport to preserve corridor and maximize transportation options for Santa Cruz County residents and visitors. In the short term, uses of the corridor will include seasonal/recreational passenger train operations and freight rail. In addition, the RTC has awarded a contract to rehabilitate some of the structures along the line. The largest is the La Selva trestle, which will be impassable for the duration of this work, expected to take 6-9 months.

Also, the RTC recently received a competitively-awarded grant to analyze potential passenger rail options. Here's an excerpt from the scope of work which we'll be starting in 2014: "the feasibility and ridership potential for commuter and intercity passenger rail service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, providing practical recommendations for phased implementation of cost-effective and efficient services that advance regional, state, and federal goals. Includes development of performance measures and objectives; capital and operating cost estimates; analysis of varying service scenarios; connectivity to other bus and rail services; and public outreach."


So yes, we're starting an evaluation of local passenger rail service feasibility to help us understand what would work, technologies available, what it will cost, and how it could be operated. I've added you to the email distribution list to stay informed about the project (please let us know if you prefer not to receive rail information).

Thank you.

Karena Pushnik
RTC | 831.460.3210
From: Cindy Jewell [mailto:cjewell@calgiant.com]
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 10:40 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: rail trail

We want to go on record as supporting the rail trail and urging that the Master Plan be adopted and move forward. We were pleased to hear that the EIR was certified at the Nov 7 meeting. Thank you.

Cindy Jewell
Director of Marketing
California Giant Berry Farms
Tel. (831) 728-1965 x258
Mobile. (831) 566-2202
Fax. (831) 728-0613
cjewell@calgiant.com

PO Box 1359
Watsonville, CA 95076
(831) 728-1773
www.calgiant.com
www.facebook.com/calgiant
follow us on twitter @californiagiant

Confidentiality Note: This e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure. Any unauthorized use, dissemination or disclosure of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please destroy the original message and all copies. Thank you.

Dear Ms. Jewell,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you,

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
November 15, 2013

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

Subject: Completion of Highway 1 Improvements – Morrissey Blvd. to Soquel Dr.

Dear Mr. Dondero,

The Santa Cruz County Business Council’s (SCCBC) Board of Directors would like to commend you and your team on the recent successful improvements on Highway 1. Highway 1 is a vital link for business and the well-being of our community. Projects that improve mobility and improve local infrastructure have benefits for all of us.

Reducing gridlock on our roads has a direct connection to improving the quality of life and business in Santa Cruz County. We look forward to continued improvements in all aspects of transportation and our partnership with SCCRTC.

Sincerely,

Joe Foster, Executive Director

cc:
SCCRTC Board of Commissioners, SCCBC Board of Directors
From: howard sosbee [mailto:hfs@sosbee.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 4:26 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Proposal

(Here is a proposal I would like to discuss with you. If you are agreeable, I can be reached at: 818-0847 or e-mail as above.)

How about a "Metro-link?"

Now that several people have established themselves as the go-to experts on how the Regional Transportation Commission should plan for the future transit needs of the County, it is time to examine some of their assumptions and offer an alternate vision. Look particularly at how to achieve dual (not “duel”) use of the rail corridor and how it fits into the county’s overall transportation planning. Some people obviously think the automobile (with express buses) is the only way for people to get around the County. It is also obvious that they overlook a large portion of the County’s population. Think of people who cannot or do not drive a car: young people, students, seniors, diehard environmentalists, working poor and others.

This is what public transit is all about in the first place, and all we need is a vision of what a future transit system could be. Here, the possibilities are enormous. First of all, forget about trains. The U.P. corridor is not in the least suitable for a train for more reasons than have been mentioned. However, it is ideally, and uniquely, suited for the century-old technology of the trolley car, supplemented by state-of-the-art small jitney-style buses rolling back and forth on short neighborhood routes bringing passengers to the trolley. You could call a system like this the "Metro link".

Trolley cars have none of the negatives of commuter trains or light rail. No costly stations or platforms, no noise or air pollution, no safety problems. Indeed, trolley cars, pedestrians, and bicyclists are sharing roadways all over the world, and have done so for generations.

As for cost, a trolley-based system can be built with little or no additional outlay from the county taxpayer. Public/private partnerships could be arranged with PG&E to supply the power line with charging stations at numerous intersections. Double tracking is unnecessary since short sidetracks can be installed at key locations to coincide with trolleys running the opposite direction. Track maintenance can be performed by the UP company on a contract basis (if the dinner train people are unable to do the upkeep.) Rolling stock can be leased through any number of leasing companies. All the County need supply is labor.

Anyone who thinks the ridership would not support such a system ignores the number of school and college age youngsters living here, the seniors, the clerks and workers in 41st Avenue and downtown, the surfers and whale watchers, the tourists and summer visitors in the beach rentals, and all the plain ordinary people who would simply like to have an alternative to the automobile and current bus system. The Santa Cruz population is spread out in a way that makes such a system ideal. It is eminently doable!

11/22/13

Hello Howard Sosbee –
Your email proposal regarding “metro link” was received and will be made available to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) for their consideration.

According to the latest census, the Santa Cruz Rail Corridor is within one mile of approximately 50% of the county’s population, over 80 parks and 20 schools. The RTC purchased the corridor on behalf of the community to maximize transportation options within the corridor for both residents and visitors.

The RTC recently received a competitively-awarded grant to analyze potential passenger rail options including various types of rail technology. Here’s an excerpt from the scope of work which we’ll be starting in 2014: “the feasibility and ridership potential for commuter and intercity passenger rail service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, providing practical recommendations for phased implementation of cost-effective and efficient services that advance regional, state, and federal goals. Includes development of performance measures and objectives; capital and operating cost estimates; analysis of varying service scenarios; connectivity to other bus and rail services; and public outreach.”

So yes, we’re starting an evaluation of local passenger rail service feasibility to help us understand what would work, technologies available, what it will cost, and how it could be operated. I’ve added you to the email distribution list to stay informed about the project (please let us know if you prefer not to receive rail information).

Thank you for your email.

----------------------------------------------------------

Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
Date: November 19, 2013
From: Will Kempton and James Earp
To: All Interested Public and Private Transportation Entities and Colleagues
cc: Chair and Members, Transportation California Board of Directors, Transportation Secretary Brian Kelly, Transportation Director Malcolm Dougherty, Chair and All Members, California Transportation Commission
Subject: Decision to Request the Attorney General of California draft "Title and Summary" for a new "California Road Repairs Act"

Yesterday, on behalf of Transportation California and the California Alliance for Jobs, we jointly submitted a request for title and summary for a proposed constitutional amendment that would provide a new source of transportation funding to address the state’s critical roadway and transit preservation fiscal crisis.

On November 5th the Transportation California Board of Directors authorized a collaboration to join with the California Alliance for Jobs to take this first serious step towards placing a new transportation funding measure on the November 2014 General Election ballot. Together, Transportation California and the Alliance for Jobs have worked diligently over the past 2 years on this effort, including substantial political survey research that has led us to this point of submitting initiative measure language.

We want to make it perfectly clear to everyone receiving this notification that Transportation California and the Alliance for Jobs, along with our coalition of interested parties, has NOT made a final decision to pursue such a measure in 2014. We are simply keeping our options open.

We intend to jointly take the necessary steps to make a final determination on whether our measure will have sufficient voter support to move forward in 2014. We anticipate that the official ballot label language will be available by the first week of January. Polling results on that language should be available to us by the end of the second week in January, and this, along with consultation with other interested parties, will determine whether we will move forward on this effort in 2014.

For your background, we have provided an overview summary of the language we have submitted along with a brief overview of the worsening transportation funding crisis we are confronting here in California.

Sincerely,

Will Kempton, Executive Director
Transportation California
1111 L Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 446-1280
wkempton@transportationca.com

James Earp, Executive Director
California Alliance for Jobs
1415 L Street, Suite 1080
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-446-2259
jearp@rebuildca.org
Our Transportation Funding Challenge

California has a critical need to implement a new revenue measure that would support maintenance and rehabilitation of its state and local road and transit systems. This new revenue source should be independent of fossil fuel consumption, increase over time at a rate that is equal to or greater than inflation, and produce enough revenue to significantly reduce the huge backlog of unmet road, bridge and transit maintenance and rehabilitation costs.

After a great deal of technical, financial and voter opinion research over the last three years, Transportation California believes a 1% annual fee on the value of all motor vehicles to fund a new “California Road Repair Fund”, best meets the current and future funding needs of California’s road and transit systems as described in the previous paragraph.

California Road Repair Act:
Program Summary

- Assess an annual California Road Repair Fee on all vehicles, excluding heavy duty trucks (over 10,000 lbs.), equal to 1% of each vehicles’ value in ¼% increments phased in over four years. The annual total estimate of revenue raised is estimated to be $2.9 billion per year when the rate reaches 1% in 2018 or nearly $25 billion over the first ten years. Heavy trucks will pay a fair share equivalent increase in the diesel tax, which they prefer to a vehicle fee based on “value”.

- All new revenue raised must be used exclusively for road, bridge and transit system maintenance, rehabilitation and transit vehicle replacement only.

- The revenue would be allocated as follows:
  - 25% of all new revenue to all cities in California distributed on a formula allocation based on population.
  - 25% of all new revenue to all counties in California based on a formula allocation equal to 75% of fee-paying vehicle and 25% road miles.
  - 40% of all new revenue to the State Highway System based on a formula allocation of ½ allocated 60% to Southern California, 40% to Northern California, and ½ allocated on a “highest need” basis statewide.
  - 10% of all new revenue to public transit system maintenance, rehabilitation and vehicle replacement based on the current State Transit Assistance Program formula.

- This is a “pay as you go” proposition, with 100% of the new revenue going to the purposes enumerated above, not bondholders.

- All new funds raised in the Act would be constitutionally dedicated only for the purposes enumerated above and not available for reallocation or loan for any other purpose, without a new authorization by the voters.

- The Act will also incorporate several Taxpayer Safeguards to ensure that the funds are effectively managed and utilized in conformity with the voters understanding. These include a cap on administrative costs and a requirement for forthright progress reports and audits.
NEWSWORTHY

- The Federal Highway Administration recently proposed a series of key highways to serve as a highway Primary Freight Network (PFN) as required by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). The network will designate up to 27,000 miles of existing interstate and other roadways with a possible addition of 3,000 miles in the future, according to FHWA. This designation helps states strategically direct resources toward improving freight movement. The PFN will become part of a larger highway National Freight Network that includes all interstates and other rural highway routes designated by states that make up critical portions of the nation’s multi-modal freight system. FHWA invites comments on all aspects of this draft designation. More information is available at:
  http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/

- The California Air Resources Board recently released a discussion draft of the updated AB 32 Scoping Plan. The plan describes the comprehensive range of efforts the state must take to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and meet its long-term goals to combat climate change. The draft includes an analysis of progress to date and found that California is on track to meet its goals. More information is available at:
  http://www.arb.ca.gov/newsrel/newsrelease.php?id=509

DISCRETIONARY FUNDING

Caltrans is accepting applications for the 2014-2015 Transportation Planning Grant Programs. A total of $5.3 million will be awarded for the following: Partnership Planning for Sustainable Transportation ($2.5 million), Transit Planning for Sustainable Communities ($1.8 million), and Transit Planning for Rural Communities ($1 million). These programs support multi-modal transportation systems improving mobility and accessibility for all users. This grant cycle will not offer awards for the Community-Based Transportation Planning and Environmental Justice programs for this fiscal year only. The one-year hiatus is to review and re-evaluate the grant program objectives’ and improve delivery as well.

Applications are due to Caltrans Monday, February 3, 2014. The applications, guidebook and more information are available at:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 1 Salinas Road Interchange (315924)</td>
<td>Highway 1, Mon. County, North of Moss Landing at Salinas Road (PM 99.9-101.5)</td>
<td>Construct new interchange</td>
<td>Spring 2010-May 2013 with 1 year plant establishment</td>
<td>$12 Million</td>
<td>STIP/CMIA</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Richard Rosales (BR)</td>
<td>Desilva Gates Construction LP, Dublin</td>
<td>Work completed May 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 1 Guardrail/Crash Cushions (OM9704)</td>
<td>Highway 1, various locations from San Lorenzo R. Bridge to Waddell Creek (PM 17.4-26.0)</td>
<td>Upgrade guard rail, end treatments</td>
<td>Summer 2013/Fall 2013</td>
<td>Total $2.8M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Coral Construction Company, Wilsonville, Oregon</td>
<td>The project began July 9, 2013 and is scheduled to complete mid-November, weather permitting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 1 Laguna Road Guardrail Upgrade (OM9804)</td>
<td>Hwy. 1, at various locations from 0.9 mile N. of Laguna Rd. to Wadell Creek Br. (PM 26.8-36.3)</td>
<td>Install MBGR and upgrade drainage systems</td>
<td>May 9 -- Fall 2013</td>
<td>$1.6M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Steve DiGrazia (KB)</td>
<td>Dreambuilder Placentia CA</td>
<td>The project began May 9, 2013 and is scheduled to complete end of October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 9 Holiday Lane Improvements (0K2304)</td>
<td>Highway 9 between Ben Lomond and the Highland Co. Park; S. of Holiday Lane (PM 8.4-8.6)</td>
<td>Construct Viaduct, Upgrade guard rail</td>
<td>Summer 2012 – June 14 2013 with 1 year plant establishment</td>
<td>$1.3 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Steve DiGrazia (AN)</td>
<td>Pavex Construction Div., Watsonville</td>
<td>Project completed June 14, 2013. One-year plant establishment will complete June 11, 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 17 Summit Slide Repair (1A7104)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County near Scotts Valley at 0.2 mile north of Glenwood Dr. (PM 11.0)</td>
<td>Construct retaining wall with concrete slab &amp; barrier, HMA pave</td>
<td>Spring 2013-Spring 2015</td>
<td>$2 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Steve DiGrazia (BR)</td>
<td>Condon-Johnson &amp; Associates Inc., Oakland</td>
<td>Project began April and scheduled for completion 4/1/2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Hwy. 17 Guardrail Upgrade (0L7014)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County near Scots Valley at various locations from Santa’s Village Road to the Santa Clara County Line (PM 6.0-12.6)</td>
<td>Upgrade guardrail</td>
<td>Summer 2013-Fall 2014</td>
<td>$10 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Steve DiGrazia (PD)</td>
<td>Pavex Construction</td>
<td>Work began on June 14, 2013. Primarily night work. Occasional daytime work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Hwy. 1 Guardrail Upgrade, Concrete Barrier, Retaining Wall (05-0R9104)</td>
<td>Highway 1 from S of South Aptos Underpass to .1 Mi N. of Rt 9 (PM 9.0-17.6)</td>
<td>Upgrade Metal Beam Guard Rail, other improvements</td>
<td>Winter 2013/Spring 2014</td>
<td>$ 2.3 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>Bids opened on 8/13/2013, pending award. Construction will start in the Winter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) receive the monthly report on construction activities for the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project.

BACKGROUND

On January 5, 2012, the RTC authorized a construction contract for work to begin on the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project. A Notice to Proceed was issued to the contractor on February 3, 2012, following receipt of performance bonds and insurance certificates.

DISCUSSION

RTC Resident Engineer, Bruce Shewchuk, will present an oral report on current construction activities and will respond to questions.

Since the last meeting, the following has occurred on the project:
- Drainage behind retaining wall #3 was completed and the dirt access pad was removed.
- Installation of irrigation lines and landscaping on the northbound slope was completed.
- Staining of the split rock face of retaining wall #3 was completed.
- Cable railing fences on retaining walls 2 and 3, and gates at the corners of the La Fonda Avenue Overcrossing were installed. Permanent signs were installed, including the bridge mounted signs, and temporary signs were removed.

As of this writing, the removal of the k-rail and construction of the barrier rail in front of retaining wall #3 is scheduled to allow paving of the northbound auxiliary lane for motorists to use before the Thanksgiving weekend. This work will effectively complete the major construction elements of the project. The project team is scheduling an inspection of the project area with Caltrans staff prior to the end of November to identify any outstanding work items for completion by the end of the year. The contractor is responsible for maintaining the storm water pollution control systems.
prevention system until construction is complete and Caltrans resumes responsibility for the area.

In the course of constructing the sound wall immediately east of the La Fonda Avenue Overcrossing the roots of 5 mature heritage trees on private property were severely damaged and the trees had to be removed for safety reasons. This work was conducted with the concurrence of the affected property owner and the City of Santa Cruz Arborist. RTC and City staff are working on a mitigation planting program that is acceptable to the property owner and complies with the City of Santa Cruz Heritage Tree Ordinance.

**Construction Financial Status**

As of this writing, no new contract change orders (CCOs) were approved through this reporting period. While final costs are not yet known, it appears the cost of the supplemental drainage work behind retaining wall #3 will be considerably less than the lump sum estimate of $960,700 offered by the contractor. As reported last month, the Ad-Hoc CCO Committee authorized up to $700,000 for this work; however, only $600,000 in CCOs has been approved to date, effectively withholding a contingency until it is proven to be needed.

Caltrans inspectors have been monitoring the installation of the supplemental drainage system and have confirmed the work’s appropriateness and value in the attached correspondence (Attachment 1).

The cost of the CCO’s approved to date is $1,154,126. As previously reported, funding for 3 of these CCO’s, in the amount of $108,000, is provided in the project’s supplemental budget for the Traffic Management Program and does not count against the contract contingency of $993,864. The drawdown of the remaining construction related CCO’s is $1,046,126 leaving a deficit in the construction balance of $52,262. There are sufficient extra funds in the “Supplemental construction activity” budget line of the project to cover this cost.

Through 21 months of construction activity, the approved progress payments total $9,816,889.44 or approximately 88% of the approved construction budget. The progress payment for the current period is still under review by the resident construction engineer and will be reported at the next meeting.

Following is the current contract cost accounting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated Contract Amount</td>
<td>$11,092,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Balance</td>
<td>$(52,262)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Contract Budget</td>
<td>$11,092,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Payments To Date</td>
<td>$9,816,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Contract Budget</td>
<td>$1,275,876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* covered by “Supplemental construction activity” budget line
Additional CCO’s are anticipated in the coming weeks, including: lighting modifications for the La Fonda Avenue Overcrossing; maintaining the freeway and construction operations including graffiti abatement; and excavation of deteriorated highway sections prior to final paving.

The RTC approved a set of policies for contract change orders prior to the start of construction and established a contract change orders ad-hoc committee currently comprised of the four commissioners. The ad-hoc committee has met twice to authorize approval of the CCO allowing work to begin on the supplemental drainage system behind the northbound retaining wall and it may be necessary to reconvene the committee in the event there are additional CCO’s greater than $100,000.

SUMMARY

Work leading up to the paving of the northbound auxiliary lanes is scheduled to allow motorists to use the new lane by the Thanksgiving weekend. A letter was received from Caltrans confirming the appropriateness and value of the supplemental drainage work behind retaining wall #3 (Attachment 1). An inspection of the project area is scheduled with Caltrans staff prior to the end of November to identify any outstanding work items for completion by the end of the year.

Attachments:

1. Caltrans letter regarding supplemental drainage work, dated 11/13/13
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November 13, 2013

Kim Shultz  
Project Manager  
SCCRTC  
1523 Pacific Ave  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Mr. Shultz:

SOQUEL TO MORRISSEY DRAINAGE AT RETAINING WALL 3

Caltrans has been monitoring the installation of the supplemental subsurface drain system being constructed by change order behind Retaining Wall 3 of the Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project. This improvement is an acceptable long-term solution to the drainage issues at this location, and is consistent with standard Caltrans construction practice when wet conditions are encountered in the field. We expect this chimney drain will eliminate the continuous flow of water through the weep holes and the saturating of the ground in front of the wall (including the roadway structural section of Route 1). With this improvement in place, we expect to get the standard 75-year service life from the retaining wall.

We appreciate the SCCRTC’s responsiveness in dealing with this issue, and commitment to delivering a quality project.

Sincerely,

Luis Duazo,  
Project Manager

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Sr. Transportation Planner

RE: Adoption of the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

---Public Hearing Scheduled for 9:30 a.m.---

AGENDA: December 5, 2013

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Consider staff, Bicycle Committee, Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) ad hoc subcommittee, and Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommendations for the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) (Attachments 2 and 3);

2. Hold a public hearing to receive comments and consider written comments (Attachment 6);

3. Adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) to program State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) funds in the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), as recommended by staff (Attachments 2 and 3);

4. Make changes to previously programmed projects to reflect current project scopes, costs and schedules (Attachment 4); and

5. Request that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) incorporate these funding actions into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), respectively.

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), as the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Santa Cruz County, is responsible for selecting projects to receive a variety of state and federal funds. These include the region’s shares of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, as well as funds previously approved for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST). STIP and RSTP funds can be used on a variety of projects, as outlined in the federal transportation act and California Transportation Commission’s (CTC) STIP Guidelines. These include: highway,
local street and road, transit and paratransit capital, bicycle, pedestrian, carpool, safety, and bridge projects. The RTC programs funds to specific projects through its Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

The RTIP serves three primary purposes: 1) list of projects that have been selected by the RTC to receive the region’s shares of state and/or federal funds; 2) the RTC’s proposal to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for the region’s share of funds from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP); and 3) a tool to assist in monitoring the delivery of projects. After considering STIP funding proposals submitted by RTPAs statewide, the CTC makes the final determination on which projects are programmed to receive STIP funds, in which year they are programmed, and when to release (allocate) funds to individual projects. Projects approved by the RTC for federal funds and regionally-significant projects must also be listed in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) produced by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG).

DISCUSSION

For the 2014 RTIP, approximately $5.9 million in new STIP is available through Fiscal Year 2018/19 and approximately $3.5 million in FY14 RSTP is available. Additionally, the RTC issued a call for projects for $5.3 million in funds previously approved for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST).

Staff recommends that upon completion of the scheduled public hearing the RTC adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) programming State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), and Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) funds, as shown in Attachments 2 and 3, and amending previously programmed projects as shown on Attachment 4.

Staff recommendations have been modified as directed by the RTC at the November 21, 2013 Transportation Policy Workshop, including increasing funding for the Mt. Hermon Road/Scotts Valley Drive intersection project based on discussions with City of Scotts Valley staff regarding available City matching funds. As requested at the workshop, information on bicycle safety and encouragement programs in the county is included as Attachment 7.

Project Evaluation

Applications for the region’s targeted share of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), and Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) funds were due October 29, 2013. Attachments 2 and 3 reflect the projects submitted by project sponsors, staff recommendations, and a summary of project benefits. Project applications are posted on the RTC website http://www.sccrtc.org/funding-planning/project-funding/. Maps of project locations are included as Attachment 5. Numbers shown on the maps correlate to project numbers shown in Attachments 2 and 3.
Given the large backlog of transportation needs in the region and the very limited amount of funding available for transportation projects, it is important to ensure that funds are used cost effectively to improve the region’s transportation system. Congress, the State Legislature, and the CTC increasingly require state agencies, federal agencies, and regions to set performance measures and criteria to evaluate projects and determine funding priorities. While specific criteria are still under development at the state and federal level, regions are required to indicate how the RTIP is consistent with the goals established in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Therefore, several factors were considered when evaluating projects, including consideration of how projects address the goals, policies, and targets developed by the RTC for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, and California Transportation Commission (CTC) and federal guidelines. These include an evaluation of the following factors:

1. Number of people served
2. Safety (reduce collisions)
3. Access for all modes, especially to and within key destinations (increase travel options, reduce number or distance of trips)
4. Air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and fuel consumption
5. Change in vehicle miles traveled
6. Change in reliability, frequency, and efficiency of transit
7. Change in travel time reliability and efficiency of the transportation system
8. Preservation of existing infrastructure or services
9. Change in passenger, freight and goods miles carried
10. Change in disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age, income, disability or minority status
11. If projects are shown as “constrained” on the draft RTP Project List, approved by the RTC August 15, 2013, which will implement the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) currently under development by AMBAG.
12. Consistency with the Complete Streets Guidelines, approved by the RTC September 5, 2013.
13. Deliverability (if there are barriers to the schedule)
14. Funding (if all other funding is secured and amount of match). Notably, the CTC will not allow partially funded phases of projects to be included in the STIP.
15. Where applicable - Consistency with the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Master Plan

Unmet Highway Needs

As discussed at prior meetings, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has indicated its intent to focus on proposals for STIP funds that meet highway needs identified by Caltrans. Caltrans has identified the Highway 1 41st Avenue to Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project as the highest priority for 2014 STIP funds. Since the region’s share of 2014 STIP funds is insufficient to fully fund the project, the RTC would need to reserve funds from this and future STIP cycles to fully fund construction by 2022. Therefore, staff recommends that the RTC reserve $2 million of the region’s 2014 STIP funds for future programming to the construction phase of this auxiliary lane project. However it would also be prudent for the RTC to reserve a higher level of funds for the project.
It is possible that if the RTC proposes STIP funds for non-highway projects, the CTC could reject the region’s RTIP and the region’s share of STIP funds may not be available until the later years of the 2016 STIP (FY19/20-FY20/21). While the instances in which the CTC has voted to program STIP funds to local road rehabilitation projects are rare, given the large backlog of diverse needs and RTP goals to maintain the existing transportation system, staff recommends seeking some of the region’s share of STIP for local road projects. Staff recommendations for STIP and RSTP funds are shown in Attachment 2.

Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Network

With completion of the MBSST Master Plan the RTC is now considering specific sections of the trail network to fund with up to $5.3 million in RSTP, STIP and federal earmarks and appropriations that have been designated to the trail network since 2000. $300,000 of the earmark and RSTP funds (above $5.3 million) are being reserved for completion of the Master Plan and EIR planning process, administration of the next steps, and any additional unforeseen consultants costs or fees.

RTC staff appreciates the extensive review of the trail network that has been undertaken by local jurisdictions and community members in identifying candidates for available funds. As noted during adoption of the Master Plan, the document provides a “30,000 foot” level analysis of the trail network. As trail components move forward and more site specific analysis is done, the design, alignment, cost, and other factors may vary from those identified in the Master Plan. Staff conducted site visits to the segments proposed for funding in this cycle and evaluated proposals based on consistency with the Master Plan and how well they advance goals identified for the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Staff recommendations for programming the $5.3 million have been modified as directed by the RTC at the November 21, 2013 Transportation Policy Workshop, and are shown in Attachment 3.

As noted in the resolution (Attachment 1) as a condition of funding, any projects approved for funds designated for the MBSST should be designed and implemented in a manner consistent with the Master Plan, Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to the extent possible. This includes incorporation of design standards, bicycle committee review of design, establishment of an agreement between RTC and local jurisdictions regarding maintenance roles, and accommodation for utilities including fiber optics (as requested by Commissioners Friend and McPherson – see Attachment 8). Staff will be working with local jurisdictions over the coming months to outline these requirements.

RTC and local jurisdiction staff will also be pursuing funds from the CTC’s new Active Transportation Program, the California Coastal Conservancy, and other public and private grant opportunities over the next several months. If additional funds are secured in 2014, the “color of funds” designated for specific projects could be modified and additional projects or sections of the trail network could be funded. See separate
agenda item for more information on MBSST implementation and private funding plan development.

Other Project Amendments

In addition to programming STIP, RSTP, and MBSST funds to various projects, staff and project sponsors recommend that the RTC amend the RTIP to reflect updated scope, schedule, cost and minor administrative changes to several previously programmed projects (Attachment 4). The RTIP must be amended to reflect these changes in order to ensure federal and state funds are retained and accessible to project sponsors.

Committee Input and Public Hearing

The Bicycle Committee, Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/DTAC) ad hoc subcommittee, and Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) reviewed projects proposed for funds at their November 2013 meetings. Committee recommendations are reflected in Attachments 2 and 3. The Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) ad hoc subcommittee emphasized its support for projects which improve pedestrian and bicycle safety, provide ease of access, and encourage exercise, mobility and reduction in driving. The Bicycle Committee decided to indicate support for bicycle projects only and not take a position on other projects.

Consistent with RTC Rules and Regulations, a public hearing has been scheduled for 10:00 a.m. to receive public input on the proposed program of projects and other amendments. A news release on the hearing was sent to local media and the hearing was advertised in the Santa Cruz Sentinel and Register-Pajaronian. Comments received as of November 26, 2013 are included as Attachment 6. Any additional written comments received by 2:00 p.m. on December 4, 2013 will be distributed at the meeting.

Next Steps

The RTC’s 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), proposing projects for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, is due to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) by December 15, 2013. The CTC will hold a hearing on STIP proposals on January 30, 2014. Based upon proposals submitted statewide, CTC staff will inform RTC staff whether the CTC is likely to approve the RTC’s proposal in January or February 2014. CTC staff recommendations will be released by February 28, 2014. The CTC is scheduled to adopt the 2014 STIP on March 20, 2014. If the CTC does not support the RTC’s proposals for STIP funds, the region’s share of STIP funds would be held in reserve for future programming. Projects approved for RSTP or Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) earmark funds will be amended into the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and implemented by project sponsors.
SUMMARY

Every other year the RTC prepares a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) which proposes projects to receive various state and federal funds. For the 2014 RTIP, approximately $5.9 million in new STIP funds and $3.5 million in FY13/14 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds are available for programming. $5.3 million in funds designated for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) are also available for programming to specific sections of the trail network. Staff recommends that, following a public hearing, the RTC adopt a resolution selecting projects to receive these funds and amending existing projects for the 2014 RTIP.

Attachments:
1. Resolution Adopting the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
2. Recommendations for STIP and RSTP (Exhibit A of Resolution)
3. Recommendations for MBSST Funds (Exhibit B of Resolution)
4. Amendments to Previously Approved Projects (Exhibit C of Resolution)
5. Maps of Proposed Projects
6. Public comments – Comments received as of November 26, 2013 are included in the packet; any additional comments received will be distributed at the meeting.
7. Summary of bicycle safety programs
8. Letter from Supervisors Friend and McPherson regarding broadband infrastructure
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission on the date of December 5, 2013 on the motion of Commissioner duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2014 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR SANTA CRUZ COUNTY TO PROGRAM STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP), REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP) FUNDS, AND MONTEREY BAY SANCTUARY SCENIC TRAIL NETWORK (MBSST) FUNDS AND AMEND PROJECT LISTINGS FOR PREVIOUSLY PROGRAMMED PROJECTS

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) prepared the 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program consistent with the 2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), state law (including SB 45) and the California Transportation Commission’s (CTC) State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines, and in consultation and cooperation with local project sponsors and Caltrans District 5;

WHEREAS, the Commission must prepare and adopt a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for submittal to the California Transportation Commission in order for projects to be considered for the 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP);

WHEREAS, the 2014 STIP Fund Estimate identifies $5,893,000 in State Transportation Improvement Program available for programming in Santa Cruz County through FY2018/19;

WHEREAS, Santa Cruz County has an unprogrammed balance of $3.46 million in federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds;

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopted the Master Plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) on November 7, 2013 and $5.3 million in federal earmarks, federal appropriations, Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds previously designated for the trail network are available for programming to specific sections of the trail; and
WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is the agency responsible for assuring that the regional shares of STIP and RSTP funds are programmed and expended according to CTC and Caltrans guidelines;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION:

1. The 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program for Santa Cruz County is hereby adopted to:
   a. Program Santa Cruz County’s regional target of 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program funds, FY14 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, and funds designated for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST), as shown in Exhibits A and B;
   b. Amend project listings for previously programmed projects to reflect the most current project funding and schedule information, as shown in Exhibit C.

2. The California Transportation Commission is hereby requested to incorporate these projects and amendments into the 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments is hereby requested to incorporate these actions into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP).

3. STIP funding availability is contingent on approval by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

4. As projects are designed, projects with bicycle and/or pedestrian components shall undergo review by the RTC’s Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and project sponsors shall incorporate complete streets components where feasible and/or appropriate.

5. Any projects approved for funds designated for the MBSST shall be designed and implemented in a manner consistent with the Master Plan, Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to the extent possible. This includes incorporation of design standards, bicycle committee review of design, accommodation for utilities including fiber optics, and establishment of an agreement between RTC and local jurisdictions regarding maintenance roles.
6. Project sponsors are required to obtain RTC concurrence in allocation, extension, amendment or other requests for proposed STIP projects prior to submittal of such requests to Caltrans or the CTC.

7. Concurrences will be handled administratively by RTC staff unless substantive project issues require that concurrence be authorized by RTC action.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS
NOES: COMMISSIONERS
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

___________________________
Neal Coonerty, Chair

ATTEST:

George Dondero, Secretary

Exhibit A: STIP/RSTP Project List
Exhibit B: MBSST Project List
Exhibit C: Amendments to Previously Approved Projects

Distribution: AMBAG, CTC, Caltrans, Project Sponsors, RTIP files
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## ATTACHMENT 2 (Exhibit A)
### 2014 RTIP Recommendations - STIP and RSTP

$9.35M Available (up to $5,893,000 STIP though CTC; up to $3.46M RSTP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name (hyperlinks to applications)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>$ previously approved by RTC</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Fund Source Rec.</th>
<th>RTC Staff Comments/Conditions</th>
<th>E&amp;D Ad Hoc Rec (prelim staff recs)</th>
<th>Bike Committee Rec</th>
<th>ITAC Rec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Caltrans/ SCCRTC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 41st Ave-Soquel Ave, Auxiliary Lanes and Chanciler, Bike/Ped Bridge: Construction Reserve</td>
<td>$43M STIP + ROW</td>
<td>$4M STIP for Design and ROW</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Total of $23M needed to fully fund construction. With average STIP=$3.5M/year, need to reserve funds each cycle in order to construct within 10 years.</td>
<td>Support reserving some funds. Provides access to Sr. Housing, Grey Bears, medical facilities, new sheriff center, shopping.</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Caltrans/ SCCRTC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Corridor/HOV and Soquel 41st Aux Tiered Environmental Document</td>
<td>Enviro: $13.2M; $600M total project cost</td>
<td>$12.7M CMAQ, RSTP, and STIP</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>CTC does not support supplemental STIP for local lead projects, so RSTP is needed.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Caltrans/ City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>State Routes 1/9 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$6,200,000</td>
<td>$850k STIP for construction</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$479,000</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Regionally significant. 3rd priority for City of SC. Staff recommendation reduced $21K from prelim rec; funds shifted to SV/Mt. Hermon</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Caltrans/ City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Highway 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening; Environmental only</td>
<td>$15,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Staff does not recommend funding for the bridge project at this time due to the over $12 million funding shortfall and prioritization in comparison to other state highway and local road needs. City will be seeking bridge and SHOPP, though not currently CT priority</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$454,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SCCRTC</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol: Highway 1, (3 years of funding)</td>
<td>$488,276</td>
<td>$135K RSTP FY15</td>
<td>$366,207</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Serves peak period travelers on Hwy 1; high cost/effectiveness rating. Staff recommendation funds only 2 years of program, rather than 3.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SCCRTC</td>
<td>Planning, Programming &amp; Monitoring (PPM) (3 years of funding)</td>
<td>$250K/year</td>
<td>Varies $150-300K STIP/yr depending on STIP limits</td>
<td>$479,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Based on STIP limits. Needed to implement state and federal mandates. Staff recommendation reduced $5K from prelim staff rec; funds shifted to SV/Mt. Hermon</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$ previously approved by RTC</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Fund Source Rec.</td>
<td>RTC Staff Comments/Conditions</td>
<td>E&amp;D Ad Hoc Rec (prelim staff recs)</td>
<td>Bike Committee Rec</td>
<td>ITAC Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO</td>
<td>Mainline Routes Runtime Recalibration</td>
<td>$33,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$31,545</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Serves major travel routes along Hwy 1 Corridor/parallel roads</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO</td>
<td>ParaCruz Van Replacement</td>
<td>$451,000</td>
<td>RTC has not funded paratransit vehicles since 2000.</td>
<td>$449,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Most federal grants now formula based, leaves few options for funding vehicle replacements. Staff recommendation reduced $5K from prelim staff rec; funds shifted to SV/Mt. Hermon</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology Action (Watsonville)</td>
<td>South County Youth Bike Safety Training</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Targets area with high bike/ped incidents involving students.</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>Bay Avenue/Capitola Avenue Roundabout Intersection Modification</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$25k STIP; $31k RSTP</td>
<td>Consider funding design phase only at this time.</td>
<td>Concerned about project</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>Upper Pacific Cove Parking Lot Pedestrian Trail and Depot Park Metro Development</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>As project is not consistent with the Trail Master Plan (proposal is for 4' sidewalk/path on northside of rail line, that only connects to rail line in one spot and does not include space for bicycles), staff recommends funding with non-MBSST funds. Support, but concerned about amount for parking lot access</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Branciforte Creek Bike/Ped Bridge</td>
<td>$2,741,000</td>
<td>$300k RSTPX</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Priority 5 of 5 for City of SC.</td>
<td>Like project, but recommend $0 at this time.</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Broadway-Brommer/ Arana Gulch Path</td>
<td>$6,122,000</td>
<td>$2.9 M CMAQ, STIP TE, and RSTPX</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Highest priority for City of Santa Cruz; long standing RTC commitment to project. CTC does not support supplemental STIP for local lead projects, so RSTP is needed.</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$ previously approved by RTC</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Fund Source Rec.</td>
<td>RTC Staff Comments/Conditions</td>
<td>E&amp;D Ad Hoc Rec (prelim staff recs)</td>
<td>Bike Committee Rec</td>
<td>ITAC Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Ocean St Pavement Rehabilitation (Water to Hwy, 17/Plymouth) &amp; Felker St (Ocean SLR Bike/Ped Bridge)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Heavily used roadway, access to county facilities. <strong>Staff recommendation reduced $10K from prelim staff rec; funds shifted to SV/Mt. Hermon</strong></td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Mt. Hermon Rd./Scotts Valley Dr./Whispering Pines Dr. Intersection Operations Improvement Project</td>
<td>$434,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$392,000</td>
<td>$346,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>High ADT and serves regional traffic (SLV). <strong>Staff recommendation increased $46K from prelim staff rec, based on confirmation SV can provide balance.</strong></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$346,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Bean Creek Road Rehabilitation, City/County limit to Bluebonnet Lane</td>
<td>$222,000</td>
<td>Funds for other sections of Bean Ck approved in past</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Low traffic volumes (ADT). 2nd priority for City of SV.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>Airport Boulevard Improvements (1200 feet east of Westgate Drive/Larkin Valley Road to east of Hanger Way)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Funds for other sections of Airport approved in past</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>$1,195,000</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Incorporates complete streets components. High ADT. <strong>Staff recommendation reduced $5K from prelim staff rec, funds shifted to SV/Mt. Hermon</strong></td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>Sidewalk Infill Harkins Slough Road and Main Street (Harkins Slough Road: east of Ohlone Parkway, and Main Street: Pennsylvania Dr-Pacifica Blvd)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Fills gaps on major roadways</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Bear Creek Rd Chip Seal (PM 4.75-PM 7.0)</td>
<td>$833,616</td>
<td>Other sections funded by RTC in past</td>
<td>$738,000</td>
<td>$432,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>While low ADT, important connection between Hwy 17 and Hwy 9/SLV.</td>
<td>$432,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$432,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Capitola Road Cape Seal (30th-17th Ave)</td>
<td>$326,443</td>
<td>Other sections funded by RTC in past</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>High ADT, bus, and bike use. Require inclusion of Complete Streets treatments.</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Casserly Rd Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$903,025</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Very low use. <strong>Staff rec: program funds for pre-construction only.</strong></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Name (hyperlinks to applications)</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$ previously approved by RTC</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Fund Source Rec.</td>
<td>RTC Staff Comments/Conditions</td>
<td>E&amp;D Ad Hoc Rec (prelim staff recs)</td>
<td>Bike Committee Rec</td>
<td>ITAC Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Empire Grade Chip Seal (130' north of Heller Dr to 0.79 mi north of Heller)</td>
<td>$211,228</td>
<td></td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Medium ADT, system preservation</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Freedom Blvd Cape Seal (Hwy 1 to Pleasant Vly Rd)</td>
<td>$1,383,712</td>
<td>Other sections funded by RTC in past</td>
<td>$1,225,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Medium ADT, system preservation</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Mt. Hermon Rd Cape Seal (Graham Hill Rd to 1000 ft north of Locatelli Ln)</td>
<td>$282,390</td>
<td>Other sections funded by RTC in past</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Key connection between Hwy 17 and SLV</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Portola Dr Cape Seal (E. Cliff to 24th Ave)</td>
<td>$230,430</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$204,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Low ADT, multimodal use</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Soquel-San Jose Rd Chip Seal (Redwood Lodge Rd-Miller Hill Rd)</td>
<td>$161,527</td>
<td>Other sections funded by RTC in past</td>
<td>$143,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Low ADT; pavement condition (PCI) medium.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Summit Rd Chip Seal (Soquel-San Jose Rd-Old SC Hwy)</td>
<td>$516,209</td>
<td>Other sections funded by RTC in past</td>
<td>$457,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>Low ADT</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,541,752</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$9,353,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,154,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regional-multi-agency/multi-jurisdictional projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Available $9,353,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name (hyperlinks to applications)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Summary of Benefits</td>
<td>Estimated Use</td>
<td>Sponsor Priority #</td>
<td>Construction schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hwy 1 41st Ave-Soquel Ave, Auxiliary Lanes and Chanicleer Bike/Ped Bridge- Construction Reserve</td>
<td>Add auxiliary lanes and bike/ped bridge over highway at Chanticleer Ave. Reserve for future programming.</td>
<td>Reduce delay and collisions. Improve pedestrian/bike access across highway. Heavily traveled - over 100,000 vehicles per day. Daily congestion results in by-pass traffic on local arterials; increased travel times and delay; auxiliary lanes from 41st Avenue to Soquel Drive, including a bike/pedestrian crossing at Chanticleer, as the most beneficial change that can be made to Highway 1, in the absence of HOV lanes.</td>
<td>Over 100,000 travelers/day</td>
<td>CT ranked #1</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hwy 1 Corridor/HOV and Soquel 41st Aux Tiered Environmental Document</td>
<td>Funds for the Tier 1 (HOV) program-level and Tier 2 Soquel-41st Ave Aux Lanes environmental document. Additional funds need to update technical studies (flora/fauna/wetlands) &amp; public outreach.</td>
<td>Analysis of options, impacts and benefits of modifying Highway 1 corridor. Reduce delay and congestion; improve travel times - especially for transit, carpools; improve pedestrian/bike access across highway. Heavily traveled - over 100,000 vehicles per day. Daily congestion results in by-pass traffic on local arterials.</td>
<td>Over 100,000 travelers/day</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 State Routes 1/9 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Intersection modifications including new turn lanes, bike lanes/shoulders.</td>
<td>Improve access and safety, reduce congestion and bottleneck, energy use and emissions. Heavily traveled, provides access for the university, Santa Cruz west side, Harvey West Area and Downtown.</td>
<td>Over 72,000 vehicles/day</td>
<td>3 of 5</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Highway 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening: Environmental only</td>
<td>Widen bridge to add travel lanes.</td>
<td>Address potential flooding and bottleneck created by inadequate lanes limits access to the Harvey West area, Downtown, the University and west side of Santa Cruz. Improve transportation reliability, safety, capacity and reduce flooding of the Tannery Art Center and Gateway Plaza. Reduce congestion, energy use and GHG emissions.</td>
<td>85,000/day</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Freeway Service Patrol: Highway 1 (3 years of funding)</td>
<td>Peak period tow trucks dedicated to patrolling highway and assisting disabled motorists, removing incidents with CHP, and clearing obstacles impeding traffic flow.</td>
<td>Reduce non-recurrent congestion, which is estimated to cause 30-50% of congestion; reduce emissions caused by idling; improve safety by reducing likelihood of secondary collisions; reduce delay.</td>
<td>85K-100K/day; 3 motorist directly served/day</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Planning, Programming &amp; Monitoring (PPM) (3 years of funding)</td>
<td>RTC tasks required to meet state and federally mandated planning and programming requirements, monitoring of programmed projects.</td>
<td>Ensure that state and federal requirements are met for projects so funding is secured and not lost and delays due to funding are avoided.</td>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name (hyperlinks to applications)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Summary of Benefits</td>
<td>Estimated Use</td>
<td>Sponsor Priority #</td>
<td>Construction schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Mainline Routes Runtime Recalibration</td>
<td>Data collection, analysis and recalibration of route runtimes to improve reliability of arrival and departure timepoints/schedule for major routes (69, 71, 91).</td>
<td>Recalibrate mainline transit routes to improve on-time performance. Improve schedule accuracy, improve system reliability, quality of service to retain and increase ridership, reduce VMT/GHG.</td>
<td>5300 riders/day</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
<td>2/14-8/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> ParaCruz Van Replacement</td>
<td>4 replacement vehicles for ADA Complementary Paratransit Service. (2 light-duty CNG vans &amp; 2 medium-duty gas fueled paratransit buses)</td>
<td>Maintain mandatory ADA Complementary Paratransit system in a state of good repair. Maintain public transit accessibility without the excessive costs required to maintain obsolete equipment. More advanced technology on new vehicles reduces fuel consumption and emissions. Allows the potential for more combined trips which could lower total VMT in the paratransit system.</td>
<td>10-22/day per vehicle</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>8/14-3/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> South County Youth Bike Safety Training</td>
<td>School-based youth bicycle safety training at 8 PVUSD elementary and middle schools. Includes in classroom and on-the-bike training.</td>
<td>Safety: reduce fatalities and severe injuries; Congestion Reduction; Environmental Sustainability: enhances the performance of the transportation system while protecting the environment.</td>
<td>1300/day</td>
<td>2 of 3 (Wats)</td>
<td>3/14-11/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> Bay Avenue/Capitola Avenue Roundabout Intersection Modification</td>
<td>Construct a roundabout. A highly skewed geometry at this intersection results in lengthy queuing and increased vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.</td>
<td>Intersection operates at an adverse LOS and queuing length during the PM peak hour. Roundabout would improve the intersection LOS and queuing to LOS C or better. Simplifies intersection and improves accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists through reduced conflicts and vehicle speeds.</td>
<td>8500 ADT</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
<td>9/15-3/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> Upper Pacific Cove Parking Lot Pedestrian Trail and Depot Park Metro Development</td>
<td>Construct 4 foot wide pedestrian pathway along City owned Upper Pacific Cove Parking lot, adjacent to rail line (680’). Includes new signal for ped crossing over Monterey Avenue. Includes a new metro shelter located and landscaped setting along the rail corridor/Park Ave.</td>
<td>Currently no pedestrian facility between City Hall/Pacific Cove parking lot and Monterey Ave. Fills gap in pedestrian network. Remove vehicle/ped conflict; improve Metro bus stop and provide pedestrian park.</td>
<td>100 peds/day during summer peak/20 per day off peak</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>3/15-6/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong> Branciforte Creek Bike/Ped Bridge</td>
<td>Build bridge to connect San Lorenzo Park Multi-use trail and levee trail near Soquel Dr.</td>
<td>Improve bike and pedestrian commute and recreational connections by completing one of the last missing links on the SLR levee trail system. Connects existing paths and bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>2000/day</td>
<td>5 of 5</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong> Broadway-Brommer/ Arana Gulch Path</td>
<td>Mutli-use accessible trail through Arana Gulch, including 340 ft stress ribbon bridge over Hagemann Gulch and viaduct over Arana Creek. Includes habitat management requirements, interpretive panels and other amenities.</td>
<td>Provide an east-west connection between Live Oak and City of Santa Cruz. Safety, reduce VMT, increase walking and biking.</td>
<td>3000/day</td>
<td>1 of 5</td>
<td>9/13-11/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Summary of Benefits</td>
<td>Estimated Use</td>
<td>Sponsor Priority #</td>
<td>Construction schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean St Pavement Rehabilitation (Water to Hwy 17/Plymouth) &amp; Felker St (Ocean SLR Bike/Ped Bridge)</td>
<td>Pavement rehabilitation using cold-in-place recycling process; includes new curb ramps, restriping of bicycle lanes and crosswalks. To be coordinated with Ocean St beautification project.</td>
<td>System preservation. PCI 52 (Ocean) and 7 (Felker). Serves transit, bikes, peds, employment, commercial, visitors.</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>2 of 5</td>
<td>fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hermon Rd./Scotts Valley Dr./Whispering Pines Dr. Intersection Operations Improvement Project</td>
<td>Add a left turn lane from northbound Mt. Hermon Rd. to eastbound Whispering Pines Dr, modify existing signal, construct curb, gutter, sidewalk and curb ramps, modify striping and pavement markings, resynchronize intersection timing, and repave intersection area.</td>
<td>Major intersection serving commercial, residential, school and regional travel through to SLV; heavy truck traffic; bus routes. With project the intersection would operate at acceptable levels; reduce delay/travel times and idling; reduce rear-end and broadside collisions.</td>
<td>MHR: 33,000 VPD and SVD: 16,500 VPD</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>5/15-9/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean Creek Road Rehabilitation, City/County limit to Bluebonnet Lane</td>
<td>Stabilization, rehabilitation and overlay of failing portions of Bean Creek Road as well as overlay or slurry seal of remaining portions from Bluebonnet Lane, .6 miles to the City/County boundary line.</td>
<td>System preservation. PCI &lt;30. Current condition discourages use by cyclists as well as pedestrians.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
<td>3/15-6/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Boulevard Improvements (1200 feet east of Westgate Drive/Larkin Valley Road to east of Hanger Way)</td>
<td>Reconstruct roadway, install new sidewalk, upgrade curb ramps and driveway crossings, install median islands, modify traffic signals to include add'l ped crossing and install rectangular rapid flashing beacon at crosswalk.</td>
<td>Major transportation corridor. Improve safety by creating a high visibility crosswalk; system preservation; fill gaps in sidewalk network; improve access for the disabled with curb ramps and increase access to bus facilities; reduce pedestrian crossing distance; add pedestrian signal heads, pedestrian-actuated traffic signals and audible countdown pedestrian signal heads.</td>
<td>ADT 18, 000</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
<td>6/15-10/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Infill Harkins Slough Road and Main Street (Harkins Slough Road: east of Ohlone Parkway; and Main Street: Pennsylvania Dr-Pacifica Blvd)</td>
<td>Harkins Slough: 6 ft wide x 180 ft long sidewalks on south side of Harkins Slough Rd and east of Ohlone Pkwy; Main St: 6 ft wide x 450 ft long sidewalks on north side of Main St from Pennsylvania Dr-Pacifica Blvd</td>
<td>Fills gap in sidewalk network; provide access to High School, transit, employment centers, commercial; safety Ped use unknown; ADT: 9,300 Harkins Slough Rd., 32,000 Main St</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td>9/15-10/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek Rd Chip Seal (PM 4.75-PM 7.0)</td>
<td>Asphalt Digout, Chip Seal, and restriping to rehabilitate the roadway surface.</td>
<td>System preservation. PCI 19-40 now, Hwy 9 to Hwy 17 connector</td>
<td>ADT 4700</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7/14-10/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola Road Cape Seal (30th-17th Ave)</td>
<td>Asphalt Digout, Cape Seal, and restriping to rehabilitate the roadway surface.</td>
<td>System preservation. PCI 43-62; heavily used by autos, buses, bikes, and peds; access to key destinations, connects Capitola, Live Oak, and City of SC, schools, emergency facilities</td>
<td>ADT 20,900</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7/14-10/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casserly Rd Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>Replace existing bridge in poor condition over a tributary of Green Valley Creek near Smith Rd intersection</td>
<td>Would open up bridge to 2 lanes</td>
<td>500 vpd</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Smr 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name (hyperlinks to applications)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Summary of Benefits</td>
<td>Estimated Use</td>
<td>Sponsor Priority #</td>
<td>Construction schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Grade Chip Seal (130’ north of Heller Dr to 0.79 mi north of Heller)</td>
<td>Asphalt Digout, Chip Seal, and restriping to rehabilitate the roadway surface.</td>
<td>System preservation. PCI 68; key road to Bonny Doon, plus serves transit, schools, bike use, and SLV</td>
<td>ADT 10,700</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7/14-10/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Blvd Cape Seal (Hwy 1 to Pleasant Vly Rd)</td>
<td>Asphalt Digout, Cape Seal, and restriping to rehabilitate the roadway surface.</td>
<td>System preservation. PCI 26-46, used by autos, buses, bikes, Aptos High. Connects communities of Aptos, Corralitos and Freedom.</td>
<td>ADT 15,700</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7/14-10/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hermon Rd Cape Seal (Graham Hill Rd to 1000 ft north of Locatelli Ln)</td>
<td>Asphalt Digout, Cape Seal, and restriping to rehabilitate the roadway surface.</td>
<td>System preservation. PCI 58. Serves public transit and autos, considered alt bike route</td>
<td>ADT 19,300</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7/14-10/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Dr Cape Seal (E. Cliff to 24th Ave)</td>
<td>Asphalt Digout, Cape Seal, and restriping to rehabilitate the roadway surface.</td>
<td>System preservation. PCI 38. Serves autos, buses, bikes/peds</td>
<td>ADT 15,200</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7/14-10/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel-San Jose Rd Chip Seal (Redwood Lodge Rd-Miller Hill Rd)</td>
<td>Asphalt Digout, Chip Seal, and restriping to rehabilitate the roadway surface.</td>
<td>System preservation. PCI 77; used as alt to Hwy 17</td>
<td>ADT 4700</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7/14-10/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Rd Chip Seal (Soquel-San Jose Rd-Old SC Hwy)</td>
<td>Asphalt Digout, Chip Seal, and restriping to rehabilitate the roadway surface.</td>
<td>System preservation. PCI 54-65; used as alternative to Hwy 17/Hwy 1</td>
<td>ADT 7600</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7/14-10/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATTACHMENT 3 (Exhibit B)

**Recommendations - Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Funds**

($5.3M available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name (hyperlinks to applications)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>REVISED Staff Recommendation (per TPW direction)</th>
<th>Fund Source Rec.</th>
<th>RTC Staff Comments</th>
<th>E&amp;D Ad Hoc Rec</th>
<th>Bike Committee Rec</th>
<th>ITAC Rec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td>Santa Cruz: Rail Trail: Segment 7 - Natural Bridges to Pacific Ave</td>
<td>$5,300,000</td>
<td>$4,240,000</td>
<td>$4,060,000</td>
<td>$805K STIP; $3,255 Earmark</td>
<td>Staff recommendation modified to add $540k based on RTC direction 11/21/13.</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$4,060,000</td>
<td>$4,060,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td>County: Twin Lakes Beachfront (5th Ave to 7th Ave)</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>While the County did not propose this project for MBSST funds, it is part of the MBSST Coastal Trail on-street facilities and eligible for MBSST funds.</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>County: Rail Trail: 7th Ave to El Dorado Ave (design, environmental, right-of-way)</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$1,575,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Funds requested for pre-construction only. Unclear how balance of project ($7.5M) would be funded.</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td>County: Rail Trail: El Dorado Ave to 17th Ave</td>
<td>$1,135,000</td>
<td>$999,220</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Proposed facility is immediately adjacent to existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, fills a less critical gap in the bike/ped network.</td>
<td>Support project, but recommend no funding this cycle</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td>Watsonville: Rail Trail: Lee Road, 4000 feet east to City Slough Trail connection</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$1,040,000</td>
<td>$1,040,000</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Staff recommendation modified to increase funds by $40,000 and remove conditions based on RTC direction 11/21/13.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,040,000</td>
<td>$1,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td>Watsonville: Rail Trail Construction – Walker Street to City Slough Trail connection</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Staff recommendation modified to $0 based on RTC direction 11/21/13.</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total - MBSST (not including reserve)**

$21,885,000 | $8,654,220 | $5,300,000
### Additional Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name (hyperlinks to applications)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Summary of Benefits</th>
<th>Estimated Use</th>
<th>Construction schedule</th>
<th>Distance in Feet</th>
<th>Estimated cost/foot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong> Rail Trail: Segment 7 - Natural Bridges to Pacific Ave</td>
<td>2.4 miles of Segment 7 (excluding Moore Creek rail trestle bridge and trail to Natural Bridges Drive). One water crossing at Neary Lagoon (not a bridge), one rail crossing near Rankin Street and two at the Neary Lagoon “Y”. Retaining structures adjacent to the Wastewater Treatment Facility and fifteen street crossings.</td>
<td>Highest rated segment in the MBSST Master Plan. High use anticipated/dense area, directly serves employment, recreational, commercial/services, and residences; safer alternative to Mission St which does not have bicycle facilities; connects to newly revamped Mission St Extension bikeway, Wilder trails and beach area.</td>
<td>1500 bikes and ped/day</td>
<td>9/16-9/17</td>
<td>12,672</td>
<td>$418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong> Twin Lakes Beachfront (5th Ave to 7th Ave)</td>
<td>Segment 9B of MBSST. Partial reconstruction of E. Cliff Dr (5th Ave-7th Ave) - part of larger Twin Lakes Beachfront project. Includes two 12’ car lanes, two 5’ bike lanes, universal pedestrian walkways, circular stop sign controlled three-way intersection at lower harbor entrance, 3”AC over 9”AB slurry seal, parking.</td>
<td>Pedestrians and bicyclists currently walking/riding in road/no separated facility on coast side; provides immediate coastal access.</td>
<td>7700 vehicles, bike/ped unknown</td>
<td>8/14-10/15</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>$6,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong> Rail Trail: 7th Ave to El Dorado Ave (design, environmental, right-of-way)</td>
<td>Pre-construction for 8 ft trail, 4.5 ft fencing, widening coastal side of right-of-way, extensive grading/cuts/benching; a 250 foot bridge; requires ROW from some property owners, including State Parks. Part of Segment 9 of MBSST Master Plan, connects to proposed El Dorado-17th Ave segment. Total cost: $7.5 M, only pre-construction costs shown.</td>
<td>Serves parks, residences, access to middle school and swim center; reduce potential conflicts between motorists/bikes on Brommer St; increase walking/biking</td>
<td>200/day</td>
<td>5/15-10/15</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>$3,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong> Rail Trail: El Dorado Ave to 17th Ave</td>
<td>8 foot wide trail; includes 4.5 ft fence, retaining walls, lighting and pedestrian RR crossing. Part of Segment 9 in MBSST Master Plan.</td>
<td>Serves parks, residences, access to middle school and swim center; reduce potential conflicts between motorists/bikes on Brommer St and within driveway to Simpkins; increase walking/biking</td>
<td>100/day</td>
<td>5/15-10/15</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong> Rail Trail: Lee Road, 4000 feet east to City Slough Trail connection</td>
<td>Construction of 4000-foot long pathway parallel to the railroad tracks: eight-foot width asphalt (hmma) and two-foot base rock shoulders on each side. A 500 foot long retaining wall up to three foot tall with fence will be needed near Lee Road. A four foot by six foot railroad building at the Ohlone Parkway will need to be relocated. A drainage structure east of Ohlone Parkway will need to be modified. Connection to Lee Road shall require installation of pathway or sidewalk to link to the existing sidewalk. At grade crossing at Ohlone Parkway and at a spur line located between Lee Road and Highway 1.</td>
<td>Reduce VMT by increasing biking and walking; improve connectivity to City trail network, reduce disparities in safety and access for transportation disadvantaged; increase economic benefits from birdwatchers. Part of larger trail network planned to eventually provide access to High School if/when bridge built over slough on Lee Rd.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>7/15-10/15</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33</strong> Rail Trail Construction – Walker Street to City Slough Trail connection</td>
<td>Construct 2400 foot long trail on Rail Trail segment 18 from the connection at existing slough trails east to Walker Street at W. Beach St.</td>
<td>Immediate access to downtown/major activity centers, close to Metro center and Elementary School. Reduce VMT by increasing biking and walking; improve connectivity to downtown; City trail network, reduces disparities in safety and access for transportation disadvantaged; increase economic benefits from birdwatchers.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>7/15-10/15</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>$313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit C

**2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)**

**Proposed Amendments to Previously Approved Projects**

*December 5, 2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO 36</td>
<td>State Park Drive/Seacliff Village Improvements</td>
<td>Update schedule, shift construction funds to FY14/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAT 01</td>
<td>Hwy 1/ Harkins Slough Road Interchange</td>
<td>Shift funds to later years. City will be proposing scope changes in near future, following concurrence with Caltrans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAT 39</td>
<td>Freedom Blvd Reconstruction (Broadis St to Alta Vista Ave)</td>
<td>Shift construction funds to FY15 to reflect updated schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC 24f</td>
<td>Hwy 1: 41st to Soquel Av Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Bridge</td>
<td>Shift design funds to FY15/16 to reflect updated environmental document schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC 27</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
<td>Shift $5.3 million previously programmed to environmental, design, and construction to specific segments of trail network. $300k to Master Plan phase for potential final expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC 30</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Bicycle/Ped Overcrossing at Mar Vista</td>
<td>Shift environmental funds to FY15/16.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Project numbers correspond to numbers on Attachments 2 & 3
* Project numbers correspond to numbers on Attachments 2 & 3
2014 RTIP Project Applicants
SANTA CRUZ AREA

Submitted Projects*

* Project numbers correspond to numbers on Attachments 2 & 3
2014 RTIP Project Applicants
CAPITOLA / LIVE OAK

* Project numbers correspond to numbers on Attachments 2 & 3
Submitted Projects*

* Project numbers correspond to numbers on Attachments 2 & 3
October 24, 2013

Commissioners
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: Letter of support for Ecology Action’s Bike Safety Training for Grade School Children

Dear Commissioners,

In the effort to increase safe and more frequent biking by our grade school students, Pajaro Valley Unified School District (PVUSD) strongly supports Ecology Action’s (EA) RSTP Bike Safety Training proposal. Pajaro Valley Unified School District has worked closely with EA to support their stellar active transportation programs at many PVUSD schools. This program would provide in-depth classroom presentations and on-the-bike safety and skills training targeting elementary school students.

Ecology Action, through this proposed RTSP funding, would be able to reach some 1,300 students with interactive, age appropriate bike safety training that provides children with the knowledge, skill development and hands-on training that instill lifelong lessons on proper bike riding techniques and skills.

In 2012 over 2,500 PVUSD grade school students participated in the bi-annual Bike/Walk to School Day, many more of our school children bike on the ever expanding City of Watsonville slough trails, and on local bike lanes but not all of these young children have received on-bike safety skills training. EA’s proposed increased coverage of their bike safety training will assure a greater number of PVUSD students receive essential safety training allowing them to participating in this healthy and environmentally beneficial activity.

Pajaro Valley Unified School District supports Ecology Action’s RSTP funding request to expand their Bike Safety Training for grade School Children.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rich Puente
Program Coordinator
October 28, 2013

File No.: 720.12677.19589

Commissioners
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to express my support for Ecology Action’s RSTP funding request.

In the effort to increase safe biking by local grade school students, the Santa Cruz Area California Highway Patrol supports Ecology Action’s (EA) RSTP Bike Safety Training proposal with the goal of expanding EA’s “Bike Smart!” program. CHP has worked closely with EA to support their safe and active transportation programs at many area schools. These programs provide in-depth classroom presentations and on-the-bike safety and skills training targeting grade school students.

Ecology Action, through this proposed RTSP funding, would be able to reach some 1,300 students with interactive, age appropriate bike safety training that provides students with the knowledge, skill development and hands-on training, with a goal to instill lifelong safe bike riding techniques and skills.

The Santa Cruz Area CHP continues to see an increase in bike traffic throughout Santa Cruz County and we continue to work to ensure safe riding by all cyclists, especially grade school children. EA’s proposed expansion of their bike safety training programs will ensure a greater number of Santa Cruz County students receive essential safety training allowing them lifelong participation in this healthy and environmentally beneficial activity.

Sincerely,

P. L. VINCENT, Captain
Commander
Santa Cruz Area

Safety, Service, and Security
An Internationally Accredited Agency
October 27, 2013

Grant Review Committee
Regional Transportation Commission
C/o Mr. Murray Fontes
Principal Engineer
City of Watsonville
250 Main Street
Watsonville, CA 95076

RE: Support for Watsonville Rail Trail Development

Dear Grant Review Committee:

I am writing to express Watsonville Wetlands Watch’s enthusiastic support for the City of Watsonville’s proposals to construct a portion of the Watsonville area rail trail project that would provide rail trail access between Lee Road to the existing Manabe trail spur of the Watsonville Wetlands Trail System. Construction of this trail will add a new and dynamic trail to the existing trails network with wide ranging benefits while providing a foundation for future development of the county-wide rail trail network.

We strongly support recreational, pedestrian, and bicycle trails in the City of Watsonville and partner with the City in the stewardship and maintenance of the existing trails network. If funding for this trail is to be awarded we would fully support the City and County in stewardship, volunteer coordination, and clean-up projects, as we do within the existing trails network.

Watsonville trails provide critically important assets to our community including safe routes to school, community recreation, and a way to access the Watsonville Slough system, fostering the appreciation of Santa Cruz county’s largest coastal freshwater wetland system. Their construction within the existing slough system network has long served to promote environmental awareness, appreciation, and support economic development providing conditions for a more walkable and bikeable city and supporting eco-tourism, such as the annual Monterey Bay Bird Festival and appropriate environmental recreation. The City of Watsonville’s proposed trail segment will greatly add to the recreational and interpretive value of the existing trails network. Additionally, it will support future economic expansion areas (the Manabe-Ow business park) that are aligned to the proposed rail trail line, providing an alternative transportation lane for the future workforce to commute to this work site.

Partnering with the City of Watsonville and the Pajaro Valley Unified School District to sponsor the Fitz Wetlands Educational Resource Center
500 Harkins Slough Road, Watsonville, CA 95076 (831) 728-1156

Watsonville Wetlands Watch is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization
Watsonville Wetlands Watch is a non-profit organization, active since 1991, dedicated to the protection, restoration, and fostering the appreciation of the wetlands of the Pajaro Valley. We have provided significant comments to the draft EIR for the rail trail and greatly value the potential of this trail balanced with the need for on-going community dialogue on the best ways to implement its construction such that it is well integrated into the places in which it is built and does not cause un-due harm. We fully support this proposal.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bob Culbertson
Chair, Planning and Conservation Committee
Watsonville Wetlands Watch
Dear Grant Review Committee:

I write to express the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County’s support for Watsonville’s proposal to launch the implementation of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Trail, ensuring that southern Santa Cruz County participates in the grand vision.

The mission of the Land Trust is to protect and manage lands of significant natural resource, agricultural, cultural and open space value in cooperation with public and private interests. The Land Trust has protected over 485 acres of wetlands, natural areas and agricultural lands around the periphery of the city, and our 2012 Strategic Plan prioritizes open space preservation in the hills and wetlands around the city and public access to the lands we already protect.

Expanding Watsonville's excellent trail system, providing this new path to help kids and commuters to travel to nearby parks and open spaces, including our Watsonville Slough Farms property, and integrating recreation and environmental interpretation are priorities.

I have had the pleasure of working with City of Watsonville staff on a number of conservation planning and management projects, and I am deeply impressed with their dedication and commitment. I encourage you to fund their grant application, and help initiate this much-needed effort for this vibrant and growing community.

Development of this segment of the Monterey Bay Scenic Sanctuary Trail will increase community support of the overall project as it demonstrates the commitment of the Regional Transportation Commission to countywide benefits.

The proposed trail will allow pedestrians and bicyclists to travel from the western City limit at Lee Road approximately 4000 feet east along the railroad right of way and link with the existing trail along Struve Slough and the entire City slough trail network. The trail will provide a bike path in an area that is lacking safe alternatives with connections to key elements of the City and surrounding community. Connection to the existing Struve Slough Trail will provide access to seven miles of City maintained slough trails. The at-grade crossing of Ohlone Parkway will eventually connect to a pedestrian and bicycle corridor that passes by 700 residential units, Landmark School and the Overlook Shopping Center before connecting with Main Street. The intersection of the trail with Lee Road will allow for future projects to provide access to Pajaro Valley High School and the Land Trust’s...
Watsonville Slough Farm.

The additional pedestrian facilities will increase walking and reduce traffic congestion, fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. It will reduce disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age, income or limited English proficiency. It will improve the convenience and quality of trips. The addition to the City’s trail network in the slough area will increase the economic benefit that is derived from bird watchers to visit Watsonville and use the paths to pursue their viewing.

Sincerely,

Bryan Largay
Conservation Director
November 14, 2013

Neal Coonerty, Commission Chairperson
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Dear Chairperson Coonerty:

On behalf of the Pajaro Valley Unified School District, I wish to express my strong support for the City of Watsonville’s application for funds to construct the Rail Trail-Lee Road Project.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be the first phase of a series of trail segments that would make critical connections to four key elements of the City and surrounding community. The Rail Trail-Lee Road Project would:

1. Create a key link between Watsonville and the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail/ Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be a key preliminary segment between the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail portion of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail and the City of Watsonville’s existing seven-mile Wetland Trail System. Watsonville’s trail system meanders along the freshwater wetlands that flow through City neighborhoods and, as delineated in the City’s 2012 Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails Master Plan, is slated for long-term expansion to thirty miles of trails in urban areas and along the urban edges of Watsonville. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road segment would provide the initial connection between the City’s and the Regional Transportation Commission’s major trail projects.

2. Create a link to a planned trail to the Santa Cruz County Land Trust Watsonville Slough Farm property

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would be the first portion and key link to a future connection between Watsonville’s Wetland Trail System and the Santa Cruz County Land Trust’s Watsonville Slough Farm. The Land Trust supports this trail connection.

3. Provide a portion of a future trail to the Pajaro Valley High School

Each school day, hundreds of students walk along high-traffic routes to reach the Pajaro Valley High School which is located across the Highway 1 overpass and west of all City neighborhoods. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would serve as a beginning portion of a future trail link to Pajaro Valley High School and will result in greatly increased safety for students who walk or bicycle to school.

4. Provide for a trail connection to major neighborhoods, shopping centers and transportation corridors

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would include an at-grade crossing of Ohlone Parkway. A planned addition of 700 feet of sidewalk on Ohlone Parkway would connect the new Rail Trail-Lee Road trail to an existing pedestrian and bicycle corridor that passes by 700 residential units including the Las Brisas, Seaview Ranch, Sunset Cove and Bay Breeze Subdivisions; Stone Creek Apartments; as well as Landmark School and the Overlook Shopping Center before connecting with Main Street.
The Rail Trail-Lee Road trail would also create a direct pedestrian and bicycle link to the Manabe-Ow business park which is located on the edge of town between a major residential area and an industrial zone.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would immediately allow pedestrians and bicyclists to travel from the western City limit at Lee Road approximately 4000 feet east along the railroad right of way. The new segment would also connect to the existing Watsonville Slough Trail which is the newest portion of the City’s seven mile Wetland Trail System.

The Santa Cruz County Land Trust has committed up to $300,000 toward the Rail Trail – Lee Road project. This would serve as the local match. The Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch have partnered with the City and are committed to help make this project a reality. The proposed trail segments are included in the City’s 2012 Trails Master Plan and Urban Greening Plan and thus part of a well-defined and strongly-supported comprehensive vision for Watsonville’s future.

The additional pedestrian facilities will increase walking, reduce driving, traffic congestion, fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Transportation equity will be provided for people experiencing poverty and others with limited or no access to vehicles. The facilities will reduce disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age or disability, as well as youth. The proposed addition to the City’s trail network in the slough area will increase the economic benefit that is derived from bird watchers who travel to Watsonville and use the paths to pursue their viewing by providing safe access to the Lee Road birding “hot spot”.

Development of this initial segment of the Rail-Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail will increase community support of the overall project as it demonstrates an ongoing commitment by the City, the Transportation Agency and the City’s project partners, the Santa Cruz County Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch. Completion of the initial segment will better prepare the City for development of the remaining segments which have been outlined above and are included in the City’s Trails Master Plan.

Thank you for your commitment to socially equitable and environmentally-sound transportation alternatives for all of Santa Cruz County. Should you have any questions regarding my strong support for this project, do not hesitate to contact me at 831 786-2312.

Sincerely,

Murry Schekman
Assistant Superintendent
Secondary Education
November 15, 2013

Neal Coonerty, Commission Chairperson
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Chairperson Coonerty:

On behalf of Central Coast Energy Services, Inc., I wish to express my strong support for the City of Watsonville’s application for funds to construct the Rail Trail-Lee Road Project.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be the first phase of a series of trail segments that would make critical connections to four key elements of the City and surrounding community. The Rail Trail-Lee Road Project would:

- **Create a key link between Watsonville and the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail**
  The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be a key preliminary segment between the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail portion of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail and the City of Watsonville’s existing seven-mile Wetland Trail System. Watsonville’s trail system meanders along the freshwater wetlands that flow through City neighborhoods and, as delineated in the City’s 2012 Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails Master Plan, is slated for long-term expansion to thirty miles of trails in urban areas and along the urban edges of Watsonville. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road segment would provide the initial connection between the City’s and the Regional Transportation Commission’s major trail projects.

- **Create a link to a planned trail to the Santa Cruz County Land Trust Watsonville Slough Farm property**
  The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would be the first portion and key link to a future connection between Watsonville’s Wetland Trail System and the Santa Cruz County Land Trust’s Watsonville Slough Farm. The Land Trust supports this trail connection.

- **Provide a portion of a future trail to the Pajaro Valley High School**
  Each school day, hundreds of students walk along high-traffic routes to reach the Pajaro Valley High School which is located across the Highway 1 overpass and west of all City neighborhoods. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would serve as a beginning portion of a future trail link to Pajaro Valley High School and will result in greatly increased safety for students who walk or bicycle to school.

- **Provide for a trail connection to major neighborhoods, shopping centers and transportation corridors**
  The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would include an at-grade crossing of Ohlone Parkway. A planned addition of 700 feet of sidewalk on Ohlone Parkway would connect the new Rail Trail-Lee Road trail to an existing pedestrian and bicycle corridor that passes by 700 residential units including the Las Brisas, Seaview Ranch, Sunset Cove and Bay Breeze Subdivisions; Stone Creek Apartments; as well as Landmark School and the Overlook Shopping Center before connecting with Main Street.
The Rail Trail—Lee Road trail would also create a direct pedestrian and bicycle link to the Manabe-Ow business park which is located on the edge of town between a major residential area and an industrial zone.

The proposed Rail Trail—Lee Road trail segment would immediately allow pedestrians and bicyclists to travel from the western City limit at Lee Road approximately 4000 feet east along the railroad right of way. The new segment would also connect to the existing Watsonville Slough Trail which is the newest portion of the City’s seven mile Wetland Trail System.

The Santa Cruz County Land Trust has committed up to $300,000 toward the Rail Trail — Lee Road project. This would serve as the local match. The Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch have partnered with the City and are committed to help make this project a reality. The proposed trail segments are included in the City’s 2012 Trails Master Plan and Urban Greening Plan and thus part of a well-defined and strongly-supported comprehensive vision for Watsonville’s future.

The additional pedestrian facilities will increase walking, reduce driving, traffic congestion, fuel consumption and green house gas emissions. Transportation equity will be provided for people experiencing poverty and others with limited or no access to vehicles. The facilities will reduce disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age or disability, as well as youth. The proposed addition to the City’s trail network in the slough area will increase the economic benefit that is derived from bird watchers who travel to Watsonville and use the paths to pursue their viewing by providing safe access to the Lee Road birding “hot spot”.

Development of this initial segment of the Rail-Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail will increase community support of the overall project as it demonstrates an ongoing commitment by the City, the Transportation Agency and the City’s project partners, the Santa Cruz County Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch. Completion of the initial segment will better prepare the City for development of the remaining segments which have been outlined above and are included in the City’s Trails Master Plan.

Thank you for your commitment to socially equitable and environmentally-sound transportation alternatives for all of Santa Cruz County. Should you have any questions regarding my strong support for this project, do not hesitate to contact me at 831-761-7080 x132.

Yours Truly,

[Signature]

Dennis Osmer
Executive Director
Central Coast Energy Services, Inc.
November 14, 2013

Neal Coonerty, Commission Chairperson
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Chairperson Coonerty:

On behalf of City Council of the City of Watsonville, I wish to express my strong support for the City of Watsonville’s application for funds to construct the Rail Trail-Lee Road Project.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be the first phase of a series of trail segments that would make critical connections to four key elements of the City and surrounding community. The Rail Trail-Lee Road Project would:

Create a key link between Watsonville and the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail/ Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be a key preliminary segment between the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail portion of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail and the City of Watsonville’s existing seven-mile Wetland Trail System. Watsonville’s trail system meanders along the freshwater wetlands that flow through City neighborhoods and, as delineated in the City’s 2012 Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails Master Plan, is slated for long-term expansion to thirty miles of trails in urban areas and along the urban edges of Watsonville. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road segment would provide the initial connection between the City’s and the Regional Transportation Commission’s major trail projects.

Create a link to a planned trail to the Santa Cruz County Land Trust Watsonville Slough Farm property

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would be the first portion and key link to a future connection between Watsonville’s Wetland Trail System and the Santa Cruz County Land Trust’s Watsonville Slough Farm. The Land Trust supports this trail connection.

Provide a portion of a future trail to the Pajaro Valley High School

Each school day, hundreds of students walk along high-traffic routes to reach the Pajaro Valley High School which is located across the Highway...
1 overpass and west of all City neighborhoods. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would serve as a beginning portion of a future trail link to Pajaro Valley High School and will result in greatly increase safety for students who walk or bicycle to school.

Provide for a trail connection to major neighborhoods, shopping centers and transportation corridors

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would include an at-grade crossing of Ohlone Parkway. A planned addition of 700 feet of sidewalk on Ohlone Parkway would connect the new Rail Trail-Lee Road trail to an existing pedestrian and bicycle corridor that passes by 700 residential units including the Las Brisas, Seaview Ranch, Sunset Cove and Bay Breeze Subdivisions; Stone Creek Apartments; as well as Landmark School and the Overlook Shopping Center before connecting with Main Street.

The Rail Trail-Lee Road trail would also create a direct pedestrian and bicycle link to the Manabe-Ow business park which is located on the edge of town between a major residential area and an industrial zone.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would immediately allow pedestrians and bicyclists to travel from the western City limit at Lee Road approximately 4000 feet east along the railroad right of way. The new segment would also connect to the existing Watsonville Slough Trail which is the newest portion of the City’s seven mile Wetland Trail System.

The Santa Cruz County Land Trust has committed up to $300,000 toward the Rail Trail – Lee Road project. This would serve as the local match. The Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch have partnered with the City and are committed to help make this project a reality. The proposed trail segments are included in the City’s 2012 Trails Master Plan and Urban Greening Plan and thus part of a well-defined and strongly-supported comprehensive vision for Watsonville’s future.

The additional pedestrian facilities will increase walking, reduce driving, traffic congestion, fuel consumption and green house gas emissions. Transportation equity will be provided for people experiencing poverty and others with limited or no access to vehicles. The facilities will reduce disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age or disability, as well as youth. The proposed addition to the City’s trail network in the slough area will increase the economic benefit that is derived from bird watchers who travel to Watsonville and use the paths to pursue their viewing by providing safe access to the Lee Road birding “hot spot”.

Development of this initial segment of the Rail-Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail will increase community support of the overall project as it demonstrates an ongoing commitment by the City, the Transportation Agency and the City’s project partners, the Santa Cruz County Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch. Completion of the initial segment will better prepare the City for development of the remaining
segments which have been outlined above and are included in the City's Trails Master Plan.

Thank you for your commitment to socially equitable and environmentally-sound transportation alternatives for all of Santa Cruz County. Should you have any questions regarding my strong support for this project, do not hesitate to contact me at 831.768-3008.

Yours Truly,

Lowell Hurst
Mayor

C: Steve Palmisano, Public Works & Utilities Director
November 19, 2013

Neal Coonerty, Commission Chairperson
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Chairperson Coonerty:

On behalf of Second Harvest Food Bank, I wish to express my strong support for the City of Watsonville’s application for funds to construct the Rail Trail-Lee Road Project. This project will directly link up with our warehouse and be of direct benefit to our families, staff and volunteers as well as general community.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be the first phase of a series of trail segments that would make critical connections to four key elements of the City and surrounding community. The Rail Trail-Lee Road Project would:

1. Create a key link between Watsonville and the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail

   The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be a key preliminary segment between the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail portion of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail and the City of Watsonville’s existing seven-mile Wetland Trail System. Watsonville’s trail system meanders along the freshwater wetlands that flow through City neighborhoods and, as delineated in the City’s 2012 Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails Master Plan, is slated for long-term expansion to thirty miles of trails in urban areas and along the urban edges of Watsonville. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road segment would provide the initial connection between the City’s and the Regional Transportation Commission’s major trail projects.

2. Create a link to a planned trail to the Santa Cruz County Land Trust Watsonville Slough Farm property

   The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would be the first portion and key link to a future connection between Watsonville’s Wetland Trail System and the Santa Cruz County Land Trust’s Watsonville Slough Farm. The Land Trust supports this trail connection.

3. Provide a portion of a future trail to the Pajaro Valley High School

   Each school day, hundreds of students walk along high-traffic routes to reach the Pajaro Valley High School which is located across the Highway 1 overpass and west of all City neighborhoods. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would serve as a beginning portion of a future trail link to pajaro Valley High School and will result in greatly increased safety for students who walk or bicycle to school.
4. Provide for a trail connection to major neighborhoods, shopping centers and transportation corridors

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would include an at-grade crossing of Ohlone Parkway. A planned addition of 700 feet of sidewalk on Ohlone Parkway would connect the new Rail Trail-Lee Road trail to an existing pedestrian and bicycle corridor that passes by 700 residential units including the Las Brisas, Seaview Ranch, Sunset Cove and Bay Breeze Subdivisions; Stone Creek Apartments; as well as Landmark School and the Overlook Shopping Center before connecting with Main Street.

The Rail Trail-Lee Road trail would also create a direct pedestrian and bicycle link to the Manabe-Ow business park which is located on the edge of town between a major residential area and an industrial zone.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would immediately allow pedestrians and bicyclists to travel from the western City limit at Lee Road approximately 4000 feet east along the railroad right of way. The new segment would also connect to the existing Watsonville Slough Trail which is the newest portion of the City’s seven mile Wetland Trail System.

The Santa Cruz County Land Trust has committed up to $300,000 toward the Rail Trail – Lee Road project. **This would serve as the local match.** The Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch have partnered with the City and are committed to help make this project a reality. The proposed trail segments are included in the City’s 2012 Trails Master Plan and Urban Greening Plan and thus part of a well-defined and strongly-supported comprehensive vision for Watsonville’s future.

The additional pedestrian facilities will increase walking, reduce driving, traffic congestion, fuel consumption and green house gas emissions. Transportation equity will be provided for people experiencing poverty and others with limited or no access to vehicles. The facilities will reduce disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age or disability, as well as youth. The proposed addition to the City’s trail network in the slough area will increase the economic benefit that is derived from bird watchers who travel to Watsonville and use the paths to pursue their viewing by providing safe access to the Lee Road birding “hot spot”.

**Development of this initial segment of the Rail-Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail will increase community support of the overall project as it demonstrates an ongoing commitment by the City, the Transportation Agency and the City’s project partners, the Santa Cruz County Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch.** Completion of the initial segment will better prepare the City for development of the remaining segments which have been outlined above and are included in the City’s Trails Master Plan.

**Thank you for your commitment to socially equitable and environmentally-sound transportation alternatives for all of Santa Cruz County.** Should you have any questions regarding my strong support for this project, do not hesitate to contact me at Willy@thefoodbank.org or 831-722-7110 ext. 211.

Yours Truly,

Willy Elliott-McCrea
Chief Executive Officer
November 22, 2013
Neal Coonerty, Commission Chairperson
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Chairperson Coonerty:

On behalf of West Marine and Watsonville Freeholders, owner of the Watsonville West Marine building, I wish to express my strong support for the City of Watsonville’s application for funds to construct the Rail Trail-Lee Road Project.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be the first phase of a series of trail segments that would make critical connections to four key elements of the City and surrounding community. The Rail Trail-Lee Road Project would:

1. **Create a key link between Watsonville and the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail**
   
   The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be a key preliminary segment between the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail portion of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail and the City of Watsonville’s existing seven-mile Wetland Trail System. Watsonville’s trail system meanders along the freshwater wetlands that flow through City neighborhoods and, as delineated in the City’s 2012 Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails Master Plan, is slated for long-term expansion to thirty miles of trails in urban areas and along the urban edges of Watsonville. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road segment would provide the initial connection between the City’s and the Regional Transportation Commission’s major trail projects.

2. **Create a link to a planned trail to the Santa Cruz County Land Trust Watsonville Slough Farm property**
   
   The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would be the first portion and key link to a future connection between Watsonville’s Wetland Trail System and the Santa Cruz County Land Trust’s Watsonville Slough Farm. The Land Trust supports this trail connection.

3. **Provide a portion of a future trail to the Pajaro Valley High School**
   
   Each school day, hundreds of students walk along high-traffic routes to reach the Pajaro Valley High School which is located across the Highway 1 overpass and west of all City neighborhoods. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would serve as a beginning portion of a future trail link to Pajaro Valley High School and will result in greatly increased safety for students who walk or bicycle to school.

4. **Provide for a trail connection to major neighborhoods, shopping centers and transportation corridors**
   
   The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would include an at-grade crossing of Ohlone Parkway. A planned addition of 700 feet of sidewalk on Ohlone Parkway would connect the new Rail Trail-Lee Road trail to an existing pedestrian and bicycle corridor that passes...
by 700 residential units including the Las Brisas, Seaview Ranch, Sunset Cove and Bay Breeze Subdivisions; Stone Creek Apartments; as well as Landmark School and the Overlook Shopping Center before connecting with Main Street.

The Rail Trail-Lee Road trail would also create a direct pedestrian and bicycle link to the Manabe-Ow business park which is located on the edge of town between a major residential area and an industrial zone.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would immediately allow pedestrians and bicyclists to travel from the western City limit at Lee Road approximately 4000 feet east along the railroad right of way. The new segment would also connect to the existing Watsonville Slough Trail which is the newest portion of the City’s seven mile Wetland Trail System.

The Santa Cruz County Land Trust has committed up to $300,000 toward the Rail Trail – Lee Road project. This would serve as the local match. The Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch have partnered with the City and are committed to help make this project a reality. The proposed trail segments are included in the City’s 2012 Trails Master Plan and Urban Greening Plan and thus part of a well-defined and strongly-supported comprehensive vision for Watsonville’s future.

The additional pedestrian facilities will increase walking, reduce driving, traffic congestion, fuel consumption and green house gas emissions. Transportation equity will be provided for people experiencing poverty and others with limited or no access to vehicles. The facilities will reduce disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age or disability, as well as youth. The proposed addition to the City’s trail network in the slough area will increase the economic benefit that is derived from bird watchers who travel to Watsonville and use the paths to pursue their viewing by providing safe access to the Lee Road birding “hot spot”.

Development of this initial segment of the Rail-Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail will increase community support of the overall project as it demonstrates an ongoing commitment by the City, the Transportation Agency and the City’s project partners, the Santa Cruz County Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch. Completion of the initial segment will better prepare the City for development of the remaining segments which have been outlined above and are included in the City’s Trails Master Plan.

Thank you for your commitment to socially equitable and environmentally-sound transportation alternatives for all of Santa Cruz County. Should you have any questions regarding my strong support for this project, do not hesitate to contact me at 831 295-2678 or randyr@westmarine.com.

Yours Truly,

Randy Repass
Chairman West Marine
General Partner Watsonville Freeholders
November 21, 2013

Neal Coonerty, Commission Chairperson
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Chairperson Coonerty:

On behalf of the Pajaro Valley Community Health Trust, I wish to express my strong support for the City of Watsonville’s application for funds to construct the Rail Trail-Lee Road Project.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be the first phase of a series of trail segments that would make critical connections to four key elements of the City and surrounding community. The Rail Trail-Lee Road Project would:

1. **Create a key link between Watsonville and the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail/ Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail**

   The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would be a key preliminary segment between the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail portion of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail and the City of Watsonville’s existing seven-mile Wetland Trail System. Watsonville’s trail system meanders along the freshwater wetlands that flow through City neighborhoods and, as delineated in the City’s 2012 Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails Master Plan, is slated for long-term expansion to thirty miles of trails in urban areas and along the urban edges of Watsonville. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road segment would provide the initial connection between the City’s and the Regional Transportation Commission’s major trail projects.

2. **Create a link to a planned trail to the Santa Cruz County Land Trust Watsonville Slough Farm property**

   The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would be the first portion and key link to a future connection between Watsonville’s Wetland Trail System and the Santa Cruz County Land Trust’s Watsonville Slough Farm. The Land Trust supports this trail connection.

3. **Provide a portion of a future trail to the Pajaro Valley High School**

   Each school day, hundreds of students walk along high-traffic routes to reach the Pajaro Valley High School which is located across the Highway 1 overpass and west of all City neighborhoods. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would serve as a beginning portion of a future trail link to Pajaro Valley High School and will result in greatly increased safety for students who walk or bicycle to school.

4. **Provide for a trail connection to major neighborhoods, shopping centers and transportation corridors**
The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would include an at-grade crossing of Ohlone Parkway. A planned addition of 700 feet of sidewalk on Ohlone Parkway would connect the new Rail Trail-Lee Road trail to an existing pedestrian and bicycle corridor that passes by 700 residential units including the Las Brisas, Seaview Ranch, Sunset Cove and Bay Breeze Subdivisions; Stone Creek Apartments; as well as Landmark School and the Overlook Shopping Center before connecting with Main Street.

The Rail Trail-Lee Road trail would also create a direct pedestrian and bicycle link to the Manabe-Ow business park which is located on the edge of town between a major residential area and an industrial zone.

The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road trail segment would immediately allow pedestrians and bicyclists to travel from the western City limit at Lee Road approximately 4000 feet east along the railroad right of way. The new segment would also connect to the existing Watsonville Slough Trail which is the newest portion of the City's seven mile Wetland Trail System.

The Santa Cruz County Land Trust has committed up to $300,000 toward the Rail Trail – Lee Road project. This would serve as the local match. The Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch have partnered with the City and are committed to help make this project a reality. The proposed trail segments are included in the City's 2012 Trails Master Plan and Urban Greening Plan and thus part of a well-defined and strongly-supported comprehensive vision for Watsonville's future.

The additional pedestrian facilities will increase walking, reduce driving, traffic congestion, fuel consumption and green house gas emissions. Transportation equity will be provided for people experiencing poverty and others with limited or no access to vehicles. The facilities will reduce disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age or disability, as well as youth. The proposed addition to the City's trail network in the slough area will increase the economic benefit that is derived from bird watchers who travel to Watsonville and use the paths to pursue their viewing by providing safe access to the Lee Road birding "hot spot".

Development of this initial segment of the Rail-Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail will increase community support of the overall project as it demonstrates an ongoing commitment by the City, the Transportation Agency and the City's project partners, the Santa Cruz County Land Trust and Watsonville Wetlands Watch. Completion of the initial segment will better prepare the City for development of the remaining segments which have been outlined above and are included in the City's Trails Master Plan.

Thank you for your commitment to socially equitable and environmentally-sound transportation alternatives for all of Santa Cruz County. Should you have any questions regarding my strong support for this project, do not hesitate to contact me at 763-6456.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Raquel Ramirez Ruiz
Director of Programs
November 18, 2013

Neal Coonerty, Commission Chairperson  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Chairperson Coonerty:

On behalf of Ecology Action, I wish to express my strong support for the City of Watsonville’s application for funds to construct the Rail Trail-Lee Road Project. As the fiscal sponsor for Friends of the Rail & Trail, Ecology Action is keenly interested in supporting construction of all segments of the 32-mile Rail Trail from Davenport to Watsonville. The full trail runs within one mile of 42 schools and is an important sustainable transportation corridor for school children, families, commuters and recreationalists alike.

Specifically, the Lee Road project would be the first phase of the trail that would make critical connections to four key elements of the City and surrounding community. The Rail Trail-Lee Road Project would:

- Create a key link between Watsonville and the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail/ Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail
- Create a link to a planned trail to the Santa Cruz County Land Trust Watsonville Slough Farm property
- Provide for a trail connection to neighborhoods, shopping centers and transportation corridors
- Provide a portion of a future trail to the Pajaro Valley High School

Each school day, hundreds of students walk along high-traffic routes to reach the Pajaro Valley High School which is located across the Highway 1 overpass and west of all City neighborhoods. The proposed Rail Trail-Lee Road project would serve as a beginning portion of a future trail link to Pajaro Valley High School and will result in greatly increased safety for students who walk or bicycle to school.

The additional pedestrian facilities will increase walking, reduce traffic congestion, fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Transportation equity will be provided for people with limited or no access to vehicles. Completion of the initial segment will better prepare the City for development of the remaining segments. Thank you for your commitment to socially equitable and environmentally-sound transportation alternatives for all of Santa Cruz County.

Sincerely,

Jim Murphy  
CEO
November 20, 2013

Neal Coonerty, Commission Chairperson
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Chairperson Coonerty:

On behalf of the City of Watsonville’s Nature Center, I wish to express my strong support for the City of Watsonville’s applications for funds to construct the Rail Trail-Lee Road Project and Rail Trail-Walker Street Project.

Together, the two projects will:

1. Create the first link between Watsonville’s Wetland Trail System and the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail/ Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network

   The City has submitted applications for two new trail segments: the Rail Trail-Lee Road Project and the Rail-Trail Walker Street Project. Together, these segments will make a 1.2 mile long connection between the Santa Cruz County Rail Trail and the City of Watsonville’s existing seven-mile Wetland Trail System.

   As delineated in Watsonville’s 2012 Pedestrian and Bicycle Trails Master Plan, the Wetland Trail System is slated for long-term expansion to thirty miles of trails in urban areas and along the urban edges of Watsonville and includes links to the 32 mile Santa Cruz County Rail Trail and 50 mile Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network. The two proposed projects will together create the critical link between the three major trail systems.

2. Create a link to a planned trail to the Santa Cruz County Land Trust Watsonville Slough Farm property

3. Provide a portion of a future trail to the Pajaro Valley High School

4. Provide for a Rail Trail connection to Watsonville’s major neighborhoods, shopping centers, Downtown, the Pajaro River, industrial zones and transportation corridors

The City’s has requested $1,040,000 for the Rail Trail-Lee Road Project and $600,000 for the Rail Trail-Walker Street Project. The Santa Cruz County Land Trust has committed up to $300,000 as the local match toward the Rail Trail-Lee Road project. The local environmental organization, Watsonville Wetlands Watch, has partnered with the City and is committed to help make both projects a reality.
The additional pedestrian facilities will increase walking and reduce driving, traffic congestion, fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Transportation equity will be provided for people experiencing poverty and others with limited or no access to vehicles. The facilities will reduce disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age or disability, as well as youth.

The proposed addition to the City’s trail network in the slough area will increase the economic benefit that is derived from bird watchers who travel to Watsonville and use the paths to pursue their viewing by providing safe access to the Lee Road birding “hot spot”.

Additionally, this project would greatly support the goals of our City Nature Center and Environmental Education Program. Our staff work to connect community with conservation. They key to engaging both our youth and adults in conservation is to provide hands-on experiences with the environment. We currently serve over 7,000 students and families a year with programs like our trail field trips and weekend guided trail tours. This project would provide a critical link to the existing trails where all of these outreach efforts take place. This connectivity would allow us to and broaden our messages while expanding the opportunities to thousands of trail users.

Thank you for your commitment to socially-equitable and environmentally-sound transportation alternatives for all of Santa Cruz County. Should you have any questions regarding my strong support for this project, do not hesitate to contact me at (831)768-1622.

Yours Truly,

Michelle Templeton
City of Watsonville
Nature Center Director
250 Main St
Watsonville, CA 95077
(831)768-1622
michelle.templeton@cityofwatsonville.org
Attachment 7:  
Summary of Bicycle Safety Programs

Ecology Action (EA’s) BikeSmart! Youth Bike Safety Training
EA’s youth bike safety training program, BikeSmart!, includes the classroom presentation and on-bike safety obstacle courses geared toward 1,300 5th and 6th grade students countywide. Bike Smart! is unique in the amount of knowledge it presents to students and the in-depth, on-bike training that each child receives. EA provides an interactive and age appropriate presentation discussing safety tips and techniques using a variety of mediums. Following the classroom presentation, students receive an on-the-bike safety course (Bike Rodeo) where students perform the skills and best practices to safely bike on the streets.

The overall goal is to provide Youth Bike Safety training to all schools in the county participating in bike encouragement programs such as Bike to School Day. Currently 35 elementary and middle schools countywide, including schools in each of the cities and unincorporated areas, participate in bike encouragement programs, but EA only has funding to provide a portion of these schools with in-depth bike safety training for this next school year.

Current Proposal to RTC: South County BikeSmart! Youth Bike Safety Training
Proposed Funding: $30,000 from RSTP
Targeted schools: 8 elementary and middle schools in the Pajaro Valley Unified School District (PVUSD) with a focus on fifth & sixth grade children.
   City of Watsonville:
   • Ann Soldo Elementary School
   • Mintie White Elementary School
   • HA Hyde Elementary School
   • MacQuiddy Elementary School
   • Rolling Hills Middle School
   County Unincorporated (Aptos & Corralitos):
   • Bradley Elementary School
   • Mar Vista Elementary School
   • Rio Del Mar Elementary School

Other EA BikeSmart! Youth Safety Training Programs (2014):
Funding Program: CA Safe Routes to School (temporary one year grant)
Objective: Classroom and on the bike safety training serving 392 students.
Targeted school: Vine Hill Elementary (Scotts Valley) 4th and 5th graders

Funding Program: Federal Safe Routes to School (one year remaining)
Objective: Classroom and on the bike safety training serving 450 students.
Targeted schools remaining: Westlake Elementary & Mission Hill Middle schools

Funding Program: Cyclists for Cultural Exchange & private donations
Objective: Classroom and on-the-bike safety training serving 270 students.
Targeted schools: 3-4 elementary & middle schools to be chosen from those participating in Bike to School Day
County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency (HSA)

Ride n’ Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program

Ride n’ Stride educates elementary school-aged children on how to walk and ride safely on streets in order to prevent traffic collisions and decrease injuries and fatalities. The goal is to reach at least 3,000 students at elementary schools throughout the County of Santa Cruz per school year. The program offers bicycle and pedestrian classroom presentations in English and Spanish that are multi-media and interactive. In addition to teaching bike and pedestrian safety to elementary school students, the program staff reaches preschool children and parents, and participates in helmet distribution, safety observation surveys, and community events.

The Health Services Agency’s Ride n’ Stride and Ecology Action’s BikeSmart! programs work in close collaboration to coordinate outreach activities and ensure complementary, non-duplicative programming.

Current Ride n’ Stride programming for 2014:

TDA through RTC - $48,500
Transportation Development Act (TDA) is the core funding for HSA’s Ride n’ Stride program. The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) considers funds for the program through the budget and TDA claim process on a year-to-year basis. All grant funding sources other than TDA that are described below may serve to provide a 100% match to TDA funding. Objectives include: Reach 3,000 elementary school students each school year. Bicycle and pedestrian safety presentations are offered to all teachers at all elementary schools throughout the county. Additional objectives as described above.

Federal Safe Routes to School (SRTS)
HSA/Ecology Action four-year funding ending Fall 2014. Performance objectives include: Bicycling and walking safety education sessions for students at the targeted elementary schools.
Targeted Elementary Schools: South County - Mintie White, Ann Soldo, H.A. Hyde, Starlight
North County - Bay View, Westlake, Del Mar

CA Safe Routes to School (SR2S)
City of Watsonville/HSA one-year funding ending June 2014. Performance objectives include: Ride n’ Stride will conduct bicycle and pedestrian safety presentations and participate in bike/walk encouragement programs overseen by Ecology Action.
Targeted Schools: Mintie White Elementary, MacQuiddy Elementary, Rolling Hills Middle, E.A. Hall Middle Schools and possibly a few other schools to be determined

State Office of Traffic Safety (OTS)
HSA one-year funding ending September 2014
Performance objectives include: The Ride n/ Stride portion of this grant will reach 300 people through community events/meetings and 100 parents/caregivers on pedestrian and bicycle safety.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation
Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Members of the Commission:

With the acquisition of the 32-mile Santa Cruz Branch rail right-of-way, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission made a bold step toward the development of a coastal, multi-modal trail to the ultimate benefit of county residents, visitors, and our precious environmental assets. We are writing today to expand the possibilities of this resource by requesting the inclusion of requirements for the placement of broadband infrastructure with all trail segment construction projects.

It is a fact that broadband is a vital component of modern economic development and that our county struggles with a lack of high-speed Internet access and capacity. The rail corridor provides a unique opportunity for placement of broadband infrastructure that would be less expensive than urban road trenching or other build out options. This proposal comes on the heels of the County taking the lead with a broadband expansion policy that is now being modeled by the State of California. In addition, all municipalities within the county are considering adopting similar or potentially uniform standards of broadband expansion (modeled after the draft County policy), which would greatly compliment the RTC's work.

While we understand that the inclusion of such a provision would appear to be outside the purview of the RTC, we believe that this presents a unique opportunity for the RTC to receive funding for future projects and expand public/private partnerships that can help with overall trail funding. In our work to improve broadband access and capacity in the county, we have heard repeatedly that the Santa Cruz Branch rail right-of-way presents an excellent opportunity to expand this infrastructure to the benefit of every resident within our area.

We propose that the Regional Transportation Commission provide for inclusion of fiber-ready conduit and pull boxes as part of all construction of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary
November 26, 2013
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Scenic Trail Network according to the specifications currently being considered by the County of Santa Cruz. These installations can be funded either directly through RTC funding or through public/private partnerships.

Thank you for considering this proposal. We look forward to providing further discussion about this unique opportunity for our region.

Sincerely,

ZACH FRIEND, Supervisor
Second District

BRUCE MCPHERSON, Supervisor
Fifth District

ZF/BAM:ted
Attachment

1992A2
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Tegan Speiser, Sr. Transportation Planner
       Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner
RE: 511 Traveler Information Service

RECOMMENDATION

Approve a resolution (Attachment 1) adopting the 511 Implementation Plan (Exhibit 1); authorizing staff to develop and implement a web-based 511 traveler information service for Santa Cruz County as outlined in the 511 Implementation Plan; and directing staff to submit a final report to Caltrans completing the Monterey Bay Area 511 planning project grant.

BACKGROUND

The RTC partnered with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) to develop a Monterey Bay Area 511 Traveler Information Service Implementation Plan. The Plan outlines a cost-effective 511 program for Santa Cruz County that will serve as a hub for traveler information. At your October 2013 meeting, staff presented and received input on the draft 511 Implementation Plan. Recommendations from Commissioners are reflected in the final 511 Implementation Plan (Exhibit 1) presented to you here today. Additions are underlined.

DISCUSSION

As a nationally recognized brand for traveler information, 511 is used on a daily basis as well as during emergencies that affect the transportation network. The purpose of 511 is to provide travelers with easy access to information and to empower people to better plan or adapt their trips based on knowledge about current travel conditions. Communities across California have developed and implemented 511 programs and the Monterey Bay Area is one of the few remaining gaps in this information network.

RTC and TAMC staff researched several 511 programs and used the lessons learned as well as feedback from stakeholders and Commissioners to guide the development of the Monterey Bay Area 511 Implementation Plan. The 511 Implementation Plan describes practical steps to implement a traveler information program in Santa Cruz County. The program is designed to provide great benefit at a low cost and increase exposure to a wide range of transportation programs, resources and services such as those provided by the RTC and Santa Cruz Metro, as well as by community groups such as Ecology Action and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition.

The Monterey Bay Area 511 Implementation Plan recommends the development of a 511 website for Santa Cruz County to provide and disseminate traveler information.
These days, more people seek information from the web rather than by making a phone call and the majority access the internet via portable devices such as tablets and smart phones. The Santa Cruz County 511 website would be designed for viewing on mobile devices as well as computers and would feature:

- Information on real-time traffic conditions;
- Multimodal trip planning;
- Emergency notices;
- Rideshare tools and information; and
- Links to transportation agency websites and local programs and resources.

Although many good traveler information tools and resources exist in our area, there is significant value in having them all in one place and easy to access. The Santa Cruz County 511 website would be a one-stop shop for traveler information around the clock.

Marketing messages will offer travelers tips on smart and safe ways to access the 511 website including: looking up traffic conditions before they begin their driving trip, pulling over and bringing their vehicle to a stop to consult 511 when stuck in traffic, having a passenger consult 511 while en-route, or tuning in a radio station that broadcasts drive time traffic reports during peak commute hours.

The major costs associated with contemporary 511 programs are typically those related to data collection and integration, hardware and software and new phone systems. The Santa Cruz County 511 program will minimize costs by providing an internet-based service and eliminating data collection and processing costs by embedding Caltrans’ QuickMap and Google’s multimodal trip planner on the 511 website. Caltrans’ QuickMap is an online traffic map that provides real-time information about traffic, incidents, lane closures, changeable message sign information and images from closed circuit traffic cameras. Further cost efficiencies will be realized by integrating tools and resources previously developed by RTC’s Commute Solutions program into the 511 website.

The startup cost for the web-based Santa Cruz County 511 program is estimated to be $92,030 and annual operation and maintenance costs are estimated to be $48,030. The Service Authority for Freeway Emergency (SAFE) will be the primary source of funding for the program. There are sufficient funds available from SAFE funds for motorist aid and in the Rideshare program budgets to fund this project.

A Caltrans Planning Grant provided funding for the RTC and TAMC to conduct the work associated with preparing the Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan for establishing a 511 service in the Monterey Bay Area. A final grant report including the 511 Feasibility Study (Exhibit 2) and the Implementation Plan (Exhibit 1), will be submitted to Caltrans by the due date of December 31, 2013.

**Recommendations**

**Staff recommends that the RTC approve a resolution to adopt the Monterey Bay Area 511 Implementation Plan, authorize staff to develop and implement**
a 511 traveler information service for Santa Cruz County, and submit the final report to Caltrans to complete the 511 Planning Grant project.

SUMMARY

The Implementation Plan for establishing a 511 Traveler Information Service for Santa Cruz County lays out the steps to develop and deploy a cost-effective, web-based 511 traveler information service along with the estimated costs and schedules. There are sufficient funds in the SAFE and Rideshare budgets to fund this project.

Attachments

1. Resolution on implementing 511 in Santa Cruz County
   Exhibit 1: 511 Implementation Plan (print attachment)
   Exhibit 2: 511 Feasibility Study (web attachment*)

* In an effort to reduce paper, this document is available on the RTC’s website at www.sccrtc.org/511-feasibility
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of December 5th, 2013
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 511 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN,
AUTHORIZING DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A WEB-BASED
511 TRAVELER INFORMATION SERVICE AND
DIRECTING SUBMISSION OF A FINAL REPORT COMPLETING
THE MONTEREY BAY AREA 511 PLANNING GRANT PROJECT

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC),
and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) received a Caltrans
planning grant to study the feasibility and prepare an implementation plan to
establish 511 Traveler information Services in the Monterey Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, the feasibility study found that there was a need for a traveler
information service in the region and that partnering with an existing traveler
information service was the best model for establishing 511 in our area; and

WHEREAS, the opportunity to partner with Caltrans to provide real-time
traffic information to the traveling public and with Google to offer a multimodal trip
planner emerged as a cost-effective way to provide high quality traveler resources
to our region; and

WHEREAS, a centralized one-stop shop for transportation information allows
the traveling public to make more informed travel choices based on current traffic
conditions in terms of when to leave, what route to take, what mode to use or
whether to eliminate a trip altogether; and

WHEREAS, the implementation plan outlines steps to take to develop and
integrate 511 with existing RTC websites and resources; and

WHEREAS, further efficiencies will be realized by utilizing tools and resources
for 511 that were previously developed by RTC’s Commute Solutions rideshare
program; and

WHEREAS, there are sufficient funds in the SAFE fund for motorist aid and in
the Rideshare budgets to fund this project; and

WHEREAS, the Caltrans planning grant is ending with the final project report
due by December 31, 2013;

NOW BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION:
1. The Commission hereby adopts the Monterey Bay Area 511 Traveler Information Implementation Plan (Exhibit 1) and the Monterey Bay Area 511 Traveler Information Feasibility Study (Exhibit 2);

2. The Commission hereby authorizes the Executive Director to develop and implement a 511 Traveler Information Service as outlined in the 511 Implementation Plan (Exhibit 1);

3. The Commission hereby authorizes the Executive Director to enter into agreements as may be needed to implement this project; and

4. The Commission directs staff to submit the final grant report to Caltrans for this project by December 31, 2013.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

______________________________
Neal Coonerty, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Exhibit 1: Final 511 Implementation Plan
Exhibit 2: 511 Feasibility Study (www.sccrtc.org/511-feasibility)

Distribution: RTC Finance Officer and Project Manager
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Executive Summary

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) have been afforded a tremendous opportunity to offer web-based 511 traveler information services for Santa Cruz County and Monterey County cost effectively. Currently, in either county, there is not one “go to” place where people can get travel information. Information is scattered in many locations making it challenging for people to know what resources are available and their many options for how to get around. Traveler information can help drivers to make more informed choices for when and how they travel. It can allow travelers to alter their routes, their departure times, or decide to avoid the trip altogether. Knowing what to expect when they get out on the road will also reduce frustration and allow travelers to plan ahead. Travelers may also decide not to drive the car, but to take the bus, ride their bike or walk to their destination if it is not too far.

This implementation plan describes how 511 multimodal transportation services can be provided on the web. This can be accomplished by integrating Caltrans QuickMap traffic conditions webpage and other 511 resources into each agency’s web presence and rideshare program. Given the considerable amount of congestion in the Monterey Bay Area and environmental concerns from greenhouse gas emissions, 511 traveler information will provide a way to better inform travelers in our region of their alternatives.

QuickMap provides a traffic conditions web page with numerous additional real time features (e.g. traffic camera images, CHP incident, lane closure information) comparable to other 511 systems that have taken significant resources and effort to develop. Multimodal resource information is also an important component of 511 services to inform users of their many travel options. Google’s multimodal trip planner, transit schedules, specialized transportation, bicycling and pedestrian resources are a sampling of the types of information that would be available on the 511 web sites. By partnering with Caltrans and using their Quickmap, quality 511 multimodal traveler information services can now be provided via the internet that takes advantage of current technology with minimal effort and resources from Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties.

By establishing a web presence for traveler information in our region, people will become familiar with 511 as the place to go for information. This is even more important during an emergency that people know where to go to get the latest real time information. A 511 web presence will reduce the number of 911 calls, both daily and during an emergency, leaving those emergency phone lines available for people in need of a live operator. Examples of emergency events in the last few years where people would have benefitted from a “go to” place for real time transportation information include the tsunami warning and Big Sur Highway 1 landslide in March of 2011 and the Trabing fire near Highway 1 in Watsonville in June 2008.
Phone calls to 511 originating from our region will be routed to the state’s California Highway Information Network (CHIN) that provides roadway condition information due to construction and weather. Caltrans will coordinate this effort with telecommunication companies at no expense to the local transportation agencies.

Due to the already limited amount of resources needed to implement 511 for Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties and the additional economy of scale of integrating 511 with each agency web presence (and rideshare for Santa Cruz County), funding needs for 511 are very low. The total start-up costs for RTC are approximately $92,030 with annual operations and maintenance of approximately $48,030. Start up costs for TAMC are higher at approximately $124,000 as they will be creating a new website both for their agency and to house 511. Annual operations and maintenance for TAMC will be approximately $48,030.

There are currently funds in the RTC Commute Solutions program to fund $54,000 of the startup costs for 511 Santa Cruz County. Additional start up costs ($38,030) and operations and maintenance costs ($48,030/year) are available from RTC SAFE funds. 511 Monterey County implementation costs ($124,030) and annual operations and maintenance costs ($48,030) are available from TAMC SAFE.

As the implementing agencies of 511 traveler information via the web, RTC and TAMC would be proactive in providing traffic condition information as well as multimodal information so people are informed of the variety of travel options in our region.
Chapter 1 – Introduction

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County have developed a feasibility study and implementation plan for a 511 traveler information service that would provide travelers in the Monterey Bay Area with traffic information and multimodal resources. This work was funded by a planning grant from Caltrans to establish 511 traveler information services throughout California. This is consistent with the National 511 Deployment Coalition’s goal for 511 systems to be operational throughout the nation by 2010. Currently, 511 traveler information services exist throughout most of California and more than two-thirds of the United States. Providing traveler information in Santa Cruz County and Monterey County would help to close the gap in 511 traveler information services along the Central Coast of California.

The Monterey Bay Area 511 Feasibility Study was completed in January, 2012. One of the key tasks of the feasibility study was to assess the need for a 511 traveler information system, to determine the primary objectives, and to evaluate the different models available to discern the appropriate system for the Monterey Bay Region. The need for a 511 traveler information system for the Monterey Bay Area was established with the following objectives:

- Consider a 511 traveler information system that provides real-time traffic conditions and multi-modal information.
- Consider providing, to the greatest extent feasible, a traveler information system that can gather all relevant information into one source (“one-stop shop”).
- Ensure that any 511 system deployed takes advantage of existing resources to the greatest extent feasible (“low-hanging fruit”).
- Provide significant benefits to the traveling public while deploying a system that is safe to operate.
- Consider planning and building a system to first focus on the needs of the greatest number of people and target markets (“biggest bang for the buck”).
The project team, with the assistance of the ICx Transportation Group consulting firm, identified a number of models that could be used to deliver traveler information to the public. The various models considered were contracting for full deployment of a 511 system (phone and web); building a 511 system in-house; sharing resources by contracting with an existing 511 system; creating a web-based traveler information hub with information that is currently available, but from many different sources and found in a variety of locations; building an advertiser- and sponsor-supported system so that there are no public costs; and doing nothing.

To help the RTC and TAMC determine which model best meets the goals and objectives of this 511 Plan, each model was set against evaluation criteria measuring the cost to deploy and operate a system, the ranges of functionality available, and the expandability and scalability of a system. In addition to these criteria, factors such as the level of risks involved and how well user needs would be met were used in the selection process.

Compared to the challenge of securing sufficient funding to develop a customized system from scratch, a deployment that takes advantage of existing resources and makes traveler information available in a centralized location would add value at a relatively low cost. The key finding of the Feasibility Study was for the RTC and TAMC to partner with an existing traveler information system in order to deliver 511 services to the Monterey Bay Region. The potential partners that were identified in the feasibility study were the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) and the San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in order to use the selected agency’s existing 511 system infrastructure. RTC Commissioners and TAMC Board of Directors approved moving forward with developing a recommended implementation strategy, cost estimate, project structure and design and schedule in January and February 2012 respectively.

In July 2012, after completion of the Feasibility Study, Caltrans launched “QuickMap” that provides real-time traffic information on the internet via a traffic map page. Caltrans created QuickMap to comply with the federal requirements of SAFETEA-LU as spelled out in Final Rule 23-CFR 511. This rule requires each state department of transportation to: establish a real-time system management information program in their state; monitor traffic and travel conditions of the major highways; and share information to address congestion problems and facilitate traveler information. These requirements continue under the current MAP-21 transportation bill.

Information available on QuickMap includes traffic speeds on highways and local roads via a Google traffic map, incidents, lane closures, traffic camera images, and changeable message sign display information. In developing QuickMap, Caltrans utilized the Google traffic conditions map as the base layer and took on the effort of transferring the CHP incident feed, Caltrans lane closures, traffic camera and changeable message sign information onto the web map. This real-time traffic map page is available at no cost and can be embedded onto a website. While there are other free traffic information services available on the internet, these services don’t provide all the additional real time features that are available on QuickMap (e.g. live traffic camera images and changeable message sign information) and the sources of information are unknown.
RTC and TAMC staff have concluded that the most cost-effective way to provide traveler information to the region is to partner with Caltrans, and use Caltrans’ QuickMap as the traffic map for 511 Traveler Information Services websites that are offered separately for Santa Cruz County and Monterey County. The 511 Traveler Information websites would be a comprehensive place to access traveler information in each county including not only QuickMap, but also emergency alerts, transit trip planning, rideshare information, bicycle and pedestrian resources, and specialized transportation services. It would include services provided by the respective transportation agency and those offered by other entities.

Development of a 511 phone service would also be through a partnership with Caltrans. Caltrans is working with telecommunication providers to route 511 calls to the Caltrans Highway Information Network (CHIN) in regions that do not currently have a 511 phone system in place. CHIN currently provides limited road condition information, but capabilities of this system may increase over time. More details are discussed in the following report.

This Implementation Plan serves as the business plan for what the 511 traveler information services will offer and how they will be developed, managed and funded by RTC and TAMC. This plan includes the following sections:

**Chapter 2 – Components.** This chapter describes the components of each of the 511 services for both Santa Cruz County and Monterey County. Content for the initial launch of 511 services, as well as potential future content areas, is discussed.

**Chapter 3 – Website Structure and Design.** This chapter proposes the approach to developing the web-based 511 service. Content development; site design; usage, hosting, storage and delivery; procedures and protocol; and mobile strategies are reviewed.

**Chapter 4 – Coordination and Operations.** Roles and responsibilities for the various partners are outlined in this chapter as well as agreements that may be needed. Management, staffing and operations, and performance measures for 511 are discussed along with market demand, sustainability and integration with existing agency operations.

**Chapter 5 – Marketing Strategies.** Promoting awareness of 511 and web-based traveler information is integral to successful usage of these services. This section outlines some low-cost, high impact strategies, including branding, media relations, advertising, and utilizing partners to help promote these services provided by RTC and TAMC.

**Chapter 6 – Financial and Schedule Information.** The Implementation Strategy provides cost, funding and schedule information for a 511 service in Santa Cruz County and Monterey County. Projected funding needs and potential revenue streams are identified for development, implementation and operations.

**Chapter 7 – Conclusion.** Conclusions and next steps to implement 511 in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties are discussed.
One of the greatest benefits of 511 traveler information services is to have a central location so people know where to go for traveler information. Many types of traveler information exist, but are scattered across multiple locations and agencies making it difficult for people to know what is available and how to find it. Developing a central location for 511 traveler information services will also help people better understand their travel choices. Traveler information can vary significantly from one region to another. Separate 511 systems would be developed for Santa Cruz County and Monterey County with the following components that are tailored to each region.

### 511 Website Traveler Information

**Traffic Information**

*Monterey County/Santa Cruz County*

Caltrans has developed a traffic information webpage called QuickMap for the state of California which provides real-time traffic information layered on a Google Map. QuickMap includes traffic speeds, incident reports, traffic camera snapshots, changeable message sign content, construction closures, and chain control requirements. Traffic speed is indicated by color-coded lines overlaying the roadway. Other information is identified by icon images on the map. Clicking on an icon displays details in a pop-up window. QuickMap can be embedded on a 511 traveler information website for both Santa Cruz County and Monterey County. Traffic information for the entire State of California is provided by QuickMap which enables users to get traffic condition information beyond the boundaries of the region for interregional trips. Figure 1 provides a screen shot of QuickMap with the various information that it displays. QuickMap has also been formatted for viewing on all smart phones and tablets through use of a QuickMap mobile web page version. A QuickMap app for Android devices is also available.
Traffic Speed

Traffic speed for both highways and local roads is available with Caltrans QuickMap as color bands on a road map (Figure 1). Data for traffic speed comes from Google Map’s traffic layer. Google Maps traffic layer has numerous sources for their speed data which is proprietary information, but includes data from cell phones, automatic vehicle locators, Caltrans traffic detectors and potentially other sources as well. Traffic data on QuickMap is refreshed every 3 minutes.

Figure 1: Caltrans Quickmap Traffic Information Page
Construction Lane Closures and Incidents

Lane closures from construction, incidents, and other events that affect road conditions are available on QuickMap. Real-time incident data for highways is shown as a yellow or red triangular hazard marker with an exclamation point and is provided by the California Highway Patrol through their Traffic Information Communications Center. Real-time construction data for highways is shown as an orange or red cone and is provided by Caltrans. Clicking on the icon will provide more detailed information in a pop-up window such as whether a single lane is closed or all lanes are out of service as shown in Figure 2. Only closures actually in effect are displayed.

Figure 2: Caltrans Quickmap showing CHP incident information in pop-up box
Closed-Circuit Television Cameras

QuickMap also provides recent snapshot images from the closed-circuit television cameras located at various places along Hwy 1 and 17 in Santa Cruz County and along Hwy 1, 68, 101 and 183 in Monterey County. The images are stamped in the lower left hand corner with the date and time that the image was recorded. (Caltrans’ goal is to update the camera images every 20 minutes or less.) There are currently 16 operational CCTVs in Santa Cruz County and 15 operational CCTVs in Monterey County that provide travelers with real time images of the roadway. These images provide motorists with an additional way to assess traffic conditions on major highways. They are shown as icons on the traffic map and when clicked, open the image in a pop-up window as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Closed-circuit Television Icons and Image

Changeable Message Signs

Real-time messages posted on Changeable Message Signs are also available on QuickMap. They are presented as icons on the map and when clicked, a pop-up box provides the sign’s current message being displayed to motorists traveling that section of the highway (Figure 4).
Multimodal information

Multimodal Trip Planner

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

Multimodal trip planning is now a common feature on 511 web sites. Google offers a trip planner that can be embedded on the Santa Cruz County and Monterey County 511 websites that provides options for trip planning for motor vehicle, transit, bike and walk trips. Figure 5 shows a transit trip from Santa Cruz to Monterey using the Google Map trip planner that includes a travel map, suggested route and directions. Google Maps lets you do the following when planning your trip: calculate travel time, calculate travel distance, get turn by turn driving directions, see road, street, and highway detail, view highlighted maps with traffic, get details on the bus fare, the nearest bus stop and how long it will take to walk to the stop. Google Maps is available in 12 different languages and is compatible with screen readers for the visually impaired. The Google Transit Trip Planning feature is also available on selected mobile devices through Google Maps for mobile. (Google notes that bike and walk trip planning features are currently in a beta test stage.)
Transit Information

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

Transit information is essential to include on a 511 website. In addition to providing the Google multimodal trip planner that includes planning trips by bus as discussed above, static transit information on 511 is planned to include schedules, maps, and general information about riding transit. This information will be accessed by clicking links to transit agency websites (Santa Cruz Metro and Monterey-Salinas Transit).

Information on Greyhound bus services and seasonal shuttle services (e.g. City of Capitola and City of Santa Cruz) will also be linked to/from a web page. Instructions will be included about using public transit to get to popular local destinations, train connection locations, and airports.

Real-Time Transit Information

Currently in both Santa Cruz County and Monterey County, real-time transit information is not yet available. Real-time transit information promotes increased ridership as riders tend to spend less time waiting at their stops and feel less frustration since they can...
manage their time more effectively. MST, the transit agency serving Monterey County, has automatic vehicle locators (AVL) on their buses which is the initial technology required to provide real-time transit information. Santa Cruz Metro is seeking funding to install AVL on its fleet. Both Monterey County and Santa Cruz County realize the importance of increasing transit ridership and will consider developing a means to deliver real-time transit information to travelers during a future phase of the 511 project.

**Rideshare Information**

**Santa Cruz**

Commute Solutions is the regional rideshare agency for Santa Cruz County. Commute Solutions serves commuters, employers, schools and other travelers by helping them successfully use the transportation system to access the things they want and need. Personalized commute trip planning, commute program assistance for employers and bike and pedestrian support are core Commute Solutions services that help people make sustainable transportation choices, and thus make the best use of our current transportation system. Online carpool and vanpool matching is also provided by Commute Solutions through an agreement with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Additional information includes the location and availability of park and ride lots, options for finding carpool partners for commute or one-time trips, telecommuting and alternative work schedules and other relevant information for making travel decisions such as a cost of driving calculator. These services can be obtained online, on the phone or in person. Commute Solutions services would be combined with a 511 Traveler Information Service for Santa Cruz County. It is envisioned that self-serve traveler information would be accessed through 511 with Commute Solutions HelpDesk services still available to provide personalized assistance to businesses and individuals by phone, email or in person.

**Monterey County**

The current rideshare program that serves Monterey County, Commute Alternatives, is run by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). This rideshare information will be linked to and from the 511 Traveler Information website for Monterey County. Plans to transition the Rideshare program to TAMC are under consideration.

**Monterey County/Santa Cruz County**

Real-time ridesharing provides an opportunity to share rides on very short notice. Due to GPS navigation devices, smart phones and social networks, real-time ridesharing is becoming much more of a reality. In future phases, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties will investigate the requirements for setting up this service for the respective counties or in recommending third party vendor(s) that are successfully and responsibly offering these services. For example, in preparation for the recent BART strike, the Bay Area 511 recommended a real-time carpool service to commuters who normally took public transit to get to work.
Bicycling and Pedestrian Information

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

Web pages on both Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties 511 websites will be devoted to bicycling and walking resources. Identification of the many resources available through the RTC and TAMC will be available as well as links to other biking and walking resources such as bicycling maps, safety information, bike registration, advocacy groups, bikes on buses, educational programs, walkability assessment tools and other relevant information. A hazard report will be available online for walkers and bikers to report access problems such as broken sidewalks, overgrown vegetation, potholes or other conditions that need attention. This information will be forwarded to the appropriate public works department for the area of concern. Google’s bicycle and walking trip planner (as discussed under section on multi-modal trip planning) can be used to recommend routes for pedestrians and cyclists from a specified origin and destination. The Bay Area’s online ridedematching service which both counties provide, also helps people find bike buddies. The availability of this bike buddy matching service will be promoted through the 511 Traveler Information program.

Other information that will be considered is a bike commute calculator, bicycle maintenance tips, and rules of the road for cyclists. A webpage could be dedicated to employers on the benefits to their company and the various incentive programs that encourage employees to bike, walk or take transit to work. An announcements section that keeps the public apprised of new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, programs, classes, volunteer opportunities could also be considered.

Specialized Transportation

Santa Cruz County/Monterey County

Accessible transportation services assist people who would otherwise use the public transportation system, but are prevented from doing so due to disability. Resources will be provided that will assist in navigating the network of specialized transportation options. In addition, the Google trip planner tool is compatible with screen readers for the visually impaired.

The following links will be included for Santa Cruz County:

- RTC’s Guide to Specialized Transportation
- Lift Line/Community Bridges
- Santa Cruz Metro’s ParaCruz, accessible services and mobility training
- UCSC/Cabrillo College/School Districts
• Veteran’s Services
• United Way’s 211 service
• Ambulance and Medical Transportation
• Volunteer Center Transportation

The following links will be included for Monterey County:

• Monterey-Salinas Travel Training and RIDES program
• CSUMB/Hartnell College/Monterey Peninsula College/Naval Postgraduate School/Defense Language Institute/School Districts
• Veteran’s Services
• United Way’s 211
• Ambulance and Medical Transportation

**Park & Ride Lots**

Park and Ride lots are centrally located pick up spots where commuters can park their cars during the work or school day to meet a carpool, vanpool, or bus ride. Most are located along highways or near transit centers. Parking is free for public use during specified hours, but no overnight parking is allowed.

**Monterey County/Santa Cruz County**

There are six Park and Ride lots that serve Santa Cruz County commuters and 4 lots that serve Monterey County commuters. Maps and user guides of the Park & Ride Lot locations will be available to view and download for both Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties. It may be possible to enable a Google map layer that includes the location of park and ride lots since Caltrans maintains an inventory of these facilities.

**Parking**

**Monterey County/Santa Cruz County**

Parking information (car and bicycle) that is available on local jurisdiction websites will be linked from 511.
EMERGENCY INFORMATION

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

511 is a valuable way to get information about emergencies out to travelers. A scrolling banner across the top of the home page is planned that would give important information about road closures, evacuation routes, or other information related to the specific emergency. Twitter feeds can also be displayed on the home page during events that could affect traffic including tweets posted by the transportation agencies, CHP, Caltrans, Metro and the Office of Emergency Services. In the event of an emergency or major transportation disruption, a special “Alert” webpage is planned to publicize information about commute alternatives and the latest service provider information.

Examples of emergency events in the last few years where people would have benefitted from a “go to” place for real time transportation information include the tsunami warning and Big Sur Highway 1 landslide in March of 2011 and the Trabing fire along Highway 1 in June 2008. A 511 web presence will reduce the number of 911 calls, both daily and during an emergency, leaving those emergency phone lines available for people in need of a live operator. Referrals to 211 for information about shelters and meal sites during an emergency will be part of the emergency coordination protocols.

Real-time wild fire information is available on QuickMap. The extent of the fire is mapped and the flame icon, when clicked, provides a pop-up box providing details about the fire (Figure 6). Real-time information during an emergency is crucial so people can avoid the area, reducing the potential for safety issues and providing first responders more room to navigate.
Additional emergency information that could affect traffic conditions can be provided by linking to a number of websites that would inform the public in an emergency with the most up-to-date information. Examples include Office of Emergency Services, County Road Closure Information, earthquake, tsunami, fire and weather information websites.

**OTHER RESOURCES**

**Radio**

**Monterey County/Santa Cruz County**

A number of local radio stations broadcast traffic reports during peak commute hours. Providing a list of radio stations on the 511 website that offer traffic information to their listeners is another way to get traveler information out to motorists.
**Carshare**

*Monterey County/Santa Cruz County*

There are an increasing number of options to participate in carsharing programs in order to reduce the need for and expense of owning your own car. Carsharing information, such as links to Zipcar, RelayRides, GetAround, Hertz 24/7 and Enterprise CarShare will be provided on a 511 website in order for people to better understand all their options for getting around without having to own a vehicle.

**Electric Vehicles**

*Monterey County/Santa Cruz County*

Electric vehicle charging locations within Santa Cruz County, Monterey County and surrounding counties can be found on the Plug Share and the Monterey Bay Electric Vehicle Alliance (MBEVA) websites as well as by searching on Google maps for “electric vehicle charging”. This information (now totaling more than 70 charging sites in the region) will be provided on the 511 websites for Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties along with other regional EV resources as they are developed.

**Taxis/Airport Shuttles**

*Monterey County/Santa Cruz County*

Taxis play an important role in providing flexible travel options. In addition, some taxi and transportation providers publicize their availability to provide Safe Rides Home during holidays that typically involve alcohol consumption such as New Year’s Eve. Contact information for taxis and airport shuttles will be made available on the 511 websites. Information about taking public transit to access airports in our region will also be provided as well as the specialized transportation service known as taxi scrip.

**Truck/Freight Information**

*Monterey County/Santa Cruz County*

511 can be a valuable resource for truck drivers. In addition to general information about road conditions that appeals to all drivers, 511 can also provide specialized information about moving goods and freight.

Examples of potential trucking resources include:

- Truck load and height restrictions
- Bridge height and weight limitations
• Road closures that specifically affect trucks
• Links to state permitting offices
• Weekly short term restrictions, oversize or overweight permits
• Weigh station requirements
• CA weigh station map (there are currently no weigh stations in Santa Cruz or Monterey Counties)

Caltrans is currently developing a special “truckers version” of QuickMap designed specifically with information for truckers. 511 in Monterey County and Santa Cruz County will include a link to this new truckers map once available.

Rail Information

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

The Santa Cruz and Monterey Bay Railway offers freight and recreational rail service operated on the 32 mile Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line by Iowa Pacific Railway. Roaring Camp Railroads operates recreational service from the San Lorenzo Valley to the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk and steam trains that travel through the redwood forest from Roaring Camp up Bear Mountain. Passenger rail is provided through Monterey County with expanded service from Salinas to the San Francisco Bay Area planned for 2018. Light rail transit is also planned for the Monterey Branch Line which will eventually connect Castroville to Monterey. Links to information on these services will be provided.

Links to rail service in surrounding counties will also be provided including information about connecting to Caltrain, Santa Clara VTA’s light rail and AMTRAK service.

Customer Comments

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

Users of the 511 websites will be able to provide feedback to their respective counties on the information provided through an online commenting system. Specific information about how users can report data discrepancies and help improve service will also be provided.

511 Phone Traveler Information

More and more individuals are looking to the internet or web-based applications for travel information. From discussions with other 511 providers in CA, the percentage of 511
phone calls relative to 511 web usage has been decreasing over time with the increase in use of smart phones and tablets to access information on the internet. Phone service is also one of the more expensive components of 511 for a couple of reasons. A 511 phone service requires real-time traffic speed data to be collected, processed and disseminated over an interactive voice response system. Because QuickMap utilizes Google Map as the base layer for traffic speed information, traffic speed data for Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties is not available in a format that could be utilized for a phone system without a significant cost associated with it. Phone service is also one of the more expensive components of operating a 511 because of the cost per call charged by the telecommunications companies and additional fees charged to transfer calls to other transportation agencies.

In an effort to keep costs down, but still provide traveler information by phone, initial implementation of 511 phone service in the Monterey Bay Area will utilize existing phone systems to route 511 calls made in our region to the California Highway Information Network (CHIN). CHIN is an automated telephone system that gives roadway condition information (such as construction and chain control requirements) for all state highways in California. Callers are prompted to say or enter the number of the highway they would like information about and the CHIN system lists off all of the roadway conditions for that particular facility. (This information is also available online, and links will be provided on the 511 website.)

RTC and TAMC staff does not recommend any additional 511 phone service beyond CHIN at this time. Staff will monitor the need for a 511 phone service for future phases and stay abreast of technological advancements that may provide voice activation and response services at a more reasonable cost.

**SOCIAL MEDIA AND PUSH NOTIFICATIONS**

An important component of this plan is to provide ways to deliver and receive transportation information from users of the 511 service. During transportation emergencies, notifications can be pushed out to 511 eNews subscribers. Posting on agency Facebook and Twitter accounts will be used to drive traffic to information available on the 511 website. Twitter can also provide a public forum for receiving and transmitting corridor specific notifications and during transportation emergencies.
Chapter 3 – Website Structure and Design

The approach to implementing 511 traveler information services in the Monterey Bay Area is to provide a centralized, one-stop-shop for transportation information in each county. However, simply providing transportation information in a single website location is not enough to become the preferred “go-to” resource. Information on a website must be eminently findable, easily and quickly accessed and visually appealing. Consequently, the 511 websites proposed for the Monterey Bay Area will be designed to have a high degree of usability by travelers. This will be achieved through a number of strategies including providing content that is easy to locate, up-to-date, well-organized and aesthetically attractive. Mobile Responsive Design will allow elements of the website to change depending on the maximum screen size of the device being used. This will allow for viewing on phones and tablets as well as via traditional computers. Strategies to achieve and maintain good rankings in search engines so that people can easily find the site through web searches will be built into the site planning and design.

As proposed, 511 websites for the Monterey Bay Area are intended to meet the routine daily information needs of travelers and to ramp up and deliver a higher volume of service during emergency situations. Given this dual role, some features of the websites will be developed and turned on only during emergencies such as scrolling text announcement banners and special alert pages. Planning adequate server capacity will ensure that during such emergencies, websites remain live and are not overwhelmed by a surge of users seeking critical information simultaneously. Creating procedures for identifying and deploying the human resources needed to maintain the websites and keep them updated on an ongoing basis as well as the reinforcements who will be called in to respond in emergencies are another aspect of 511 website planning. Recent lessons learned from New York and New Jersey’s 511 services as well as examples from the Bay Area and Los Angeles are invaluable to 511 planning for both day to day and emergency conditions.

The proposal for delivering traveler information in our region is for the transportation agencies to implement a 511 service in their respective county utilizing a similar set of components and features and integrating 511 with other transportation information already available through their agency and rideshare program websites. The sites will provide content from both internal and external sources. Planning for each agency’s website will include: content development, site planning and design, plans for viewing the site on mobile devices, a strategy for sufficient hosting, storage and delivery capacity, and the human resources that will be required.
Web-based 511 programs for the Monterey Bay Area will be designed in accordance with the following attributes:

- **Cost-effective**: High benefit to cost ratio and utilizes existing resources
- **Streamlined**: 511 information architecture contains only pertinent components that can be easily and efficiently managed and operated
- **User-friendly**: Easy for users to find and understand information. High site ranking in search engine queries.
- **Adaptable and scalable**: Able to adapt and take advantage of new technology without having to significantly change the basic program structure/framework
- **Easy to navigate across counties**
- **Integrate with social media such as Twitter feeds, Facebook alerts, etc...**

**CONTENT DEVELOPMENT**

**Monterey County/Santa Cruz County**

A significant limitation of the existing Traffic Conditions page on the RTC Commute Solutions website is that it only provides links to resources. Additional clicks are needed to access information. Directly embedding QuickMap onto the page would make viewing traffic conditions immediately available to the user and allow them to interact with the information. Adding Google’s multimodal trip planner to the same 511 home page with the traffic map would allow the viewer immediate access to other travel options as they are checking out the traffic conditions. Both of these – QuickMap and the Google Trip Planner – are proposed to take central positions on the 511 Santa Cruz and 511 Monterey traveler information home pages.

Additionally, existing content from the current Commute Solutions and Commute Alternatives websites will be integrated with the new offerings to implement a fully multimodal 511 site in Santa Cruz County and Monterey County respectively. Further value to users will come from expanding content beyond those services offered by the RTC and TAMC to include information about other community transportation services and providers as well as emergency transportation information sources (See Chapter 2 for more information on Components).
SITE DESIGN

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

Drawing heavily upon the finely-tuned layout and organization of several successful 511 traveler information websites and market research conducted during the Feasibility Study for our region, the layout of the website’s content and an outline of the navigation structure will be developed to guide the site design and technical work required to publish the 511 sites. Some user testing may be used to help inform 511 project team members about customer preferences. Strategies and tools for search engine optimization will be included in the design to ensure that the 511 service ranks at the top of the list in online search results and that this position is maintained.

Santa Cruz County

In 2011, the RTC launched two new agency websites – sccrtc.org and commutesolutions.org. Although they use different color palettes, the websites have a similar look and feel and both sites use WordPress, a robust, free, open source publishing platform that is actively maintained and upgraded. This platform allows for easy updating and administration and permits RTC staff members to add pages and update copy to keep the website content current. A framework that sits on top of WordPress as well as widgets and plugins are used to leverage and extend site functionality.

The sccrtc.org website provides information to the public regarding the RTC’s functions primarily as a planning and funding organization. The commutesolutions.org website reflects the RTC’s long-standing commitment to help people successfully use the existing transportation network efficiently by providing information about a variety of transportation options including carpooling, vanpooling, walking, biking and riding the bus. The redesigned Commute Solutions website now includes more than 50 pages of transportation resources.

Among the most important of these new pages is the Traffic Conditions page that brings together links to many real-time transportation resources that can help travelers make choices about when to travel, what route to take, or if a trip can be avoided altogether. Even though this page relies exclusively on links, it now ranks as the page most frequently accessed directly by users visiting the Commute Solutions website. Currently one quarter of the visitors to the Commute Solutions website are visiting the Traffic Conditions page generating 700 page views per month.

The 511 website will build upon the commutesolutions.org website and will continue to use the WordPress publishing platform. To create a website that allows pages to be viewed on a wide variety of devices (Mobile Responsive Design,) the latest version of WordPress that includes html5 will need to be installed along with some site redesign.
Monterey County

In 2012, new webpage templates were designed for the Transportation Agency website. The templates were built on a CSS platform which enables content to be viewed via mobile device (compatible with Android, iPhone and Blackberry). The Transportation Agency website is expected to be updated using the new templates in 2014. To ensure design consistency and minimize cost, the Monterey County 511 website will use the new Transportation Agency website templates. In addition to providing traveler information, the 511 Monterey website will include rideshare information and resources for Monterey County. Rideshare information for Monterey County will be adapted from the rideshare website currently managed by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments.

Usage

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

Predicting potential usage of a 511 Traveler Information website is somewhat challenging since this will be a new service for the region and we are one of the first California communities to approach implementing 511 by utilizing Caltrans Quickmap as the cornerstone for providing traffic information. Analytic tools installed on the site will continuously monitor volume and usage. Automated reporting systems will enable 511 team members to stay apprised of activity on the site. Performance targets will be established following the first 6 months of operation. Currently, there is significant unused capacity on the Commute Solutions website which utilizes less than 1/10th of the disk space allotted to it and 1/50th of the bandwidth available. (See Chapter 4 – Coordination and Operations, for a list of proposed performance measures.)

Mobile Strategies

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

According to the Pew Research Center, as of May 2013, 91% of US adults have a cell phone and more than half of these (56%) use their phone to go online. Add to these “mobile internet users”, another 60% of adults who access the internet via a tablet or eReader and it becomes clear that plans for delivering 511 must include optimizing the experience for mobile device users, the fastest growing segment of the internet market. Project staff recommends a two-fold approach -- using mobile responsive design to ensure that 511 website resources are easily viewed on mobile devices right now and consider developing apps in the future. The trend seems to be that apps are becoming less utilized as responsive design continues to increase.
Monterey County

The CSS platform that the 511 Monterey website will be built on enables content to adjust to mobile device viewing automatically. There will be no additional cost associated with providing mobile access as the templates that will be used for the 511 Monterey website have already been designed using a CSS platform.

Hosting, Storage & Delivery

Santa Cruz County

Currently, the RTC uses a firm based in Houston, Texas to host its three websites and there are no plans to change this arrangement in the foreseeable future. The web host’s servers are 130% wind powered -- equivalent to taking 444 cars off the road each year. There are advantages to the hosting servers being located in another state. Emergencies specific to California conditions such as earthquakes and tsunamis are unlikely to affect the hosting operations in Texas. The RTC’s web host has a 99.9% uptime guarantee as well as 24/7 support. In addition to having backup generators available during power outages, regular backups to a different storage area are made in the event that the hardware on the hosting server fails so RTC doesn’t lose data. The agency’s local web support contractor is available to help handle after hour emergencies.

The agency has confirmed that the capacity of the server on which the Commute Solutions website is currently hosted can handle a significantly higher volume of traffic than it currently receives and is scalable based on demand. If, in the final planning stages, more overall resources are required, RTC’s hosting plan can be upgraded without additional coding or moving servers. Pages will be cached for site speed and hosting requirements.

Monterey

The Transportation Agency is considering the use of a cloud-based web hosting service that offers unlimited bandwidth and storage. Advantages to cloud-based hosting are that they are cost-effective, can handle spikes in use which is important in case of an emergency, and are not themselves susceptible to local emergency conditions. Currently the Transportation Agency uses a brick and mortar hosting firm located in Salinas, California. If the Transportation Agency stays with the current firm it may be necessary to increase the server capacity in order to accommodate increased user traffic and peaks in use during times of emergency.
PROCEDURES & PROTOCOLS

Santa Cruz County

Agency staff is already performing many of the functions that will be needed for managing the 511 service. That is part of what makes implementation of this project so cost effective. Not only are streamlined systems for updating information already in place, but there is no learning curve needed for using WordPress, the software platform upon which the 511 site will be built. Most of the day-to-day maintenance of the RTC’s websites is conducted by a web/social media team of three. In addition, a highly capable web local contractor provides technical support for the agency’s three websites when something is needed beyond the skill set of the staff.

Monterey County

Staff regularly updates the Transportation Agency website and provides traveler information reports online. Minimal additional staff time will be required to manage and maintain the 511 Monterey website. Initial content development of the 511 Monterey County website will require additional staff time. Once the 511 Monterey County website is up and running, portions of the website will be updated on a weekly basis with changing traveler information such as the “Cone Zone Report”, which details planned lane closures due to construction projects.
Chapter 4 – Coordination and Operations

Since a substantial portion of the 511 product will be generated from external resources, the success of implementing 511 in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties depends on maintaining strong relationships and effective communication between the transportation agencies and our respective partners and information providers. This chapter makes the case for how the 511 websites proposed for our region will fill a market niche that is currently unmet, provides a discussion of staffing and oversight, and the particular suitability of the RTC and TAMC to deliver this service. It also highlights the roles and responsibilities of partners, discusses recommended agreements, production and operations and proposes performance measures for 511.

COORDINATION

Market Demand

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

The market for traveler information services has grown over the past decade as more and more web based transportation information services have been developed. Real-time traffic condition information used to be the exclusive domain of motorists who had on board navigation systems installed in their vehicles and who paid for this subscription service. The proliferation of free and low-cost, web-based services and apps such as those offered by Google, Sigalert, Beat the Traffic, Waze, and Garmin OnDemand has tremendously increased access to this information. As mentioned previously, the market segment that the proposed 511 system will serve is travelers in the region who want to find a wide variety of transportation resources assembled in one place – not just a site limited to traffic information or about a single mode such as bicycling.

While the 511 brand will be new when it is rolled out in the Monterey Bay Area, in fact this brand is now already widely used and recognized throughout the country including the San Francisco Bay Area and Greater Sacramento regions. Customers will be residents, visitors, commuters, and travelers in the region. Within that group, the target market for this free service will be people who use computers, tablets and phones to access information on the internet. In recognition of the fact that not all travelers have access to this technology, maintaining existing personalized trip planning assistance offered by the
rideshare agencies is proposed as a way to ensure that everyone has access to traveler information.

While providers of traffic maps and other online transportation resources and apps might be characterized as competitors, in reality they are only offering a portion of the 511 information service being proposed. The most obvious strength of taking the comprehensive approach to transportation information is that there is definite value added by providing a single place for the customer to find a wide range of transportation resources. The challenge of this approach is that there are lots of content and information resources to keep fresh and up-to-date. This challenge will be mitigated by linking to other sites where possible so information will be kept up-to-date by providers.

Given the rapidly changing market conditions in terms of how people access information online, and via computers, tablets and phones, we will create a website that is responsive to current technology and highly adaptable to future developments. (For information about proposed strategies to market 511 in our region, see Chapter 5 – Marketing Strategies.)

**Agency History and Operations**

**Monterey County/Santa Cruz County**

The agencies that would be responsible for developing and launching 511 are the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County. These two Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) have had the primary responsibility for conducting long-range planning and funding for transportation in their respective counties. In addition, they offer motorist aid services such as the Freeway Service Patrol tow trucks and the yellow call boxes along the highways that can be used by stranded motorists.

The RTPAs are well established and well respected in the community having managed and delivered many highly visible and innovative projects in recent years. For the RTC in Santa Cruz County, these include the purchase of the rail corridor, the development of a sustainability framework for the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan and the construction of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project. For TMC, recent noteworthy projects in Monterey County include the planning and construction of the US 101 interchange at San Juan Road, Prunedale Improvement Project, Highway 1-Salinas Road interchange, and securing funding for a passenger rail service extension to Monterey County. The addition of the 511 service would complement existing roles and services offered by the transportation agencies.
**Santa Cruz County**

The RTC has a long track record of providing transportation assistance services to the Santa Cruz County community including personalized trip planning for all modes and helping people find carpool and vanpool partners with whom they can share rides. For 34 years, RTC has helped people learn about their travel options and how to successfully navigate the transportation system. Personalized help under the Commute Solutions brand is provided via phone, email and at outreach events. While this has allowed the agency to deliver highly customized services, this method is quite labor intensive. Starting with the shift that moved carpool matching services to the web, the trend has continued to shift tools and services provided by rideshare agencies to an online environment. The RTC followed this trend when it converted its paper True Cost of Driving worksheet on a printed brochure to an interactive online calculator which is now frequently cited and used by people all over the country.

Online tools allow travelers greater self-serve access to transportation resources and tools and are available around the clock. The strategy for implementing 511 in Santa Cruz County is to further this trend by formally integrating traveler information with rideshare agency services creating a significantly stronger and more effective online resource for travelers. This strategy is expected to reduce Commute Solutions costs as staff resources can be applied to developing quality online services which have the potential to serve multiple people at the same time. Commute Solutions is committed to continued availability of personalized assistance for people who can’t access online resources.

**Sustainability Goals**

**Monterey County/Santa Cruz County**

In addition to the obvious value that a 511 service would provide travelers in terms of improving mobility, it also helps to advance the transportation agencies sustainability goals. Requirements from Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375 call for regions throughout California to reduce greenhouse gas (GhG) emissions from cars and light trucks. Making it easier for people to find out about how to access services by walking, biking, and/or transit will help reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and in turn GhG produced. Regardless of the initial reason a traveler is drawn to the 511 website, every time they visit, they will be exposed to the range of travel choices available to them. Having the Google multimodal trip planning tool also readily available on the site can help take the mystery out of how to use alternative transportation modes, reducing anxiety about trying out a new way to get around.
Staffing and Oversight

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

Oversight of both the development and implementation of the 511 traveler information service would be conducted by the Executive Director of each transportation agency. Staff assigned to planning and web projects in each agency will manage the 511 service and serve on the 511 project teams. A reorganization of duties and responsibilities of RTC’s rideshare staff would result in no net increase in staffing after development and launch of the site is complete. Day to day management of the site will be conducted by transportation agency staff. A small technical consulting contract with a firm specializing in web design and programming will be needed to provide expertise beyond the skill set of agency staff assigned to the project.

Roles & Responsibilities of Partners

Monterey County/Santa Cruz County

Partnerships among public agencies and private partners are critical to a successful 511 implementation and sustainable operations. A principal relationship between the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTC and TAMC) and Caltrans will continue to be fostered as the 511 service for both counties depends on the accuracy and reliability of Caltrans’ QuickMap. The list of partners and their roles are included in Table 1 and 2.

Table 1: Santa Cruz County Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County 511 Traveler Information lead agency; share resources with TAMC for development of 511 Traveler Information website; Rideshare Agency for Santa Cruz County; publisher of Guide to Specialized Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Agency for Monterey County</td>
<td>Monterey County 511 Traveler Information lead agency; share resources with RTC for development of 511 Traveler Information website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Headquarters</td>
<td>Provide QuickMap and CHIN; collect, manage and distribute transportation data through the Commercial Wholesale Web Portal; provide statewide perspective and coordinate alliance of all CA regional 511 services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 1: Santa Cruz County Partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Google</td>
<td>Provide multimodal trip planner; provide basemap and traffic speed layer used in Caltrans QuickMap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System Architecture; Rideshare Agency for Monterey County and provide some Transportation Demand Management programs for region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Districts 4 and 5</td>
<td>As Transportation Management Center operators for the region, provide construction, changeable message sign and camera data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>Provide incident data for region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District</td>
<td>Provide fixed-route transit and paratransit service and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area 511/MTC</td>
<td>Provide use of online ridematching database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County 911</td>
<td>Provide emergency information and response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Office of Emergency Services</td>
<td>Provide emergency response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County 211</td>
<td>Provide information about specialized transportation and human service needs in emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Conference and Visitors Council</td>
<td>Provide visitors with travel and event information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Monterey County Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Agency for Monterey County</td>
<td>Monterey County 511 Traveler Information lead agency; Share resources with RTC for development of 511 Traveler Information website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County 511 Traveler Information lead agency; Share resources for development of 511 Traveler Information website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Headquarters</td>
<td>Provide QuickMap and CHIN; Collect, manage, and distribute transportation data through the Commercial Wholesale Web Portal; Provide Statewide perspective and coordinate alliance of all CA regional 511 services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google</td>
<td>Provide multimodal trip planner; Provide basemap and traffic speed layer used in Caltrans QuickMap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System Architecture; Rideshare for Monterey County; and provide some Transportation Demand Management programs for the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans District 5</td>
<td>As Transportation Management Center operators for the region, provide construction, changeable message sign and camera data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>Provide incident data for region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey-Salinas Transit District</td>
<td>Provide fixed-route transit and paratransit service and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area 511</td>
<td>Provide use of online ridematching database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey 911</td>
<td>Provide emergency response and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County Office of Emergency Services</td>
<td>Provide emergency response and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County 211</td>
<td>Provide information about specialized transportation and human service needs in emergencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Monterey County Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County Convention and Visitors Bureau</td>
<td>Provide visitors with travel and event information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordination with Council of San Benito County of Governments**

This 511 planning effort was coordinated with the Council of San Benito Governments (San Benito COG). San Benito COG was working on a related project to implement Google Transit in San Benito County which has been now been completed. Several meetings were held between the two project teams to exchange information and explore opportunities to collaborate. Trips between Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties and San Benito County can now be planned using Google’s multimodal trip planner, a planned feature of the 511 systems for Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties. The model selected for implementing 511 in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties by integrating Caltrans QuickMap and Google’s multimodal trip planner into existing agency websites could also be utilized by San Benito COG. In the event that San Benito COG is interested in pursuing this direction, both TAMC and RTC could share resources.

**OPERATIONS**

The 511 service will be produced by leveraging existing online transportation resources and assembling them in a coherent, easy to use and to access format available to travelers in our region. To those resources, new original content will be added as needed to fill in any gaps in the information provided by others. The integration of both internal and external content will be an ongoing responsibility of the RTPAs.

One benefit of this strategy is that for the most part, it takes advantage of resources already developed and maintained by other entities. This significantly cuts down on time it takes to develop and prepare content for the web and has a major impact on reducing costs both to launch and operate the site. The down side of this strategy is that much of the information that the RTPAs are displaying is material and services that they have permission to use, but don’t directly own or control. Consequently issues with accuracy or timeliness of updates will have to be coordinated with the content owner. This is another reason that maintaining strong, cooperative relationships with our partners will be critical to the success of the operation.

As we’ve seen over the two years that we’ve been working on the 511 feasibility study and implementation plan, this industry is very dynamic and new developments take place all the time. In light of this, there will no doubt be plenty of opportunities to enhance the
offerings of 511. It will be critically important for project staff to keep abreast of feedback from customers using the service as well as new developments and industry trends in order to assess which ones make sense for our region and to present enhancements for consideration by their respective boards.

While the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County will own the 511 website services developed for their respective counties, it may be important to solidify arrangements to use key components of partner sites such as Caltrans’ QuickMap and Google’s Trip Planner.

**Agreements & Protocols**

Although not required, it may be in the interest of RTC and TAMC, to establish Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) regarding data availability with external providers so that expectations are clearly outlined. This includes MOUs with Caltrans regarding the use of QuickMap for providing 511 web-based traffic conditions information for Santa Cruz County and Monterey County as well as 511 phone calls being routed to CHIN. Agreements between the transportation agencies and Google may also be desirable regarding use of Google’s multi-modal trip planner. Agreements with telecommunications carriers for routing 511 calls originating in our region to Caltrans’s CHIN system will be determined by Caltrans.

During times of emergency, coordination with emergency information providers will be crucial. Lessons learned from 511 service providers during Hurricane Irene and Superstorm Sandy along the East Coast stress the importance of accurate and reliable information. Protocols will need to be set up between the transportation agencies and emergency response providers to determine the chain of command for providing emergency transportation information to the public. Internal business operations processes also need to be established so that the respective transportation agencies can deploy staff resources efficiently in response to an emergency.

**Performance Measures**

*Monterey County/Santa Cruz County*

System monitoring is a critical function for 511. It can help to direct resources more effectively, and can be useful when seeking funding to continue or expand 511 services. In addition, system monitoring is an effective tool for ensuring customer satisfaction. Through monitoring the accuracy and reliability of the 511 system, agencies can obtain feedback on the quality of their 511 service, and can respond to problems or issues as they arise. System monitoring is important to ensuring that customers receive a high quality product.

System monitoring can be divided into four primary categories: usage, reliability, accuracy and customer engagement.
System usage: Usage of 511 website services will be tracked and reported by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County. Usage information is valuable in marketing and outreach activities and for fine-tuning how information is organized and presented on the website. Web analytics can help gauge consumer response and engagement with services, and enable comparisons to similar systems. A list of potential statistics to monitor and track is shown below.

- **Website visits** - the total number of visits to the 511 website
- **Pageviews** – how many individual pages are visited
- **Peak daily visits and reason** – the days that the system received the highest amount of traffic and possible reasons for this influx (for example: transit strike)
- **Peak load** – the peak number of simultaneous visits. This measure can assist the agency with planning for and activating additional resources when peaks occur.
- **User agent** - the type of web browser, operating system, and device that a user is visiting the site from. This conveys which users are visiting from mobile devices vs. from standard computers.
- **Length of visit** – the average amount of time spent on the site per user
- **Keywords** – the keywords people are using to find the website in search engines
- **Top categories** – a breakdown of visits to the top categories of information such as: Traffic Conditions, Transit, Bicycling, Carpooling / Vanpooling, Employer Assistance, Weather, Airports, Paratransit and Other Language

Given this new approach to implementing 511 and the wide number of variables that could affect initial usage, data will be collected and monitored during the first six months of operation. Following this launch period, data and statistics will be reviewed and analyzed and performance targets established.

System reliability: System reliability is the second key component of system monitoring. It is measured by comparing the system availability with a pre-determined standard. The national 511 Coalition recommends that the 511 system be available 99.8% of the time (allowing for 17.5 hours of downtime annually). The RTC and TAMC will use this standard for system reliability.

System accuracy: The purpose of system accuracy monitoring is to ensure that the 511 information provided to users matches actual conditions. This is especially true in terms of the traffic conditions displayed on Caltrans Quickmap. RTC and TAMC will effectively communicate the clear path for users to let our agencies, Google or Caltrans know when
issues arise with data and information provided through 511. Reported issues with data will be tracked in order to identify trends.

**Customer engagement:** Both users and non-users of 511 are excellent sources of information about how well the system is meeting people’s needs. Online surveys and comments submitted through the 511 website provide a way to get feedback from users that can be used to improve the service. Broader community based surveys will help assess the degree to which there is an awareness of the services offered through 511. It can also help identify where people go to get transportation information now and provide insights about potential new 511 advertising and marketing venues that could be utilized to reach more people.
Promoting awareness of the availability of 511 for traveler information in the Monterey Bay region is an integral part of implementing and launching a 511 service. Considerations for marketing traveler information services include:

- Branding both phone and web-based tools
- Co-branding 511 with current traveler information resources such as the Commute Solutions/Commute Alternatives websites as well as existing transportation agency sites
- Partnering with local media to promote 511 as traveler information resource
- High impact, low-cost strategies that will provide sustained exposure to 511
- Utilizing a network of public and private partners to provide several channels for awareness
- Cost of marketing strategies both to launch and ongoing
- Promoting 511 as a free public service with no cost to users and broadly accessible to all segments of the population
- **Highlighting safe ways to access 511 and prevent distracted driving**

This section includes lessons learned from other areas’ marketing and outreach activities for their traveler information systems. It also includes strategies for co-branding phone and web traveler information tools, as well as preliminary recommendations for media coordination, involving partners to help market 511 in the Monterey Bay Area, and potential cost considerations to implement a marketing plan. Market research conducted as part of the 511 Feasibility Study is also factored into these recommendations.

**Identity and Co-Branding**

A focused outreach and promotional effort will establish 511 as the ‘brand’ for traveler information in Monterey Bay Area. While 511 is now nationally recognized as the place to go for traveler information, there is some variation between 511 systems in terms of services offered and delivery methods. Effective marketing will help guide users to access the specific services available to travelers in our region.
To support agencies in their 511 marketing efforts, American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials’ (AASHTO) 511 Coalition developed a national 511 logo. This logo and corresponding design standards has helped to create an awareness of and a consistent look and feel for 511 services around the country (Figure 6). A version of this logo, used with or without a tag line, creates a brand awareness for 511 that is easily recognizable. The logo trademark is registered to AASHTO, but is available for deploying agencies to use. Both Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties will create 511 logos that represent their respective county.

Figure 6: 511 Logo

Branding 511 will need to take into account how the new brand will interact with existing traveler information resources in the region namely those offered by the rideshare agencies Commute Solutions in Santa Cruz County and Commute Alternatives in Monterey County. One option would be for the rideshare agencies to continue delivering the personalized services under the existing rideshare brands. For example, Commute Solutions’ Transportation HelpDesk would be used to refer to the personalized assistance available. Information offered in a more self-serve manner online would be part of the 511 brand.

**PUBLIC INFORMATION AND AWARENESS**

The most significant lesson learned from agencies that developed 511 services is that the agencies that did not market the availability of this information to the public often showed low usage of the service. Based in part on a review of other 511 efforts, as well as an understanding of the goals and objectives in promoting 511, several potential marketing strategies have been identified.
RTC/TAMC’s marketing efforts will focus on the following key areas:

- 511 Launch
- Media Relations
- Other Outreach Strategies
- Promotional Materials and Messaging
- Partner Co-promotion

Activities that will be most likely to reach a large number of potential users at a reasonable cost will be utilized. The following subsections provide additional detail of recommended marketing strategies within these focus areas.

**511 Launch**

A 511 launch provides an excellent opportunity for a focused marketing campaign. An event to launch the 511 system will be the first public notification that RTC and TAMC are making this service available to travelers. Several regions have had a very formal launch event while other regions have opted to issue press releases to announce the availability of 511 phone and/or web-based tools. Providing media with information about 511 in advance of the launch date will help to generate mentions and potentially articles about traveler information services in the Monterey Bay Area. Media materials should include the following:

- Press release
- Fact Sheet and/or Rack Card on 511 Traveler Information Service
- FAQ’s and tips for using the system

The formal launch will take place after a soft launch and beta testing have been conducted.

**Media Relations**

Media, including radio, television, and online and print publications, will be RTC and TAMC’s most powerful public awareness tool for 511. RTC and TAMC will need to actively coordinate with and educate its media partners about the 511 system and its benefits. Building upon successful media relations that both agencies already have will help to keep 511 in the news long after the launch event.
Media Contacts/511 Media Database

511 staff will review the transportation agencies’ respective contact and distribution lists of print, online and broadcast media and update as needed. Public information officers for transportation related agencies and staffs of RTC, TAMC, and Caltrans should also be included on the 511 media contact list along with:

- AM and FM Radio stations including Spanish language stations
- TV news stations (weather and traffic reporters)
- Newspapers (major dailies, as well as weekly and/or regional publications)
- Online news services
- Social media communities and networks
- Special interest magazines and publications, with an emphasis on tourism
- Private sector traffic information services
- AAA California
- California Highway Patrol
- City Police Departments
- Trucking Associations
- Cities and County Public Works Departments
- Transit agencies

Ongoing Media Releases

RTC and TAMC will have an opportunity to promote 511 with each media release issued. Transportation or weather advisories, major construction projects, enhancements to the traveler information service and others should include a short description of 511 and encourage travelers to use these resources for up-to-date information. Potential media releases include:

- In advance of major holidays and high-volume driving weekends (Labor Day, Thanksgiving, Christmas) long-term construction projects, and emergency news releases about incidents or weather impacting roadways and travel.
- A ‘trigger’ event to generate news coverage including 511 milestones (5,000 web visits, or at the 6 month and one year system launch anniversaries).
• ‘Triggers’ can also include announcements of major enhancements to the information or services provided.

**Roadway Signs**

Many regions install roadway signs to promote 511, typically in conjunction with use of a tag line such as “Dial 511 for Travel Info”. Since 511 service in our area will primarily be web rather than phone based, installing new highway signs in our region is a significant expense and is not being recommended at this time.

Signs with the phone numbers of local Rideshare Agencies are already installed in several high visibility locations along the state highways in our region to promote carpooling. It may be possible to repurpose these existing road signs by adding a new 511 logo and website url to the existing rideshare message and sign. The agencies will explore this option with Caltrans.

The Bay Area’s Transportation Management Center is responsible for posting messages to be displayed and maintaining the infrastructure that supports the Changeable Message Signs (CMS) in Santa Cruz County. Due to this relationship, when new 511 signs were installed onto the Changeable Message Signs throughout the Bay Area, the CMS signs in Santa Cruz County were included in this installation. While the 511 logo is the color scheme and design used in the Bay Area, it helps reinforce the 511 brand rather than detract from it. For that reason, plans are to keep the 511 signs that are currently installed on Changeable Message Signs in Santa Cruz County.

**Radio Advertising**

Paid radio spots have been demonstrated as an effective 511 outreach tool in several states, including Iowa, Kansas, the Bay Area, and others. However, paid radio ads come at a high price. Radio spots that last 10, 15, or 20 seconds during peak drive times on popular radio stations are at a premium because they have the potential to reach several thousand drivers while they are en-route. For this reason, it is not recommended that paid advertising be used for RTC/TAMC 511 promotional efforts. The exception would be if contracting for some paid spots could be used as leverage to get a substantial number of additional donated spots by a radio station.

**Public Service Announcements (PSAs)**

PSAs are an alternative to paid advertising that is relatively low-cost to develop and that do not require payment for airing. Most commercial radio stations have an annual target for the number of PSAs they run. To help raise awareness following the initial launch of 511, a 511 PSA could be developed by RTC and TAMC and distributed to radio (AM and FM) contacts throughout the region. Follow-ups with the radio stations will help encourage them to play the PSAs.
Leveraged Advertising

Partnering with other transportation agencies, facilities, and providers can be a cost-effective way to increase awareness of 511. Examples include having the 511 logo and call to action printed on transit schedules and bus stops, or working with event managers to include a “511” message in event programs and media releases. Both exterior and interior advertising on transit buses will be explored.

Promotional Material

RTC and TAMC’s marketing and outreach will be supported by collateral pieces that are intended to be: multi-purpose, cost-efficient, widely distributed and have a long shelf-life. The following are examples of promotional materials that can be prepared to promote recognition of 511 in Monterey Bay Area. They would be provided to media and partner agencies as a comprehensive guide to traveler information resources available through the system. These materials can also be distributed to Welcome Centers, airports, rental car companies, hotels, attractions, restaurants, and other venues.

- Fact Sheet and/or Rack Card on 511 Traveler Information Service – provide an overview of the services, how to access information, what information is available.
- Frequently Asked Questions – provide answers to typical questions about 511 services and tips for using the system

Messaging about ways to safely access 511 will be included in outreach and marketing efforts with the express intent to prevent distracted driving. Recommendations such as the driver viewing the traffic map before starting their trip to find out the current conditions, having a passenger access 511 on a phone or mobile device or simply pulling over and stopping their vehicle in order to consult 511 will all be promoted. Providing users with the radio stations that broadcast traffic reports during peak commute times will also be among the resources provided on 511.

The National 511 Coalition has made various logo and written materials available to deployers to support their 511 marketing and outreach efforts and to foster a national identity for 511 services across the country. Whenever possible, RTC and TAMC will make use of 511 Coalition materials to help offset design and production costs.

Partner Co-Promotion

Promoting 511 in the Monterey Bay region will require establishing a network of partners, both public and private, to help get the word out about these traveler information resources. These partners can help promote 511 by including press release info and features about 511 in their newsletters (both print versions as well as on web and social media sites) and by providing links to 511 on their web sites. Combined with coverage in print and broadcast media, promoting 511 through other partners will provide increased exposure on a regional level.
Organizations that will be requested to add links to 511 to their websites and social media venues include:

- Conference and visitor organizations
- Chamber and business organizations
- Trucking associations
- City/County governments
- College and universities
- 211 services
- Transit operators
- Environmental and conservation organizations
- Transportation providers
- Businesses (add to their address and map info)
- Media

**Marketing Costs**

Levels of investment in marketing 511 vary substantially. Based on the specific strategies proposed for implementation, marketing costs for each agency’s 511 traveler information service are estimated at $15,000 for the launch year and $10,000/year for ongoing operations. These identify both direct costs and staff time. Although some of the costs are one-time start up costs, ongoing media releases, roadside signage, and co-promotion with partners are long-term strategies that typically are found to be the most cost-effective, and which will be utilized by RTC and TAMC.
Chapter 6 – Financial and Schedule Information

COST ESTIMATES

511 traveler information web services can be implemented, operated and maintained for the Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties extremely cost-effectively. The ability to utilize the Caltrans QuickMap for real-time traffic condition information as well as the economy of scale of integrating 511 with agency websites and rideshare services will allow 511 to be developed for our region for a minimal cost compared to most existing systems. In addition, since Caltrans will be setting up a 511 phone service directed to CHIN for regions in California without a current service, RTC and TAMC will not require funding for this phone service.

Startup costs as well as ongoing operations and maintenance expenses for both 511 Santa Cruz County and 511 Monterey County are listed in Table 3.

The total start up costs for RTC will be approximately $92,030 with annual operations and maintenance of approximately $48,030. Start-up costs include the equivalent of approximately a half-time employee for one year as well as consultant fees on the order of $18,000. Annual maintenance and operation costs include the equivalent of approximately one-quarter employee for one year as well as tech support of approximately $10,000. Major efficiencies are anticipated by utilizing information resources and tools previously developed and delivered by RTC’s Commute Solutions program.

Start up costs for TAMC will be higher at approximately $124,000 as they will be creating a new website both for their agency and to house 511. Start-up costs include approximately a three-quarter time employee for one year as well as consultant fees on the order of $28,000. Annual operations and maintenance for TAMC will be approximately $48,030. These costs include equivalent of approximately one-quarter employee for one year as well as tech support of approximately $10,000.
RTC start up costs will be directed primarily towards:

- Working with Caltrans to embed QuickMap
- Working with Google to embed the multimodal trip planner
- Working with emergency providers to develop a protocol for providing information to public during times of emergency
- Creating the information architecture, designing and testing the website
- Developing new content as needed to expand current multimodal information to include other transportation services in region.
- Launching and marketing the new service

**Table 3: DRAFT Cost Estimate for Deploying a 511 Traveler Information Service and Ongoing Operations and Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Start Up Costs for RTC</th>
<th>Annual Operation &amp; Maintenance Costs for RTC</th>
<th>Start Up Costs for TAMC</th>
<th>Annual Operation &amp; Maintenance Costs for TAMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone - CHIN</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web - Main</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$57,000**</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content development</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Architecture and Navigation</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Site design, devt &amp; programming</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ongoing tech support</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emergency alerts</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hosting &amp; domain registration</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Translation*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$92,030</td>
<td>$48,030</td>
<td>$124,030</td>
<td>$48,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Google Translator
Currently, the Commute Solutions site has multimodal information related primarily to RTC programs. The multimodal information will be expanded to include a more comprehensive picture of multimodal resources throughout Santa Cruz County.

TAMC start up costs will be directed primarily towards:

- Working with Caltrans to embed QuickMap
- Working with Google to embed the multimodal trip planner
- Working with emergency providers to develop a protocol for providing information to public during times of emergency
- Creating the information architecture, designing and testing the website
- Developing content for multimodal information in region
- Launching and marketing the new service

RTC and TAMC operations and maintenance costs will primarily be for:

- updating content
- marketing and maintaining high ranking in search engines
- assessing performance
- rapidly disseminating customized information in emergencies
- serving as a liaison with partners
- working with contractor and managing tech support contract
- watching trends in technology and traveler information and proposing service enhancements as opportunities arise

**POTENTIAL REVENUE**

Implementing a 511 service will require financial and staff resource commitments to implement, operate and maintain this service. A variety of funding strategies using federal, state and local funds have been used to implement 511 systems throughout the country. In California, Service Authority for Freeway Emergency (SAFE) funds have been
used by a number of regional 511 programs. SAFE funds are local revenues generated by an annual $1 vehicle registration fee that can be used to provide motorist assistance.

There are currently funds in the RTC Commute Solutions program to fund $54,000 of the startup costs for 511 Santa Cruz County. Additional start up costs ($38,030) and operations and maintenance costs ($48,030/year) are available from RTC SAFE funds. Funds for 511 Monterey County for implementation ($124,030) and annual operations and maintenance ($48,030) are available from TAMC SAFE. Efficiencies and economies of scale will be realized by using the same staff and consultants who manage the agencies’ websites (and rideshare services for RTC).

**PHASING PLAN**

Given the current economic climate and rapid changes in technology, only an initial phase is being recommended at this time. The initial phase of the project will be to develop a 511 website which will serve as a comprehensive traveler information resource that includes features as outlined Table 4 of this chapter and in Chapter 2 – Components. The 511 sites for both agencies will be optimized to provide access via mobile devices. The Regional Transportation Agencies (RTC and TAMC) will partner with Caltrans to provide information through real-time traffic maps (QuickMap) which will be embedded on the 511 website for each agency. Also as part of this initial phase, RTC and TAMC will work with Caltrans as necessary to direct 511 phone calls to Caltrans Highway Information Network (CHIN) for road conditions information.

Future phases will be dictated by user need and funding availability. Possible projects include:

- Consider developing a service that would allow subscribers to get real-time conditions pushed out to them via text or email on routes that they travel regularly

- Work with local transit providers to provide real-time arrival and departure information at stops and stations via mobile devices

- Consider developing mobile apps in order to enhance use of the 511 websites or features of the website such as encouraging the use of alternative transportation or ridesharing

- Consider developing an interactive voice response (IVR) phone system that directs calls to various locations including transit, Bay Area 511.org, CHIN, rideshare, etc. if need is substantiated

Potential future phases are not being recommended at this time.
### Table 4: 511 Program Features and Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>511 Program Features</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Future Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QuickMap Traffic Information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-time Push Notifications for Traffic Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Multimodal Trip Planner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-Time Transit Application</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Program Features</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Future Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare Information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling and Pedestrian Information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Transportation Mobile Apps</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride Lots</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>511 Program Features</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Future Consideration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carshare</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxis/Airport Shuttles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck/Freight Information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>511 Program Features</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Future Consideration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Comments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Network (CHIN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Voice Response Phone System</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The schedules in Tables 5 and 6 show deployment of 511 Santa Cruz by November 2014 and 511 Monterey County by May 2015. TAMC will need to design a new agency website that will house 511 Monterey County and thus the public launch date is 6 months later than that of 511 Santa Cruz.

### Table 5: Santa Cruz County 511 Traveler Information Deployment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop 511 Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Website Design &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Website Soft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Website - Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (develop,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>test, launch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 6: Monterey County 511 Traveler Information Deployment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop 511 Website Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Website Design &amp; Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Website Soft Launch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Website - Public Launch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness Program (develop, test, launch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 7 – Conclusion

There are a multitude of benefits to providing a centralized web-based location for 511 traveler information services for Santa Cruz County and Monterey County. The transportation system in the Monterey Bay Area experiences significant congestion and environmental concerns necessitate the need to promote sustainable transportation alternatives. 511 traveler information can play a significant role in making better use of our existing transportation infrastructure and addressing environmental impacts of transportation.

511 traveler information services can improve traffic flow and increase safety by providing real time traffic condition information so people can be informed and avoid congested areas. Traveler frustration due to lack of reliability in the transportation system from experiencing unexpected delays can also be reduced when given the ability to become informed on the level of traffic congestion.

As necessitated by environmental concerns of greenhouse gas emissions from transportation and Senate Bill 375 requirements, the proposed 511 traveler information service will help the public become informed of their full range of multimodal transportation options to promote more sustainable choices. Available information will include: what mode(s) of travel are available, how long the trip will take, what traffic conditions are currently like, and identifying alternative routes that might be available.

Having a single “go to” place in each county for transportation programs and resources, would be of major value to both travelers and the region’s transportation service providers. While there are many transportation services in the region, they are scattered throughout the internet. RTC and TAMC are the logical choices for developing and operating centralized “one-stop” traveler information services. Both agencies already successfully operate motorist aid services in their respective counties in the form of the Freeway Service Patrol and Call Box Programs. In addition, the RTC also delivers rideshare assistance services to the community. The addition of a 511 Traveler Information service would complement these existing traveler services and integrate well with the wide range of transportation information already provided on the regional transportation agency websites.

Emergencies in our region are inevitable. Between earthquakes, floods, fires and tsunamis, we live in a very active area. Not to mention the unpredictability that climate change is having on established weather patterns. So the question is not if there will be an emergency that affects transportation, but rather when. Add to the equation that we rely on just a few major routes to carry a huge amount of traffic within and through our region, and it becomes clear how important good information about transportation conditions becomes in an emergency. Coordination with law enforcement and emergency
responders will be necessary to deliver their information through 511. Emergency features include scrolling banners, twitter feeds and special alert pages. Providing a “go to” place for transportation during emergencies will take some of the call load off of 911 dispatchers. In addition, having 511 in place, will provide 911 personnel with a place to refer callers who don’t need first-responder assistance, but who simply want timely information.

The economy of our area will benefit from a centralized 511 “one-stop” location. Tourists will know where to go to get the most reliable, real time traffic conditions information and the many alternative choices for getting around the Monterey Bay region. Employers, in striving to become green businesses or reach sustainability goals, can point their employees to 511 resources for sustainable transportation choices. Truckers will have accurate and reliable information on traffic delays to plan their pickup and delivery times.

The cost of offering 511 Traveler Information Services through a partnership with Caltrans for use of the QuickMap traffic conditions map and Google for use of its multimodal trip planner will be extremely low. The availability of Caltrans’ QuickMap for traffic conditions and Google trip planner for multimodal trip planning will save the transportation agencies in our region millions of dollars that transportation agencies in other areas of California have had to spend on developing these tools. In addition, an economy of scale will be realized by utilizing staff that is already assigned to managing the agency’s online and social media presence, and in Santa Cruz to delivering rideshare assistance services. Also, in the case of RTC, a wealth of content about alternative transportation that was recently developed for the Rideshare agency website can be integrated into the new 511 site design.

Given the numerous benefits of providing 511 traveler information services for our region and the low cost of implementation, RTC and TAMC have a remarkable opportunity to offer traveler information services to the public. A web-based 511 traveler information service can be quickly developed and deployed in Santa Cruz County and in Monterey County by the respective transportation planning agencies, RTC and TAMC, to offer Monterey Bay Area travelers access to a full range of 511 traveler information resources.