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Executive Summary

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County is designated by the State of California to serve as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the County. The mission of the Agency is to proactively plan and fund a transportation system that enhances mobility, safety, access, environmental quality and economic activities by investing in regional transportation projects serving the needs of Monterey County residents, businesses and visitors.

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s 2014 Regional Transportation Plan is a road map to meeting our transportation challenges and achieving these goals.

The Transportation Agency is governed by a 17-member Board of Directors representing the five county Supervisorial Districts, each of Monterey County’s 12 incorporated cities, and ex-officio members representing Caltrans, Monterey-Salinas Transit, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, the Monterey Regional Airport, and the City of Watsonville.

The Transportation Agency prepares the Regional Transportation Plan every four years, which provides a basis for actions to allocate state and federal funding to transportation projects. The Agency prepares its plan in coordination with AMBAG, which prepares a Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the three-county Monterey Bay Area in its role as the federal Metropolitan Planning Organization for this region. These plans outline the Agency’s priorities for meeting future transportation and mobility needs, consistent with the policy goals and objectives adopted by the Agency, as well as within the constraints of transportation revenues forecast over the 20-year planning horizon of the document.

Regionally Significant Transportation Issues

The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan attempts to address two major challenges and one opportunity confronting Monterey County:

The first challenge is decreasing revenues dedicated to transportation in a period of increasing needs. Taxing fuel sales has been the primary source of funding for transportation for the last 60 years plus years. It has been 20 years since gas taxes have been increased. Since 1994, when gasoline cost $1.11 cents a gallon, increases in inflation and fuel efficiency have eroded the buying power of the gas tax to a point where this revenue source only buys half as much as in 1994.

Local street and road maintenance needs are significantly underfunded. The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan identifies approximately $3.84 billion in costs for local streets and roads operations, maintenance and rehabilitation across Monterey County, of which only 11.5% is assumed to be funded in the plan. According to the most recent California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment sponsored by the League of California Cities and the California Association of Counties, pavement conditions in Monterey County have deteriorated from an “at risk” score of 63 on a 100 point scale in 2008, to a score of 50 in 2012, which the study considers to be on verge of falling into critical condition.

The second challenge, resulting from the first, is state and federal transportation revenues available to Monterey County are decreasing and becoming less consistent. Most new state
transportation funding in the last ten years has been from one-time bond programs that allocate funds competitively. The elimination of federal earmarks has significantly reduced the amount of federal funding received for local transit and road projects. While Monterey County has successfully received some of the state competitive bond funds, those funds are no longer available. The general trend has forced agencies implementing projects to work harder while receiving less funding.

Optimistically, the current backlog in local street and road maintenance needs provides an opportunity to build smarter when funding becomes available. Anticipating the opportunity to build smarter, the Transportation Agency adopted Complete Street Guidelines in 2013. These guidelines are designed to facilitate incorporating active transportation features that improve opportunities to walk, bicycle and access transit when streets are repaved or new roads are built. In addition to creating a more desirable place to live and work, active transportation is proving to benefit public health, social equity and our local economy.

**Planning for Sustainable Communities**

In 2008, California Senate Bill 375 was passed requiring Metropolitan Planning Organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy. AMBAG serves as the lead agency to prepare this strategy. The Sustainable Communities Strategy integrates land use and transportation planning by coordinating transportation investments with land use patterns to reduce greenhouse gas emissions targets set by the state for each region. Besides meeting emissions goals, the Sustainable Communities Strategy also accommodates regional housing needs, and represents an important statewide effort to build healthy communities and ensure convenient, safe access to high quality transportation options.

SB 375 requires that the Regional Transportation Plan be consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy. To develop this strategy, the Transportation Agency coordinated with AMBAG, regional transportation planning partners and member jurisdictions to craft a Policy Element, a Financial Element and a regional list of transportation investments which achieve regional greenhouse gas emissions targets and support the Sustainable Communities Strategy. The list of projects identified for funding in the Regional Transportation Plan was identified through coordination with member jurisdictions and selected based on extensive public outreach and evaluation of project performance relative to adopted goals and policy objectives. AMBAG likewise developed a sustainable land use pattern in conjunction with local jurisdictions that is supportive of the countywide transportation project lists. To view the Sustainable Communities Strategy, refer to AMBAG’s *Monterey Bay 2035: Moving Forward*.

**Plan Components**

The main components of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan include:

- The Policy Element;
- The Financial Element and fund estimate;
- Transportation Investments included in the plan; and
- Environmental Documentation.
1. Introduction

The mission of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County is to plan and proactively fund a transportation system that enhances mobility, safety, access, environmental quality and economic activities by investing in regional transportation projects serving the needs of Monterey County residents, businesses and visitors.

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s 2014 Regional Transportation Plan is a road map to meeting our transportation challenges and achieving these goals. The Agency prepares the Regional Transportation Plan every four years, which provides a basis for actions to allocate state and federal funding to transportation projects. The Agency prepares its plan in coordination with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, which prepares a Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the three-county Monterey Bay Area in its role as the region’s federal Metropolitan Planning Organization. These plans outline the Agency’s priorities for meeting future transportation and mobility needs, consistent with the policy goals and objectives adopted by the Agency, as well as within the constraints of transportation revenues forecast over the 20-year planning horizon of the document.

Document Structure

The 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan includes the following components:

- **Chapter 1: Introduction**
  
  Introduction describes the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the regional planning process, a description of Monterey County, economic and demographic forecasts upon which long range planning is based, and a summary of significant issues discussed in the document.

- **Chapter 2: The Policy Element**
  
  The Policy Element describes the long range goals and policy objectives established for prioritizing transportation investments.

- **Chapter 3: The Financial Element**
  
  The Financial Element describes the fund estimate prepared of all transportation revenues that the Transportation Agency reasonably expects to be available over the twenty year life of the plan.

- **Chapter 4: Transportation Investments**
  
  This chapter serves as the Action Element of the Regional Transportation Plan, describing the regionally significant transportation investments included in the plan, which were prioritized based on the Policy Element and constrained by the fund estimate.

- **Chapter 5: Environmental Documentation**
  
  A coordinated Draft Environmental Impact Report was prepared by AMBAG for the Monterey Bay 2035: Moving Forward plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy, which also evaluates the program-level environmental impacts associated with implementation of the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan.
Regionally Significant Transportation Issues

The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan attempts to address two major challenges and one opportunity confronting Monterey County:

The first challenge is decreasing revenues dedicated to transportation in a period of increasing needs. Taxing fuel sales has been the primary source of funding for transportation for the last 60 years plus years. It has been 20 years since gas taxes have been increased. Since 1994, when gasoline cost $1.11 cents a gallon, increases in inflation and fuel efficiency have eroded the buying power of the gas tax to a point where this revenue source only buys half as much as in 1994.

Local street and road maintenance needs are significantly underfunded. The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan identifies approximately $3.84 billion in costs for local streets and roads operations, maintenance and rehabilitation across Monterey County, of which only 11.5% is assumed to be funded in the plan. According to the most recent California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment sponsored by the League of California Cities and the California Association of Counties, pavement conditions in Monterey County have deteriorated from an “at risk” score of 63 on a 100 point scale in 2008, to a score of 50 in 2012, which the study considers to be on verge of falling into critical condition.

The second challenge, resulting from the first, is state and federal transportation revenues available to Monterey County are decreasing and becoming less consistent. Most new state transportation funding in the last ten years has been from one-time bond programs that allocate funds competitively. The elimination of federal earmarks has significantly reduced the amount of federal funding received for local transit and road projects. While Monterey County has successfully received some of the state competitive bond funds, those funds are no longer available. The general trend has forced agencies implementing projects to work harder to obtain less funding.

Optimistically, the current backlog in local street and road maintenance needs provides an opportunity to build smarter when funding becomes available. Anticipating this opportunity, the Transportation Agency adopted Complete Street Guidelines in 2013. These guidelines are designed to facilitate incorporating active transportation features that improve opportunities to walk, bicycle and access transit when streets are repaved or new roads are built. In addition to creating a more desirable place to live and work, active transportation is proving to benefit public health, social equity and our local economy.

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County and the Regional Planning Process

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County is designated by the State of California to serve as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the County. The Transportation Agency is governed by a 17-member Board of Directors representing the five county Supervisorial Districts, each of Monterey County’s 12 incorporated cities, and ex-officio members representing Caltrans, Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST), the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, the Monterey Regional Airport, and the City of Watsonville.

The Agency maintains following four standing advisory committees that provide input to staff and the Board of Directors on plans, programs and regionally significant transportation issues:
Executive Committee

The Executive Committee is a subcommittee of the Board of Directors responsible for making recommendations on critical policy and administrative issues to be considered by the Board.

Rail Policy Committee

The Rail Policy Committee is a subcommittee of the Board of Directors responsible for making recommendations to staff and the Board on major policy issues related to the implementation of rail projects being planned by the Agency.

Technical Advisory Committee

The Technical Advisory Committee advises staff and the Board of Directors on issues related to plans, programs, project delivery and funding. Membership of this committee includes public works and planning representatives from the Agency’s member jurisdictions.

Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee

The Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee advises staff and the Board on bicycle and pedestrian plans, programs and funding. This citizen advisory committee includes representatives appointed by the Board to represent the Agency’s member jurisdictions.

MST Mobility Advisory Committee

In addition to the standing committees described above, the Agency has designated the MST Mobility Advisory Committee to serve as the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council for Monterey County pursuant to the Transportation Development Act. This citizen advisory committee includes members appointed by the MST Board that are responsible for advising the Agency on unmet transit needs and specialized transportation needs of the elderly, people with disabilities and people of limited means.

Public participation in the regional planning process is necessary and essential for developing plans, programs and projects that meet the needs of the county’s citizens. The Agency employs the following strategies to engage the public in the regional transportation planning process to provide a range of opportunities for the public to provide input on the Agency’s activities:

- **Public Meetings**: The Agency schedules and holds noticed public meetings of the Board of Directors and advisory committees, which include structured opportunities for the public to provide testimony. All Board of Directors meetings are televised and available for viewing on the Transportation Agency’s website.

- **Transportation Agency Website**: the Transportation Agency maintains a website where information about all plans, programs and activities are posted. This includes all public meeting agendas, minutes and outreach material. Questions and requests for information can be submitted through the website, which are directed to the appropriate staff for response within 24 hours if possible.
• **Annual Report and Outreach Materials:** The Agency has prepared and distributed an Annual Report throughout Monterey County since 2005, which includes information about actions taken by the Agency during the previous year, as well as transportation issues confronting the community. The Agency also maintains a set of brochures, flyers and other outreach materials for distribution at meetings and presentations. The Agency translates these materials into Spanish whenever possible.

• **Media Outreach:** The Agency regularly issues press releases and responds to media inquiries for news stories. Social media, including Facebook and Twitter are also used to keep the public informed about Agency activities.

• **Transportation Forums:** The Agency periodically schedules and hosts forums on transportation topics of relevance to Monterey County, which has included meetings of the California Transportation Commission and other regional and statewide bodies.

• **Ad-hoc Committees:** The Agency creates ad-hoc advisory committees to gain stakeholder input on focused transportation issues, studies or projects.

• **Targeted Presentations:** Agency staff regularly delivers presentations to public groups and local jurisdictions. The Agency also participates in community group, and private industry group associations.

• **Public Outreach Coordination:** The Agency staff includes a public outreach coordinator to serve as the lead contact for responding to questions from the media and public about the Agency, and for engaging in public outreach activities.

These public participation strategies are undertaken on a continual basis. Projects included in the Regional Transportation Plan are shaped by ongoing public engagement. Specific public outreach activities undertaken by the Agency to develop the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan are described in more detail later on in this Chapter.

**Monterey County Geography and the Regional Transportation System**

Monterey County covers 3,324 square miles of coastal mountains and valleys stretching along 100 miles of the California coastline. The County is bordered by Santa Cruz County to the north, San Benito and Fresno Counties to the east, Kings County in the southeast, and San Luis Obispo County to the south. The geography of Monterey County is defined by the Monterey Bay, the Santa Lucia Mountain Range that stretches southward from the Monterey Peninsula along the Coast, the Diablo Range along the eastern borders of the County, and the central Salinas Valley. Monterey County can generally be divided into five sub-areas:

1) **North Monterey County:** including the unincorporated communities of Castroville, Prunedale, Moss Landing and Aromas;

2) **Greater Salinas area:** including Salinas and unincorporated communities to the west;

3) **Monterey Peninsula:** including the cities of Marina, Seaside, Sand City, Del Rey Oaks, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Carmel-by-the-Sea and the unincorporated communities of Pebble Beach and Carmel Valley;

4) **South Monterey County:** including the Salinas Valley cities of Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield and King City, as well as the unincorporated communities of Chualar, San Lucas, San Ardo and Bradley; and
5) **Big Sur Coast:** between Carmel and San Luis Obispo County.

Major water features include the Monterey Bay, the Salinas River, the Pajaro River separating Monterey County from Santa Cruz County and the Elkhorn Slough at Moss Landing.

**Figure 1-1** illustrates Monterey County’s regional location, the cities and communities within the county, as well as the Regional Transportation System. Existing regional transportation facilities connect the communities described above and are also defined by the County’s physical geography. The main north-south interregional facilities include State Route 1 along the coast and US 101 through the inland Salinas Valley, as well as the Union Pacific Coast Mainline railroad. State Routes 156, 183 and 68, as well as various county roads, serve to connect the coast and inland communities.

Land uses in Monterey County are diverse. Agricultural production in North Monterey County and the Salinas Valley areas contribute significantly to the area’s economy. Approximately 1,210,000 acres are devoted to irrigated cropland, dry farming, grazing, animal husbandry, and related agricultural services, representing an over $4.14 billion industry to Monterey County. More than 80 percent of this land is rangeland, with much of the remainder in locally cultivated prime farmland (187,015 acres) and farmland of statewide importance (42,650 additional acres). These farmlands are most widespread in the North County, greater Salinas area, and central Salinas Valley areas. The importance of agriculture to the Monterey County economy cannot be underestimated: the county grows approximately 80% of the nation’s lettuce and roughly the same percentage of its artichokes. Monterey County has also become a significant wine-growing region with approximately 40,000 acres devoted to wine grape cultivation in the county. The transportation needs of the agricultural industry are an important consideration in planning for the movement of goods and commodities in Monterey County, as discussed later in this chapter.

The Monterey Peninsula primarily serves residential, tourism, educational and commercial uses. Several military facilities are located on the Monterey Peninsula. Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary and the marine related educational institutions, is a growing contributor to the area’s economic mix. Internationally popular visitor attractions are also located in Monterey County, particularly on the Monterey Peninsula and coast which
support a roughly $2.3 billion annual hospitality industry supporting roughly 22,000 jobs. Major attractions include the Monterey Bay Aquarium, annual events such as the Pebble Beach Concours D’Elegance and AT&T Golf Pro-am, and major car races at the Laguna Seca International Raceway, as well as natural attractions such as the Pacific coastline and state and regional parks. The transportation needs of this industry creates significant demands on the County’s infrastructure, particularly on regional roads and highways connecting Monterey County with the San Francisco Bay area to the north. Many of the improvements identified in the Regional Transportation Plan accommodate the transportation demands of this segment of Monterey County’s economy.

Educational institutions, including California State University at Monterey Bay, the Naval Postgraduate School, the Defense Language Institute, the Monterey Institute for International Studies, and Monterey Peninsula and Hartnell Community Colleges, also form an important part of the region’s economy.

**Monterey County Economic and Demographic Trends**

The Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan is based on regional growth assumptions included in the 2014 AMBAG forecast. That forecast includes population, employment and housing unit projections over the 20 year planning horizon. Detailed information about the forecast can be found as an Appendix in *Monterey Bay 2035: Moving Forward*, which is the Metropolitan Transportation Plan prepared by AMBAG.

**Monterey County Population**

Table 1-1 below summarizes forecast population growth by jurisdiction. The forecast estimates that the population of Monterey County will grow by more than 19% during the 20-year planning period. Although the Salinas Valley cities are expected to have largest percent increases in population and housing units (Table 1-2), growth is distributed more or less equally between the coast and inland Salinas Valley areas when looking at the county as a whole.

**Table 1-1: Monterey County Population Forecast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmel-By-The-Sea</td>
<td>3,722</td>
<td>3,541</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>5.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>113.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>8,187</td>
<td>13,340</td>
<td>19,333</td>
<td>136.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>16,330</td>
<td>21,341</td>
<td>23,609</td>
<td>44.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>12,874</td>
<td>14,568</td>
<td>18,620</td>
<td>44.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>19,718</td>
<td>21,315</td>
<td>24,225</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>27,810</td>
<td>28,004</td>
<td>30,647</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>15,041</td>
<td>15,394</td>
<td>17,030</td>
<td>13.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>150,441</td>
<td>156,793</td>
<td>172,499</td>
<td>14.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>364.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>33,025</td>
<td>36,120</td>
<td>42,256</td>
<td>27.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>25,738</td>
<td>31,316</td>
<td>33,628</td>
<td>30.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>100,213</td>
<td>102,847</td>
<td>104,304</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>415,057</td>
<td>447,516</td>
<td>495,086</td>
<td>19.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Housing Units**

Housing unit growth estimated over the planning period is summarized by jurisdiction in Table 1-2 below. Again, the distribution of total growth over the planning period is expected to be evenly split between coastal and inland communities in Monterey County.

Table 1-2: **Housing Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmel-By-The-Sea</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>105.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>131.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>4,734</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>36.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>4,484</td>
<td>39.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>8,248</td>
<td>9,797</td>
<td>36.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>13,584</td>
<td>13,665</td>
<td>14,001</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>8,169</td>
<td>8,169</td>
<td>8,478</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>42,651</td>
<td>43,174</td>
<td>46,883</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>333.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>11,335</td>
<td>12,556</td>
<td>13,664</td>
<td>20.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>3,876</td>
<td>5,231</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>146.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>38,971</td>
<td>39,337</td>
<td>39,735</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>139,048</td>
<td>147,106</td>
<td>157,992</td>
<td>13.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment**

Employment by industry is summarized in Table 1-3 below. The forecast is divided between the coast (Carmel by-the-Sea, Del Rey Oaks, Marina, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Sand City, Seaside and unincorporated coastal areas) and inland areas (Gonzales, Greenfield, King City, Salinas, Soledad, and unincorporated inland areas). The AMBAG Population and Employment forecast projects that Agriculture and Tourism will continue to be sectors of the economy that perform strongly. The forecast also projects that largest employment gains to be in education and healthcare. Education has been the third most important sector of the Monterey County economy and is expected to be important in the future. Employment in healthcare is expected to grow as the population ages.
Table 1-3: Employment by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 Coast</th>
<th>2010 Inland</th>
<th>2020 Coast</th>
<th>2020 Inland</th>
<th>2035 Coast</th>
<th>2035 Inland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>44,260</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>46,546</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>47,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>3,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>3,669</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>3,678</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>3,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>6,796</td>
<td>13,303</td>
<td>7,994</td>
<td>15,312</td>
<td>9,245</td>
<td>14,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>24,149</td>
<td>36,751</td>
<td>28,282</td>
<td>43,148</td>
<td>32,851</td>
<td>44,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>17,366</td>
<td>28,633</td>
<td>19,471</td>
<td>32,785</td>
<td>22,601</td>
<td>37,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52,698</td>
<td>129,274</td>
<td>61,089</td>
<td>144,888</td>
<td>69,903</td>
<td>152,234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued development to accommodate the county’s growing population, the needs of the agricultural and shipping industries, coastal visitor attractions such as the Monterey Bay Aquarium, and expanding educational facilities, will drive long term regional transportation planning in Monterey County.

Development of the Regional Transportation Plan: Planning for Sustainable Communities

In 2008, California Senate Bill 375 was passed requiring Metropolitan Planning Organizations to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy. AMBAG serves as the lead agency to prepare this strategy. The Sustainable Communities Strategy integrates land use and transportation planning by coordinating transportation investments with land use patterns to reduce greenhouse gas emissions targets set by the state for each region. Besides meeting emissions goals, the Sustainable Communities Strategy also accommodates regional housing needs, and represents an important statewide effort to build healthy communities and ensure convenient, safe access to high quality transportation options.

SB 375 requires that the Regional Transportation Plan be consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy. To develop this strategy, the Transportation Agency coordinated with AMBAG and regional transportation planning partners in the three county Monterey Bay area to craft a Policy Element, a Financial Element and a regional list of transportation investments which achieve regional greenhouse gas emissions targets and support the Sustainable Communities Strategy. The list of projects identified for funding in the Regional Transportation Plan was identified through coordination with member jurisdictions and selected based on extensive public outreach and evaluation of project performance relative to adopted goals and policy objectives. AMBAG likewise developed a sustainable land use pattern in conjunction with local jurisdictions that is supportive of the countywide transportation project lists. To view the Sustainable Communities Strategy, refer to AMBAG’s Monterey Bay 2035: Moving Forward.

Public Participation

A detailed summary of public outreach activities undertaken by the Transportation Agency to develop the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan is included as Appendix A. Given the coordinated nature of the planning process, outreach for this plan was also included.
in the public participation process for the Sustainable Communities Strategy. This public outreach plan has been designed to meet environmental justice requirements and ensure that reasonable opportunities to comment on the plan are available to the public and a diverse range of stakeholders.
2. Policy Element:  
A Framework for Meeting Long-term Mobility Needs

The Policy Element of the Regional Transportation Plan provides a framework for selecting and evaluating transportation projects to meet Monterey County’s mobility needs over the twenty-year lifetime of the plan. To develop a list of transportation improvements that support land use assumptions in the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy, the Policy Element of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan incorporates goals, objectives and performance measures that are oriented toward achieving a balanced transportation system. This policy framework moves away from automobile-oriented goals and measures and instead evaluates how well the planned system transports people and goods.

To accomplish this, the Policy Element of the plan is derived from the Smart Mobility Framework developed by Caltrans, which has been used by other regions across California to address state sustainability planning requirements. This Policy Element is also designed to be consistent with the goals, policies and measures included in the Monterey Bay 2035: Moving Forward plan prepared by AMBAG for the Monterey Bay region. The element includes the following broad set of goals, which are tied to objectives and performance measures:

- **Access & Mobility**: Improve ability of Monterey County residents to meet most daily needs without having to drive. Improve the convenience and quality of trips, especially for walk, bike, transit, car/vanpool and freight trips.

- **Safety & Health**: Design, operate, and manage the transportation system to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, promote active living, and lessen exposure to pollution.

- **Environmental Stewardship**: Protect and enhance the County's built and natural environment. Act to reduce the transportation system’s emission of greenhouse gases.

- **Social Equity**: Reduce disparities in healthy, safe access to key destinations for transportation-disadvantaged populations. Demonstrate that planned investments do not adversely impact transportation-disadvantaged populations.

- **Economic Benefit**: Invest in transportation improvements – including operational improvements – that re-invest in the Monterey County economy, improve economic access and improve travel time reliability and speed consistency for high-value trips. Optimize cost-effectiveness of transportation investments.

The Policy Element for the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan is included as Figure 2-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access &amp; Mobility</strong></td>
<td>• To improve safe, attractive and affordable access to work, school, goods and other key destinations by walking, bicycling and transit. &lt;br&gt; • Improve travel time and travel time reliability for pedestrian and bicycle trips between key origins and destinations. &lt;br&gt; • Improve travel time reliability and speed consistency for transit, car/vanpool and freight trips between key origins and destinations. &lt;br&gt; • Improve the quality of walk, bicycle, car/vanpool and transit trips.</td>
<td>• Percentage of work trips that are 30 minutes or less by mode. &lt;br&gt; • Average work trip travel time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve ability of Monterey County residents to meet most daily needs without having to drive. Improve the convenience and quality of trips, especially for walk, bike, transit, car/vanpool and freight trips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety &amp; Health</strong></td>
<td>• To decrease fatalities and injuries for all travel modes. Pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries will not be higher than their proportion of total trips. &lt;br&gt; • Improve health by increasing percentage of trips made by healthy transportation options (bicycle, pedestrian and transit trips). &lt;br&gt; • Decrease the quantities of harmful airborne pollutants and congested vehicle miles traveled.</td>
<td>• Number of fatalities and injuries per capita. &lt;br&gt; • Bicycle, pedestrian and transit mode share. &lt;br&gt; • Congested vehicle miles of travel. &lt;br&gt; • Harmful airborne pollutants (tons/day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, operate, and manage the transportation system to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, promote active living, and lessen exposure to pollution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2-1: **Regional Transportation Plan Goals, Policies and Performance Measures**
### Regional Transportation Plan Goals, Policies and Performance Measures

**Environmental Stewardship**

**Protect and enhance the County's built and natural environment.**
**Act to reduce the transportation system’s emission of greenhouse gases.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce greenhouse gas emissions consistent with regional targets.</td>
<td>• Projected greenhouse gas emissions in 2020 and 2035.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoid or minimize impacts to local, state and federally defined sensitive areas.</td>
<td>• Impacts to open space (acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conserve farmland resources.</td>
<td>• Impacts to farmland conservation (acres).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Equity**

**Reduce disparities in healthy, safe access to key destinations for transportation-disadvantaged populations.**
**Demonstrate that planned investments do not adversely impact transportation-disadvantaged populations.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate that planned investments reduce or eliminate disparities in Access &amp; Mobility, Economic Benefit, and Safety &amp; Health objectives between transportation-disadvantaged and non-transportation disadvantaged populations.</td>
<td>• Distribution of investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate that transportation-disadvantaged communities do not experience disproportionate impacts from transportation construction or operations.</td>
<td>• Equitable transit access: Low income and minority populations within 1/2 mile of a high quality transit stop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic Benefit**

**Invest in transportation improvements – including operational improvements – that re-invest in the Monterey County economy, improve economic access and improve travel time reliability and speed consistency for high-value trips. Optimize cost-effectiveness of transportation investments.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve regional accessibility for freight and reduce truck hours of delay.</td>
<td>• Jobs near transit (percent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritize enhancement and maintenance of the existing transportation system. Maintain streets and roads in a condition rated good or higher according to the Pavement Management Index.</td>
<td>• Truck delay (hours).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain the transportation system (percent of funding).</td>
<td>• Maintain the transportation system (percent of funding).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Policy Element is structured around both short-term and long-term strategies and actions for meeting mobility needs, while supporting development of healthy communities, preserving the environment, ensuring the equitable distribution of investments and enhancing the county’s economy. Performance measures evaluate the planned system relative to the 2020 and 2035 timeframes for achieving state greenhouse gas targets.

The following chapters describe the Transportation Agency’s plan for funding and delivering a transportation system in the future within this policy framework. The Policy Element is not just a yardstick to evaluate projects by, however. The Policy Element serves as a guide for an iterative scenario planning process followed to develop the project list described in Chapter 4.

Performance Measurement

Performance measures for the plan described above are aligned with the measures included in the AMBAG Monterey Bay 2035: Moving Forward plan for the region given the coordinated relationship between the plans. The performance of regionally significant projects and investment categories described above has been assessed on a region-wide basis and can be referenced in the AMBAG document. Performance of the plan relative to these measures has also been analyzed and reported in the coordinated Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared by AMBAG for the transportation plans in the three county region. Environmental documentation is discussed further in Chapter 5.
3. Financial Element: Investing in our Transportation System

Projects in the Regional Transportation Plan are constrained by available revenues. The Financial Element identifies the revenues that the Transportation Agency reasonably expects to be available to fund projects over the life of the plan. Actual revenues secured for transportation over the next twenty years will be dependent on variables such as the local, state and national economy, and the public’s willingness to approve additional revenues to maintain and improve our transportation infrastructure.

The Agency coordinated with AMBAG and regional transportation planning partners in the Monterey Bay area to develop a 20-year fund estimate of local, state and federal transportation revenues assumed to be available for transportation projects. The financial estimate identifies a total of approximately $4.42 billion in projected funding for transportation projects in Monterey County through the 2035 horizon year of the plan, in current year dollars.

Figure 3-1 below summarizes the Financial Element by funding source. The fund estimate assumes that the primary burden for funding transportation improvements will fall to regions and localities. The most important source of existing funding is the gas tax that motorists pay when filling-up at the pump. It has been 20 years since gas taxes have been increased. As mentioned previously, the gas tax that motorists pay at the pump pays for a shrinking percentage of transportation costs and needs.

The Regional Transportation Plan assumes that new sources of funding are needed to fully fund transportation priorities identified in the plan.

Figure 3-1: Transportation Funding by Source

Figure 3-2 below summarizes the Financial Element by discretionary vs. dedicated revenues. The bulk of the funding available is considered dedicated to specific projects or types of projects, limiting the amount of flexibility available to the Agency to move funding to different types of projects. Dedicated funding includes sources such as the Monterey County Regional Development Impact Fee program and federal grants for public transit. Discretionary funds are eligible for allocation to a wider range of types of projects. State Transportation Improvement
Program and Regional Surface Transportation Program funds are the largest source of discretionary funds allocated by the Agency.

Figure 3-2: **Dedicated vs. Discretionary Funding**

![Pie chart showing Discretionary 6%, New Revenues 13%, Dedicated 81%]

Figure 3-2 also identifies new revenues. This category represents new discretionary funding sources included in the financial estimate based on regional efforts to plan and secure these funds in the future. These new revenues are included to document the level of funding needed to deliver regional projects to achieve greenhouse gas targets and implement the Sustainable Communities Strategy. This approach is allowed by the Federal Highways Administration and has been used by other regional agencies in California to develop Regional Transportation Plans to comply with Senate Bill 375's requirement for meeting greenhouse gas emissions targets. New revenues included in the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan include a transportation sales tax measure, a new transit-only sales tax, and a toll to construct the State Route 156 West Corridor project (described in Chapter 4). All of these new discretionary funds are still under study by the implementing agencies as a means to meet our growing transportation needs. More detail about the new funding sources included in the plan is provided below.

**Local Transportation Sales Taxes**

Based on numerous surveys and the successes in other regions of the state representing over 80 percent of the state population, the Regional Transportation Plan assumes voter approval of new local transportation sales taxes, equivalent to an eighth of cent sales tax for public transit and a half cent sales tax for regional transportation in Monterey County. It is reasonable to include this potential revenue for several reasons:
• Numerous surveys, public workshops, and outreach to community and business leaders and stakeholder groups have demonstrated broad based support for new taxes to fund transportation projects, most recently for the transit sales tax proposed by Monterey-Salinas Transit.

• 33% of counties in California representing 84% of the population are self-help counties benefiting from increased locally sourced transportation revenues and the Transportation Agency continues efforts to make Monterey County a self-help county through a statewide Aspiring Counties group. Based on these efforts, it is reasonable to assume that this trend will continue in the future and that these new local revenues can be identified as an assumption in the Financial Element based on direction from the Federal Highways Administration. This assumption was also included in the 2005 and 2010 Regional Transportation Plans for Monterey County.

• While current state law requires that two-thirds of voters approve any new local sales tax which includes a specific list of projects, legislative efforts are underway to reduce the two-thirds (66.67%) vote requirement for special taxes to 55% which will increase the likelihood for local transportation measures to be approved.

• Local transportation sales taxes and vehicle registration fees are among the more feasible funding sources to adopt logistically, as state law already authorizes voters to raise such taxes.

• In order to further reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, additional revenues are needed to build the infrastructure and expand services to achieve state and local goals.

• As fewer state and federal dollars are designated for transportation, local communities are increasingly recognizing the need to generate reliable local funding that cannot be taken by the state.

Strategies to implement local revenue measures include:

• Development of a draft expenditure plan of projects to receive sales tax revenues based on funding projections included in the Regional Transportation Plans, including gaps in available revenue for some projects.

• Polling at various points to test support for expenditure plans, test key messages and ballot language.

• Development of a public education plan and build support coalitions.

• Outreach that includes roundtables, focus groups, community meetings, workshops, work with advisory bodies to solicit input from local jurisdictions.

• A public information program which may include: presentations to community and business groups, development of project Fact Sheets, articles for newsletters, newspaper inserts, brochures, a designated website or webpage, media outreach, and development of a Frequently Asked Questions document.

• Legal and environmental review of the expenditure plan.

• Development and filing of official ballot language.
**State Route 156 Toll Revenues**

Tolling revenues for State Route 156 West are included as a reasonably available revenue source for Monterey County. TAMC has been working closely with Caltrans to outline the tasks, activities and agreements necessary to consider tolling via a public-private partnership as an option to fund construction of the State Route 156 West Corridor project. The agency completed a Tolling Traffic and Revenue Study for State Route 156 in 2013 and took action to further study the feasibility of the project. TAMC and Caltrans also held a private industry workshop to gauge private interest in investing in the tolling project.

Strategies to implement local revenue measures include:

- Execution of a Pre-Development Agreement between Caltrans, TAMC and a private developer team in which the developer participates in project planning, value engineering, determining financial feasibility and other activities that take place before the construction procurement phase.
- Completion of an investment-grade Traffic and Revenue Study, as other products needed to inform TAMC’s decision to proceed with tolling for the project.
- Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report.
- Evaluation of various design and financing options that would allow building both phases of the project.

A summary of the fund sources included in the Financial Element is included in Table 3-1 below. To comply with state and federal regulations, the fund estimate has also been escalated using a flat rate assumed throughout the three-county AMBAG region to forecast project costs in year-of-expenditure dollars. Fund sources in Table 3-1 not escalated represent funds that have been secured, but which are not assumed to be available in the future. The detailed 20-year fund estimate and fund source descriptions are included as Appendix B. The fund estimate is consistent with the State Transportation Improvement Program fund estimate, the first five years of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program, and is consistent with the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program to meet state and federal planning requirements.
## Table 3-1: Transportation Revenue Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCES (all figures in 1000's)</th>
<th>22 Year Not Escalated</th>
<th>22 Year Escalated (1.75%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,596,969</td>
<td>$ 3,115,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Sales Taxes Used on Transportation</td>
<td>$ 1,211</td>
<td>$ 3,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Developer Fees</td>
<td>$ 360,235</td>
<td>$ 408,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County General Funds (used for for Transportation)</td>
<td>$ 57,109</td>
<td>$ 64,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORA Capital Improvement Program Fees &amp; Presidio</td>
<td>$ 116,713</td>
<td>$ 132,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax (Highway User Tax)</td>
<td>$ 453,923</td>
<td>$ 514,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 42</td>
<td>$ 450</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Line Lease Revenue</td>
<td>$ 1,768</td>
<td>$ 1,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Developer Fees</td>
<td>$ 133,506</td>
<td>$ 151,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas Municipal Airport Revenues</td>
<td>$ 25,580</td>
<td>$ 27,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Ad Revenue &amp; Interest</td>
<td>$ 5,955</td>
<td>$ 6,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Fares</td>
<td>$ 220,863</td>
<td>$ 350,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit non-fare revenue</td>
<td>$ 202,463</td>
<td>$ 229,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Sales Tax</td>
<td>$ 213,696</td>
<td>$ 251,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act/Local Transportation Fund</td>
<td>$ 274,516</td>
<td>$ 311,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Transportation Sales Tax</td>
<td>$ 380,000</td>
<td>$ 428,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 156 Toll Revenues</td>
<td>$ 148,981</td>
<td>$ 232,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>$ 23,069</td>
<td>$ 27,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District Grants (AB 2766)</td>
<td>$ 23,069</td>
<td>$ 27,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE SOURCES (all figures in 1000's)</td>
<td>22 Year Not Escalated</td>
<td>22 Year Escalated (1.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,170,712</td>
<td>$ 1,429,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Improvement Program match</td>
<td>$ 47</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Aid to Airports program</td>
<td>$ 690</td>
<td>$ 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>$ 5,543</td>
<td>$ 6,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1 B</td>
<td>$ 36,387</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways</td>
<td>$ 8,133</td>
<td>$ 9,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>$ 838,679</td>
<td>$ 1,099,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA) (e.g., population/revenue based, Prop 42)</td>
<td>$ 72,603</td>
<td>$ 85,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Interregional Share</td>
<td>$ 36,017</td>
<td>$ 37,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Regional Share</td>
<td>$ 138,119</td>
<td>$ 148,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program</td>
<td>$ 34,495</td>
<td>$ 41,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL TRANSIT REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>$ 309,013</td>
<td>$ 472,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (5310)</td>
<td>$ 3,335</td>
<td>$ 3,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning Grants (5304)</td>
<td>$ 414</td>
<td>$ 486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Bus (5311f)</td>
<td>$ 27,600</td>
<td>$ 32,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning (5303)</td>
<td>$ 230</td>
<td>$ 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grants (5309)</td>
<td>$ 54,000</td>
<td>$ 183,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area Formula Program (5311)</td>
<td>$ 8,533</td>
<td>$ 10,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)</td>
<td>$ 145,901</td>
<td>$ 162,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Grants (5339)</td>
<td>$ 44,000</td>
<td>$ 53,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Very Small Starts</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 26,336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REVENUE SOURCES (all figures in 1000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>22 Year Not Escalated</th>
<th>22 Year Escalated (1.75%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL HIGHWAY REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>$ 180,568</td>
<td>$ 204,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk Rural Road (HR3)</td>
<td>$ 15,502</td>
<td>$ 18,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Bridge Program (HBP)</td>
<td>$ 20,240</td>
<td>$ 23,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>$ 8,694</td>
<td>$ 10,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scenic Byways Program</td>
<td>$ 575</td>
<td>$ 676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)</td>
<td>$ 128,777</td>
<td>$ 151,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)</td>
<td>$ 6,780</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL AVIATION REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td>$ 138,575</td>
<td>$ 162,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP)</td>
<td>$ 138,575</td>
<td>$ 162,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$ 4,418,906</td>
<td>$ 5,411,304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fund estimate above includes all transportation funds that the Agency reasonably expects to be available over the life of the plan to fund the transportation investments described in Chapter 4. As stated earlier, this estimate includes new sources of discretionary revenue to provide the flexibility needed to fund the mix of projects that address the goals and objectives of the plan.
4. Transportation Investments

The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan identifies a range of transportation investments to be funded over the lifetime of the document that support the goals and policy objectives of the plan, as well as the region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Agency coordinated with member jurisdictions to assemble a list of transportation projects for consideration in the plan. The list of projects was evaluated through a scenario planning process undertaken by AMBAG. After conducting quantitative and qualitative assessments of how different project scenarios performed relative to the adopted goals and policy objectives described in Chapter 2, the Agency selected a preferred project scenario.

Figure 4-1 summarizes the total distribution of funding to project categories in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan. The plan assumes increased investment relative to the previous plan in active transportation projects (supporting bicycling and walking), public transit improvements, and local streets and roads projects. Local streets and roads improvements are important for implementing Complete Streets projects that ensure that pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities appropriate to the type of street and location are included in each project.

Although the Regional Transportation Plan highlights large projects that improve the regional transportation system, maintaining local streets and roads, public transit, airports, and providing for active transportation are equally important to the quality of life in Monterey County. These improvements support the Sustainable Communities Strategy and are part of a planned system that achieves the region’s greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Transportation investments described in this chapter are divided between regionally significant transportation improvements funded in the plan, and local, non-regional project costs that are summarized in the plan according to the project categories identified above. The project list for the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan, including project cost estimates and project descriptions for regional projects, is included as Appendix C to this document.
Regional Transportation Investments

As described above, the Regional Transportation Plan is focused on regionally significant projects on the regional road, highway, transit and rail network that are described individually in the plan and included in the AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model for evaluation purposes. The plan incorporates long-term priorities adopted by the Transportation Agency Board of Directors in 2011 and updated in January 2013. These regional priorities were identified using a qualitative assessment consistent with the regional goals and objectives approved for the policy element of the regional plan.

Regional Development Impact Fee Program

The Transportation Agency administers the Monterey County Regional Development Impact Fee Program, which collects fees from development projects to mitigate the cumulative regional impacts of new trips on the regional road and highway network. The Regional Development Impact Fee Nexus Study establishes a relationship between the impact fees and new development, projects needed to serve new trips, and the proportion of project costs attributable to those trips. Projects included in this fee program must also be included in the Regional Transportation Plan. A regular update to the Nexus Study was therefore completed in concert with development of a preferred scenario for the 2014 regional plan. The Nexus Study update was also prepared in coordination with member jurisdictions and adopted by each city and the County of Monterey. Readers are referred to the Regional Development Impact Fee program Nexus Study for more information on how the program was developed.

Goods Movement

As noted in Chapter 1, the regional highway and rail network in Monterey County also serves as the regional goods movement system supporting the county’s major industries. Improvements included in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan have been identified to serve goods movement needs and are consistent with recent corridor-based studies and funding efforts. These include the 2012 Commercial Flows Study and Salinas Valley Truck-to-Rail Intermodal Facility Feasibility Study completed by AMBAG. The truck to rail study recommended sites for an intermodal facility for shipping Salinas Valley agricultural products to market by rail, which is assumed to be a privately funded project not included on the project list in this plan.

US 101 serves as the main north-south corridor for goods movement between Los Angeles and San Francisco, and is the primary corridor for goods movement into and out of the Central Coast counties. AMBAG has now initiated a US 101 Corridor Freight Study through a Caltrans planning grant that will recommend improvements for freight movements in the corridor. The Transportation Agency will evaluate the sustainability of freight alternatives through a Infrastructure Voluntary Evaluation Sustainability Tool (INVEST) grant.

The Agency is also working with the Central Coast Coalition, which is a partnership of Central Coast transportation agencies from Santa Cruz to Santa Barbara, to improve funding in the region and to seek funding for US 101 improvements that support goods movement and interregional access.

Regionally significant transportation investments that are included in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan are divided into the following four regional corridors described below:
- Corridor 1: North Monterey County Gateways
- Corridor 2: Inland Salinas Valley/US 101 Corridor
- Corridor 3: Salinas-Monterey Corridor
- Corridor 4: Coastal Corridor/State Route 1

Detailed information about these projects, including project descriptions and project costs are included in Appendix C.
Corridor 1: North Monterey County Gateways

Regional routes connecting Monterey County to the San Francisco Bay Area and Northern California are critical to the Monterey County economy, serving commuters and students, visitors to Monterey County, transporting county goods to market and providing access to medical facilities. Planned improvements on these gateway routes will expand transportation options, improve safety and support the county’s leading industries: agricultural and tourism.

A. Rail Extension to Salinas: This project will provide a safe, healthy alternative to driving on US 101 by establishing new daily passenger rail service between Salinas and Sacramento. Service will extend Capitol Corridor trains, with new stations planned in Pajaro/Watsonville, Castroville and Salinas. Major stops in Gilroy, San Jose and Oakland will allow convenient transfers to Caltrain and BART service to San Francisco and nearby destinations. In 2013, the Agency created the Kick Start project, which fully-funds the first phase of the improvements focused on bringing two trains daily to Salinas and Gilroy.

B & C. State Route 156 West Corridor: The Transportation Agency and Caltrans are researching the feasibility of installing an electronic toll facility as a way to finance the project, similar to other toll freeways in California. A citizen’s advisory committee is part of this effort. This funding strategy, if approved after additional environmental review, could bring the full project to construction by 2018. While the project is described in phases, the Agency’s goal is to construct it all at once if funding is available.

B. Phase 1: This high priority project will meet critical safety needs and reduce traffic congestion by adding four lanes between Castroville and US 101 adjacent to Highway 156. The existing highway will be converted into a frontage road for safe access to the Oak Hills community, and to provide a designated route for bicyclists. The project will also remove the signal and construct a new interchange at Castroville Boulevard.

C. Phase 2: This project will complete the State Route 156 West Corridor by replacing the existing interchange at US 101 with a new interchange connecting to the four lane freeway constructed during Phase 1. This improvement is necessary to improve operations and increase capacity to serve existing and projected travel volumes.

D. State Route 156/Blackie Road: This project will construct a new road connecting the existing Blackie Road in Castroville with Castroville Boulevard at the State Route 156 interchange that is part of Project B above. This road will provide a new connection from the major distribution center in south Castroville to State Route 156, reducing truck traffic and reducing congestion on Merritt Street through town.

E. Monterey County G12 Operational and Capacity Improvements: This project will widen San Miguel Canyon Road to four lanes between Castroville Boulevard and Hall Road, and Hall Road between San Miguel Canyon Road and Elkhorn Road. Class II bike lanes will be installed and maintained throughout widened segment. Traffic signal and intersection improvements will be constructed on San Miguel Canyon Road at Castroville Boulevard. Intersection improvements will be constructed on Hall Road at Sill Road and Willow Road. Intersection improvements will also be constructed on San Miguel Canyon Road at Moro Road and Langley Canyon Road.
North Monterey County Gateways

- A: Rail Extension to Salinas
  Represents Planned Stops
- B: SR 156 156 West Corridor
- C: SR 156 156 West Corridor—U.S. 101/SR 156 Interchange
- D: SR 156/Blackie Road Project
- E: Monterey County G12 Operational and Capacity Improvements
Corridor 2: Inland Salinas Valley/US 101 Corridor

The inland US 101 Corridor includes the City of Salinas and the South Monterey County cities of Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield and King City. This corridor serves as both a significant county commute corridor and an important interregional corridor for goods movement and Monterey County’s agricultural industry. Planned improvements in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan will enhance mobility and expand travel options in the City of Salinas. The projects in the plan will also improve access to transportation for the South Monterey County cities for work, recreation, education and travel outside of Monterey County. Improvements to US 101 will upgrade this facility to improve safety and operations and enhance capacity.

A. Russell Road Widening: This project will widen Russell Road to four lanes between US 101 and San Juan Grade Road.

B. US 101 Alvin Drive: This project will construct a new overpass/underpass on US 101 and a new road connecting to Alvin Drive in North Salinas.

C. US 101 Salinas Corridor: This project will widen US 101 to six lanes from Boronda Road to south of the Airport Boulevard interchange within the existing right-of-way where feasible to increase capacity and improve operations at existing interchanges.

D. US 101 Sanborn Road Improvements: This project will construct operational improvements at the US 101 Sanborn Road interchange at the southbound off-ramp and Elvee Drive/Sanborn Road intersection. This area is currently a bottleneck during peak travel times on Sanborn Road, which is an important route for goods movement providing access to agricultural coolers and truck facilities in south Salinas. Traffic queues on the off-ramp during peak travel times also impact the US 101 mainline.

E. US 101 Harris Road Interchange: The project will construct a new interchange on US 101 at Harris Road south of Salinas, which will provide access to US 101 for the industrial facilities on Harris Road and in Spreckels. The project will connect to improvements planned in Project D below.

F. US 101 South County Frontage Roads/Freeway Upgrade: This project will eliminate highway crossings to improve safety and enhance highway capacity, and construct frontage roads between Salinas and Soledad for access to farms and cities. The first phase of this project will construct a two lane frontage road on the west side of US 101 between the Abbott Street Interchange and Chualar. This phase will also close Abbott Street between US 101 and Harris Road, construct a two lane frontage road on the east side of US 101 from Harris Road to Chualar and construct a new overcrossing at or near Spence Road. The second phase will extend frontage roads from Chualar to Soledad. The Agency is working with a coalition of Central Coast counties in to secure state funding for these improvements, which are important for moving goods to market.

G. US 101 Gloria Road Interchange (Gonzales): The project will re-align and reconstruct the Gloria Road / US 101 interchange in Gonzales.
Inland Salinas Valley

- Russell Road Widening
- U.S. 101 Alvin Dr.
- U.S. 101-Salinas Corridor
- U.S. 101 Sanborn Rd. Improvements
- U.S. 101 Harris Rd. Interchange
- U.S. 101 South County Frontage Roads (Freeway Upgrade)
- U.S. 101 Gloria Rd. Interchange (Gonzales)
- U.S. 101 North Interchange—Soledad
- U.S. 101 South Interchange—Soledad
- SR 146 Bypass—Soledad
- U.S. 101 Walnut St. Interchange—Greenfield
- U.S. 101 1st St. Interchange—King City
- Amtrak Coast Daylight

(N. Main St. and MST Line Alisal Route)

South Monterey County Regional Transit Improvements, Salinas to King City
H. **US 101 North Interchange (Soledad):** This project will modify the north Soledad interchange and construct related ramp improvements, which could accommodate future widening of US 101 mainline to six lanes.

I. **US 101 South Interchange (Soledad):** This project will modify south Soledad interchange and construct related ramp improvements to accommodate possible future widening of US 101 mainline to six lanes as well as the planned SR 146 Bypass from Front Street to Metz Road.

J. **State Route 146 Bypass:** This project will realign State Route 146 and construct a new two lane arterial around the south edge of Soledad, connecting the South Soledad interchange with Metz Road with a crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. This facility will serve interregional traffic traveling to the Pinnacles National Park.

K. **US 101 Walnut Avenue Interchange (Greenfield):** This project will reconstruct the existing tight-diamond interchange with a wider Walnut Avenue overcrossing and implement signal improvements at the ramp intersections.

L. **US 101 1st Street Interchange (King City):** This project will extend San Antonio Drive from Lonoak Road to First Street/US 101 interchange, including a grade separated crossing over the Union Pacific railroad tracks.

M. **Amtrak Coast Daylight:** The Transportation Agency is coordinating with the Central Coast Coordinating Council to extend once daily Amtrak California Pacific Surfliner service from San Luis Obispo to Downtown San Francisco. The planned project will include station stops in Salinas, Soledad and King City to provide interregional access to and from South Monterey County. New stations are being planned by the City of Soledad and King City for this service, which are included in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan as separate projects.

N. **Salinas Bus Rapid Transit (North Main Street and East Alisal Routes):** This project will expand transit access and improve travel options in the City of Salinas by constructing high quality Bus Rapid Transit improvements on the following routes: 1) North Main Street between the downtown Salinas Transit Center and Boronda Road, and 2) Monterey-Salinas Transit Line 41 service in the East Salinas/Alisal corridor.

O. **South Monterey County Regional Transit Improvements (Salinas to King City):** This project is designed to expand regional transit access in South Monterey County. The project will expand Monterey-Salinas Transit Line 23 service between King City and Salinas to provide 30 minute headways and construct Bus Rapid Transit improvements on the existing route through Salinas to eliminate bottlenecks at major intersections that can impact on-time performance on this line.
Corridor 3: Salinas-Monterey Corridor

The Salinas-Monterey Corridor includes two major regional commute routes between Salinas that connect employment centers in Salinas and on the Monterey Peninsula. These routes include State Route 68 between Salinas and Monterey and the Blanco Road-Reservation Road-Imjin Parkway route connecting Salinas to State Route 1 through Marina. Both of these routes are conventional two lane roadways that are congested during peak travel times.

The corridor has numerous constraints in serving the major commute flows between these communities. Projects to either widen State Route 68 between Salinas and Monterey or construct a bypass through the former Fort Ord have not been pursued due to significant cost and environmental factors. Blanco and Reservation Roads have served as an alternative to travel on State Route 68, but improvements to Blanco Road are constrained by impacts to prime farmlands. Beginning with the closure of Fort Ord in 1994, the regional plan began identifying the Davis-Reservation-Imjin route for multi-modal regional improvements, which were subsequently included in the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan and refined in the Regional Transportation Plans that followed.

The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan identifies improvements to both regional routes, which are necessary to accommodate commute needs in this corridor.

A. Salinas-Marina Multi-Modal Corridor: The Transportation Agency is in the process of identifying a preferred alternative and conceptual designs for a transit, bicycle and pedestrian corridor between Salinas and Marina to provide travel options for commuters. The planned project will accommodate high quality transit service via a dedicated busway or priority at signals, as well as improvements for bicyclists and pedestrians along an alignment through the former Fort Ord, unincorporated Monterey County and the City of Salinas. The preferred alignment for this project will connect the Salinas Transit Center with the Monterey Branch Line at 8th Street.

B. Marina-Salinas Corridor Widening: This project will add capacity serving commute flows between Salinas and Marina by constructing a four lane commute corridor between Salinas and State Route 1 through Marina. The project will widen Davis and Reservation Roads between Blanco Road and the existing four lane section of Reservation Road at Intergarrison Road. The project also includes widening of Imjin Road to four lanes between Reservation Road and Imjin Parkway, and interchange improvements at State Route 1 and Imjin Parkway. This project will be planned and constructed in coordination with Project A described above.

C. State Route 68 Commuter Improvements: This project will add capacity on State Route 68 to serve commuters by widening the roadway to 4 lanes between the existing 4 lane highway at Toro Park and Corral de Tierra Road.

D. State Route 68 Corral de Tierra Intersection Improvements: This project, sponsored by the County of Monterey, will make operation improvements to the Corral de Tierra intersection, which is currently a bottleneck for regional commuters on State Route 68. The project will construct dual left turn lanes on westbound SR 68, a merge lane on southbound Corral de Tierra, and a right turn lane on northbound Corral de Tierra.
Salinas-Monterey Corridor

- Salinas-Marina Multi-modal Corridor (Conceptual Alternative Shown; Alignment Under Study)
- Salinas-Marina Multi-modal Corridor (Interim Route)
- Marina-Salinas Corridor Widening and SR 1/Imjin Pkwy. Interchange Improvements
- SR 68 Commuter Improvements
- SR 68 Corral De Tierra Intersection Improvements
Corridor 4: Coastal Corridor/State Route 1

State Route 1 between Castroville and Carmel serves as a commute corridor for work trips between Salinas and Marina during weekdays, and provides interregional access to the Monterey Peninsula and coast from the San Francisco Bay Area and Northern California on weekends, holidays and peak travel periods. The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan accommodates travel needs in this corridor through a combination of transit, rail and roadway improvements.

A. MST State Route 1 Bus on Shoulder: To improve travel times and on-time performance for regional transit between Salinas and Monterey through Marina, this project will construct bus improvements in the State Route 1 corridor between Marina and Fremont Boulevard in Seaside, either through bus improvements on the State Route 1 shoulder, or by constructing a dedicated busway parallel to the existing freeway. Monterey-Salinas Transit has secured state legislation allowing a bus-on-shoulder project to proceed.

B. Monterey Branch Line Light Rail: This project will reconstruct the Monterey Branch Line between Castroville and Monterey and establish light rail service with stops serving Castroville, Marina, Seaside, Sand City and Monterey. The first phase of the project will reconstruct tracks, construct stations, purchase rolling stock and operate service between Marina and Monterey with 15 minute headways. The second phase of the project will reconstruct tracks and extend service to Castroville with connections to interregional rail service at the station planned as part of the Rail Extension project described under Monterey County Gateways above. The second phase would also include increased frequencies during peak periods. Reconstruction of the Salinas River Railroad Bridge for service between Marina and Castroville is included as a separate project in the plan.

C. State Route 1 Monterey Road Interchange: This project will construct a new interchange on State Route 1 north of the existing Fremont Boulevard interchange, connecting to Monterey Road, which is designed to serve future development on the former Fort Ord.

D. State Route 1 Sand City Widening: This project will widen State Route 1 to 6 lanes between Fremont Boulevard and State Route 218/Canyon Del Rey with interchange improvements at State Route 1 and Fremont Boulevard. The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan includes the interchange components of the project – the roadway widening is assumed to be beyond the time horizon of this plan based on the Regional Development Impact Fee program.

E. Del Monte Avenue Widening (Camino El Estero to Sloat Avenue): This project, sponsored by the City of Monterey, will widen Del Monte Avenue by adding an additional eastbound lane between Camino El Estero and Sloat Avenue. This project could also support future Bus Rapid Transit Service in this corridor.

F. State Route 1/State Route 68 (Holman Highway) Roundabout: This project, sponsored by the City of Monterey, will either construct intersection improvements on Holman Highway at State Route 1 or replace the existing signalized intersection at that location with a roundabout. The roundabout project being considered will allow for free movements through the intersection, reduce traffic queues onto State Route 1 and Holman Highway, and improve access to Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula. The project will also include bicycle and pedestrian improvements to fill this gap in the Coastal Bike Route.
Coastal Corridor/SR 1

A. MST SR 1 Bus on Shoulder
B. Monterey Branch Light Rail
   ○ Represents Planned Stops
C. SR 1/Monterey Rd. Interchange
D. SR 1/Sand City Widening—Fremont Blvd. Interchange Improvements
E. Del Monte Avenue Widening
   (Camino El Estero to Sloat Avenue)
F. SR 68 Holman Highway Roundabout
G. SR 68 Holman Highway Access to CHOMP
H. SR 1 Carmel Operational Improvements
G. State Route 68 Holman Highway Access to CHOMP: This project will widen the Holman Highway between State Route 1 and Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula to four lanes, which will improve access to the hospital, connect to the roundabout included in Project F above.

H. State Route 1 Carmel Operational Improvements: This project, sponsored by the County of Monterey, will construct a northbound climbing lane on State Route 1 between Rio Road and Carmel Valley Road to relieve congestion on this facility.
The Multi-Modal Transportation System:

Non-Regional Investments

The Regional Transportation Plan serves as the first step toward securing state and federal funding for transportation projects. As such, the plan includes an estimate of all transportation revenues forecasted to be available over the life of the plan, and a listing of all non-regional transportation costs proposed by municipalities and public transit operators.

The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan is also an important component of the process to plan for healthy, sustainable communities through the Sustainable Communities Strategy. As such, the plan must identify all proposed transportation projects in the county because the local and regional road, highway, rail and transit networks function as a system. The plan is used to identify all projects that can be included in the AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model for evaluation relative to the goals and objectives identified in Chapter 2. The Regional Transportation Plan serves as an important mechanism for ensuring that plans for transportation projects are integrated and different modes of transportation are effectively coordinated.

Non-Regional Transportation Costs

The local, or non-regional transportation costs included in the Regional Transportation Plan are summarized in Appendix C.

These costs represent hundreds of relatively minor transportation improvements that the Transportation Agency may be directly involved with and which are being planned, developed and prioritized by member jurisdictions. Projects may be modified or eliminated, and also represent ongoing needs (street and road maintenance or operating costs are examples) that are difficult to predict over the twenty year planning horizon. Costs for these minor projects, although important for planning and funding purposes, are therefore accounted-for in grouped categories. This method best reflects the priorities of member jurisdictions and eliminates the need to amend the long range plan for modifications to minor projects between regional plan updates.

The current Federal Transportation Act also mandates that all project costs be escalated to show to "year of expenditure" dollars and matched to escalated projected revenues. Some projects could be constructed significantly sooner or later than the years shown. Escalated project costs in the Regional Transportation Plan do not reflect a commitment to construct projects in a certain timeframe, but rather demonstrate how much projects could cost if projects were constructed in these years.

Highway Operations, Maintenance and Rehabilitation

Costs to operate, maintain, repair or upgrade the State Highway system are included in the Regional Transportation Plan. These costs include projects planned and funded by Caltrans through the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP). Since Caltrans is directly responsible for planning and initiating these minor projects in cycles, All SHOPP projects are included in the group listings in Appendix C. Costs in this category are based on the level of funding estimated over the twenty year planning period and included as a funding category in this plan.
Local Streets and Roads

Local streets and roads connect people to homes, employment, recreation and the regional transportation system. These facilities do not just provide access for automobiles; improvements to local streets and roads are important for accommodating walking, bicycling and access to public transit services. Investments in local streets and roads are an important part of the strategy for planning sustainable communities. The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan attempts to maximize funding for local streets and roads and incorporate other transportation needs that support the Sustainable Communities Strategy when local streets and roads are maintained or constructed.

Local street and road costs in the Regional Transportation Plan are divided between new facilities and costs to operate, maintain and rehabilitate existing infrastructure.

**New Facilities**

Costs for new street and road facilities include new streets and roads, as well as projects to widen existing facilities. Costs for new facilities in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan are targeted at serving planned growth in priority areas, including the City of Salinas, and the South Monterey County cities. New local facilities identified in the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan and the Capital Improvement Program prepared by the Fort Ord Reuse Authority are included in this funding category. New facilities can be constructed as Complete Streets that accommodate all forms of transportation, as discussed in the section that follows.

**Operations, Maintenance and Rehabilitation**

This funding category includes costs to construct operational and intersection improvements on roadways that improve safety, rehabilitate failing streets and roads, as well as maintain and resurface existing facilities on an ongoing basis. The 2014 Regional Transportation Plan supports increased investment in street and road operations, maintenance and rehabilitation over the existing plan, but assumes that funding will continue to fall far short of the level needed to meet these needs and maintain local streets and roads in a state of good repair. The *California Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment*, sponsored in
part by the League of California Cities and California Association of Counties, has surveyed municipalities and evaluated the condition of facilities across the state since 2008 using a scoring system based on a 100 point scale. A score of 71-80 is considered to be good, and a range where best management practices can be employed. Between 2008 and 2012, the condition of Monterey County roadways deteriorated from a score of 63, which is considered at risk in the assessment, to a score of 50, which is on the cusp of failing.

This plan identifies a total of $3.84 billion in costs needed to improve and maintain the system in a state of good repair, of which only 11.5% is assumed to be funded in the plan. As described in Chapter 3, even if all of the transportation funding forecasted for the plan were discretionary, these costs would consume most of the county’s transportation funding capacity, and other important goals of the plan would not be met.

Costs included in the regional plan, however, do present an important opportunity to implement complete streets projects whenever improvements are proposed and funded, which can improve access for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit at a relatively low cost.

**Complete Streets**

Complete Streets projects are an important component of the strategy to develop sustainable communities in Monterey County and to achieve greenhouse gas targets. California Assembly Bill 1358 requires that policies supporting the implementation of complete streets be incorporated into municipal general plans whenever those plans are updated. As part of the coordinated process to prepare the Sustainable Communities Strategy, the Transportation Agency completed a Complete Streets Needs Assessment of Monterey County to identify gaps in priority development areas where complete streets projects are needed to accommodate pedestrian, bicycle and transit access appropriate to the type of street and location. Projects identified for these locations are included in the Regional Transportation Plan as operations, maintenance and rehabilitation costs.

To facilitate the implementation of Complete Streets projects, the Agency also prepared a *Complete Streets Guidebook*, which contains resources that member jurisdictions can use to evaluate street projects to ensure that Complete Streets features are considered during planning and design. The Guidebook, and links to other online Complete Streets resources, is available on the Transportation Agency website.

**Roundabouts**

Complementary to the complete streets policy approach described above, consideration and implementation of roundabouts at intersections is an important strategy for achieving the goals of the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan. Roundabouts at intersections...
allow for free movement of vehicles at intersections, which reduces vehicle emissions. Roundabout intersections are a proven to be safer than signalized intersections given low design speeds, simplified turn movements and the reduced number of conflicts through intersections. Roundabouts also incorporate pedestrian and bicycle friendly accommodations that Roundabouts are increasingly supported by state and federal policy and technical guidance. Specifically, Intersection Control Evaluation is a framework adopted by the Caltrans that includes consideration of roundabouts for intersection improvements. The Transportation Agency recommends that member jurisdictions utilize the Intersection Control Evaluation guidance available through Caltrans whenever considering intersection improvements.
Public Transit

Public transit provides an important alternative to travel by car and represents another set of investments needed to achieve regional sustainability goals. Regionally significant transit improvements, which accommodate interregional travel and travel options for commuters, were described for the regional transportation corridors above. This section describes the public transit system supported by funding in the Regional Transportation Plan.

The 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan supports expansion of public transit service and improvements to meet the county’s long term transit needs. The ability of MST and the Transportation Agency to expand service or implement service improvements have either been hampered by the lack of a stable fund source for public transit, and an overall lack of funding beginning in 2008 with the onset of the economic downtown. Rising costs, particularly for Americans with Disabilities Act service provided through a largely unfunded mandate, also have played a role. Although local and state revenues for transit are slowly recovering, the total amount of traditional state support for transit has been capped by structural changes.

Federal operating support is another critical funding component to delivering quality transit service. MST has been successful at securing competitive grants through the Federal Transit Administration for new services, but these fund sources are relatively short-term or one-time revenues. Changes to these programs in the most recent MAP-21 transportation bill consolidate programs and will most likely limit the amount of funding that will be secured. Further, federal operating fund payments have been regularly delayed, which generates continual cash flow issues. Most recently, actions by the Department of Labor to withhold operating funds in response to disputes about California pension reforms resulted in significant service cuts.

As described in Chapter 3, the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan identifies new sources of discretionary funding to address these issues and implement service improvements that can help the County meet greenhouse gas targets and other sustainability goals.

The significant public, private and non-profit transportation services provided in Monterey County are listed below.

**Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST):** MST is the sole public transit service provider in Monterey County. MST is a public transit district established in 2010 that operates fixed route transit services across a 280 square mile service area stretching between Paso Robles in San Luis Obispo County, and San Jose in Santa Clara County. MST also operates an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant paratransit service fleet of 36 vehicles, as well as special transit services and mobility management programs. Membership in the MST District includes each city in Monterey County, as well as representation from the County of Monterey for service to the population within ¾ mile of MST routes in the unincorporated County.

**Regional Vanpools:** A regional vanpool program is administered in Monterey County through the California Vanpool Authority, which provides vans and organizes both traditional vanpools and vanpools serving agricultural workers in rural areas.

**Greyhound Bus Lines:** Greyhound operates inter-county service linking Monterey County with adjacent counties. Greyhound also provides limited service between Gilroy, Salinas and the
South County cities [im not sure this is true of all south county cities. I thought greyhound only serves Salinas and King City. you might want to check into this.] via the Highway 101 Corridor.

**Amtrak California:** Amtrak California operates daily intercity *Thruway* bus service between Santa Barbara and Oakland with scheduled stops in Salinas and King City. This service operates as a bus bridge connecting Pacific Surfliner service in Southern California with the Amtrak Capitol Corridor and Bay Area destinations.

**Monterey Airbus:** Main Event Transportation of Monterey operates daily scheduled airport shuttle service between downtown Monterey, San Jose Mineta International Airport, and San Francisco International Airport.

**Taxi Operators:** Private taxis are an important link in the transportation system, providing flexible transportation based on demand. Taxis are also important for serving the needs of residents without access to automobiles, including the elderly and people with disabilities. Taxi operations in Monterey County are regulated through the Monterey County Regional Taxi Authority. MST staff support the daily operation of the taxi authority.

**Independent Transportation Network Monterey County:** This Monterey County affiliate of the Independent Network America Program coordinates rides for enrolled seniors and adults with visual impairments in Salinas and on the Monterey Peninsula using volunteer drivers.

Given that MST is the sole public transit operator, investments in the MST system supported by this plan are described in more detail in the sections that follow.

**Public Transit Operations**

Operating funds included in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan support the services operated my MST. The MST system, as of April 26, 2014, operates 60 fixed route lines with a fleet of 104 vehicles. **Figure 4-2** illustrates the existing MST system.

Significant new services established since adoption of the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan, including services receiving state and federal grant support, are highlighted below.

**JAZZ Bus Rapid Transit:**
In 2013, MST completed construction and initiated service on the JAZZ Bus Rapid Transit line, operating on three routes between David Avenue/Cannery Row in Monterey and the Edgewater Transit Exchange in Sand City. This service features 15 minute headways, bus priority and queue jumps at signals, and unique branding and
Figure 4-2: MST Regional Service (2013)
bus stops. By providing a high quality transit service on major local travel corridors, this service has decreased transit travel times for between major destinations on the Monterey Peninsula. Construction of the project was funded through state bonds and a federal appropriation, and planning was partly funded through a grant from the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

**Service to Military Installations:** MST partners with the Department of Defense to fund and operate transit service for employees and personnel of military installations in Monterey County, including the Presidio of Monterey Defense Language Institute, the Naval Postgraduate School and Fort Hunter Liggett in South Monterey County. This service, also open to the general public, provides interregional connections that fill service gaps.

- **Presidio of Monterey** services connect this facility with the following destinations:
  - Presidio - Salinas
  - Presidio - Del Monte Center (Monterey)
  - Presidio - La Mesa Housing Complex (Monterey)
  - Presidio - Marina
  - Presidio - Preston Park (Marina)
- **Naval Postgraduate School** service is provided between this major facility and employer with the La Mesa Housing complex in Monterey and the Ord Military Community in Seaside as well as the Dunes Shopping Center in Marina.
- **Fort Hunter Liggett** service provides interregional connections for base personnel and employees between Salinas and Paso Robles in San Luis Obispo County, with stops in Salinas, Soledad, Greenfield, King City, Fort Hunter Liggett and Paso Robles. New service from Fort Hunter Liggett to San Jose International Airport and Diridon Train Station begins in April 2014.

**MST Trolley:** MST operates free seasonal trolley service oriented towards visitors on the Monterey Peninsula between Memorial Day and Labor Day. The Trolley operates between Downtown Monterey and the Monterey Bay Aquarium/Cannery Row to reduce congestion on the impacted Lighthouse Avenue corridor.

**MST On-Call:** MST operates demand-responsive public transit service in the City of Marina, and the south Monterey County cities of Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield and King City. On-Call Service replaced the municipal dial-a-ride services formerly operated by Soledad, Greenfield and King City in response to recommendations made in past service studies and triennial transit performance audits.

**MST Line 55 San Jose Express:** MST operates daily scheduled service between Downtown Monterey and San Jose Diridon Station in Downtown San Jose, which also serves as the Amtrak California Thruway bus connection to the Monterey Peninsula. This service provides bus access...
from the Monterey Peninsula to the Bay Area, with connections to Amtrak California Capitol Corridor Service and Caltrain in San Jose, as well as stops serving San Jose State University.

Service Improvements & Unmet Public Transit Needs

The 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan supports expansion of public transit service and improvements to meet the county’s long term transit needs. The ability of MST and the Transportation Agency to expand service or implement service improvements have either been hampered by the lack of a stable fund source for public transit and an overall lack of funding beginning in 2008 with the onset of the economic downturn. Rising costs, particularly for Americans with Disabilities Act service provided through a largely unfunded mandate, also have played a role. Although local and state revenues for transit are slowly recovering, the total amount of traditional state support for transit has been capped by structural changes.

Federal operating support is another critical funding component to delivering quality transit service. MST has been successful at securing competitive grants through the Federal Transit Administration for new services, but these fund sources are relatively short-term or one time revenues. Changes to these programs in the most recent MAP-21 transportation bill consolidate programs and will most likely limit the amount of funding that will be secured. Further, federal operating fund payments have been regularly delayed, which generates continual cash flow issues. Most recently, actions by the Department of Labor to withhold operating funds in response to disputes about California pension reforms resulted in significant service cuts.

As described in Chapter 3, the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan identifies new sources of discretionary funding to address these issues and implement service improvements that can help the County meet greenhouse gas targets and other sustainability goals.

MST periodically analyzes its service improvement needs in a Short Range Transit Plan and area service studies. The most recent studies were completed for the Salinas Area in the 2012 Salinas Area Service Study and for South Monterey County in the 2010 South County Area Service Analysis. Key recommendations of these studies include:

- Simplification or realignment of routes in Salinas
- Extension/restoration of service hours
- Expansion of service to East Salinas
- Improved intercity transfers for South Monterey County passengers
- Establishment of an intercity circulator between South Monterey County cities
- Provision of shelters and amenities in South Monterey County

Major regional improvements included in the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan, including Salinas Bus Rapid Transit and South County Regional Transit Improvements, partly address these issues. This plan would also support reestablishment of MST Line 42 service between Downtown Salinas and the Westridge Shopping Center via East Alisal Street and Laurel Avenue.

The Short Range Transit Plan and Service studies for the Peninsula Area were last completed in 2006; however, if there were the capacity to expand service, MST would propose re-establishment of the following:
• **Line 5 – Carmel**: Hourly service between Downtown Monterey and Downtown Carmel by-the-Sea.

• **Line 20 – Salinas/Monterey**: 15 minute headways during periods and 30 minute headways on Sunday.

A *Marina Area Service Study* was also completed in 2009. Improvements identified in that study for service to California State University Monterey Bay and major origins and destinations in Marina have largely been implemented, albeit in modified form.

**Unmet Public Transit Needs**

The Transportation Agency also conducts a public outreach process on an annual basis to determine whether or not there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in Monterey County. The Agency has identified the following standing list of unmet needs through this process since 2010:

• **Countywide Operating Support**: This finding allows MST to claim all available Local Transportation Funds to support public transit service countywide.

• **MST Line 20**: Establish 15 minute headways during peak periods and provide 30 minute headways on Sundays.

• **Spreckels Service**: Expand service between Salinas, Spreckels and residential areas off of River Road.

• **Bolsa Knolls**: Expand service to the unincorporated Bolsa Knolls area north of Salinas.

• **Service South of King City (San Lucas, San Ardo, Bradley)**: Expand service to unincorporated communities along US 101 South of King City.

**Transit Capital, Rehabilitation and Replacement**

This funding category includes costs for capital facilities and vehicle replacement needs. This section includes a description of existing facilities, future facility needs and vehicle replacement needs.

**Existing Transit Facilities**

Monterey-Salinas Transit operates from six key transit centers. Each of these centers operates on a time-transfer pulse schedule, providing easy connections and quick transfers among multiple routes. MST is supported by two maintenance and operations facilities.

• **Monterey Transit Plaza**: This center occupies a triangular city park formed by the intersection of Munras, Pearl, and Tyler Streets in downtown Monterey. The plaza can accommodate eight coaches simultaneously, with a ninth bus stop located on Pearl Street and a tenth bus located on Tyler Street across from the Transit Plaza. It is a transfer center for all routes serving the Monterey Peninsula. Amtrak also uses this facility for its bus connection between Carmel/Monterey and Salinas, which is timed to meet the Amtrak Coast Starlight arrivals.

• **Sand City Station (formerly known as Edgewater Transit Exchange)**: Located in Sand City between the Edgewater and Sand Dollar Shopping Centers adjacent to Highway 1,
this exchange provides a key regional transit hub to Seaside and linkages to employment, residential, and shopping in Monterey, Marina, and Salinas. It is also used to provide direct daily bus service to the regional employment center at Ryan Ranch in Monterey. This exchange has been improved to serve as a terminus for the MST JAZZ Bus Rapid Transit service and rechristened “Sand City Station.”

- **Marina Transit Exchange**: This center is a hub for both local and high frequency transit lines and links directly with California State University at Monterey Bay, University of California MBEST Center, residential and commercial redevelopment for Marina and Seaside at the former Fort Ord military base, Watsonville and the Monterey Peninsula. The exchange facility was completed in 2008. MST is working with the City of Marina to redevelop property adjacent to the new transit exchange as a transit-oriented development.

- **Salinas Transit Center**: The Salinas Transit Center, located between Salinas and Lincoln Streets in the 100-block of “Old Town” Salinas, was constructed in April 1989 and serves all of Salinas and the north and south county routes. The transit center operates on a pulse system from nine departure gates to allow transfers between Salinas and inter-city routes. MST is planning to retain this transit center following construction of the Salinas Intermodal Transit Center at the existing Amtrak station, which will be used as a super-stop for MST buses.

- **Watsonville Transit Exchange**: The Watsonville Transit Center, serving North Monterey and Santa Cruz County, is located at the corner of West Beach and Rodriguez Streets and is the transfer point between Monterey-Salinas Transit and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD). This center serves MST routes between Salinas and Watsonville.

- **Maintenance and Operations Facilities**: Monterey-Salinas Transit owns two operations facilities, the Thomas D. Albert (TDA) Operations Facility in Monterey, and the Clarence “Jack” Wright, Jr. (CJW) Operations Facility in Salinas. MST’s administrative offices, dispatch, Monterey Peninsula operations and maintenance departments are located at the Albert Division on Ryan Ranch Road in Monterey. The Wright Division houses maintenance and operations facilities for Salinas area services and provides a backup dispatcher location.

**Future Facility Needs**

The following capital improvements are envisioned within the 20-year time horizon of the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan:

- **Maintenance and Operations Facility Replacement**: MST has outgrown its existing maintenance and operations facilities, which are a barrier to expanding and improving service. MST’s plans to design and construct a new facility on the former Fort Ord were ultimately not approved by the County of Monterey. MST is in the process of considering alternatives for accommodating its future support needs, most likely through multiple satellite facilities. The 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan includes long-term funding for these future facilities.
• **Monterey Transit Exchange**: The existing Monterey Transit Exchange location is not adequate to meet existing and projected operating needs. MST is coordinating with the City of Monterey to plan a replacement exchange, which may be located somewhere else in the downtown area, perhaps at a location two blocks north of Jules Simoneau Plaza on Tyler Street between Del Monte Avenue and Franklin Street. This planned exchange would transform the block between the existing City of Monterey parking garages into a transit exchange. The west side of this street already functions as a transit stop for regional routes. The MST Bus Stop Shop customer service center and Monterey Mobility Management Management Center are located at this location as well.

**Municipal Facilities - Designing for Transit**

Support from city and county governments and private developers with the installation of bus stops, bus pull-outs, and transit amenities are important for improving public transit access. Appropriate accommodation for transit should be considered and designed into new streets and development projects from the outset. *Designing for Transit* is a manual created by Monterey-Salinas Transit for integrating public transportation and land use in Monterey County. The manual discusses ten ways to design more transit-friendly communities and encourages the inclusion of transit-related improvements early in the design of a development project. The manual includes a set of design standards (bus stops, pavement requirements, turning radii, etc.) that can be used in designing new roadways and developments, smart growth and livable community incentives, as well as specific policy and implementation language for use in local general plans, zoning ordinances, building and public works permit process. That document is available electronically on the Monterey-Salinas Transit website – www.mst.org.

**Vehicle Replacements**

Replacement of aging vehicles is a costly, ongoing and significant capital need for MST. The MST service is area is vast due to its regional intercity travel routes, so MST vehicles accumulate mileage rapidly. MST vehicles must be replaced according to the following schedules:

- **Transit coaches**: Every 12 years or 500,000 miles
- **MST RIDES and other minibuses**: 5 years or 150,000 miles
- **MST Trolley coaches**: Every 10 years or 350,000 miles.
- **Accessible taxis**: Every 4 years or 100,000 miles.

This plan accommodates scheduled MST vehicle replacements over the planning horizon.

**Americans with Disabilities Act – Mobility Management**

Meeting the goal of improving access and mobility in the transportation plan requires that investments be made to serve the needs of the elderly, people with disabilities, and other transit-dependent individuals. The elderly, in particular, is a population expected to grow considerably over the planning horizon, which will place unique demands on Monterey County communities and the transportation system. The Regional Transportation Plan includes the costs of supporting programs and services that meet these needs.
In 2006, the Transportation Agency designated MST to serve as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency for Monterey County, which is responsible for planning and coordinating transportation services for specialized needs groups. MST has since been successful at securing grant funding, primarily through the Federal Transit Administration, to initiate new mobility management programs and services. A dedicated source of funding is needed to maintain these programs and services after grants expire. These ongoing transit operating costs are supported in the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan, and are described in more detail below.

- **MST RIDES Program:** The RIDES program is an accessible, demand-responsive service operated by MST to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Eligible riders within ¾ mile of MST routes can enroll in the program and schedule trips a day in advance. MST also maintains an agreement with the County of Monterey to operate Special Transit Service which is also provided to the population within a mile of MST routes in the unincorporated areas, as well as within the US 101 Corridor south of King City.

- **MST Senior Shuttles:** MST secured funding through the former New Freedom grant program administered by the Federal Transit Administration to establish transit routes planned by and tailored to the needs of elderly residents on the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas.

- **Accessible Taxi Program:** Wheelchair-accessible taxis are critical for meeting the mobility needs of people with disabilities. MST secured grant funds to purchase nine accessible taxis and coordinated with taxi operators to put these vehicles into service.

- **Senior Taxi Voucher Program:** MST secured funding to distribute discount taxi vouchers for seniors in participating communities. The program currently serves the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas. Rides using a voucher require a $3.00 co-pay and are good for trips up to $17.00 (which accounts for most trips in the areas served). The program is administered through the Monterey County Regional Taxi Authority.

- **Senior Travel Training Program:** MST offers a travel training program to train seniors how to use public transportation, which enhances mobility for this vulnerable population, but also is used to reduce demands placed on the RIDES program and associated costs.

- **MST Navigator Program:** MST recruits and trains volunteers to assist customers at transit exchanges. This program is targeted at serving the elderly and persons with disabilities and complements the Senior Travel Training Program.

- **Monterey Mobility Management Center:** This center, located in Downtown Monterey, is staffed to serve as a one-stop source of information about services to the elderly and people with disabilities. The Mobility Management Programs described above are administered from this facility. MST also operates a satellite Mobility Management Center in Salinas, which is planned to be relocated to the Train Station when renovations are complete in an expanded capacity.
Coordinated Public Transit - Human Services Transportation Plan: Meeting Future Needs

AMBAG adopted a Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan (or Coordinated Plan) in 2013 to serve as a plan for coordinating and funding projects meeting the specialized needs of the elderly, people with disabilities and the transit-dependent. Any project applying for Section 5310 grants through the Federal Transit Administration must be derived from or consistent with this plan. The document also serves as a resource for identifying long-term strategies and actions for meeting specialized mobility needs, which are supported by the Regional Transportation Plan.

The Coordinated Plan identifies the following long-term projects which are included here to identify long term needs in the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan.

- Ongoing replacement of aging RIDES vehicles
- Expansion of the RIDES program to provide door to door or door through door service
- Maintenance and expansion of MST Mobility Management Programs
- Maintenance of the MST Taxi Voucher program
- Expansion of the accessible taxi program
- Expansion of the Independent Transportation Network America service in Monterey County
- Expansion of the regional vanpool program to serve the needs of agricultural workers and to serve rural areas.
Active Transportation: Bicycle and Pedestrian Investments

Bike and pedestrian facilities are integral components of Monterey County’s multi-modal transportation system. The region’s mild climate and relatively flat topology make biking and walking a viable mode of travel for many living in the county. The close proximity between housing and jobs in the older communities of Monterey County also support the use of bicycles and walking as a transportation alternative, although key gaps in the network currently exist.

The Regional Transportation Plan includes policies for maximizing the transportation system to promote walking and bicycle travel, including development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, safety programs and promotional events, improved access and safety provisions, and improved linkages to bikeways and recreational trail system.

Bicycle Facilities

Monterey County’s regional bikeways system, and the Agency’s regional bicycle planning activities are described in more detail below.

Bikeways and Planning in Monterey County – Existing Conditions

Monterey County has approximately 246 miles of maintained bikeways on state, county and local roads. Bikeways in the county are classified as Class I, II, and III. These classifications generally follow design standards established by Caltrans. Classifications are described as follows:

- **Class I: Bicycle Paths** are bikeways separated from vehicle traffic.
- **Class II: Bicycle Lanes** provide cyclists a marked area of the roadway that is part of the roadway also used by motor vehicles. Bicycle lanes have identification signage, pavement stencils, striping, and minimum width requirements.
- **Class III: Bicycle Routes** are recommended roadways that bicycles share with motor vehicles without a marked bike lane. Bicycle Route signs are placed periodically along the route and at changes of direction.

The majority of bikeways in Monterey County are Class II and III, however a large Class I facility exists along the Monterey Peninsula coastline. The Monterey Bay Coastal Trail extends from Lovers Point in Pacific Grove to Del Monte Boulevard, north of Marina, providing a scenic and highly traveled recreational opportunity as well as an important bicycle and pedestrian commuter link in the Monterey peninsula. It is anticipated that the Monterey Bay Coastal Trail
will become an important link in the proposed Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (described later in this chapter) and larger California Coastal Trail.

**Recreational Bicycling**

Many of the bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Monterey County also serve recreational users. The need for recreational facilities in the area is also supported by the county’s tourism economy. Cycling events held at Laguna Seca each year draw visitors to Monterey County seeking recreational opportunities, which contributes to the need for quality facilities.

**Intermodal Transportation Links**

Bicycle riders may connect with other transportation modes if the proper facilities are available. These modes include transit, carpool, rail, and air transportation. Bike racks are now available on all MST buses. MST now carries more than 2,200 bikes on buses every month.

State and federal rail services are required to offer accommodations to store bicycles during short trips. Presently, interstate Amtrak service still requires bicycles to be boxed and stored in the baggage compartment; however, intercity and commuter trains within California do provide for unboxed bicycle storage. Amtrak stations are not equipped with secure bicycle locking facilities for either employees or passengers. Local jurisdictions may apply for funding for such facilities near or at the stations. Improvements to the area’s rail system will also benefit bicycle usage, as future rail facilities will include bicycle storage to promote multi-modal travel.

**Policy Considerations for Bicycle Facility Design**

The Transportation Agency has adopted two policies at the recommendation of its Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee to guide planning for bicycle facilities in Monterey County and direct input provided by the Agency on plans and designs developed by member jurisdictions. In order to facilitate regional travel by bicycle, TAMC encourages its member agencies to construct bicycle facilities on new roadways as follows:

- In coordination with regional and local bikeways plans;
- According to the specifications in Chapter 1000 of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual;
- With consideration of bicycle lanes (Class 2 facilities) on all new major arterials and on new collectors with an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) greater than 3,000, or with a speed limit in excess of 30 miles per hour;
- With special attention to safe design where bicycle paths intersect with streets; and
• With consideration of sharrows in plans and projects proposed by the Agency and member jurisdictions, consistent with the Monterey County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and the California Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

Bicycle Programs

The Transportation Agency administers several programs to promote and facilitate bicycle travel in Monterey County, which include:

• **Monterey County Bikeways Map:** In 1997, TMC published the first Monterey County Bikeways Map. The Agency completed the most recent update in 2008, illustrating bikeways, recommended routes, and bicycle facilities throughout Monterey County. The Agency expects to complete and distribute the next Bike Map in 2014.

• **Bicycle Service Request Form Program:** In 2001, the Agency initiated a Bicycle Service Request Form Program. Service request forms are available at bike shops and on-line to report roadway hazards to bicyclists. The Agency distributes these request forms to local public works departments for their response and action.

• **Bicycle Protection Program:** Between 2001 and 2012, the Agency received funding through the Monterey Bay Air Pollution Control District to help increase the number of bike racks and lockers in the county. Through the Bike Protection Program, the Agency provided bike racks and lockers in the locations most heavily used by bicyclists. A total of 185 bicycle racks and lockers and providing secured bicycle parking facilities for 506 bicycles distributed through the program. Public bicycle storage continues to be a pressing need in Monterey County. The Agency plans to pursue funding to reinstate the program.

• **Monterey County Bike Month:** Public education is important for increasing interest in, bicycling as a form of daily transportation. Up to 2012, the Transportation Agency planned and coordinated a Monterey County Bike Week public awareness campaign each May to coordinate with National Bike Month. The Agency plans to support future campaigns as a sponsor and work with its Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee to organize activities.

Bicycle Sharing

In 2012, the Transportation Agency prepared a study that examined the feasibility of establishing a bicycle sharing program in Monterey County. The concept of bicycle sharing originated in Europe and has been gaining popularity in the United States. Bicycle sharing is a form of public transportation that allows riders to rent bicycles from automated docking stations and return the bicycles to any station in the network. Similar to car sharing, bicycle sharing systems are membership-based. Membership fees typically pay for the first half hour of use, at which point additional charges are assessed in half-hour intervals. The pricing structure of these systems therefore incentivizes short trips. Benefits of bike sharing systems identified in published research include traffic congestion and emissions reductions by providing an alternative to short automobile trips, increased public awareness and enthusiasm for bicycling, economic benefits around bike sharing stations, and possible public health benefits.
The Bicycle Sharing Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan identified a system of stations on the Monterey Peninsula and in Salinas that would form the basis of a viable program. The study identified strategies for partnering with local bicycle rental business to establish a program, as well as a concept of operations document to serve as a roadmap for implementing a system.

Monterey County has a relatively small population with unique conditions that pose challenges for establishing a bicycle sharing program. The County has a robust tourist economy and established local business serving the local visitor rental market; although the program is targeted toward residents and commuters for short trips, a bicycle sharing program was seen during the outreach process as a competitor for visitor business.

A Bay Area Bikeshare program deployed in the San Francisco Bay Area in 2013 and expansion is already planned. Interest in bicycle sharing may increase in Monterey County as the public becomes more familiar with that program. The Bicycle Sharing Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan is available as a resource for implementing a program in Monterey County in the future.

Pedestrian Facilities

Walking is a viable, inexpensive, non-polluting, and healthy way to travel. Walking also serves as intermediary trips between other transportation modes, such as work-bus stop, shop-car, and school-bike trips. The Sustainable Communities Strategy calls for increased investment in improvements for pedestrian access as a means to encourage more walking trips.

As described above, pedestrian investments can be incorporated into local streets and roads projects as Complete Streets components. Pedestrian-specific enhancements can include sidewalks, intersection improvements incorporating bulb-outs and pavement treatments, as well as streetscape improvements that enhance the attractiveness and comfort of the pedestrian environment. The Complete Streets Needs Assessment identifies regionally significant gaps in the existing pedestrian circulation system. Improvements identified in Safe Routes to School Plans are included in lists of local projects upon which the Active Transportation group funding category is based.
**Americans with Disabilities Act**
The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), passed in 1990, is a comprehensive law prohibiting discrimination against people with disabilities. ADA requires access to public transportation systems for people with disabilities equal to the service available to the able-bodied. Problems commonly associated with sidewalks and pathways for the disabled are driveway cuts, lack of curb cuts, sign posts, benches, and rough and severely cracked sidewalk surfaces.

**Future Needs: The Monterey County Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan**
The Transportation Agency has worked closely with its Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee and 13 member jurisdictions to identify gaps in the countywide road and highway network where bicycle and pedestrian improvements are needed. In 2011, the Agency adopted the *Monterey County Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan* to provide a basis for the allocation of state and federal funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

The Plan serves to accomplish two main purposes. First, the plan lists all existing and proposed projects and facilities of jurisdictions within Monterey County and satisfies the General Bikeways Plan requirements set by the California Department of Transportation (California Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2). Local jurisdictions may choose to adopt the plan or submit an equally qualified plan to ensure eligibility for state and federal bicycle-funding sources.

Second, the plan establishes a countywide list of projects. This list assists the Agency in the allocation of various funds for regional bicycle and pedestrian projects. The plan identifies over 500 bicycle and pedestrian projects to accommodate non-motorized travel, which are reflected in the active transportation costs included in the Regional Transportation Plan. The plan also assigns rankings to projects in the plan to serve as a guide for funding and implementation. The top ranked projects identified in the Master Plan are identified in Table 4-1 below.

**Table 4-1: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan – Top Ranked Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Imjin Parkway Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Stripe bike lanes on Imjin Parkway in addition to Class I bike path</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Canyon del Rey Blvd</td>
<td>Stripe Class II Bike lanes on east side of Canyon Del Rey Blvd and fillgaps on Westside; Stripe/Restripe bike lanes to the left of right-turn lanes.</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>Del Rey Oaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Castroville Bicycle Path and Railroad Crossing</td>
<td>Install a Class I bike/ped path and bridge over railroad crossing</td>
<td>$5,995,000</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blanco Rd</td>
<td>Install Class II Bikeway from Research Rd to Luther Way</td>
<td>$221,880</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Davis Rd</td>
<td>Install Class II Bikeway from Blanco Rd to Rossi St</td>
<td>$3,411,000</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blanco Rd</td>
<td>Install Class II Bikeway from Luther Way to Abbott St</td>
<td>$107,300</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Install Class II Bikeway from Del Monte Blvd to Mescal St</td>
<td>$67,900</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail

One of the most important planned regional bicycle facilities in Monterey County is the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail. The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail is a collaborative effort among public agencies, non-profit organizations and the public to construct a trail that would span Monterey Bay from the city of Pacific Grove to Santa Cruz County line. The primary purpose of the Trail is to enhance appreciation and protection of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary as well as provide a safe, accessible scenic trail for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other users free of automobile traffic. The Sanctuary Scenic Trail originally was a project of the Santa Cruz County Inter-Agency Task Force, a Santa Cruz Committee that formed in 1993.

The Transportation Agency completed the Monterey County portion of the Sanctuary Scenic Trail Master Plan in 2008. That plan lists the various components needed to complete the trail. There are 17 planned trail segments with a total length of 33 miles in Monterey County. With...
parts of the trail already constructed, the plan is oriented around gaps, improvements to existing sections, and installation of wayfinding and interpretive elements.

Figure 4-3 depicts the phased segments of the Sanctuary Scenic Trail, as well as priorities in the corridor that will connect surrounding communities to the trail. Segments are assigned to one of the three phasing categories: short term (1-5 years), mid-term (5-10 years) and long term (10-20 years). The cost for the entire trail network is estimated to be $28.5 million.

The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail incorporates the California Coastal Trail and includes coordination with the State Coastal Conservancy and Coastal Commission to implement the California Coastal Trail in Monterey County. Future development of the trail will be significantly constrained by the coastal geography or topography south of the Monterey Peninsula. The Agency will continue to coordinate with coastal partner agencies to develop and accommodate the California Coastal Trail in the regional plan.

Work to Date

The Agency is currently coordinating with county jurisdictions and congressional representatives to fund and construct trail segments identified in the Master Plan, which will be incorporated in a larger California Coastal Trail project being developed statewide.

Planning for the Moss Landing segment from Moss Landing Road to the existing highway bridge on State Route 1, including a new bicycle and pedestrian bridge over the entrance to Elkhorn Slough, is ongoing. Construction is expected to take place in 2016.

Congressman Sam Farr (D-Carmel) has worked to provide federal funding for the trail construction effort, delivering $4.5 million to Monterey County. Congressman Farr continues his effort to make completion of the trail a reality.
Figure 4-3: Sanctuary Scenic Trail Segment Map
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Transportation System Management

The Regional Transportation plan incorporates a supply component, and a demand component for meeting the county’s long-term transportation needs. The existing and projected need for capital improvements to Monterey County’s regional transportation infrastructure to serve planned growth across the county is substantial relative to the amount of transportation resources that the Transportation Agency and its regional planning partners have available to fund and deliver projects. Given the number of capital improvement needs, the Agency has identified a corresponding need for strategies and measures that can be implemented, to maximize use of existing regional infrastructure and resources. These measures include:

- **Monterey County 511 Program** to provide current information to the traveling public
- **Rideshare Programs** to promote carpooling and travel alternatives;
- **Safety Programs** that support the safe use of existing regional roadways to eliminate congestion due to traffic accidents; and
- **Intelligent Transportation Systems** involving the application of technology that maximizes the efficiency of the existing system.

The following discussion addresses the Transportation Agency’s efforts to manage the existing transportation system and reduce the county’s long-term transportation costs and need for expensive capital infrastructure projects.

**511 Traveler Information System**

A 511 Traveler Information System generally provides a wide range of travel information, from vehicle travel times, to transit schedules, rideshare and carpooling information and weather and tourism information. By making travel information easy to access, it is expected that people can make more informed choices about when to travel, what type of transportation to use, and what route to take.

A Monterey Bay Area 511 System will be an effective strategy for simultaneously addressing numerous transportation challenges in both the short and long-term, at a low cost, and with significant benefits for multiple modes. The system would be designed to maximize the opportunities to build upon existing local transportation resources.

The Agency partnered with the Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission and the California Department of Transportation to fill the remaining 511 system gap on the Central Coast. The Transportation Agency completed a Monterey Bay Area 511 Traveler Information System Feasibility and Implementation Plan in 2013 and is working to deploy a system in late 2014.

**Rideshare Programs**

The Transportation Agency will begin administering the Commute Alternatives Program for Monterey County in 2014, which is intended to promote carpooling and alternatives to driving. This program provides resources and information about travel alternatives, and assistance with organizing commuter carpools. The program includes direct outreach to employers to develop
and implement alternative commute programs, as well as to offer financial incentives to participants. Specific programs that have been offered include:

- **Guaranteed Ride Home Program**: Registered participants can be reimbursed for taxi fares or rental car costs should an employee carpool or ride transit to work and be stranded without means of returning home.
- **Commuter Choice Programs**: IRS offers tax benefits that commuters and employers can take advantage of for commute benefits.
- **Park & Ride Lots**: Park-and-Ride Lots serve as convenient pick-up points for your carpool, vanpool, or bus.
- **Rideshare Month**: This statewide initiative in the month of October is designed to increase awareness about the benefits of using sustainable transportation such as carpooling, vanpooling, riding the bus, bicycling, walking, and telecommuting. Commuters are asked to make a commitment to use a sustainable form of transportation at least one day during Rideshare Week.

**State Highway Safety Programs**

The Transportation Agency is involved in, or administers, several programs to enhance safe use of regional infrastructure and reduce travel delays associated with accidents on regional roadways.

**SAFE Call Box Program**

The Transportation Agency is the designated Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE) for Monterey County. The SAFE is a countywide motorist aid program that is funded with a one dollar-per-vehicle annual registration surcharge assessed by the state Department of Motor Vehicles to Monterey County residents. The program, cosponsored by the CHP and Caltrans, supports the installation and service of the emergency dispatch phones on the major roadways. The call boxes are designed to be used by motorists in emergency situations to summon assistance. Roadside call boxes can assist and expedite the clearing of accidents and other incidents that contribute to traffic congestion.

TAMC adopted the Monterey County Call Box Implementation Plan in February 1999. As of 2001, call box units had been installed along Route 101 between Salinas and San Luis Obispo County (at 2 mile increments) and Salinas and San Benito county lines (at 1 mile increments), along Route 156 (at 2 mile increments), along Route 1 between the Monterey Peninsula and the northern county line (at 2 mile increments), and along Route 68. Phase III of the call box
program included the installation of eight call boxes along Highway 1 in the Big Sur area which was completed in 2007. The Agency, in coordination with Monterey County Public Works, the Fire Protection District and CalFire, selected twelve new call box locations along Jolon Road, Carmel Valley Road and Arroyo Seco Road for installation. These locations include areas that have historically seen accidents and fires, and that have limited cell phone coverage and are far from residences or businesses.

The Monterey County call box system has been installed as fully accessible to the mobility and hearing impaired in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) by being equipped with TTY technology. The system has also been upgraded to use digital technology.

**Freeway Service Patrol**

The Freeway Service Patrol was initiated by the Transportation Agency in 2000 with state funds to provide motorists with emergency roadside assistance from roving tow truck services through a contractual arrangement with tow truck operators. Since congestion often occurs as the result of stranded vehicles, the patrol qualifies as a Traffic Demand Management project for air quality evaluation purposes.

The Freeway Service Patrol operates on Route 101, from Sanborn Road in Salinas to the San Benito County line, Monday through Friday, during the AM and PM commute periods and on Sunday afternoons during peak travel months and holiday/special event weekends. It also operates along Route 1, between Reservation Road in Marina and Carpenter Road in Carmel, on Monday through Friday during AM and PM commute periods and special event weekends. This service could be expanded if additional needs are identified and the state approves additional funding.

**Intelligent Transportation Systems**

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) enable people and goods to move more safely and efficiently through a state-of-the-art, inter-modal transportation system through the application of advanced sensor, computer, and communication technologies and management strategies.

The Intelligent Transportation Society of America (ITS America) is an organization founded by a congressional mandate to coordinate the development and deployment of intelligent transportation systems in the United States. Their mission is to foster public/private partnerships to increase the safety and efficiency of surface transportation through the application of advanced technologies. According to ITS America, intelligent transportation system technologies are currently used to:

- Collect and transmit information on traffic conditions and transit schedules for travelers before and during their trips. Alerted to hazards and delays, travelers can change their plans to minimize inconvenience and additional strain on the system.
- Decrease congestion by reducing the number of traffic incidents, clearing them more quickly when they occur, rerouting traffic flow around them, and automatically collecting tolls.
• Improve the productivity of commercial, transit, and public safety fleets by using automated tracking, dispatch and weigh-in-motion systems that speed vehicles through much of the red tape associated with interstate commerce.

• Assist drivers in reaching a desired destination with navigation systems enhanced with pathfinding, or route guidance.

Public agencies such as the Transportation Agency also stand to derive enormous benefits from the deployment of these technologies. For government agencies at all levels, the innovative application of advanced technologies means lower costs, enhanced services, and a healthier environment for the constituents these agencies serve. Intelligent transportation systems encompass all transportation modes, and this regional plan includes these systems within several areas of the action element including roadway, transit, and commercial vehicle projects.

Central Coast Strategic Deployment Plan

The Central Coast Intelligent Transportation Systems group, comprised of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, Caltrans, and the transportation planning agencies of Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara Counties, authored the Central Coast Region ITS Strategic Deployment Plan in 2000. The Central Coast ITS Strategic Deployment Plan is a road map to implement an integrated system of technology-based transportation strategies. The plan is designed to meet current federal and state regulations and to include all the intelligent transportation system-related projects in the counties.

The key to making intelligent transportation systems work at the regional level is integration. This means agencies working together, sharing information, and coordinating activities. One of the main elements of the Central Coast ITS Strategic Plan is a centralized Transportation Management Center. A center located in San Luis Obispo that is jointly managed by Caltrans District 5 and California Highway Patrol staff has been operational since October 2001. It uses a computer-aided dispatching system to more efficiently manage California Highway Patrol and Caltrans vehicles/resources and serves as the central clearinghouse facility to manage incidents and/or special events, monitor freeway conditions using closed-circuit television, issue SigAlerts via e-mail, and post messages on changeable message signs.

Examples of Intelligent Transportation Systems currently in use or proposed for use in Monterey County include:

• Ramp meters to more effectively control the flow of traffic on major freeways
• Dynamic speed and curve warning systems to alert motorists to unsafe driving or road conditions
• Interactive traffic counts website to display traffic volumes during peak and off-peak driving seasons
• Use of transit vehicle tracking systems to support transit operations
• Advanced traffic signal control systems;
• Closed circuit television cameras on state routes to help monitor congestion and respond to incidents and blockages more quickly;
• Temporary changeable message signs on major roadways to advise motorists of local traffic conditions during special events.
• Emergency vehicle signal pre-emption
The Central Coast ITS Strategic Plan lists several priorities for Monterey County. These are:

- Installations of motorist aid call boxes along US 101, SR 1 and SR 68, with particular sensitivity given to the visual aspects of any installation along scenic roadways;
- Traveler information systems (changeable message signs, highway advisory radio) along US 101, SR 1, SR 68 and SR 156;
- Upgrades to traffic signal systems to improve signal coordination;
- Safety applications on rural highways; and
- A 511 telephone call-in system

The Central Coast ITS Strategic Plan provides an architecture, or map, of the implementation strategy. Also, the Plan notes the steps that need to occur to implement the Plan. One of those steps is integrating intelligent transportation systems into mainstream transportation planning efforts, such as the Regional Transportation Plan. As such, intelligent transportation system projects have been included in the regional plan project list, and will be implemented either as separate safety projects, or as part of new capacity projects.

Intelligent Transportation Systems and Transit

As part of the deployment plan, Monterey-Salinas Transit has installed several intelligent transportation system projects:

- **Signal Priority**
  In cooperation with the City of Monterey and with a grant from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality, MST and the City installed signal priority equipment on key commuter routes at selected intersections to speed bus and traffic flow in commute hours. This technology has been installed on the MST JAZZ Bus Rapid Transit Route described earlier in the Chapter. MST hopes to further expand signal priority to the Cities of Salinas, Seaside, Marina, and selected state highway intersections.

- **Advance Communication System (ACS)**
  MST is installing the latest radio, dispatch, and vehicle locator systems. They are connected to Global Positioning Satellites (GPS) that allow for a wide variety of technological advances. These systems will assist to speed buses and transfer connections, aid in bus scheduling, provide passenger counting and loading data thus helping to reduce overcrowding. ITS will provide a higher level of customer service such as buses enunciators and real-time bus arrival times and system conditions.
Airports

Airports in Monterey County provide interregional connections to and from the County. Airport projects from the adopted capital improvement programs are included in the plan’s project list. Publicly-owned civil aviation airports are discussed below.

Regional Airport System Plan

Aviation forecasts in this plan are based on the Regional Airport System Plan prepared by AMBAG most recently in 2006, which provides a basis for assisting airport sponsors and local communities with general aviation, commercial aviation, and military airports.

Table 4-2 below describes airport forecasts for Monterey County. The Regional Airport System Plan provides forecasts to the year 2025. Both the number of total based aircraft in the county and annual operations are projected to increase over this forecast period.

Table 4-2: Aviation Forecasts - Based Aircraft and General Aviation Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Based Aircraft</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marina Municipal</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas Municipal</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Peninsula</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Del Rey (King City)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County Total</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Aviation Operations</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marina Municipal</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>47,530</td>
<td>55,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas Municipal</td>
<td>78,400</td>
<td>94,170</td>
<td>101,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Peninsula</td>
<td>78,565</td>
<td>92,890</td>
<td>98,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Del Rey (King City)</td>
<td>13,860</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County Total</td>
<td>202,625</td>
<td>258,590</td>
<td>281,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No major deficiencies to aviation services are identified in the Regional Airport System Plan.

Based on the airport service areas, population growth, aviation trends, and the character and nature of aviation facilities within the Monterey County and Santa Cruz County region, the plan forecasts the following developments:

- **Moderate increase in demand**: The growth of population in the region will moderately increase commercial and general aviation demand;
- **Capital Upgrades Needed**: Facilities are needed to support increased business and corporate travel demand. Runway extensions, minor land acquisition, additions of navigational aids, and development of new aircraft hangars are necessary to meet forecast demand.
- **No new commercial airport development required**: The quality of commercial passenger service at the Monterey Peninsula airport, and the proximity of San Jose International Airport will allow for airline service without the need for new commercial airport development. With availability for increased operations, the existing general public airports in the region could absorb aircraft from other regions if facilities are closed in those regions.
The roles and configuration of the system in Monterey County is expected to remain the same. Monterey Peninsula Airport will remain the sole commercial facility. Salinas and King City Municipal Airports will continue to provide agricultural operations.

Future airport development depends on the ability of an airport to cover development costs. The primary responsibility for financing rests with each airport. There are many sources of airport development funds, including FAA’s Airport Improvement Program (AIP), the California Department of Transportation, passenger facility charges, private donations, leasebacks, direct revenue loans, certificates of participation, and revenue and general obligation bonds. Capital improvements can also be financed from annual operating and tax revenues.

The county’s publicly owned airports are described in the sections that follow.

**Monterey County Airports**

There are four publicly-owned airports located in Monterey County:

- **Monterey Peninsula Airport (MPA)**
- **Mesa Del Rey Airport in King City**
- **Marina Municipal Airport**
- **Salinas Municipal Airport**

Passenger and general aviation air services are provided at Monterey Peninsula Airport. The airports at Salinas, King City (Mesa Del Rey), and Marina Municipal Airports are limited to general aviation. Public Airports in Monterey County are described in Table 4-3 below.

**Table 4-3: Description of Public Airports in Monterey County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Monterey Regional</th>
<th>Salinas</th>
<th>Marina</th>
<th>King City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Runways</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longest Runway (in feet)</td>
<td>7,598</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Landing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Tower</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled passenger service</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional airport surveillance radar</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner/operator</th>
<th>Airport District</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td>Primary Commercial Service</td>
<td>Regional-General Aviation</td>
<td>Community–General Aviation</td>
<td>Community–General Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Hub Business/Corporate</td>
<td>Business/Corporate</td>
<td>Av</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monterey Regional Airport

The Monterey Peninsula Airport is located in the central coastal area of Monterey County, three miles east of Monterey. The airport is owned and operated by the Monterey Peninsula Airport District, and is the only airport served by certified air carriers in Monterey County. The California Aviation System Plan classifies the Monterey Peninsula Airport as a primary commercial service airport of regional significance. The airport operates from 6:00 AM to 11:00 PM on a daily basis. The airport has its own independently elected board of directors.

Facilities and Services

The airport site consists of approximately 498 acres. The airfield operating area occupies the center of the airport and contains two runways; one for commercial jet operations and the other is a general aviation runway. The airport’s south area contains the passenger terminal, with related access and parking facilities, and three fixed based operators, serving commercial private jets. The Monterey Regional Airport is currently served by five airlines providing scheduled passenger service to San Francisco, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, Salt Lake City, Phoenix and Denver.

Ground Access

The regional transportation network that provides access to the Monterey Regional Airport includes US 101, State Route 68 and State Route 1, as well as the Blanco, Davis, Reservation and Imjin Parkway corridor between Salinas and State Route 1 in Marina. Regional access is also provided by Monterey-Salinas Transit. An airport limousine service and taxicabs also serve the airport. Much of the local hospitality industry provides its own shuttle services for guests. Transportation services at the airport are currently sufficient to accommodate demand.

Ground Access Improvement Program

The 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan supports development of the Monterey Regional Airport by expanding regional access. Strategies for enhancing ground access to this airport as part of the Ground Access Improvement Program include continued implementation of projects on the regional ground access network identified above, with a focus on State Route 68 between Salinas and Monterey, as well as development of transit service providing airport connections and continual evaluation of transit routes serving the airport.

Specific regional projects to be implemented as part of the Ground Access Improvement Program include the following:

- US 101 South County Freeway Upgrade
- US 101 Harris Road Interchange
- State Route 68 Commuter Improvements
- State Route 68 Corral De Tierra Intersection Improvements
- Marina-Salinas Corridor Widening
- Marina-Salinas Multimodal Corridor
- Monterey Branch Line Light Rail
Planning Activities
A comprehensive land use plan was adopted in 1987 for the Monterey Peninsula Airport influence area by the Monterey County Airport Land Use Commission. The Plan serves to alert land use agencies to potential future incompatible land uses in the areas adjacent to the airport.

The most recent master plan for the Monterey Peninsula Airport was updated in 1993. A new Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan were initiated in 2014.

Noise Mitigation
The Airport District has adopted the FAR Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Program that mitigates noise intrusion into surrounding communities. The noise program, like the land use plan, is designed to consider future incompatible land uses in the areas adjacent to the airport.

Salinas Municipal Airport
Facilities and Services
The Salinas Municipal Airport, owned by the City of Salinas, is located on the southeastern boundary of Salinas. This general aviation facility occupies 763 acres and has three runways serving single and twin-engine aircraft and helicopters, as well as an increasing number of turboprops and turbine-powered business jets. The airport has an air traffic control tower and a precision instrument approach system serving one of the runways. More than 40 individual buildings serve airport users, including a terminal building with a flight service station.

Planning Activities
An Airport Master Plan was prepared for Mesa Del Rey Airport in 1976, and has not been updated since that time.

Mesa Del Rey (King City) Airport
Facilities and Services
Mesa Del Rey Airport is owned and operated by the City of King City, and covers 214 acres on King City's north boundary within the city limits. There is no control tower so incoming and outgoing flights operate under visual flight rules. Terminal facilities include a service and maintenance hangar for the FBO (Fixed Based Operator), two storage hangars with a capacity for 18 aircraft, and uncovered tie-downs for an additional 58 aircraft. A radio station is used for homing. The airport meets general aviation requirements for the areas extending generally from the town of Greenfield on the north to town of San Lucas on the south.

Planning Activities
An Airport Master Plan was prepared for Mesa Del Rey Airport in 1976, and has not been updated since that time.

Marina Municipal Airport
The former Fritzche Army Airfield was part of the military operations at Fort Ord from the 1950s until the base’s closure in 1994. As an army airfield, it was primarily used by rotary-wing aircraft (helicopters). There were some fixed-wing operations by aircraft under 12,500 pounds gross landing weight and the airfield was used for approach training by U.S. Air Force tactical aircraft and U.S. Navy Aircraft.
Facilities and Services

Marina Municipal Airport occupies 845.5 acres of the former Fritzsche Army Airfield within the City limits of Marina. The facility includes approximately 100,000 square feet of hangar space, 70,000 square feet of hangar-related office/shop space, 50,000 square feet of other shop/office and storage area, and other flight-related facilities. The regional Airport Surveillance Radar, which services the major airports in the Monterey Bay region, is located at the airport. Since the departure of the military, private uses such as training, light industrial and recreational activities take place at the airport.

Planning Activities

The City of Marina initiated an update to the airport Master Plan in 2014.
Maritime Transportation

There are two coastal harbors in Monterey County:

- City of Monterey Harbor
- Moss Landing Harbor

The harbors primary function is to support activities related to commercial fishing and pleasure vessels. Shipping occurs mainly from seaports in San Francisco and Oakland. Combined, the harbors have 1,145 slips. Each slip may be used by one or more boats, and slips are filled to capacity a majority of the time. Access to the harbors is provided via Route 1.

In addition to these harbors, the Moss Landing Energy Plant maintains an offshore mooring facility for oil tankers located ¾ mile offshore. The tankers transport the fuel required to serve the electrical generating plant at Moss Landing. Highway access to the harbors is provided via Route 1.

The Monterey Bay currently does not have maritime passenger transportation services, and no plans are currently in place to study the feasibility of implementing passenger services. The long-term feasibility of ferry service between Santa Cruz, the Monterey Peninsula, and points in between would be limited by the sea conditions and current lack of competitiveness with auto travel times (about 45 to 60 minutes).
5. Environmental Documentation

This chapter presents an overview of the environmental review process conducted to determine the probable environmental impacts associated with adoption of the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan, including the projected greenhouse gas emissions associated with implementation of the plan.

Coordinated Environmental Review

As described elsewhere in this document, the Monterey Bay 2035: Moving Forward plan prepared by AMBAG and the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan are coordinated documents. The Regional Transportation Plan is used by AMBAG to prepare a combined plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Monterey Bay Area. These plans can be classified as a project under the California Environmental Quality Act requiring environmental review appropriate to the scope and nature of the document.

Recognizing an opportunity to achieve cost savings and streamline the environmental review process, AMBAG, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, the San Benito Council of Governments and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, elected to merge the environmental analysis for each of their respective long-range transportation plans into one analysis. A single Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has therefore been prepared by AMBAG for the Monterey Bay 2035: Moving Forward plan that includes the Regional Transportation Plans prepared in each county.

Notice of Preparation

AMBAG prepared and released a Notice of Preparation for the EIR in June, 2013. AMBAG held three scoping meetings on the EIR in Monterey County in July, 2013, which served as public workshops for the regional transportation plans and Sustainable Communities Strategy. The purpose of scoping meetings for the EIR was to collect public input on issues that the EIR should analyze. Input received at the scoping meetings and responses to the Notice of Preparation was incorporated into development of the environmental document.

Program Environmental Impact Report

The EIR has been prepared as a Program EIR (rather than a "project" EIR). Adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan represents a first step in qualifying projects identified in the document for state and federal funding. The plan does not provide project designs nor details relating to the site-specific alignment, location, and scheduling of the transportation projects. Adoption of this comprehensive planning document does not represent an approval action for any of the individual transportation programs and projects listed in the plan. Additional actions on the part of the agencies and jurisdictions responsible for implementation of individual programs and projects are necessary for projects to proceed.

The program EIR is, therefore, intended to focus on those probable regional environmental effects associated with the implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan that can be identified now, while deferring analysis of site-specific impacts. Further project-specific environmental review is necessary as projects are developed and proposed for funding. Subsequent project specific review is tiered-off of the program-level analysis prepared for the long-range plan.
More Information
The EIR is incorporated into the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan by reference. The reader is referred to the EIR for more information on potential regional, system-wide environmental effects associated with implementation of the plan. The report provides an evaluation of alternatives, identifies an environmentally superior alternative, and identifies potential impacts that could be significant and unavoidable. The Draft EIR is available for review on the AMBAG and Transportation Agency websites and copies can be obtained by contacting either AMBAG or the Transportation Agency.

Air Quality Conformity
AMBAG is responsible for determining that the combined transportation plan for the tri-county Monterey Bay Area conforms with the federally-mandated Air Quality Management Plan prepared by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District). Air quality planning and regional planning through growth projections are interdependent processes. AMBAG provides regional growth data to the Air District. The Air District regularly updates the Air Quality Management Plan based in part upon those regional projections. The Monterey Bay Area is classified as an attainment area for ozone precursors based on federal ozone standards. The region is in conformity with the State Implementation Plan for air quality and AMBAG is exempt from preparing a conformity analysis.
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Public Outreach
2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan

Public Outreach

Chapter 1 of the 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan describes the regional transportation planning process through which public outreach is sought on an ongoing basis to develop plans, programs and inform decision-making for transportation. The Monterey Bay Area Public Participation Plan adopted by AMBAG in 2011 serves as a guide for structuring public outreach into the long range planning process and identifies a menu of strategies to be employed to solicit public feedback.

Public outreach efforts undertaken to develop the Regional Transportation Plan are summarized below.

2013 Regional Development Impact Fee Program Update

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County established a regional impact fee program to mitigate the cumulative traffic impact of new development projects, which took effect in 2008. The program includes development and updating of a Nexus Study that identifies regional transportation projects to be funded through the program. Since projects funded through the program must be included in the Regional Transportation Plan, this study is updated on a regular schedule that is coordinated with preparation of the Plan.

Outreach undertaken by the Agency for the fee program was also used to guide development of a project list for the Regional Transportation Plan. This outreach included:

- Presentations to member jurisdictions and adoption of the program by each city and the County of Monterey.
- Coordination with member jurisdictions through public meetings of the Transportation Agency Technical Advisory Committee.
- Targeted meetings with South Monterey County jurisdictions to address comments on the program and fees collected on new development in this area specifically.
- Public meetings of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County Board of Directors.
- Posting of information about the program through the Transportation Agency website.

Public Meetings

Outreach to stakeholders, the public and member jurisdictions was undertaken through noticed public meetings of AMBAG and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County. Public presentations about preparation of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan were initiated in 2012 and meetings were scheduled to provide information and request actions at key
milestone points during development of the plan. Presentations and discussion about the plan were held with the following bodies:

**AMBAG Board of Directors**

Informational presentations about the coordinated planning process used to develop the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan were initiated by AMBAG in May, 2012 and continued through adoption of the AMBAG Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Sustainable Communities Strategy and coordinated EIR in June 2014. The reader is referred to the AMBAG website (www.ambag.org) for more information about this outreach process.

**Transportation Agency for Monterey County Board of Directors**

May 20, 2012: Overview of Transportation Plan Overview and Process
December 2012: Review of draft Regional Transportation Plan Policy Element
January 2013: Approval of Policy Element
February 2013: Approval of list of regionally significant projects
June 2013: Review of Planning Scenarios and transportation projects for the Sustainable Communities Strategy and Regional Transportation Plan; Review of Complete Streets project list; Review of Regional Transportation Plan public survey
August 2013: Approval of a project list for inclusion in the Sustainable Communities Strategy Preferred Scenario; Adoption of Complete Streets Guidebook
February 2014: Authorization to release Draft Regional Transportation Plan
March 2014: Noticed Public Hearing on the Draft 2014 Regional Transportation Plan
May 2014: Report on public comments received on the Draft 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan and Draft EIR during the public comment period.
June 2014: Adoption of 2014 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan and EIR

**Executive Committee**

May 2013: Discussion of Regional Transportation Plan public survey
August 2013: Review of Sustainable Communities Strategy Preferred Scenario
March 2014: Discussion of Draft Regional Transportation Plan
May 2014: Report on public comments received on the Regional Transportation Plan and Draft EIR

**Technical Advisory Committee**

November 2012: Discussion/feedback on financial assumptions and call for projects
January 2013: Review of Regional Transportation Plan update and Policy Element
February 2013: Review of Base Case Land Use Scenario for the Sustainable Communities Strategy
April 2013: Update of Regional Transportation Plan project list update; Review of Complete Streets assessment and Sustainable Communities Strategy
May 2013: Discussion of preliminary scenarios for the Sustainable Communities Strategy and Regional Transportation Plan
June 2013: Update on Complete Streets project list for Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy.
August 2013: Update on Draft Preferred Scenario for the Sustainable Communities Strategy and Regional Transportation Plan
March 2014: Update on draft Regional Transportation Plan

Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee
January 2013: Update on Regional Transportation Plan and Review of Policy Element
April 2013: Review of Complete Streets project list
May 2013: Review of Complete Streets project list
June 2013: Review of Complete Streets checklist
August 2013: Review of Complete Streets Guidebook
March 2014: Update on draft Regional Transportation Plan

MST Mobility Advisory Committee
August 2013: Review of Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan)
January 2014: Update on Regional Transportation Plan

Public Workshops
The following public workshops were held in Monterey County to solicit public input on the Sustainable Communities Strategy, Metropolitan Transportation Plan and transportation investments included in the Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan. These workshops also served as public scoping meetings for the coordinated Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared for these documents:
May, 2013: Public workshops on initial scenarios, land use and transportation investments for the Sustainable Communities Strategy
- Salinas
- Gonzales
- Seaside

July, 2013: Public workshops on revised, “hybrid” scenarios for the Sustainable Communities Strategy and transportation plans
- Monterey
- Greenfield
- Salinas

March, 2014: Public hearings on the final Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Sustainable Communities Strategy and transportation plans
- Monterey
- Greenfield
- Salinas

A wide range of groups were invited to, and participated in these workshops, including members of the general public, and representatives of disadvantaged communities and environmental interests.

**Telephone Survey**

The Transportation Agency conducted a preferences telephone survey on the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy from May 28 through June 6 of 2013. The survey provided valuable public input on preferences for transportation, investments, support for the sustainable communities strategy and funding for transportation. The survey results are included with this appendix.

**Other Direct Outreach**

In addition to public meetings, presentations and workshops, the Transportation Agency met directly with the following groups to present and review components of the Regional Transportation Plan during development:

- California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
- South County Outreach Effort (SCORE)
- Building Healthy Communities, Salinas – Complete Streets
- Salinas Chamber of Commerce
Monterey Bay Metropolitan Transportation Plan
Sustainable Communities Strategy
Priorities and Preferences Survey

Executive Summary of Findings
Prepared for Transportation Agency for Monterey County
June 26, 2013

EMC Research, Inc.
Contact: Ruth Bernstein and Sara LaBatt
436 14th Street, Suite 820
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 844-0680
EMC 13-4879
To assist AMBAG and the three local transportation agencies (Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito), a three-county voter survey was commissioned about priorities for funding and projects being considered for their long-range plans.

This survey is one of many public engagement tools being used in the development of these plans.
Methodology

- Telephone survey of registered voters in Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties
- Conducted May 28 to June 6, 2013
- Interviews conducted by trained, professional interviewers in English and Spanish

As with any opinion research, the release of selected figures from this report without the analysis that explains their meaning would be damaging to EMC. Therefore, EMC reserves the right to correct any misleading release of this data in any medium through the release of correct data or analysis.

Please note that due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Margin of Error</th>
<th>Weighted %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>±2.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>±4.6</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>±4.6</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>±5.7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall optimism appears to be on the rise.

Transportation continues to be a top-five concern, but it follows crime, education the economy, and water.

There is concern about protecting the environment, open space and agriculture – less specific concern about greenhouse gas emissions.

Few are interested in giving up their cars today, but many want long-term planning for change in the future.

Preliminary questions about a sales tax suggest moving forward with next steps in planning for a future measure.
Issue Environment
Optimism in the county appears to be on the rise

Do you think things in Monterey County are generally going in the right direction, or do you feel that things are pretty seriously off on the wrong track? (Q4)

---

**Graph**

- **Wrong Track**: 36% (2003), 35% (2004), 32% (2005), 34% (2007), 35% (2008), 31% (2013)
- **(Don't know)**: 18% (2003), 18% (2004), 22% (2005), 23% (2007), 24% (2008), 23% (2013)

---

Monterey County Voters EMC 13-4879
June 26, 2013
Crime is a top of mind concern in all three counties

What is the most important problem facing _____ County today? (Open-end—Top responses shown) (Q5)

- Santa Cruz
- Monterey
- San Benito

- Crime/gangs
  - Santa Cruz: 28%
  - Monterey: 20%
  - San Benito: 28%

- Water shortage
  - Santa Cruz: 6%
  - Monterey: 20%
  - San Benito: 3%

- Economy
  - Santa Cruz: 13%
  - Monterey: 11%
  - San Benito: 24%

- Education
  - Santa Cruz: 5%
  - Monterey: 7%
  - San Benito: 5%

- Traffic/Transportation
  - Santa Cruz: 10%
  - Monterey: 6%
  - San Benito: 4%

- Homeless population
  - Santa Cruz: 9%
  - Monterey: 1%
  - San Benito: 0%

- Don't know
  - Santa Cruz: 13%
  - Monterey: 17%
  - San Benito: 11%
Transportation continues to be a top 5 concern in Monterey; crime mentions are on the rise

What is the most important problem facing Monterey County today?
(Open-end—Top responses shown) (Q5)

- Crime/Gangs
- Water shortage
- Economy
- Education
- Traffic/Transportation
- Growth/Development

- 2003
- 2004
- 2005
- 2007
- 2008
- 2013

Monterey County Voters EMC 13-4879
June 26, 2013
In Monterey County, education and the economy are top priorities when rating issues that didn’t include crime and water.

For each of the following items, please tell me how high a priority that item should be for Monterey County. Use a scale of 1 to 9, where 1 means the lowest priority and 9 means the highest priority. (Q7-14)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>1 (Low priority)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Don't know)</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9 (Highest priority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving public education (Q7)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving job creation &amp; the economy (Q10)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the environment (Q12)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving safety on local roads &amp; highways (Q8)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing greenhouse gas emissions (Q14)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing affordable housing options (Q13)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing traffic congestion on local roads &amp; highways (Q9)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving local public transit (Q11)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Safety improvements continue to outrank traffic and transit concerns

For each of the following items, please tell me how high a priority that item should be for (Santa Cruz/Monterey/San Benito) County. Use a scale of 1 to 9, where 1 means the lowest priority and 9 means the highest priority. (Q7-14) (Mean Response)

MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Improving safety on local roads and highways (Q8)

Reducing traffic congestion on local roads and highways (Q9)

Improving local public transit (Q11)
Many think the transportation system in Monterey has improved

Thinking about the local transportation system, including roads, highways, bike paths, buses, and sidewalks; over the past two or three years, do you think the local transportation system has gotten better, worse, or stayed the same? (Q6)

- Better: 31%
- Same/(Don't know): 44%
- Worse: 25%
Travel Behaviors
Over half of Monterey County voters commute alone by car

Do you go to work, school, or a volunteer position outside of your home at least three times a week or not. (Q62)

58% are solo drivers

30% do not commute

12% not solo drivers

Less than 25 minutes, 1-way: 67%

25 minutes or more, 1-way: 33%

Carpool: 68%

Bicycle: 14%

Motorcycle: 9%

Bus: 5%

Walk: 4%

Do you go to work, school, or a volunteer position outside of your home at least three times a week or not.
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One-third of voters in the county frequently or occasionally walk as a form of transportation

I'm going to read you a short list of activities you might do, for each one, please tell me if you do it frequently, occasionally, rarely or not at all during a typical week. (Q67-71)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at all/(Don't know)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk for transportation (Q69)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommute, or work from home (Q71)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool or vanpool (Q70)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride a bicycle for transportation (Q67)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take public transit (Q68)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudinal Questions
Nearly all in the county agree that planning should continue to accommodate drivers

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement. (Q20-23, 26-28)

MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY

- We must accept that people need their cars to get around and should have long term planning in our area that accommodates drivers. (Q21)
  - Strongly agree: 60%
  - Somewhat agree: 31%
  - (Don't know)
  - Somewhat disagree: 9%
  - Strongly disagree: 16%

- Improving the roads and highways in our area is necessary to support our economy. (Q23)
  - Strongly agree: 50%
  - Somewhat agree: 38%
  - (Don't know)
  - Somewhat disagree: 13%
  - Strongly disagree: 9%

- It is necessary for the future of our economy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. (Q26)
  - Strongly agree: 48%
  - Somewhat agree: 27%
  - (Don't know)
  - Somewhat disagree: 13%
  - Strongly disagree: 9%

- We must accept that climate change is a problem and should have long term planning in our area that will result in people using cars less. (Q22)
  - Strongly agree: 40%
  - Somewhat agree: 33%
  - (Don't know)
  - Somewhat disagree: 10%
  - Strongly disagree: 16%
A majority also believe that we need long term planning to reduce car use

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement. (Q20-23,26-28)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

Fixing potholes and maintaining roads should be our highest transportation priority, even if it means putting off other transportation projects and improvements. (Q28)

Strongly agree: 37%  
Somewhat agree: 37%  
(Don't know): 2%  
Somewhat disagree: 16%  
Strongly disagree: 9%

It is necessary for the health of our community to reduce our reliance on cars. (Q27)

Strongly agree: 28%  
Somewhat agree: 37%  
(Don't know): 3%  
Somewhat disagree: 17%  
Strongly disagree: 16%

We need to drastically reduce our reliance on cars in our area, even if doing so is difficult for us today. (Q20)

Strongly agree: 25%  
Somewhat agree: 31%  
(Don't know): 5%  
Somewhat disagree: 18%  
Strongly disagree: 21%
Support for reducing reliance on cars is higher among Latinos

Do you agree or disagree: We need to drastically reduce our reliance on cars in our area, even if doing so is difficult for us today. (Q20)

MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>(Don't know)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (27%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Latino (73%)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. District 1 (11%)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. District 2 (20%)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. District 3 (12%)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. District 4 (21%)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. District 5 (35%)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for reducing reliance on cars is higher among women and younger respondents

Do you agree or disagree: *We need to drastically reduce our reliance on cars in our area, even if doing so is difficult for us today.* (Q20)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>(Don't know)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nearly half say they would drive a lot less if gas were significantly more expensive, and many others would drive less with other changes

I am going to read you a few different situations. For each of these situations, please tell me if you think it would make a difference in how much you drive a car. For each one, do you think you would drive a lot less, a little less or would it make no difference in how much you use a car? (Q73-82)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Drive a lot less</th>
<th>Drive a little less</th>
<th>No difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If gas cost more than six dollars per gallon (Q73)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there were more stores and services near your home (Q79)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you had to pay for parking, or if it cost more (Q75)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there was less expensive housing that you liked near your job (Q80)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there was better public transit (Q76)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At least 12% say they are very likely to drive less if changes take place

I am going to read you a few different situations. For each of these situations, please tell me if you think it would make a difference in how much you drive a car. For each one, do you think you would drive a lot less, a little less or would it make no difference in how much you use a car? (Q73-82)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Drive a lot less</th>
<th>Drive a little less</th>
<th>No difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If traffic gets worse (Q82)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there were more sidewalks (Q74)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there were more bike lanes (Q77)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there were safe places to store your bicycle (Q78)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your work hours were more flexible (Q81)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects and Programs
Street/Road Projects: Road safety and maintenance are high priorities in Monterey County

Now I’m going to read you a list of possible transportation projects in your area. For each of the following projects, please tell me whether you support or oppose the project, using a scale of one to nine where one means strongly oppose and nine means strongly support. (Q29-59)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

- Improving roads to make driving safer (Q34)
  - 1-4 Oppose: 7%
  - 5/(Don't know): 10%
  - 6: 9%
  - 7: 15%
  - 8: 13%
  - 9: 47%

- Maintaining roads and repairing potholes (Q33)
  - 1-4 Oppose: 8%
  - 5/(Don't know): 8%
  - 6: 8%
  - 7: 15%
  - 8: 16%
  - 9: 45%

- Widening Hwy-68 between Monterey and Salinas (Q49)
  - 1-4 Oppose: 17%
  - 5/(Don't know): 11%
  - 6: 6%
  - 7: 12%
  - 8: 12%
  - 9: 42%

- Widening Hwy-156 between Castroville and Prunedale including a new interchange at Hwy-101 (Q52)
  - 1-4 Oppose: 15%
  - 5/(Don't know): 12%
  - 6: 7%
  - 7: 15%
  - 8: 12%
  - 9: 39%

- Improving highways to reduce traffic and travel times (Q35)
  - 1-4 Oppose: 9%
  - 5/(Don't know): 14%
  - 6: 7%
  - 7: 19%
  - 8: 15%
  - 9: 35%

- Improving Hwy-101 South of Salinas to increase safety and reduce traffic (Q51)
  - 1-4 Oppose: 18%
  - 5/(Don't know): 15%
  - 6: 8%
  - 7: 13%
  - 8: 12%
  - 9: 34%
Now I’m going to read you a list of possible transportation projects in your area. For each of the following projects, please tell me whether you support or oppose the project, using a scale of one to nine where one means strongly oppose and nine means strongly support. (Q29-59)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

- **Making it easier and safer for people to walk to schools, stores, jobs, and other places (Q38)**
  - 1-4 Oppose: 12%
  - 5/(Don't know): 9%
  - 6: 6%
  - 7: 15%
  - 8: 11%
  - 9-Strongly support: 48%

- **Extending the walking and bicycling trail along the coast (Q53)**
  - 1-4 Oppose: 21%
  - 5/(Don't know): 12%
  - 6: 6%
  - 7: 14%
  - 8: 12%
  - 9-Strongly support: 35%

- **Expanding and improving bike lanes and bike paths (Q37)**
  - 1-4 Oppose: 18%
  - 5/(Don't know): 15%
  - 6: 8%
  - 7: 14%
  - 8: 12%
  - 9-Strongly support: 34%
Transit Projects: Improving transportation for seniors and those with disabilities is a high priority

Now I’m going to read you a list of possible transportation projects in your area. For each of the following projects, please tell me whether you support or oppose the project, using a scale of one to nine where one means strongly oppose and nine means strongly support. (Q29-59)

MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY

- Improving transportation for seniors and people with disabilities (Q29)
  - 6% oppose
  - 11% strongly oppose
  - 6% don't know
  - 14% support
  - 15% strongly support
  - 48% strongly support

- Adding new train service between Salinas and Silicon Valley (Q48)
  - 21% oppose
  - 15% strongly oppose
  - 6% don't know
  - 12% support
  - 13% strongly support
  - 33% strongly support

- Avoiding cuts to existing bus service (Q32)
  - 16% oppose
  - 15% strongly oppose
  - 9% don't know
  - 14% support
  - 14% strongly support
  - 32% strongly support

- Expanding opportunities for carpooling and vanpooling (Q36)
  - 13% oppose
  - 14% strongly oppose
  - 10% don't know
  - 19% support
  - 12% strongly support
  - 32% strongly support

- Adding commuter train service (Q31)
  - 24% oppose
  - 14% strongly oppose
  - 8% don't know
  - 11% support
  - 14% strongly support
  - 29% strongly support

- Expanding and improving bus service (Q30)
  - 14% oppose
  - 15% strongly oppose
  - 14% don't know
  - 16% support
  - 15% strongly support
  - 27% strongly support

- Building light rail to improve travel between the Mont. Peninsula and Cal State-Mont. Bay (Q50)
  - 33% oppose
  - 12% strongly oppose
  - 5% don't know
  - 14% support
  - 11% strongly support
  - 25% strongly support
Other Projects: Farmland preservation is important to county voters

Now I’m going to read you a list of possible transportation projects in your area. For each of the following projects, please tell me whether you support or oppose the project, using a scale of one to nine where one means strongly oppose and nine means strongly support. (Q29-59)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

1. Preserving farmland and agriculture (Q39)
   - 1-4 Oppose: 4%
   - 5/(Don't know): 6%
   - 6: 5%
   - 7: 9%
   - 8: 18%
   - 9-Strongly support: 57%

2. Preserving open space and wildlife habitat (Q40)
   - 1-4 Oppose: 9%
   - 5/(Don't know): 8%
   - 6: 4%
   - 7: 12%
   - 8: 19%
   - 9-Strongly support: 49%

3. Focusing housing near jobs and services to have neighborhoods where less driving is needed (Q41)
   - 1-4 Oppose: 16%
   - 5/(Don't know): 16%
   - 6: 12%
   - 7: 13%
   - 8: 12%
   - 9-Strongly support: 31%
Transportation Tax
61% conceptually support a transportation sales tax in Monterey

I would support a half-cent sales tax for transportation improvements in my county. (Q25)  
MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY

Monterey

- Strongly disagree: 25%
- Somewhat disagree: 12%
- (Don't know): 2%
- Somewhat agree: 29%
- Strongly agree: 32%
Two-thirds say they would support a sales tax measure after hearing all projects

(This question was asked after the list of projects in Q29-59) Many of the projects and programs we just discussed do not have adequate funding. With that in mind, would you vote yes to approve or no to reject a half-cent sales tax for The Transportation Agency for Monterey County, or TAMC, to support improvements to local transportation, with all money staying local? (Q61)

- Yes, approve: 66%
- Lean yes: 4%
- Lean no: 27%
- No, reject: 0%
- (Don't know): 0%
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Reactions to a tax are fairly consistent with previous data

### Monterey County Transportation Tax Measures: Polls and election results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Lean No</th>
<th>(Don't know)</th>
<th>Lean Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 Survey</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Election results</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Survey</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Survey</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Election results</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Concept (agree/disagree)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 After projects</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-thirds
Conclusions – Sustainability

- The vast majority of survey respondents drive alone and believe current transportation planning must accommodate use of cars.

- That being said, there is strong interest especially among younger residents, for long-term planning that will result in less use of cars in the future.

- Additionally, the survey identifies opportunities for greenhouse gas reduction with policies related to parking, land-use and walkability. Small gains are achievable and the community is willing.
Conclusions – Future Revenue Measure

- Survey results indicate continued interest in the community for: transportation safety, road maintenance, transportation for seniors, transit, and improving walkability.
- The level of support for a sales tax suggests moving forward with community building and planning for the possibility of a measure in 2014 or 2016.
- Additional research and political viability evaluation will need to be conducted.
APPENDIX B

Regional Transportation Plan Fund Estimate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCES</th>
<th>Assumptions/ Source Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Sales Taxes Used on Transportation</td>
<td>Includes funding estimates for Salinas Measure V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Developer Fees</td>
<td>Impact fees on new development projects. Fees currently collected in Salinas, Monterey, Gonzales, Marina, and Carmel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County General Funds for Transportation Projects</td>
<td>Based on information provided by jurisdictions on local revenues budgeted to transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORA CIP Fees &amp; Presidio (Monterey County)</td>
<td>Presidio fees collected are partially discretionary to military projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax (Highway User Tax)</td>
<td>Gas tax to escalate at 1.75% throughout the entire period of the Regional Transportation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 42</td>
<td>Left over Prop 42 funds is available in Pacific Grove for FY12/13, but this fund will no longer be available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Line Lease Revenue</td>
<td>Revenues generated from Monterey Branch Line property leases. Lease revenues will no longer be available once rail line service begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Developer Fees</td>
<td>Based on information provided by member jurisdictions on impact fee revenues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas Municipal Airport Revenues</td>
<td>Provided by the City of Salinas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Ad Revenue &amp; Interest</td>
<td>Provided by MST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Fares</td>
<td>Public transit fare revenue assumptions provided by MST. Revenue assumptions for Salinas Rail ($4 mill./year starting in 16/17, and $1 million for Monterey Branch Line service in 18/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit non-fare revenue</td>
<td>Provided by MST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Sales Tax</td>
<td>Provided by MST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act/LTF</td>
<td>Estimate developed by TAMC. Revenues generated from a 1/4 percent of retail sales tax, returned to county and allocated by TAMC. Funds designated for planning, bike &amp; ped projects and public transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 156 Toll Revenues</td>
<td>Toll revenues being studied to finance construction of the State Route 156 West Corridor project. Assumptions based on Tolling Traffic and Revenue Study Appendix, Revenue Schedule Tolling Plan D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2766</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District grants. Based on actual grant amount for 12/13. Regional funds divided between Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz Counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE REVENUE SOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Improvement Program match</td>
<td>$1,650 for FY 2012/2013 Statewide. Based on match of FAA grants. Assumptions: used annual average of last 8 years of funding ($47 Monterey County).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Aid to Airports program</td>
<td>Dedicated to all public use airports. $10,000 annually. $30K Monterey County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>Vehicle license fee revenue for statewide freeway tow truck programs. Based on FY 11/12 numbers: Monterey County: $241,224.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1 B</td>
<td>Bond revenues dedicated to transportation from 2006 California Prop 1B. Not anticipating future bond revenues. Fund estimate only includes funding programmed for projects. FY 12/13: $28,325,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE SOURCES</td>
<td>Assumptions/ Source Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways</td>
<td>Based on the $1 fee levied on registered vehicles in each county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>Average based on amount programmed in 2008 through 10-year SHOPP (2023); Funding in 2024-2035 is based on annual average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td>FY12/13 State Controller estimates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Interregional Share</td>
<td>Programmed projects, plus $10M/year average. Matching specific funding to projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Regional Share</td>
<td>Regional Improvement Program: Based on statewide 2012 Fund Estimate &amp; percent of program for each county; excluding Transportation Enhancement funds after 2014. Assumes no new Prop 1B program. Transportation Enhancements eliminated in MAP-21; Transportation Alternatives Program calculated under Federal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program</td>
<td>Based on funding levels for bicycle and pedestrian programs consolidated into the California Active Transportation Program. Calculated the 10% rural competitive portion using Rural Planning Assistance fund formula, and the 50% statewide competitive using population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FEDERAL TRANSIT REVENUE SOURCES**

**Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)**

| Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (5310)          | Federal Transit Administration Grants for transit and non-profit projects supporting needs of the elderly and people with disabilities. Includes funding formerly included in the New Freedoms grant program. Monterey County estimate based on population (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/5310.html). |
| Transit Planning Grants (5304)                                                 | Federal grant funding for transit planning. Based on an annual average of transit planning funds received over the last five years (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants_archive.html). |
| FTA Section 5305                                                               |                                                                                                                                                          |
| Intercity Bus (5311f)                                                          | Federal grant funds supporting projects that provide transportation between non-urbanized areas and urbanized areas that result in connections of greater regional, statewide, and national significance. $3.4 mil was available in fy 2011. Fund source for MST projects. Estimate provided by MST. |
| Metropolitan Planning (5303)                                                   | Use the AMBAG OWP total. AMBAG provides MST approximately $10k annually in this category.                                                              |
| Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grants (5309)                               | MST received a one time new starts grant in the amount of $33 million. Assuming the receipt of $75 million each for the TARC commuter rail project and for the Monterey Branch Line project. |
| Rural Area Formula Program (5311)                                              | Federal transit grants for transit service in rural areas. Based on 2012 apportionments. Expanded to include some funds formerly allocated through the Jobs Access Reverse Commute program. |
| Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)                                          | Available for area with population over 50,000. Estimates came from Chris Giglio, a consultant to Metro, from a chart made by FTA after MAP 21. Numbers are under the transit tab. Expanded to include some former Jobs Access Reverse Commute funding (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/5311/2012estimates.pdf). |
| Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Grants (5339)                                  | Estimate provided by MST.                                                                                                                                  |
| Federal Very Small Starts                                                      | Federal grant funds available for small fixed guideway projects. Included as funding source for a State Route 1 bus transit project.                     |

**FEDERAL HIGHWAY REVENUE SOURCES**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Sources</th>
<th>Assumptions/ Source Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Risk Rural Road (HR3)</strong></td>
<td>Estimate based on annual average of 5 years of awarded project list. (<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HR3/approved_project_lists.html">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HR3/approved_project_lists.html</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Bridge Program (HBP)</strong></td>
<td>Federal funding to replace or rehabilitate bridges. Estimate assumes annual average of awarded project list from FFY 12 to 15 (<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hbrr99/hbrr99a.html">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hbrr99/hbrr99a.html</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</strong></td>
<td>Federal funds for projects that improve safety on roads and highways. Some funding available for bike and pedestrian improvements. Estimate uses annual average of the HSIP funds over the last 5 year period under SAFETEA-LU (<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/prev_cycle_results.html">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/prev_cycle_results.html</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Scenic Byways Program</strong></td>
<td>Federal funds to develop National Scenic Byways projects. Estimate assumes annual average of Scenic Byways funds received during the 5 year period of SAFETEA-LU (<a href="http://www.bywaysonline.org/grants/funded/funded_report?report=summary_state&amp;format=html">http://www.bywaysonline.org/grants/funded/funded_report?report=summary_state&amp;format=html</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)</strong></td>
<td>Flexible source of discretionary funds for transportation projects. Funds for Monterey County are exchanged for state funding, so these funds are received as state funding. Included under federal category in the fund estimate to reflect source. Summary charts include these funds as state funds. Estimate based on apportionment forecast summary (<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/federal/rstp/rstp_est_2012_16.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/federal/rstp/rstp_est_2012_16.pdf</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Enhancements (TE) /Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)/ (to be discontinued)</strong></td>
<td>Programs eliminated and consolidated into California Active Transportation Program. Funds programmed to projects are reflected in baseline but not available in future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Federal Aviation Revenue Sources

| FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP) | Federal funding for airports. Estimate assumes annual average of FFA grants from Federal Fiscal Year 2006 to 2011. |
## 2014 Multnomah County Regional Transportation Fund: Plan Fiscal Year (FY) 2012/13 - 2024/25

### Table: Revenue Sources

<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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,096,940</td>
<td>$3,118,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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><strong>State and Local Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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><strong>Interstate, Federal, and Other Federal Aids</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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><strong>Tolls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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><strong>Other Non-Tax</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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><strong>Interest Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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><strong>In-Kind Contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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><strong>Lease Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>
### Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan: Fund Estimate (FY 2012/13 - 2034/35)

<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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Escalated (1.75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>

#### Federal Revenue Sources

<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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next Federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>8,133</td>
<td>10,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Surface Transportation Program (STP)</td>
<td>145,401</td>
<td>162,684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Rural and Bus Facilities Formula Grants (SB290)</td>
<td>44,080</td>
<td>53,112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Federal Very Small Starts</td>
<td>20,085</td>
<td>26,136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>

#### State Revenue Sources

<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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Bridge Program (SBP)</td>
<td>20,240</td>
<td>23,778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>8,694</td>
<td>10,101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>National Scenic Byways Program</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)</td>
<td>128,777</td>
<td>151,289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>

#### Domestic Revenue Sources

<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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP)</td>
<td>138,575</td>
<td>162,799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>

#### Total

<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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,133</td>
<td>10,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>
APPENDIX C

Regional Transportation Plan Project List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID No.</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT045-MA</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>SR 1 - Monterey Rd Interchange</td>
<td>Construct new interchange. (PM E8 R80.75/R83.27)</td>
<td>$25,935</td>
<td>$25,935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT015-CT</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>SR 3 - Widening Seaside to Sand City</td>
<td>Construct interchange and related local road improvements in the vicinity of Fremont Boulevard.</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT008-UM</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>SR2 Operational Improvements</td>
<td>Constructs one new northbound climbing lane between Rio Road and Carmel Valley Road, modifies intersections and enhances turn movements.</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MYC153-UM</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>SR 68 - Corral de Tierra</td>
<td>Install dual left-turn lanes on westbound Hwy 68, add a merge lane on southbound Corral de Tierra, add right-turn lane on northbound Corral de Tierra. (EA 05-OH823) (PM 12.8/13.2)</td>
<td>$2,860</td>
<td>$2,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT011-CT</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>SR 68 - Commuter Improvements</td>
<td>Widen existing roadway to 4-lanes between existing 4 lane segment at Toro Park and Corral de Tierra Road (MON 68-4.0/15.0).</td>
<td>$25,555</td>
<td>$25,555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MRY027-MY</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>SR 68/SR 1 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>Construct new roundabout at the interchange of SR 68 and SR 1.</td>
<td>$6,850</td>
<td>$6,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT017-CT</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>SR 68 - (Holman Hwy - access to Community Hospital)</td>
<td>Widen Holman State Route 68 Holman Highway to 4 lanes from Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula to State Route 1, make operational improvements at the SR 68 - SR 1 interchange and construct roundabout at hospital entrance. (EA 05-44800) PM 3.8/4.3</td>
<td>$26,620</td>
<td>$26,620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS006-SL</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>US 101 - Alvin Drive</td>
<td>Construct overpass/underpass and 4 lane street structure.</td>
<td>$13,325</td>
<td>$13,325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT030-SL</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>US 101 - Salinas Corridor</td>
<td>Widen US 101 to 6 lanes within the existing right of way at locations where feasible.</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS122-SL</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>US 101 - Sanborn Road/Elvee</td>
<td>Construct offramp and intersection improvements.</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT044-SL</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>US 101 - Harris Road Interchange</td>
<td>Construct new interchange on US 101 at Harris Road.</td>
<td>$57,662</td>
<td>$57,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT031-CT</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>US 101 - South County Frontage Roads</td>
<td>Construct Frontage Roads from Harris Road to Chualar, then to Soledad. (EA 05-OH380)</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-G0N015-CT</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>US 101 - Gloria Road Interchange</td>
<td>Construct interchange improvements at US 101 at Gloria Road</td>
<td>$39,503</td>
<td>$39,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SOL002-SO</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>US 101 - North Interchange</td>
<td>Install new interchange north of US 101 and Front Street.</td>
<td>$17,490</td>
<td>$17,490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SOL003-SO</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>US 101 - South Interchange</td>
<td>Install new interchange south of US 101 and Front Street.</td>
<td>$18,810</td>
<td>$18,810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-GRN008-GR</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>US 101 - Walnut Avenue Interchange</td>
<td>Relocate and replace existing US 101/Walnut Avenue Interchange and widen to six lanes. (EA 05-OI160) PM 53.4/54.3</td>
<td>$28,784</td>
<td>$28,784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-KCY006-CK</td>
<td>King City</td>
<td>US 101 - 1st Street Interchange (Lonoak Street I/C)</td>
<td>Extend San Antonio over railroad tracks from Lonoak to US 101/first Street Interchange. (PM R39.77)</td>
<td>$42,592</td>
<td>$42,592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT036-CT</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>SR 156 - West Corridor (Phase I)</td>
<td>Widen existing highway to 4 lanes and upgrade highway to Freeway status with appropriate interchanges. Interchange modifications at US 156 and 101. (EA 05-31600) PM R1.8/74.8</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT022-CT</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>SR156 - West Corridor (Phase II)</td>
<td>Construct interchange modifications at US 101 at State Route 156</td>
<td>$133,130</td>
<td>$133,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MYC147-UM</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>SR 156 - Blackie Road</td>
<td>Construct new road from Castroville Boulevard/SR 156 to Blackie Road</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SOL014-SO</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>SR 146 Bypass</td>
<td>Construct to 4 lanes from SR 146 (Metz Road) to Nestles Road. Install Class II bike facility.</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS050-SL</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Russell Road Widening</td>
<td>Widen Street from US 101 to San Juan Grade Road.</td>
<td>$3,078</td>
<td>$3,078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID No.</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Total Cost 2020</td>
<td>Total Cost 2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MAR001-MA</td>
<td>County, Marina, Caltrans</td>
<td>Marina-Salinas Corridor</td>
<td>Widens Davis Rd to 4 lanes from Blanco Rd to Reservation Rd, Construct new 4 lane bridge over the Salinas River, Widens Reservation Rd to 4 lanes from Davis Rd to existing 4 lane section adjacent to East Garrison at Intergarrison Road, Widens Imjin Pkwy to 4 lanes from Reservation Rd to Imjin Rd, construct new Imjin Parkway interchange at SR 1. Include accommodations for bicyclists, pedestrians and transit; consider highquality transit service along corridor.</td>
<td>$90,508</td>
<td>$90,508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MR002-MY</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Del Monte Corridor</td>
<td>Add eastbound lane from El Estero to Sloat Ave. Intersection improvements to Sloat Ave and Aguajito Ave including addition of left turn lanes and signal operations improvements.</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MYC181-UM</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>G12 Operational and Capacity Improvements</td>
<td>Operational and capacity improvements, including road widening, turning lanes, signalization and intersection improvements, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MST008-MST</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>Salinas-Marina Multimodal Corridor</td>
<td>Construct multimodal Bus Rapid Transit Improvements between Salinas and Marina, including a multimodal transit corridor through the former Fort Ord in Marina.</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MST011-MST</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>Salinas Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Construct Bus Rapid Transit improvements along Alisal Street and North Main Street.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MST015-MST</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>Transit Capacity for SR 1</td>
<td>Construct improvements to accommodate regional MST bus service on the SR 1 shoulders during peak travel periods.</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MST016-MST</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>South Monterey County Regional Transit Improvements</td>
<td>Increases the frequency of MST Line 23 service between King City and Salinas and constructs improvements along Abbott Street between US 101 and Romie Way in Salinas. Stops in King City, Greenfield, Soledad, Gonzales, Chualar and Salinas.</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-TAMC001-TAMC</td>
<td>TAMC</td>
<td>Monterey Branch Line Light Rail</td>
<td>Construct light rail transit using the existing 16 mile Monterey Branch Line between Monterey and Castroville adjacent to Highway 1. Phase 1 includes reconstruction of tracks, construction of stations, purchase of vehicles and operating costs for service between Monterey and Marina. Phase 2 includes reconstruction of tracks to connect to the planned commuter rail station in Castroville and include operating costs to Castroville and increased frequencies.</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-TAMC002-TAMC</td>
<td>TAMC</td>
<td>Monterey Branch Line Light Rail - Salinas River Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>Construct new rail bridge on the Monterey Branch Line over the Salinas River.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-TAMC003-TAMC</td>
<td>TAMC</td>
<td>Rail Extension to Monterey County</td>
<td>Extends existing rail service from San Jose to Salinas and constructs station improvements in Gilroy, Pajaro, Castroville and Salinas. Kickstart phase to be completed by 2020 will establish stops in Gilroy and Salinas with limited Salinas station improvements.</td>
<td>$135,710</td>
<td>$67,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-TAMC004-TAMC</td>
<td>TAMC</td>
<td>Amtrak Coast Daylight Rail Service</td>
<td>Establishes once daily Amtrak intercity rail service between downtown San Francisco and downtown Los Angeles.</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**: $1,475,114 $266,435 $1,208,679
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID No.</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Regional Grouped</td>
<td>Non-Regional Grouped Project Costs (Current Year; $1,000's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rail and Bus Rapid</td>
<td>$6,086 Transit New Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital, Rehab &amp;</td>
<td>$164,281 Capital, Rehab &amp; New Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48,375</td>
<td></td>
<td>$115,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$501,592 Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>$149,992</td>
<td></td>
<td>$351,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADA &amp; Mobility</td>
<td>$87,500 ADA &amp; Mobility Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$759,459 Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$228,953</td>
<td></td>
<td>$530,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Projects</td>
<td>$28,674 Highway Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Operations,</td>
<td>$758,840 Highway Operations, Maintenance and Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td>$210,877</td>
<td></td>
<td>$547,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$787,514 Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$239,547</td>
<td></td>
<td>$547,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Streets &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Expansion</td>
<td>$294,805 Capital Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,208</td>
<td></td>
<td>$159,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations,</td>
<td>$270,860 Operations, Maintenance &amp; Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td>$96,485</td>
<td></td>
<td>$174,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$565,665 Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$231,693</td>
<td></td>
<td>$333,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Transportation, Transportation Demand &amp; System Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>$737,360 Active Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$147,742</td>
<td></td>
<td>$589,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
<td>$5,250 Transportation Demand Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$1,670 Transportation Systems Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>$435</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$744,280 Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$149,677</td>
<td></td>
<td>$594,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airports</td>
<td>$87,875 Airports</td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,056</td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$87,875 Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,056</td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,944,793 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$865,256</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,079,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID No.</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Total Unconstrained Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT015-CT</td>
<td>SR 1 - Widening Seaside to Sand City</td>
<td>Widen SR 1 to six lanes from Fremont Boulevard to at least Canyon Del Rey and make interchange and related local road improvements in the vicinity of Canyon Del Rey.</td>
<td>$47,434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-CT016-CT</td>
<td>SR 68 - Bypass or Widening</td>
<td>Construct 4-lane bypass along Ft. Ord ROW or widen existing roadway to 4-lanes (MON-68-4.0/15.0).</td>
<td>$436,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MRY025-MY</td>
<td>SR 68 - SR 1 Overcrossing</td>
<td>Reconstruct Highway 1 overcrossing near Holman Highway.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-KCY020-CK</td>
<td>US 101 - Broadway Interchange</td>
<td>Install dual on and off ramps. (PM BB R41.17/EB R 41.20)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SOL004-SO</td>
<td>US 101 - Camphoria Interchange</td>
<td>Install new interchange at Camphoria-Gloria Street.</td>
<td>$35,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-MAR115-MA</td>
<td>Imjin Parkway full widening</td>
<td>Widen from 4 lanes to 6 lanes and construct turning lanes.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON-SNS001-SL</td>
<td>Westside Bypass</td>
<td>Construct 4-lane westside bypass around Salinas from Boranda to Davis Rd, including 4-lane Rossi St connector. Includes widening of Davis to 4 lanes from bypass connection to W Blanco Rd.</td>
<td>$50,472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unconstrained Non-Regional Grouped Costs**

### Highways
- **New Projects**
  - Highways
    - $109,707
- **Operations, Maintenance & Rehabilitation**
  - Highways
    - $164,515

### Local Streets & Roads
- **Capital Expansion**
  - Local Streets & Roads
    - $228,450
- **Operations, Maintenance & Rehabilitation**
  - Local Streets & Roads
    - $3,591,766
APPENDIX D

Regional Transportation Plan Checklist
By completing this checklist, the MPO/RTPA verifies the RTP addresses all of the following required information within the RTP.

### Regional Transportation Plan Contents

**General**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pg 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chap 2 Pg 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pg 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (MPOs only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Government Code Section 65584? (MPOs only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region? (MPOs only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Government Code Section 65080.01? (MPOs only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f. Consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581? (MPOs only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. Utilize the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors? (MPOs only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h. Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the ARB? (MPOs only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
i. Provide consistency between the development pattern and allocation of housing units within the region (Government Code 65584.04(i)(1)? (MPOs only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
j. Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Section 7506)? (MPOs only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Does the RTP include Project Intent i.e. Plan Level Purpose and Need Statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chap 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Does the RTP specify how travel demand modeling methodology, results and key assumptions were developed as part of the RTP process? (Government Code 14522.2) (MPOs only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultation/Cooperation**

1. Does the RTP contain a public involvement program that meets the requirements of Title 23, CFR part 450.316(a)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pg 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Did the MPO/RTPA consult with the appropriate State and local representatives including representatives from environmental and economic communities; airport; transit; freight during the preparation of the RTP? (23CFR450.316(3)(b))

3. Did the MPO/RTPA who has federal lands within its jurisdictional boundary involve the federal land management agencies during the preparation of the RTP?

4. Where does the RTP specify that the appropriate State and local agencies responsible for land use, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation consulted? (23 CFR part 450.322(g))

5. Did the RTP include a comparison with the California State Wildlife Action Plan and (if available) inventories of natural and historic resources? (23 CFR part 450.322(g))

6. Did the MPO/RTPA who has a federally recognized Native American Tribal Government(s) and/or historical and sacred sites or subsistence resources of these Tribal Governments within its jurisdictional boundary address tribal concerns in the RTP and develop the RTP in consultation with the Tribal Government(s)? (Title 23 CFR part 450.316(c))

7. Does the RTP address how the public and various specified groups were given a reasonable opportunity to comment on the plan using the participation plan developed under 23 CFR part 450.316(a)? (23 CFR 450.316(i))

8. Does the RTP contain a discussion describing the private sector involvement efforts that were used during the development of the plan? (23 CFR part 450.316(a))

9. Does the RTP contain a discussion describing the coordination efforts with regional air quality planning authorities? (23 CFR 450.316(a)(2)) (MPO nonattainment and maintenance areas only)

10. Is the RTP coordinated and consistent with the Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan?

11. Were the draft and adopted RTP posted on the Internet? (23 CFR part 450.322(j))

12. Did the RTP explain how consultation occurred with locally elected officials? (Government Code 65080(D)) (MPOs only)

13. Did the RTP outline the public participation process for the sustainable communities strategy? (Government Code 65080(E)) (MPOs only)

**Modal Discussion**

1. Does the RTP discuss intermodal and connectivity issues?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21-28; 35-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45-48,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5, 21-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programming/Operations

1. **Is a congestion management process discussed in the RTP? (23 CFR part 450.450.320(b)) (MPOs designated as TMAs only)**
   - N/A

2. **Is the RTP consistent (to the maximum extent practicable) with the development of the regional ITS architecture?**
   - Yes 55

3. **Does the RTP identify the objective criteria used for measuring the performance of the transportation system?**
   - Yes 12-13

4. **Does the RTP contain a list of un-constrained projects?**
   - Yes Appendix C

### Financial

1. **Does the RTP include a financial plan that meets the requirements identified in 23 CFR part 450.322(f)(10)?**
   - Yes Chapter 3; Appendix B

2. **Does the RTP contain a consistency statement between the first 4 years of the fund estimate and the 4-year STIP fund estimate? (2006 STIP Guidelines, Section 19)**
   - Yes 16

3. **Do the projected revenues in the RTP reflect Fiscal Constraint? (23 CFR part 450.322(f)(10)(ii))**
   - Yes 15-19; Appendix B

4. **Does the RTP contain a list of financially constrained projects? Any regionally significant projects should be identified. (Government Code 65080(4)(A))**
   - Yes Appendix C
5. Do the cost estimates for implementing the projects identified in the RTP reflect “year of expenditure dollars” to reflect inflation rates? (23 CFR part 450.322(f)(10)(iv))  Yes  Appendix C

6. After 12/11/07, does the RTP contain estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to operate and maintain the freeways, highway and transit within the region? (23 CFR 450.322(f)(10)(i))  Yes  Appendix B

7. Does the RTP contain a statement regarding consistency between the projects in the RTP and the ITIP? (2006 STIP Guidelines section 33)  Yes  16

8. Does the RTP contain a statement regarding consistency between the projects in the RTP and the FTIP? (2006 STIP Guidelines section 19)  Yes  16; Appendix B

9. Does the RTP address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the identified TCMs from the SIP can be implemented? (23 CFR part 450.322(f)(10)(vi) (nonattainment and maintenance MPOs only)  N/A

Environmental

1. Did the MPO/RTPA prepare an EIR or a program EIR for the RTP in accordance with CEQA guidelines?  Yes  64

2. Does the RTP contain a list of projects specifically identified as TCMs, if applicable?  N/A

3. Does the RTP contain a discussion of SIP conformity, if applicable? (MPOs only)  N/A

4. Does the RTP specify mitigation activities? (23 CFR part 450.322(f)(7))  Yes  DEIR

5. Where does the EIR address mitigation activities?  Exec. Summary

6. Did the MPO/RTPA prepare a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the RTP in accordance with CEQA guidelines?  No

7. Does the RTP specify the TCMs to be implemented in the region? (federal nonattainment and maintenance areas only)  N/A

I have reviewed the above information and certify that it is correct and complete.

(Must be signed by MPO/RTPA Executive Director or designated representative)  March 7, 2014

Debra L. Hale  Executive Director  Print Name  Title