

Sunday, March 22, 2026

Barry Jones' Comments/questions relating to State Route 68 Corridor Status report to TAMC Board : March 25, 2026

I have compiled some comments and questions that I would like Board members to consider and/or ask TAMC staff about, and receive detailed answers, during the presentation.

The following relates to the various sections of the Report.

Recommended Action

- Is this purely a “Receive Status Report” item/paper... or is it actually requesting any decisions/permission to continue as intimated?
- There is also a “State Route 68 Salinas to Monterey Multimodal Corridor” Project Fact Sheet that has been published
 - What is the relationship of the 2 ie. this Report and Fact Sheet?

SUMMARY

- This Report seems to only focus on the Adaptive Signal Installation and the Phase 1 , 3 roundabouts ... please confirm.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

- The stated proposed 3 roundabout costs \$69.6m.
 - Does the \$69..6m include cost of land acquisition?
 - Under which specific SB1 programs will TAMC/Caltrans apply for the \$57m noted ?
 - If the SB1 grant is successful ..is it expected that the \$12.6 balance will come from Measure X funds...and where will funds come from if the project costs exceed the budget?

- If the SB1 grant application is not successful..will there be a request for Measure X to fill the void?.. ie the entirety of the project cost?

DISCUSSION

- “intended to address traffic issues without adding capacity” ... is surely a fundamental intention that is misguided...as it is only possible to get a finite volume of traffic through a single lane carriageway.. irrespective of what type of intersection controls are implemented.

Adaptive Traffic Signal Project

- The conflict point positioning is skewed especially when considering two lane roundabouts..there is weaving involved prior and after the roundabouts, and uncertainty as drivers exit, as to who lane they should be in.
- In addition roundabouts depend on drivers yielding, rather than obeying legal traffic signals ie. jumping or trying to “beat the lights”. The use of ANPR cameras ,drastically reduces the number of collisions at traffic signals ... reference many papers following the AB645 implementations throughout California and other states.
- I would welcome the Board asking for specific information to be supplied by MioVision directly, relating to the statements in the report about maintenance costs, wait times, and operations during power outages
- Has “training “been completed...this paper is dated 25 March 2026
- What is the length of the “after study”... the report is intimating that the adaptive operations will be optimized in May...but surely a 12 month study is required to determine/evaluate seasonal , weather, tourist and Laguna Seca Raceway/Car week event flows before decisions to spend monies on ROW and construction.

Phase 1 Roundabout Project

- “Caltrans anticipates using the hybrid roundabout design...” surely it is now past the “anticipation stage”.. they are already way down the design process.
- From a highway design viewpoint the Holman/ Pebble roundabout layout is not a comparable implementation either in through or cross traffic volumes...issues that need to be considered.

- For clarification...does “ready for listing”...mean “going out to tender for construction bids” ?
- “ Lost time” is a very debatable concept....given that the AI Adaptive ensures more optimized flows and will provide the best possible solution throughout the corridor for any given set of traffic flows/conditions at any time.
- There seems to be a lot of “fluffy” wording in this section...”slightly increase travel times..” ..”often avoids complete stops..” ..”roundabouts along the corridor are expected to reduce queues...” Surely we need to have actual facts to support these claims on what the impact will be on this actual corridor.

Benefit-Cost Analysis for Phase 1 Roundabouts

- GHD are doing both the “ before and after study” for the Adaptive Installation.....and also the benefit-cost study...any conflict of interest here?
- It will be very positive to receive the detailed collision analysis for the past 5 years.
- What are the dates for the submission of the Benefit - Cost analysis and also the Qualitative Analysis (QA) and which company will be carrying out the QA?
- “Addition of a bridge widening”...this is mentioned in the increased costs area... which bridge is being referred to?
- March 2026 \$69.6m “all-inclusive cost estimate”...does this include contingencies for over spend or possible unforeseen increases?

NEXT STEPS

- ROW acquisition is a focal point for the project delivery team”....what are the expected challenges...increased land values compared to predicted values??
- Benefit- Cost Analysis presentation to TAMC Board ..May or June. This is such a key issue for the Board and public... I would suggest that the presentation and related documents should be circulated at least one week before the meeting.

Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor plan

- Surely the Multimodal plan needs to be prepared and reviewed before the TAMC Board May or June meeting, when decisions will be made re: going forward with the SB1 Grant application...not “providing draft report in late summer followed by public community engagement” ..this really seems very strange.!!!

- Why the difference when comparing with the State Route 68 Salinas to Monterey Multimodal Corridor Project Fact Sheet.... which states

- Construction costs:

- Scenic Route 68 Ph 1. \$57m
- Toro Park Trail \$4.025m
- Zero Emission Buses \$3m
- Total \$64.025m

BOTTOM LINE..

- This feels like project creep/adjustment to race ahead and support an SB1 grant application that is not solid enough to stand on its own merits.
- The Toro Park trail has been added
- In addition...Out of the blue, we now see that 2 Zero emission buses will be purchased...can anyone provide details about how this will specifically impact traffic flows ...indeed what level of schedule can 2 buses provide for the Salinas.Monterey commute...what is the route and will that be one per hour in each direction or what?
- Does the Board truly believe these fulfill the criteria for a MultiModal Corridor when many other projects throughout the State have widely more deserving projects seeking funds?

As Always.... Many Thanks to those of you who read this and are prepared to ask the searching questions on behalf of the Public

Barry Jones