AGENDA

Complete agenda packets are on display at the Transportation Agency for Monterey County office and at these public libraries: Carmel, Monterey, Salinas Steinbeck Branch, Seaside, Prunedale, and King City. Any person who has a question concerning an item on this agenda may call the Transportation Agency office to make inquiry concerning the nature of the item described on the agenda. Please recycle this agenda.

1. **ROLL CALL:** Call to order and self-introductions. Committee bylaws specify that a quorum shall consist of a majority (6) of the number of voting memberships actually filled at that time (11); the existence of any vacancies shall not be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum. *If you are unable to attend, please contact the Transportation Agency. Your courtesy to the other Committee members to assure a quorum is appreciated.*

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS:** Any member of the public may address the Committee on any item not on the agenda but within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Each member of the public is allotted with three minutes to address any concerns. Comments on items on today’s agenda may be given when that agenda item is discussed.

**BEGINNING OF CONSENT AGENDA:** Approve the staff recommendations for items 3.1 to 3.2 below by majority vote with one motion. Any member may pull an item off the Consent Agenda to be moved to the end of the **CONSENT AGENDA** for discussion and action.

**3.1 APPROVE** minutes of Committee meeting January 8, 2014.

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA**
4. PROVIDE INPUT on the draft Regional Surface Transportation Program 2014 Guidelines and Policies.

The Transportation Agency periodically programs Regional Surface Transportation Program funds to local projects. Staff presented a proposal for distributing the funds via fair-share and competitive grants to the Technical Advisory Committee. After receiving comments, staff is seeking policy direction from the Executive Committee on the draft guidelines.

5. Monterey County Bike Week – Cook
   1. RECEIVE report from Bike Week subcommittee on recommendations for Bike Week in 2014; and
   2. PROVIDE direction to staff on proposal for Monterey County Bike Week.

Bike Week is a national campaign held annually in May to promote bicycling as transportation. At its January meeting, the Committee formed a subcommittee to discuss recommendations for undertaking Bike Week activities in 2014. The subcommittee, which met on January 30, will report to the committee on its recommendations.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS and/or COMMENTS from Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee members on bicycle and pedestrian related items that are not on the agenda. No Enclosure

7. ADJOURNMENT.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Next Committee meeting:
Wednesday, March 5, 2014
Transportation Agency for Monterey County Conference Room
55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, California 93901
*Light refreshments will be provided*

If you have any items for the next agenda, please submit them to:
Andy Cook, Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator
By Thursday, February 20, 2013
andy@tamcmonterey.org
Documents relating to an item on the open session that are distributed to the Committee less than 72 hours prior to the meeting shall be available for public inspection at the office of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, 55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, CA. Documents distributed to the Committee at the meeting by staff will be available at the meeting; documents distributed to the Committee by members of the public shall be made available after the meeting.

Transportation Agency for Monterey County
55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas, CA 93901-2902
Monday thru Friday
8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
TEL: 831-775-0903
FAX: 831-775-0897

The Committee Agenda will be prepared by Agency staff and will close at noon February 20, 2013 nine (9) working days before the regular meeting. Any member may request in writing an item to appear on the agenda. The request shall be made by the agenda deadline and any supporting papers must be furnished by that time or be readily available.

If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Individuals requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, may contact Transportation Agency at 831-775-0903. Auxiliary aids or services include wheelchair accessible facilities, sign language interpreters, Spanish Language interpreters and printed materials, and printed materials in large print, Braille or on disk. These requests may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting, and should be made at least 72 hours before the meeting. All reasonable efforts will be made to accommodate the request.

CORRESPONDENCE, REPORTS, MEDIA CLIPPINGS
This agenda with all attachments is available online at http://tamcmonterey.org/committees/bpc/meetings.html

Correspondence
None this month.

Reports, Meetings, Announcements and Publications

R1 People for Bikes & Alliance for Walking and Biking. Bike Lanes Mean Business.

Media Clippings
None this month.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Members</th>
<th>APR 13</th>
<th>MAY 13</th>
<th>JUN 13</th>
<th>AUG 13</th>
<th>SEP 13</th>
<th>OCT 13</th>
<th>NOV 13</th>
<th>JAN 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Petersen, District 1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.L. Johnson, District 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Wriedt, District 4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Lindenthal, District 5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin Meheen, Carmel-By-The Sea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Ragsdale-Cronin, Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Meehan, Monterey</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Roehl, Pacific Grove</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Alan Hedegard, Salinas, Vice-Chair</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Yenovkian, Seaside</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Craft, MBUAPCD</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Cappelli, Velo Club of Monterey (Robin Harness)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Garcia, FORA (Jim Arnold)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. County Recreation &amp; Park District - Vacant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non Voting Members**

| James Serrano, Salinas Public Works                                           | -      | -      | -      | -      | P      | -      | -      |        |
| Patricia Lopez, County Public Works (Oga Carranza)                            | -      | -      | P      | -      | -      | -      | -      |        |
| Adam Fukushima, Caltrans - District 5                                         | -      | -      | -      | -      | -      | -      | -      |        |
| Sasha Tepedelenova, AMBAG                                                     | -      | -      | -      | -      | -      | -      | -      |        |
| Kevin Cole, Pebble Beach Company                                              | P      | -      | P      | E      | P      | E      | -      |        |
| Megan Tolbert – CSUMB                                                         | -      | P      | P      | E      | P      | P      | P      | P      |
1. Chairman Eric Petersen called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. A quorum was established and self-introductions were made.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
   Chairman Eric Petersen announced that Committee member Phil Yenovkian was injured while riding his bike and distributed a get well card from the Committee.

3. **BEGINNING OF CONSENT AGENDA**
   
   **M/S/C**  
   Johnson / Craft / Unanimous
   Abstain: Meheen, Henderson and Roehl
   
   **3.1** Approved minutes of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee meeting of November 6, 2014.
   
   **3.2** Received report on proposed federal bicycle and pedestrian legislation.

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA**
4. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT 2% GRANT PROGRAM

The Committee provided input on a strategy for allocating Transportation Development Act 2% program funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects, as well as draft guidelines for the next competitive Regional Surface Transportation Program funding allocations.

Andy Cook, Senior Transportation Planner reported that the Transportation Agency manages the Transportation Development Act 2% program, which provides local funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects of regional significance. He noted that eligible projects under this program include planning and construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and bicycle outreach, events and safety education. In the last funding cycle, the Committee recommended that funds be allocated to two major projects sponsored by the County of Monterey which have not been completed: the Moss Landing segment of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail and the Castroville railroad crossing project. Staff expects that both of these projects will be fully funded through other sources.

Mr. Cook noted that staff is now preparing to allocate discretionary funds available through the Agency, which include TDA 2% program and Regional Surface Transportation Program funds. The latter program is a flexible fund source that the Agency allocates to member jurisdictions through a formula based “fair share” allocation and a competitive allocation. Agency staff estimates that $7.2 million will be available through the competitive allocation for the next funding cycle. In the next funding cycle, staff is recommending that the Agency allocate TDA 2% funds through the Regional Surface Transportation Program call for projects to implement “complete streets” projects and maximize funding available for bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Mr. Cook explained that a review panel would be organized to assist in scoring project applications, which will include members of the Technical Advisory Committee and Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee.

Comments made by the committee included a recommendation that the application guidelines prioritize projects that fill gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian network and expressed a desire to allocate funding to more small projects instead of a few large, expensive ones. The following Committee members volunteered to serve on the application review panel:

- Eric Petersen
- D.L. Johnson
- Devin Meheen
- Megan Tolbert

5. BIKE WEEK ACTIVITIES IN 2014

The Committee discussed Bike Week activities in 2014.

Andy Cook reported that the Transportation Agency funded and coordinated a Monterey County Bike Week public awareness campaign trough 2012, which was timed to coordinate with National Bike Week. As follow-up from past committee action requesting that a plan be prepared for undertaking Bike Week campaigns in the future, staff requested input from Committee on activities to promote as part of a possible campaign in May, 2014. Mr. Cook noted that the Agency could allocate limited funding to promote or fund a campaign this year, with the expectation that activities would be organized and undertaken by volunteers, and that resources could be made available to print posters and promote events.
The Committee had the following comments for Bike week activities in 2014:

- Find sponsors in the bicycle industry
- Consider getting more schools involved
- Provide a Bike to School Day resource guide and giveaway prizes to schools
- Consider funding for family-oriented events, such as Ciclovia, during Bike Week
- Consider more television advertising
- Recruit CSUMB students to volunteer for campaign activities or participate as part of a capstone project
- Advertise Bike to Work day
- Consider putting together a Bike Week packet for employers
- Consider hiring Mary Lynch to advertise Bike Week

The following Committee members volunteered to serve on the planning for 2014 Monterey County Bike Week subcommittee:

- Eric Petersen
- Susan Ragsdale-Cronin
- Alex Cappelli
- Megan Tolbert

Mr. Cook agreed to schedule and host the subcommittee meeting.

6. BICYCLE FRIENDLY COMMUNITY APPLICATION

The Committee discussed possible candidates for the League of American Bicyclists 2014 Bicycle Friendly Community application.

Andy reported that the League of American Bicyclists’ Bicycle Friendly Community designation recognizes local communities nationwide that are prioritizing implementation of bicycle infrastructure and safe bicycling policies and programs. Since the program’s inception in 2004, the League has received more than 600 applications and awarded more than 280 communities with Bronze, Silver, Gold or Platinum designations. He noted that the designation lasts for four years, after which communities must reapply to renew their designation level or seek an enhanced designation. He noted that the next deadline for applications to receive this designation is February 19, 2014. Mr. Cook requested that the Committee provide input on possible nominations in Monterey County.

Megan Tolbert suggested that South Monterey County cities may be good candidates for the program.
7. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND/OR COMMENTS**

Committee member D.L. Johnson announced that he is an avid hiker and mentioned there should be a trail map to better assist those who are not familiar with trails in Monterey County. Megan Tolbert added that Trails.com is a good resource and announced that the Monterey County Business Council convenes an Ecotourism committee, which could be an appropriate forum for vetting that idea. David Craft suggested that Google Earth could be upgraded with trail imagery.

Mr. Johnson commented that he had volunteered to recommend locations for bike racks in Carmel by-the-Sea for a city-sponsored project funded through a grant from TAMC, but that had not yet provided any information to the City staff. He suggested that the committee’s Carmel by-the-Sea representative provide input to the City.

Committee member Chris Flescher announced that San Francisco Sunday Streets will be starting in March, 2014 and that 10 events will be scheduled through October.

David Craft remarked that 50% of trips in Groening, Netherlands are made by bicycle.

Committee member Megan Tolbert announced that Agency staff will be presenting on the planned Salinas-Marina Multi Modal Corridor at CSUMB on February 5, 2013.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Petersen adjourned the meeting at 7:05pm
Memorandum

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
From: Michael Zeller, Senior Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: February 5, 2014
Subject: Regional Surface Transportation Program Guidelines

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
PROVIDE INPUT on the draft Regional Surface Transportation Program 2014 Guidelines and Policies.

SUMMARY:
The Transportation Agency periodically programs Regional Surface Transportation Program funds to local projects. Staff presented a proposal for distributing the funds via fair-share and competitive grants to the Technical Advisory Committee. After receiving comments, staff is seeking policy direction from the Executive Committee on the draft guidelines.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The three-year estimated funding of Regional Surface Transportation Program for fiscal years 2014/15/16 is $3.6 million for fair share and $7.2 million for competitive grants.

DISCUSSION:
The Surface Transportation Program is a federal program that provides states and local jurisdictions with funding for highway improvements, street rehabilitation and transportation enhancements. The Transportation Agency receives an annual apportionment of Regional Surface Transportation Program funding, passed through the State. Because Monterey County didn’t have an urbanized area with a population of greater than 200,000 in the 1990 census, it qualified for the state exchange Surface Transportation Program, whereby Caltrans keeps the federal Surface Transportation Program apportionments for a region and gives the regional agency an equivalent amount of state cash.

The Transportation Agency historically has distributed Regional Surface Transportation Program funding through fair-share and competitive programs. Monterey County and the cities receive fair-share Regional Surface Transportation Program funds based on their urbanized populations. The total fair share allocation over the next three years is estimated to be $3.6 million (see Attachment 1). The County of Monterey also receives an additional estimated $725,000 annually in Regional Surface Transportation Program funding directly from the state for the management of county roads.
The Transportation Agency also distributes part of the Regional Surface Transportation Program funding on a competitive basis to transportation projects based on a variety of criteria, including traffic volume and project deliverability. This process in the past has involved the release of grant materials by the Transportation Agency, and the Technical Advisory Committee establishing a subcommittee to review and rank project proposals (see Attachment 2). The estimated three-year total available for grant funds is $7.2 million.

In recent years, Regional Surface Transportation Program has been on hold, as the available funding has been used to complete the construction of the US-101 San Juan Road interchange project. The amount used for this project was $15.6 million, equivalent to just over four years of total funding. With the interchange project nearing completion, the Transportation Agency is seeking to begin a new funding cycle, as described above.

Transportation Agency staff provided an update at the January meetings of the Executive and Technical Advisory Committees on the guidelines (see Attachment 3). As discussed at these meetings, the draft guidelines and policies were developed by staff for alignment with Board direction that sources of discretionary funding be used to deliver projects of regional significance that improve safety and support the development of a multimodal transportation network utilizing the principles of Complete Streets.

The split of the funding between fair share and competitive serves the purpose of providing the jurisdictions a set amount of fair share funding over three years to fund transportation related projects, including maintenance, that meet the program criteria, while allowing all jurisdictions the opportunity to fund larger projects through the competitive program. The design of the competitive program also gives the Transportation Agency the ability to ensure that projects of a regional nature, which could potentially span jurisdictions, receive funding and that the Board maintains discretion in the projects that receive funding from the Agency.

After presenting the proposed 2014 guidelines and policies to the January Technical Advisory Committee meeting, staff received comments from the County of Monterey and the City of Salinas as to the distribution of fair share and competitive funding:

- All proposed funding should be made available as fair share or to increase the fair share amount. This action would eliminate or reduce the competitive program.
- The competitive grant application should provide more points for maintenance projects. Previous grant applications also provided no additional points for maintenance projects, as the jurisdiction’s fair share allocation could be used.

Staff provided the Technical Advisory Committee members until January 23rd to submit all comments on the guidelines. Staff will review these comments with the Executive Committee and discuss policy options for the Regional Surface Transportation Program.

Approved by: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director  
Date signed: 1/21/14

Regular Agenda
Counsel Approval: N/A
Admin/Finance Approval: N/A

Attachment: 1) RSTP Fair-Share Distribution  
2) RSTP Competitively Funded Projects  
3) Draft 2014 Regional Surface Transportation Guidelines
## Attachment 1: Regional Surface Transportation Program Fair-Share Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Total Population</th>
<th>Annual Allocation</th>
<th>3-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmel-by-the Sea</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>$10,747</td>
<td>$32,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>$4,692</td>
<td>$14,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>8,296</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>$23,619</td>
<td>$70,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>16,729</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>$47,628</td>
<td>$142,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>13,073</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>$37,219</td>
<td>$111,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>20,073</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>$57,148</td>
<td>$171,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>28,252</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>$80,434</td>
<td>$241,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>15,268</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>$43,468</td>
<td>$130,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>153,215</td>
<td>36.35%</td>
<td>$436,205</td>
<td>$1,308,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>$962</td>
<td>$2,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>33,312</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>$94,840</td>
<td>$284,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>25,430</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>$72,400</td>
<td>$217,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>102,085</td>
<td>24.22%</td>
<td>$290,638</td>
<td>$871,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>421,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population**: January 1, 2013 Department of Finance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>(Imjin Road) California Ave.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Ragsdale To 218 Improvement</td>
<td>$470,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>MST Transit Village</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Lupine - Pedestrian enhancements - Front St. &amp; East Alisal.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Tynan - Pedestrian enhancements- Front St. &amp; East Alisal.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>68 Ragsdale</td>
<td>$590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>ITS Completion</td>
<td>$123,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>Fremont Blvd.</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>E. Market St. Overlay</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Marina/FOR A</td>
<td>12 St. Realignment</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Abbott St Rehab</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sandholt Rd Bridge #112</td>
<td>$535,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Hall Rd. / Los Lomas Dr. Signal</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>US-101 &amp; Front St. NB off-ramp</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Monterey/MST</td>
<td>Lighthouse traffic flow</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>P.G. Rec Trail Repair</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>San Miguel Cyn. Rd. Bridge Widening</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Carmel</td>
<td>Junipero Ave. ( Ocean &amp; 8th)</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>King City</td>
<td>First St Reconstruction</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>King City</td>
<td>First St Reconstruction</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Monterey/MST</td>
<td>Foam and Drake Signal Project</td>
<td>$266,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Moss Landing Harbor District</td>
<td>Moss Landing Coastal Trail</td>
<td>$73,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>North Fremont / Del Monte / Lighthouse Signals</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>Fremont Blvd improvements</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Bus Route Preservation Program</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>N. Main St rehabilitation &amp; signal modifications</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>TAMC</td>
<td>Holman Hwy / CHOMP intersection improvements</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Arroyo Seco Rd bridge replacement</td>
<td>$565,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>Speed Zone Changes</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>TAMC</td>
<td>Carmel Hill and River Trail Corridor</td>
<td>$139,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Pedestrian Enhancemt Project - Hartnell Gulch Walkway Project</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Gateway Apartments</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Cynara Court</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the Regional Surface Transportation Program?
The Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) was established by California State Statute utilizing Surface Transportation Program Funds that are identified in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code. The State of California allows smaller Counties to exchange their apportionment of federal RSTP funds for State Highway Account funds, which are easier for local agencies to use for transportation with less stringent paperwork than with federal funds.

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) distributes these funds to local agencies as part of its responsibilities as a Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

The RSTP program generates approximately $4 million annually for transportation projects in Monterey County.

Project Eligibility
RSTP funding is eligible for a wide variety of transportation projects. In general projects must meet the criteria in Sections 133(b) and 133(c) of Title 23 of the United States Code (USC) and Article XIX of the State Constitution (Appendix A). Projects eligible for funding from the RSTP include:

- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements on
  - Federal-aid highways (i.e., on any highways, including NHS and Interstate Highways that are not functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors).
  - Bridges (including bridges on public roads of all functional classifications), including any such construction or reconstruction necessary to accommodate other transportation modes, and including the seismic retrofit and painting of and application of calcium magnesium acetate on bridges and approaches and other elevated structures.
- Mitigation of damage to wildlife, habitat, and ecosystems caused by a transportation project funded under RSTP.
- Capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under the Federal Transit Act and publicly owned intracity or intercity bus terminals and facilities.
- Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, and bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways on any public roads in accordance with Section 217 of Title 23, U.S.C.
- Highway and transit safety improvements and programs, hazard elimination, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife, and railway-highway grade crossings. Safety improvements are eligible on public roads of all functional classifications.
- Highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs.
- Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management and control facilities and programs.
- Surface transportation planning programs
- Transportation enhancement activities.
- Transportation control measures listed in Section 108 (f)(1)(A) (other than clauses xii & xvi) of the Clean Air Act.
- Development and establishment of management systems under Section 303 of Title 23, U.S.C.
- Wetlands mitigation efforts related to RSTP projects.

**Funding Levels**
The following table shows the total amount of RSTP funding apportioned to TAMC since Fiscal Year 1991/92 (as of November 2013):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Apportionment</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Flood Repair Reimbursement</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91-92, 92-93</td>
<td>$2,858,528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,858,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93/94</td>
<td>$2,423,472</td>
<td>$155,272</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,578,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/95</td>
<td>$2,817,633</td>
<td>$174,030</td>
<td>$423,000</td>
<td>$3,414,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95/96</td>
<td>$1,987,659</td>
<td>$174,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,161,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96/97</td>
<td>$2,270,101</td>
<td>$232,429</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,502,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/98</td>
<td>$2,449,175</td>
<td>$309,011</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,758,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98/99</td>
<td>$2,864,522</td>
<td>$319,221</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,183,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/00</td>
<td>$2,670,544</td>
<td>$565,807</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,236,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>$3,288,365</td>
<td>$521,364</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,809,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>$3,460,201</td>
<td>$331,485</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,791,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>$2,911,306</td>
<td>$208,581</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,119,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>$3,484,606</td>
<td>$203,109</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,687,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>$4,168,498</td>
<td>$245,186</td>
<td>$2,571</td>
<td>$4,416,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>$3,857,207</td>
<td>$520,490</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,377,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>$4,044,157</td>
<td>$585,140</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,629,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>$3,863,139</td>
<td>$332,462</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,195,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>$4,177,999</td>
<td>$93,881</td>
<td>-$253,001</td>
<td>$4,018,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>$3,964,507</td>
<td>$60,151</td>
<td>$47,646</td>
<td>$4,072,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>$4,721,239</td>
<td>$29,115</td>
<td>$1,955,682</td>
<td>$6,706,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>$4,721,239</td>
<td>$53,317</td>
<td>$23,821</td>
<td>$4,798,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>$5,112,619</td>
<td>$52,503</td>
<td>-$3,000,000</td>
<td>$2,165,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Received</td>
<td>$72,116,716</td>
<td>$5,166,749</td>
<td>$2,199,720</td>
<td>$79,483,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Apportionments Disbursed</th>
<th>Interest Disbursed</th>
<th>Cash on Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91-92, 92-93</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93/94</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/95</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95/96</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96/97</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/98</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/00</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>$62,372,874</td>
<td>$3,990,588</td>
<td>$13,119,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programming of Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds
Since 1991, TAMC has funded transportation projects in two grant categories, Fair Share and Competitive. The Transportation Agency also sets aside RSTP in a reserve for use on eligible transportation projects by the Agency. These categories are described below.

**RSTP Reserve:** RSTP Reserve is an approved TAMC policy that reserves up to 10% of the annual RSTP funding amount off the top for use by TAMC for eligible transportation project and planning activities. The reserve amount has historically been $200,000 annually.

**RSTP Fair-Share Allocation Process:** RSTP Fair Share is an approved TAMC policy that apportions part of the RSTP funding by formula to the Cities and County of Monterey. The Fair Share amount has historically been $1,200,000 annually. TAMC has distributed this Fair Share funding every two to three years. The distribution of Fair Share funds is based on population and approved by the Board of Directors.

The programming is based on each jurisdiction’s share of the total urbanized population, as estimated by the California Department of Finance. Historically, TAMC has programmed three years’ worth of Fair Share funding for a total of $3.6 million. The following table shows the Fair Share funding amounts for each of the cities and County for Fiscal Years 2013/14-15/16:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Total Population</th>
<th>Annual Allocation</th>
<th>3-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmel-by-the Sea</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>$10,747</td>
<td>$32,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>$4,692</td>
<td>$14,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>8,296</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>$23,619</td>
<td>$70,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>16,729</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>$47,628</td>
<td>$142,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>13,073</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>$37,219</td>
<td>$111,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>20,073</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>$57,148</td>
<td>$171,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>28,252</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>$80,434</td>
<td>$241,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>15,268</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>$43,468</td>
<td>$130,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>153,215</td>
<td>36.35%</td>
<td>$436,205</td>
<td>$1,308,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>$962</td>
<td>$2,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>33,312</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>$94,840</td>
<td>$284,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>25,430</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>$72,400</td>
<td>$217,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>102,085</td>
<td>24.22%</td>
<td>$290,638</td>
<td>$871,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>421,494</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td><strong>$1,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population:** January 1, 2013 Department of Finance

**RSTP Competitive Grants:** RSTP Competitive Grants are an approved TAMC policy that apportions part of the RSTP funding on a competitive basis. The competitive amount varies from year to year based on the annual apportionment of RSTP funds. TAMC has distributed this competitive funding every two to three years. The distribution of competitive funds is based on a project scoring criteria, peer review and approved by the Board of Directors.
Projects rank higher when the project can be completed within three years and the project is consistent with a local transportation plan or general plan. Application materials and scoring criteria are included in Appendix B.

Once funds are programmed to projects by the TAMC Board of Directors, the grantee may submit a claim for payment according to the procedures outlined in Appendix C.

**Regional Surface Transportation Grant Procedures**

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County staff will advise prospective claimants (eligible entities: cities, County, and Monterey-Salinas Transit) of the funds anticipated to be available, and of the procedures for applying for Regional Surface Transportation Program grant-awarded funds. Transportation Agency staff will adhere to the following procedures when administering the RSTP Competitive Grant program; however the Transportation Agency Board may elect to opt-out of a Competitive Grant cycle and program the RSTP funds towards projects of regional significance, foregoing this process.

- To be considered for funding, a grant application must be received by TAMC by the deadline specified in the call for projects.
- TAMC’s Technical Advisory Committee will appoint a Subcommittee, generally comprised of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (BPC) members, partner agency staff, and Transportation Agency staff without a conflict of interest, to evaluate and rank all applications according to the “Criteria” listed in these policies. Subcommittee members will make their recommendations for projects to receive funding to the TAC.
- The TAC will consider approving the initial rankings recommended by the Subcommittee. The TAC will recommend approval for funding by the Transportation Agency Board. Alternative projects will also be listed in case recommended projects fail to be constructed.
- The TAC will forward their recommendations on to the BPC for comment. If the comments cannot be incorporated, differences in recommendations will be discussed with the TAMC Board.
- The Transportation Agency Board will consider the recommendations made by the TAC and the BPC. The Transportation Agency Board will vote to approve projects for funding by adopting a resolution.
- Transportation Agency staff will notify the agencies of those applications that have been funded.

**Project Programming and Delivery**

Projects using RSTP funds are not required to have a local match like federal transportation programs. Once funds are allocated to an approved project, the project sponsor has three years to expend the funds. Funds are paid to projects on a reimbursement basis and upon claim by the project sponsor to TAMC.
Programming Policies
The cities and County may program funds to eligible transportation projects within their Fair Share amounts apportioned by TAMC. With Transportation Agency Board approval, Fair Share funds can be deleted from one project and added to another project at the discretion of the project sponsor by submitting a written request to the Transportation Agency, provided that the change does not cause an over programming of total Fair Share available to the city or County. Fair Share funds provide the most amount of flexibility for the cities and County when moving funds between projects.

Moving funds from the competitive or Transportation for Livable Communities categories is not allowed. If a project is not built or the project sponsor decides not to build the project, the funds revert back to the pool of funding for the next round of programming. If a city or County was awarded funding for two projects under the competitive category, the city or County may submit a written request for Transportation Agency Board approval to adjust funds between the two projects provided the total amount remains the same.

Local Jurisdictions Responsibility in RSTP Project Implementation
Once a project has been recommended and approved for RSTP funding then the local jurisdiction will need to implement the project in a timely manner.

Timely Use of Funds: California State Assembly Bill 1012 (AB102) requires that RSTP funds are subject to a “timely use of funds” provision. AB102 requires that once funds are obligated towards a project then the jurisdiction has up to three years to use the funds or lose them. The TAMC Board also has implemented a timely “Use of Funds Provision” that is similar to AB1012. The TAMC Timely Use of Funds provision gives the agency staff authority to de-obligate funds from a local agency if project implementation is not moving forward in a satisfactory manner and reapply these funds towards a project that is ready for implementation. This process of fund redistribution would first require the approval by the TAMC Board of Directors.

Annual Reporting: Recipients of RSTP funding will be required to submit an annual report to TAMC describing the use of funds. This report will provide interagency coordination to better assist in timely project implementation.

Project Completion Report: Recipients of RSTP funding will be required to submit a Project Completion Report, which includes before and after photos of the project, within sixty (60) days of the project being accepted as complete by the sponsor.

Media: Any press releases or media events held by the project sponsor to promote a RSTP funded project will include mention of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s role in funding the project.
APPENDIX A

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

23 USC § 133 - Surface transportation program
(b) Eligible Projects.— A State may obligate funds apportioned to it under section 104 (b)(2) for the surface transportation program only for the following:

(1) Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, preservation, or operational improvements for highways, including construction of designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads under section 14501 of title 40.

(2) Replacement (including replacement with fill material), rehabilitation, preservation, protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events) and application of calcium magnesium acetate, sodium acetate/formate, or other environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and deicing compositions for bridges (and approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels on public roads of all functional classifications, including any such construction or reconstruction necessary to accommodate other transportation modes.

(3) Construction of a new bridge or tunnel at a new location on a Federal-aid highway.

(4) Inspection and evaluation of bridges and tunnels and training of bridge and tunnel inspectors (as defined in section 144), and inspection and evaluation of other highway assets (including signs, retaining walls, and drainage structures).

(5) Capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, including vehicles and facilities, whether publicly or privately owned, that are used to provide intercity passenger service by bus.

(6) Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, including electric vehicle and natural gas vehicle infrastructure in accordance with section 137, bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways in accordance with section 217, and the modifications of public sidewalks to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

(7) Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, installation of safety barriers and nets on bridges, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife, and railway-highway grade crossings.

(8) Highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs.

(9) Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs, including advanced truck stop electrification systems.

(10) Surface transportation planning programs.

(11) Transportation alternatives.

(12) Transportation control measures listed in section 108 (f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi)) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408 (f)(1)(A)).
(13) Development and establishment of management systems

(14) Environmental mitigation efforts relating to projects funded under this title in the same manner and to the same extent as such activities are eligible under section 119 (g).

(15) Projects relating to intersections that—
   (A) have disproportionately high accident rates;
   (B) have high levels of congestion, as evidenced by—
      (i) interrupted traffic flow at the intersection; and
      (ii) a level of service rating that is not better than “F” during peak travel hours, calculated in accordance with the Highway Capacity Manual issued by the Transportation Research Board; and
   (C) are located on a Federal-aid highway.

(16) Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements.

(17) Environmental restoration and pollution abatement in accordance with section 328.

(18) Control of noxious weeds and aquatic noxious weeds and establishment of native species in accordance with section 329.

(19) Projects and strategies designed to support congestion pricing, including electric toll collection and travel demand management strategies and programs.

(20) Recreational trails projects eligible for funding under section 206.

(21) Construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities eligible for funding under section 129 (c).

(22) Border infrastructure projects eligible for funding under section 1303 of the SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 101 note; Public Law 109–59).

(23) Truck parking facilities eligible for funding under section 1401 of the MAP–21.

(24) Development and implementation of a State asset management plan for the National Highway System in accordance with section 119, including data collection, maintenance, and integration and the costs associated with obtaining, updating, and licensing software and equipment required for risk based asset management and performance based management, and for similar activities related to the development and implementation of a performance based management program for other public roads.

(25) A project that, if located within the boundaries of a port terminal, includes only such surface transportation infrastructure modifications as are necessary to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of the port.

(26) Construction and operational improvements for any minor collector if—
   (A) the minor collector, and the project to be carried out with respect to the minor collector, are in the same corridor as, and in proximity to, a Federal-aid highway designated as part of the National Highway System;
   (B) the construction or improvements will enhance the level of service on the Federal-aid highway described in subparagraph (A) and improve regional traffic flow; and
(C) the construction or improvements are more cost-effective, as determined by a benefit-cost analysis, than an improvement to the Federal-aid highway described in subparagraph (A).

(c) Location of Projects.—Surface transportation program projects may not be undertaken on roads functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors unless the roads were on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991, except—

(1) as provided in subsection (g);
(2) for projects described in paragraphs (2), (4), (6), (7), (11), (20), (25), and (26) of subsection (b); and
(3) as approved by the Secretary.

California Constitution - Article 19 Motor Vehicle Revenues
SEC. 2. Revenues from taxes imposed by the State on motor vehicle fuels for use in motor vehicles upon public streets and highways, over and above the costs of collection and any refunds authorized by law, shall be deposited into the Highway Users Tax Account (Section 2100 of the Streets and Highways Code) or its successor, which is hereby declared to be a trust fund, and shall be allocated monthly in accordance with Section 4, and shall be used solely for the following purposes:

(a) The research, planning, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of public streets and highways (and their related public facilities for non-motorized traffic), including the mitigation of their environmental effects, the payment for property taken or damaged for such purposes, and the administrative costs necessarily incurred in the foregoing purposes.

(b) The research, planning, construction, and improvement of exclusive public mass transit guideways (and their related fixed facilities), including the mitigation of their environmental effects, the payment for property taken or damaged for such purposes, the administrative costs necessarily incurred in the foregoing purposes, and the maintenance of the structures and the immediate right-of-way for the public mass transit guideways, but excluding the maintenance and operating costs for mass transit power systems and mass transit passenger facilities, vehicles, equipment, and services.
APPENDIX B

REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM COMPETITIVE FUNDING
APPLICATION FORM
Grant Application Materials

Regional Surface Transportation Program Competitive Grants & Transportation Development Act 2%

Applications due: May 1, 2014 - 12:00 PM

Transportation Agency for Monterey County
55B Plaza Circle
Salinas, California 93901
Purpose & Principles

The Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) was established by California State Statute utilizing Surface Transportation Program Funds that are identified in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) distributes these funds to local agencies as part of its responsibilities as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Monterey County.

The purpose of the program is to provide funding to local jurisdictions for a wide variety of transportation planning and improvement projects, such as the research, planning, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of public streets and highways (and their related public facilities for non-motorized traffic), including the mitigation of their environmental effects. A full listing of eligible projects can be found in the Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s Guidelines & Policies for the Administration of Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds.

In establishing the Regional Surface Transportation Program Competitive Grants program, the Transportation Agency is seeking to fund projects that advance the goals of the Transportation Agency Board. These include funding and delivering projects of regional significance that improve safety, provide maintenance for existing facilities, or support the development of a multimodal transportation network utilizing the principles of Complete Streets. Fair geographic balance in distributing the funds and the cost effectiveness of the proposed projects in meeting the program’s goals are also taken into consideration when awarding grant funds.

Instructions

(1) You must complete an application form for each project. All projects must submit an application, even if it has previously applied and received RSTP funding.

(2) If your agency submits more than one project application, you must identify your highest priority project.

(3) You are responsible for completing all sections of the application form and attaching any relevant information. Your project application will only be scored based on the information that is provided in your application. Additional information will not be accepted after the deadline; however, it may be presented to the TAMC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review.

(4) Your project must pass the “Screening Criteria” section of this application form in order to qualify for funding.

(5) You should refer to the attached RSTP Scoring Criteria when preparing the “Project Information” section of your application. You are responsible for providing complete and accurate information in order to receive the highest points possible.

(6) The deadline for applications is the first Thursday in May by 12:00 PM. All applications must be received by TAMC on this date. No postmarks or faxes will be accepted. No application forms or additional information will be accepted after this date.
Screening Criteria

In order to qualify for RSTP funding, your project must meet the following criteria:

A. Your project must be implemented within a 3-year timeframe. Please specify if your project will meet this deadline. Please note that after three years, your project will lose the funding if it has not yet been completed.

B. Your project must be consistent with a minimum of one of the local or regional plans listed below. Please check off the applicable plans:

   Local General Plan
   Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
   Pavement Management System (PMS)
   Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP)
   MST Service Improvement Plan
   Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
   Approved Transportation Impact Study
   Other (please specify)
## Section A: Project Information & Regional Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Sponsor / Lead Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Contact Information (address, phone, email)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Amount of RSTP Funds Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Identify the funding sources for the project. You must specify if these funding sources are secured or proposed. Also indicate fiscal years in which these funds are programmed. Attached additional information if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description** (include Average Daily Traffic data – vehicle, bike & ped, or transit passengers)

Is there a history of collisions in the project area (pedestrian, bicycle, motorist)?

**Project Benefits** (attach additional information if needed)

Describe how your project links regional origin / destinations or serves regional travel

### Scoring Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1) Traffic volume</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2) Regional Significance</td>
<td>1-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The application will receive 1-15 points based on how well the project serves travelers from other areas or more than one jurisdiction.

Subtotal (max.) 25
Section B: Complete Streets

Complete the attached Complete Streets Checklist and include with your application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1) Project increases non-motorized demand</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2) Stakeholder outreach was conducted on the project scope and design</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3) Pedestrian facilities are improved with the project</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4) Bicycle facilities are improved with the project</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5) Transit facilities are improved with the project</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (max.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHECKLIST - Existing Conditions

#### 4. Existing Land Uses (check all that apply)
- [ ] Residential
- [ ] Mixed Use
- [ ] Institutional/School
- [ ] Civic/Public Facilities
- [ ] Park/Open Space
- [ ] Visitor-Serving/Commercial
- [ ] Senior Housing
- [ ] Rural/Agricultural

#### 5. Safety (See Complete Streets Needs Assessment Matrix & http://tims.berkeley.edu/)
- Are there perceived safety/speeding issues in the project area? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Is there a history of collisions in the project area?
  - [ ] Pedestrian
  - [ ] Bicyclist
  - [ ] Motorist

#### 6. Congestion
- Does the roadway experience congestion? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- If so, at what time(s) is it congested?
  - [ ] AM Peak
  - [ ] PM Peak

#### 7. Existing Roadway Conditions/Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Functional Classification</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROW Width</strong></td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway Pavement Width</strong></td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of Lanes</strong></td>
<td>NB/EB: [ ] Yes [ ] No, SB/WB: [ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Center Turn lane</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Width</strong></td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping/Parking</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoulder Width</strong></td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike Lane Width (&lt;5’)</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection(s)</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Signalized [ ] Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Condition</strong></td>
<td>Poor [ ] Fair [ ] Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posted Speed Limit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Volumes (AADT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Route/ Stops</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truck Route</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Future Roadway Conditions

Are there planned transportation & land use projects that could affect circulation in the project area? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If so, please list the project(s)

Are planned projects anticipated to increase travel demand in the area? (mark yes or no for each mode)

[ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Yes [ ] No

9. Stakeholder Outreach (check all that apply)

Please indicate which stakeholder groups provided input on project scope and design:

- Neighborhood Group
- Business Association
- School
- Property Owners
- Environmental Group

Bicycle Committees
Pedestrian Committee
Senior Group
Transit Agency
Transportation Disadvantaged

Specific changes requested by stakeholders? [ ] Yes [ ] No

10. Circle the Complete Street Design Type - (See Table 2 of Guidebook)

Street Design Type

- Main Street
- Avenue
- Boulevard
- Parkway

- Local/Subdivision Street
- Rural Road

- Local Collector Arterial
- Functional Classification

- Pedestrian/Bicycle-Oriented
- Auto/Truck-Oriented
### 11. Transportation Network Deficiencies (Refer to Existing Conditions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficiency</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lacking/Insufficient Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking/Insufficient Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking/Insufficient Transit Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for students/youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transits/Bicycle/Pedestrian Prioritization at Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the Existing and Future Conditions the project area is a candidate for:

- **Road Diet** (3 or more lanes; AADT<20,000; bicycle collisions)
  - Yes
  - No

- **Traffic Calming**
  - Yes
  - No

- **Roundabout**
  - Yes
  - No

- **Transit-Oriented Development/Transit Corridor** (15 min headway)
  - Yes
  - No

- **Neighborhood Shared Street**
  - Yes
  - No

- **Pedestrian Place**
  - Yes
  - No

- **Transit/Bicycle/Pedestrian Prioritization at Intersections**
  - Yes
  - No
CHECKLIST - Design

The purpose of this section is to ensure all users have been considered in the design of the project. Complete street design is context-sensitive and a complete street in a rural area may look different than one in an urban area. Refer to safety and special user needs identified in the existing and future conditions sections. The Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook Chapter 5 contains design best-practices and sample accommodations for these users.

12. Pedestrian Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

- Minimize Driveways
- Sidewalk/Path
- Landscaping/Parking Buffer
- ADA Access
- Street Trees
- Crossing Treatments
- Traffic Calming
- Wayfinding Signage
- Audible Countdown
- Other (Describe)

Existing

13. Bicycle Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

- Bicycle Lanes
- Shared-Lane Markings
- Multiuse Path
- Route/Wayfinding Signs
- Bicycle Parking
- Bicycle Detection
- Bicycle Box
- Color-Treated Bike
- Floating Bike Lanes
- Other (Describe)
### CHECKLIST - Design

#### 14. Transit Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Bus Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Bulbs/Pull-Outs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Bus Arrival Info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS/Signal Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service (15 min headways)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-Fi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop/Station Amenities*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transit Amenities include: Bench, lighting, trash can, route information/maps, concessions, music, and public art.
### CHECKLIST - Trade-Offs & Exemptions

#### 15. Project Trade-Offs

Is the recommended complete street cross section/design supportable?  
- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

If not, explain why:

- Lack of ROW width
- Existing Structures
- Trees/Environmental Features
- Insufficient Funding
- Other

Have alternative designs been considered?  
- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

What refinements to the cross section/needed were needed?

- Removed/partial zones (Ch. 5) for:
  - Pedestrians
  - Bicyclists
  - Landscaping
  - Vehicles
- Parking

- Considered alternative routes/locations for:
  - Pedestrians
  - Bicyclists
  - Landscaping
  - Vehicles
- Parking

#### 16. Exemptions (Refer to Ch. 6 of the Guidebook)

Is the project exempt from accommodating certain users?  
- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

Cost of accommodation is excessively disproportionate to the need or probably use?  
- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

Documented absence of current and future need?  
- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

Other
### Section C: Project Readiness & Cost Effectiveness

What is the status of your project? Provide a schedule of when the project components (e.g. design, construction) will be started and completed. Attach supporting documentation and additional information as needed.

List all costs associated with the project. This money will be granted for a three-year time frame. Indicate whether matching funds are secured or unsecured.

Total RSTP funding request: $__________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>RSTP Funds</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Fund Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY14/15</td>
<td>FY15/16</td>
<td>FY16/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Document:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach and Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROJECT COST:**

#### Scoring Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 5 points = Environmental Document
- 5 points = Plans, Specifications, and Estimates
- 30% complete = 1 point
- 60% complete = 2 points
- 90% complete = 4 points
- 100% complete = 5 points

**Subtotal (max.)** 25
Section D: Safety Improvements & Sustainability Features
Consistency with the goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan is a requirement for all projects applying for Regional Surface Transportation Program competitive grant funding. Please indicate below how your proposed project will help to achieve the program goals of safety and sustainability on a qualitative scale of low, medium, or high projected impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access &amp; Mobility</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces passenger hours of delay</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces average peak period travel time</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety &amp; Health</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces the number of fatalities and injuries due to collisions</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves bicycle, pedestrian, and transit mode share</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Stewardship</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect and enhance the County’s built and natural environment. Act to reduce the transportation system’s emission of Greenhouse Gasses.</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves sensitive habitat or prime agriculture land</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce disparities in healthy, safe access to key destinations for transportation-disadvantaged populations.</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides funding for project serving Environmental Justice populations</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases the percent of population within ½ mile of high quality transit stop</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Benefit</th>
<th>Projected Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invest in transportation improvements – including operational improvements – that reinvest in Monterey County economy, improve economic access and improve travel time reliability and speed consistency for high-value trips.</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces vehicle hours of delay</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces the number of distressed lane miles</td>
<td>Low  Medium  High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1) Project demonstrates an improvement in the safety and mobility of the facility</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 points = Safety Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 points = Access &amp; Mobility Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2) Project includes features that promote social, environmental, and economic goals</td>
<td>1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 points = Social Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 points = Economic Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 points = Environmental Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal (max.) 25
APPENDIX C

REIMBURSEMENT FORM
**TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY (TAMC)**

**CLAIM FOR PAYMENT**

Name and Address of Claimant: MONTEREY COUNTY (TAMC)

55-B Plaza Circle
Salinas, CA 93901-2902
831-775-0903 Tel
831-775-0897 FAX

Claim For Funds

**Description of Project or Purposes of Expenditures:**

- Street and Road Purposes
- Public Transit - Operating
- Public Transit - Capital
- 2% Bicycle and Pedestrian Account Purposes
- Other:

**Expended to date on this project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Less amount claimed to date on this project:**

**Amount of this claim:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Special Handling Instructions:**

TOTAL CLAIM $ __________

**SIGNATURE OF CLAIMANT**

I certify that this claim is in accordance with provisions of the Transportation Development Act:

Signature, title of claimant: ____________________________ Date: __________

**APPROVAL OF DEPARTMENT**

This claim is based on TMAC approved application and there are adequate funds available in claimant’s account:

TAMC Executive Director: ____________________________ Date: __________

Approved as stated hereon:

TAMC Administrative Services Manager: ____________________________ Date: __________

**APPROVAL OF AUDITOR**

I certify that I have received all required documents for this claim and that the computations on the documentation and Claim are correct. This claim is approved for payment.

Mike Miller, AUDITOR – CONTROLLER, By Deputy Auditor: ____________________________ Date: __________
Memorandum

To: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee
From: Andy Cook, Senior Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: February 5, 2014
Subject: Monterey County Bike Week

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
1. RECEIVE report from Bike Week subcommittee on recommendations for Bike Week in 2014; and
2. PROVIDE direction to staff on proposal for Monterey County Bike Week.

SUMMARY:
Bike Week is a national campaign held annually in May to promote bicycling as transportation. At its January meeting, the Committee formed a subcommittee to discuss recommendations for undertaking Bike Week activities in 2014. The subcommittee, which met on January 30, will report to the committee on its recommendations.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
The Agency budgeted $7,500 in Transportation Development Act funds toward bicycle safety training in the current fiscal year ending June 30. These funds are eligible to be spent on other bicycle related outreach and events that have been undertaken in the past as part of Bike Week.

DISCUSSION:
The purpose of the Bike Week campaign, held annually in May, is to increase public awareness of bicycling as a form of transportation, as well as public enthusiasm for bicycling in general. In the past, the Agency coordinated planning and marketing efforts for a Monterey County Bike Week campaign with Ecology Action, a Santa Cruz-based non-profit that plans and organizes Santa Cruz County Bike Week with financial assistance from the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission. The Bike Week calendar organized by staff through a combination of Agency funds, sponsorships and donations, included Bike to School, Work and City Council events, a Company Bike Challenge, a Bike vs. Car Challenge, as well various bike rides and safety events. The Agency had been dedicating half of a planner’s staff time to the planning and fundraising tasks associated with Bike Week.
Due to staffing cutbacks in 2012 and 2013, the Agency allocated funding in its budget that traditionally had been used for Bike Week activities, to bicycle safety trainings at schools performed under contract by Ecology Action, which administers a BikeSmart bicycle safety training program. The safety trainings delivered by Ecology Action at school sites in Salinas and Greenfield were well received by the schools, and staff has received input from both the committee and the public about the need for continued bicycle safety education.

When it took action to approve the allocation of resources to safety trainings, the committee agreed to discuss a plan for continuing Bike Week in the future with the understanding that the Transportation Agency could support the campaign in the future as a funding partner and that planning responsibilities would fall to volunteers or an outside organization. At its January meeting, the committee formed a subcommittee to discuss options for organizing Bike Week Events in 2014. The subcommittee met on January 30 and will report back to the committee at its February meeting. At this time, staff is requesting direction from the committee on a proposal for undertaking Bike Week this year.

Moving forward, the Agency is preparing to allocate Transportation Development Act funds for the next three year funding cycle. Staff plans to recommend that the Agency allocate Transportation Development Act funds to Bike Week activities and continued bicycle safety trainings at schools based on feedback received to date expressing a need for both types of outreach.

Approved by: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Date signed: 1/22/14

Counsel Review: N/A
Finance/Admin Review: Yes
How 21st Century Transportation Networks Help New Urban Economies Boom

A report from PeopleForBikes and Alliance for Biking & Walking

PROTECTED BIKE LANES MEAN BUSINESS
As the American economy slowly recovers, U.S. businesses are weighing their opportunities to make the most of that returning energy with new jobs, products and services. And as the dust settles on the Great Recession, business leaders from coast to coast are seeing four related mega-trends reshaping American urban economies.

**THE GREAT URBAN REBOUND**

After 40 years of being synonymous with decay, inner cities have come alive and are booming with new development and residents. Twenty years of falling crime rates have helped make urban life desirable again, especially for young adults. As successful city centers fill with people, city leaders find that building high-quality bicycle networks is an efficient and appealing way to move more people in the same amount of space.

**THE BATTLE FOR HUMAN CAPITAL**

White-collar workers, from software developers to graphic designers to management consultants, are redefining the “service sector” — creating a digital workforce armed with technical skill and a generational preference for urban living. Companies and cities are scrambling to attract the most talented Millennials and Generation X-ers, who increasingly prefer downtown jobs and nearby homes.

**RISING HEALTH CARE COSTS**

Desk-bound jobs and sedentary travel modes are contributing to spiking health care costs and alarming obesity rates. It’s getting more and more costly for employers and insurers to finance health coverage for working families — and more cost-effective for cities and companies to lower their costs by incentivizing healthier living.

**PLANNING FOR WEALTH, NOT TRAFFIC**

After 50 years of framing their work around the automobile, retail analysts in both the private and public sectors are shifting to a new consensus: cars don’t spend money — people do. By closely studying the ways people move and do business in the urban environment, proponents of local business are boosting sales in retail districts by looking for optimal ways to use public street space.
A NEW BIKE LANE FOR A NEW ECONOMY

U.S. cities have discovered an unexpected tool to create new opportunities in urban economies: the protected bike lane.

The conventional bike lane is getting a makeover in American cities. No longer relying on just a few inches of white paint to give people on bikes a feeling of security and comfort on busy streets, modern protected bike lanes use curbs, planters, parked cars or simple posts to clearly separate bikes from auto traffic and sidewalks. They are proving effective in creating appealing places for everyone, but are especially inviting to new riders.

To show how these trends work, this report compiles the latest hard data and showcases interviews with 15 businesspeople in five U.S. cities where protected bike lane networks are expanding quickly: Austin, Texas; San Francisco, California; Portland, Oregon; Chicago, Illinois; and Washington, DC.

Of course, better bike lanes can’t singlehandedly solve every problem. They’re one of many tools cities are deploying to help boost business, and they aren’t magic. And, like all good transportation systems, they require smart investments and careful planning to thrive.

But as these stories and studies show, there’s a developing consensus in many American cities that great bike networks are worth the effort.
FOUR WAYS PROTECTED BIKE LANES BOOST ECONOMIC GROWTH

FUELING REDEVELOPMENT TO BOOST REAL ESTATE VALUE
As city populations grow, motor vehicle congestion increases. New roads are rarely an option in mature cities. Protected bike lanes bring order and predictability to streets and provide transportation choices while helping to build neighborhoods where everyone enjoys spending time. By extending the geographic range of travel, bike lanes help neighborhoods redevelop without waiting years for new transit service to debut.

HELPING COMPANIES SCORE TALENTED WORKERS
Savvy workers, especially Millennials and members of Generation X, increasingly prefer downtown jobs and nearby homes. Because protected bike lanes make biking more comfortable and popular, they help companies locate downtown without breaking the bank on auto parking space, and allow workers to reach their desk the way they increasingly prefer: under their own power.

MAKING WORKERS HEALTHIER AND MORE PRODUCTIVE
From DC to Chicago to Portland, the story is the same: people go out of their way to use protected bike lanes. By creating clear delineation between auto and bike traffic, protected bike lanes get more people in the saddle — burning calories, clearing minds, and strengthening hearts and lungs. As companies scramble to lower health care costs, employees who benefit from the gentle exercise of pedaling to work help boost overall hourly productivity and cut bills.

INCREASING RETAIL VISIBILITY AND SALES VOLUME
In growing urban communities, protected bike lane networks encourage more people to ride bikes for everyday trips. And when people use bikes for errands, they’re the ideal kind of retail customers: regulars. They stop by often and spend as much or more per month as people who arrive in cars. Plus, ten customers who arrive by bike fit in the parking space of one customer who arrives by car.
It’s an iron law of real estate: Land is more valuable if more people can get to it easily.

As more Americans — especially Millennials and Generation X-ers — gravitate towards urban centers, many city neighborhoods are seeing massive population influxes. With space at a premium, people need robust transportation systems to move from home to work to shops.

Low-stress bike networks can help relieve pressure on the street system. By making biking safe and pleasant for a broader range of people, bike lanes are bringing more residents, employees and customers to neighborhoods without swamping streets with traffic. They help free the street system for buses, freight and essential car trips.

And as city dwellers prioritize dog-walking and bike-riding over sitting in traffic, investment is flowing toward streets that are built for connectivity and comfort.

In other words: location, location, location.
CREATING MAIN STREET

Langley Investment Properties
Portland, OR

Everything was in place for Wade Lange’s project, a 21-story tower with 657 apartments and 44,000 square feet of retail space. The only problem: the four-lane street below was sterile and boring. Nobody spent time on it.

So Lange threw his weight behind a plan to remove two auto travel lanes from NE Multnomah Street and replace them with a pair of protected bike lanes.

“It’s about visibility — if you’re driving by at 35 mph in a car, you’re not going to stop,” said Lange, vice president of property management for Langley Investment Properties. “But you slow the traffic down, you do landscaping and you get more people walking, and suddenly the retail exists.”

Lange and other landlords in Portland’s job-oriented Lloyd District see the more attractive, bike lane-calmed road as part of its transformation into a livelier “16-hour district” that will be active from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m.

“It just becomes a more active street than it ever was before,” Lange said. “A place where pedestrians want to spend their time.”

INVITING APPRECIATION

David Baker + Partners Architects
San Francisco, CA

David Baker, founder and principal at David Baker + Partners Architects, was dubbed “a starchitect for the common man” for his firm’s work designing green buildings and innovative housing complexes.

Baker’s motivation for supporting a new protected bike lane along San Francisco’s Second Street, though, is “purely selfish: I’d like to have my employees safe on the way to work.”

But Baker is also thinking about his own bottom line. As a veteran in Bay Area real estate and development, he’s been around long enough to see that wide streets with fast-moving car traffic tend to depress property values, while buildings on streets with new bicycle facilities and pedestrian improvements have appreciated.

“I own the office. I know that if we have protected bike lanes out there, it will improve my property value,” he said. “World class bike networks can’t come soon enough.”

For every quarter mile nearer to an off-street bicycle trail, the median home value in Minneapolis-St. Paul increases by $510. ¹

83% of residents near Washington, DC’s 15th Street protected bike lane say it’s a valuable asset to the neighborhood. ³
HAPPIER TENANTS

Brookfield Office Properties

Washington, DC

By 2005, Kathy Card, a 20-year veteran of the DC real estate market, knew the Chinatown area was on the upswing. When the chance came to buy a building in the neighborhood, her firm jumped.

Good choice.

“People were like, ‘Isn’t that area a bit sketchy?’” Card recalled. “Now, it’s the most sought-after neighborhood in DC.”

There’s one thing Chinatown is still missing, Card says: a protected bike lane, like the ones the city has been adding downtown. New bike lanes could bring more order to the fast-moving thoroughfare and boost her buildings’ appeal to the private-sector office tenants she targets.

But on H Street, which currently has two auto travel lanes in each direction plus auto parking, people riding bikes have to “take their life in their own hands,” Card said. “You really need to have nerves of steel to do that right now.”

Card says good bike lanes can help the area complete its journey from a place people just want to get through to a place they want to get to. It’s a trend as plain as the constant flow of people checking bikes in and out of the busy nearby Capital Bikeshare station.

“This neighborhood has just turned a 180 in the last 15 years,” she said. “Obviously the demand is there.”

REAL ESTATE

Homes within a half-mile of Indiana’s Monon Trail sell for an average of 11% more than similar homes farther away. ²

Rio Grande Street, Austin, TX

SOLD

11%
Transportation has always been at the heart of a city’s prosperity. Once, sitting on the right river junction or rail hub was enough to guarantee generations of successful businesses.

Globalization has ended that guarantee. Now, the natural resources that keep cities competitive are residents with knowhow. Cities and companies can best prosper by attracting and retaining people with the skills and talents that fit the niches the global economy needs.

And for a rising generation of workers who’ve grown up amid the urban rebound, traffic jams and office parks are the last places they want to spend time.

That’s why companies that rely on young talent are increasingly seeking offices in central cities with good bike facilities. The appealing transportation options give workers the commutes they prefer – and the lower demand for auto parking, in turn, makes it possible for small companies to afford the neighborhoods where workers thrive.

Today’s cities are actively creating vibrant city life to attract top talent and economic development.
THE SIGN OF A GOOD CITY

Signal
Chicago, IL

Working in a city with comfortable bike lanes is so important to Jeff Judge that when his business was considering a relocation, his first bit of research was the bike lane network near his potential new headquarters.

Judge recently weighed moving his marketing startup, Signal, from Chicago to Boston when a Massachusetts-based company approached him about acquisition.

“The first thing I looked at was what the bike infrastructure is like in Boston,” said Judge. “It’s so important to me. ... Cities that invest in biking infrastructure are going to win. It’s better for business. It’s better for planning. It’s better for infrastructure. It’s better all around.”

Signal worked to create a marketing platform for small businesses. Judge’s small team works out of 1871, a coworking space for digital startups in downtown Chicago’s Merchandise Mart.

“We’re close to many protected bike lanes downtown,” explained Judge, who rides in Chicago’s new protected bike lanes on his commute to work. “For me and for my employees, it makes a big difference.”

As Judge sees it, protected bike lanes are great for businesses that choose to locate downtown. “They’re good for general health of the employees,” he said. “People work long hours, and it’s great to be out running, riding, walking. It encourages physical health and makes workers more mobile.”

Judge noted that plenty of skilled technology workers, faced with employment options in many parts of the country, are lured to coastal or mountainous cities because of their proximity to outdoor activity.

“It’s a recruiting tactic for companies from the West Coast,” he offered. “Come here and you can go snowboarding on your lunch break!” But for cities that lack natural resources that readily lend themselves to outdoor recreation, next-generation bicycle infrastructure can be a powerful lure. “With Chicago, cycling is important,” said Judge. “We take advantage of what we can do.”

ENABLING DOWNTOWN

Mutual Mobile
Austin, TX

When it comes to attracting the best employees, Mutual Mobile runs with the bulls.

The Austin-based tech firm, which builds mobile applications used by Google, Xerox, Audi, NASA and others, is fighting to import talent from across the country and grab University of Texas graduates with a head for algorithms before they jet to California or New York.

But instead of a free all-you-can-eat buffet on a suburban campus, this fast-growing company offers a location in the heart of Austin, where employees love to spend their time.

“We’ve seen companies like Facebook and Google and plenty of others move out to the suburbs and we’ve done feasibility studies on that,” co-founder Ed Ireson said. “Not only would it change the lives of half our population, but we’d lose the culture.”

A suburban campus would mean interfering with the bike, bus and foot commutes of the other half of MM’s 350-strong Austin workforce — and hampering everyone’s access to downtown’s entertainment and diversity.

“The ability to go walk and have lunch means a lot,” Ireson said. “I and nearly all the other founders live in downtown. We’d rather cram into an office downtown than have plenty of breathing room out in the middle of nowhere.”

VENTURE CAPITAL INVESTMENTS GO URBAN

An increasing percentage of U.S. venture capital investment in the same metro area now takes place in urban ZIP codes, as opposed to suburban ones.³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles/OC</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A SHIFT TO CAR-LITE LIFE

The average young person is driving less and biking and taking transit more.⁴
SKILLED WORKERS

PRIORITIZING PEOPLE

Pollinate
Portland, OR

It wasn’t until after he decided to start a business that Ben Waldron learned just how important a good bike commute was becoming to Portland’s creative workers.

July 2008 seemed like “probably the worst time in economic history” to strike out on your own, Waldron recalled. But he and his colleague Levi Patterson had the itch. So they rented a few hundred square feet in central Portland and co-founded Pollinate, an advertising agency.

When Pollinate started hiring, they found that bike accessibility was a key recruiting asset.

“It used to be a perk,” Waldron said. “Now it seems like it’s a right.”

Five years later, Waldron estimates that 20 of Pollinate’s 30 employees bike to work regularly. The company negotiated bike access into their lease two years ago; for their next move, he plans to look for a building with bike lockers and showers.

The people Pollinate wants to hire expect to be able to bike in comfortably if they want. And in Portland’s increasingly creative-service-oriented economy, Waldron said, no competitive edge is more important to his business than the team of workers he can offer.

“We help our clients develop ideas and help create and foster them,” Waldron said. “The only thing that does that is the people here. Our only benefit is the people that we have.”

LICENSE TO DRIVE: A LOWER PRIORITY

The percent of people 16-24 with a driver’s license peaked in 1983 and is now at its lowest rate since 1963.$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CREATIVE CULTURE

Capital Factory
Austin, TX

Fred Schmidt is addicted to entrepreneurship. The founder of two downtown retail stores and two technology companies in Austin, Texas, Schmidt believes that innovative transportation networks are essential to building a robust downtown economy.

“Every one of my companies has a strong alternative transportation focus,” Schmidt said. “We try to engage with people who are already thinking that way in order to build a creative culture correctly.”

To this end, Schmidt looks for office locations that are central, transit oriented, walkable and bikeable. As Austin moves towards being a more bicycle-friendly city, Schmidt hopes the city will soon boast more protected bike lanes to provide safe transportation networks for retail workers and tech employees alike.

“Tech companies, especially in the game industry, like to be where there’s a lot of buzz, where there’s entertainment and energy. In order to attract those type of companies, we need to continue to provide buildings and workspaces and infrastructure that supports the culture that thrives on that type of urban environment.”

Schmidt acknowledged that the process would not be easy. “We’re having to literally recreate a lot of our cities in order to get there,” he said. “Building a world-class city means doing it a different way, a better way, a more responsible way.”

“Getting to permanent, dedicated, protected bike lanes is the ultimate grail.”
Americans have been losing battles with waistlines for decades, and we’re paying for it not just in our daily lives but in the explosion of our health care costs.

Due to falling physical activity, the current generation of U.S. children could be the first in 200 years to have lower life expectancies than their parents. Among Medicare recipients, diabetes alone, often tied to obesity, now engulfs 32 percent of Medicare dollars and 4 percent of the entire federal budget.

Directly or indirectly, employers are paying for this — and passing the cost on to local economies in the form of slow-rising wages and positions that companies can’t afford to fill.

With rapid growth in health care expenses, everyone is seeking ways to manage risks and costs. By choosing locations with good bike access, employers offer their workers the preventative medicine of daily exercise, conveniently bundled into the trip to work. Building physical activity into a daily commute lengthens lives, strengthens bodies and makes people the best workers they can be: happy, fully alive and ready to start a productive day.
Kaiser Permanente Northwest
Portland, OR

American health insurers are under intense pressure to hold down operating costs. “We’ve got a very trim budget,” Shannon Mayorga, executive assistant to Kaiser Permanente Northwest’s vice president for human resources, said. “Affordability is really the mantra right now.”

Making salaries go further is one reason Kaiser Northwest, a regional health insurance and care provider, was a major backer of a new protected bike lane outside its Portland headquarters, Mayorga said.

“All the literature clearly shows that healthy people perform more effectively,” he said. “Less sick days. The performance is higher on a day-to-day level. Productivity goes up. There’s definitely a correlation between wellness and business viability.”

By making healthy commutes easier for the 1,000 employees in its office building, Kaiser is maximizing those benefits. “There’s an intrinsic value in community health,” Mayorga said. “We’re really excited about the prospect of moving the needle with people who don’t typically have exposure to bike commuting.”

CREDO Mobile
San Francisco, CA

As a growing mobile network operator in San Francisco, CREDO Mobile could choose to move to a more isolated campus outside of the city.

But Becky Bond, vice president and political director at CREDO, said that the company stays put because it’s surrounded by region’s best bike and transit infrastructure.

“Just like our employees have access to a gym and quality healthcare, we think that bicycling can be an important benefit,” said Bond. “We pay the premium to be located in downtown because it means our employees can enjoy the benefits of public transit and can bike to work.”

The City by the Bay is adding more bike lanes, and city officials plan to install new protected bikeways on its streets soon. CREDO employees have embraced the growth in bike infrastructure.

“As we’ve seen improvements in the bike plan, more of our employees bike to work,” Bond noted. “More protected bike lanes would be such a boon to employees’ health and safety.”

Better Bike LANES ATTRACT RIDERS
If you build it, they will come. Folks are more likely to bike if protected bike lanes are available. Cities that added protective bike lanes saw bike traffic growth, compared to pre-installation levels.

Buffered bike lanes on Spruce and Pine Streets in Philadelphia
+266%

Protected bike lane on Kinzie St. in Chicago
+55%

Protected bike lane on Columbus Avenue in NYC
+56%

Protected bike lane on Dunsmuir St. in Vancouver, Canada
+54%

Buffered median bike lanes in Washington, DC on Pennsylvania Ave.
+200%

Protected bike lane on Prospect Park West in NYC
+190%

Protected bike lane on Market St. in San Francisco
+115%

Better bike lanes attract riders.
HEALTH

WAKING WORKERS UP

Field Museum

Chicago, IL

When Karen Bean moved from Chicago’s suburbs to its close-in Pilsen neighborhood, she soon realized that in a bustling city, biking to work just made sense. But once she started, Bean, who works as a staff photographer for Chicago’s renowned Field Museum, realized that biking was doing great things for her body, too.

“When you drive home, all you want to do is go to sleep,” Bean said. “I get up and I ride my bike and I ride back home. … I’m at a much healthier weight, and in general I do feel better.”

Though she never would have predicted it, she’s even decided to pedal through Chicago’s icy Januaries — aided, recently, by the city’s fast-growing network of protected bike lanes.

“It makes me actually do some activity in the winter,” Bean said.

Around the museum, Bean is now an evangelist for biking, talking up the health and energy it’s brought her with her co-workers. The protected lanes, she said, have been a help because they advertise biking to people who, like Bean a few years ago, had never really thought about it.

“I’ve gotten a lot more people to try out biking just using those lanes,” Bean said. “After doing it for a couple weeks, it kind of sticks.”

BETTER SAFETY, MORE BIKING

Physical fitness improves work. People who ride their bike regularly benefit in many different ways.

- Up to 99% Of riders in new protected bike lanes in San Francisco and DC said the facilities made biking safer.
- Up to 30% Said they had already increased their biking as a result.
- Up to 32% Use fewer sick days
- Up to 55% Have lower health costs
- Up to 52% Increase productivity

DAILY RECHARGE

American Bar Association

Chicago, IL

As Cheryl Zalenski was working her way up the ranks of her career, she would go to a gym every evening after work. But as she advanced, the time was harder to fit in. The answer for her schedule, Zalenski found, was a tool she’d lost track of after college: the bicycle.

“Having that time to recharge your brain gives you more creative energy and allows you to come up with ideas that you wouldn’t while sitting and staring at the computer,” said Zalenski, a middle manager at the American Bar Association’s Chicago headquarters.

She’s certain that bike commuting makes her better at her job, and that Chicago’s fully signalized and protected bike lane on Dearborn Street, one of her frequent routes, makes the street better for bikes and cars alike.

“The cars who are turning left seem to be more calm about knowing their turn is going to come, and waiting in their row during that period,” Zalenski said. “It seems to be a more calm and much more peaceful traffic situation.”

In retrospect, Zalenski said, the choice of biking as a way to build physical health into a busy schedule seems obvious.

“I was like, how come I didn’t do that sooner?” she said.
American shop owners in cities have a terrific problem on their hands: their neighborhoods are filling up with people.

This wouldn’t even be a problem, of course, if it weren’t for the bulky device most people bring with them wherever they go: a car. For many customers who drive to shops and restaurants, patronizing a store means hunting for scarce parking and crawling through traffic. And for some retailers, winning the race for customers means giving passers-by a compelling enough reason to suffer through the process of storing their vehicle.

To fix these problems, some cities have demolished buildings or built garages to provide more parking — huge expenses that can actually hurt the increasingly valuable neighborhoods they aim to serve. But others have focused on a tool that, it turns out, is ideal for short retail trips: the bicycle. Equipped with baskets or racks, a regular bike can carry the day’s shopping. Increasingly popular cargo bikes offer even more capacity.

A new round of entrepreneurial innovators are discovering that protected bike lanes can help modern retailers get more customers in the door and boost sales. Though customers who bike to a store tend to buy less in a single visit, they return more often, spending as much or more over time than the average customer who arrives by car.

Because bicycles are quick to park and space-efficient, bikes turn people into the customers of retailers’ dreams: easy to attract, cheap to serve and more likely to return again and again.
THE MODERN MINIMART

Green Zebra Grocery
Portland, OR

Good bike access isn’t optional for Lisa Sedlar’s Green Zebra Grocery. It’s the key to a whole new business model that’s bringing fresh food to more neighborhoods.

After 17 years as a corporate leader in grocery businesses, Lisa Sedlar saw a new trend: more shoppers seemed to be choosing to make small daily grocery trips by foot or bike instead of big weekly ones by car.

So Sedlar launched the first location of a 7,000-square-foot mini-grocer that includes a cook-from-scratch kitchen, fresh-cut meat, a massive salad bar, grab-and-go sandwiches and beer and wine on tap.

The model can only succeed in bringing fresh food to new areas, she figures, if about 30 percent of customers come in by foot, bike or public transit.

That’s why Sedlar’s first location has more on-site bike parking spaces (20) than car spaces (17). It’s also why she’s joined a group pushing to remove a lane of auto traffic on the road that goes past her shop, Lombard Street, to make room for a wide or protected bike lane, green bike markings and better pedestrian crossings.

“It’s never not going to be a main thoroughway,” Sedlar said. “I would totally take away a travel lane. That’s what makes the most sense.”

BIKE LANES PART OF SALES BOOST

In New York City, after the construction of a protected bike lane and other improvements on 9th Avenue, local businesses saw up to a 49% increase in retail sales, compared to 3% increases in the rest of Manhattan.

9th Avenue
49% Increase in sales

Rest of Manhattan
3% Increase in sales

BIKE SHOPPING: SMALLER TRIPS, MORE VISITS

People who arrive to a business on bike spend less per visit but visit more often, resulting in more money spent overall per month.

In Portland, OR, people who traveled to a shopping area by bike spent 24% more per month than those who traveled by car.

Studies found similar trends in Toronto and three cities in New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AVERAGE SPENDING PER TRIP</th>
<th>AVERAGE SPENDING PER MONTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>$13.70</td>
<td>$61.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>$10.66</td>
<td>$75.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DROP-IN DINING

694 Wine & Spirits
Chicago, IL

For 694 Wine & Spirits, a new protected bike lane outside the bar meant a big increase in notoriety.

“It’s created more traffic,” said owner Chris Dunstatter. “There are so many cyclists on here.”

The new steady stream of passers-by on two wheels is great news for the bar. The local lounge, which serves meats, cheeses and boutique spirits, was able to open a sidewalk café thanks to the new lane — boosting the bar’s seating capacity and public profile.

“There’s just a little more acknowledgement of the business now because people bicycle by instead of driving by,” he continued. “When you’re in a car, you can’t really see what’s going on. But when you’re cycling by, you take a little more notice of everything. We have more curb appeal, more window shoppers.”

“When they created the bike lane, they removed parking from this side of the street, which also meant removing parking signs,” said Dunstatter. “Because they did that, we were able to get a sidewalk café permit. Now we have a little more notoriety, so people know where we are a little better.”

The new sidewalk café has improved business and gives customers a place to watch bicyclists stream by.

“Any small business owner should push for something that’s going to bring by traffic at a slower rate,” Dunstatter said. “Parking is going to be a problem at first, but everyone adapts after a while.”
PARKING, OUTSIDE THE BOX

Green Apple Books
San Francisco, CA

There never seemed to be anywhere for a car to park outside Pete Mulvihill’s bookshop. Which was exactly why he wanted to replace one of the auto parking spots with a bike parking corral.

To someone who spends less time than Mulvihill thinking about the way streets work, his plan might seem counterintuitive. But for an independent bookstore, being part of an efficient transportation system isn’t a matter of theory. It’s a matter of survival.

“It takes a couple hundred people walking in our store every day to keep our doors open,” said Mulvihill, co-owner of Green Apple Books in San Francisco’s Richmond District.

So Mulvihill got the city parking department to put 10 bike parking spots where one parked car used to sit.

“It benefits drivers by having fewer cars, it benefits cyclists by having a place to park, it benefits pedestrians by having fewer bikes on the sidewalk,” Mulvihill said.

Mulvihill’s intuition is backed by hard science. A growing body of scholarship shows that although people on bikes usually spend less per shopping trip than people in cars, they more than make up for it by visiting the same retailers more often and by using up less parking space when they do. Foot for foot and minute for minute, a full bike corral tends to be about four times more lucrative to nearby businesses than a full auto parking space.

“The refrain is that bookstores are a dying thing, but most of us have had growing sales in the last couple years,” Mulvihill said. “People value having our store here. They vote with their dollars on the retail landscape.”

VISIBLE FUN

Alamo Drafthouse Cinema
Austin, TX

Alamo Drafthouse Cinema, named “Best Theater Ever” by Time Magazine and “Coolest Movie Theater in the World” by Wired, is expanding rapidly in cities across the country. Founder and CEO Tim League hopes to see protected bike lanes expand at a similar rate.

“When a city builds protected bike lanes correctly, they are most certainly used,” said League. “In an urban center, bike lanes are going to create a community that will use the lanes for their commerce.”

League is a frequent bike rider in Austin, Texas, where Alamo got its start.

“I tend to frequent the businesses that are on the most friendly routes to bike,” said League. “Commerce on a protected bike lane is great, because you don’t need the parking that you need for cars, and people can stop anytime they want to.”

When a business faces a choice between a good bike lane and several parking spots, League thinks it should be an easy decision.

“The amount of parking loss is incidental when you’re exchanging minimizing parking for creating a community of people that are going to be biking past your business,” League said. “All the forward-thinking cities are doing it.”

66% OF MERCHANTS SEE INCREASED SALES.

When San Francisco reduced car lanes and installed bike lanes and wider sidewalks on Valencia Street, two-thirds of merchants said the increased levels of bicycling and walking improved business. Only 4 percent said the changes hurt sales. 14

SMALLER PARKING SPACE, MORE VALUE

19 cents: retail revenue per hour per square foot of on-street auto parking.
69 cents: retail revenue per hour per square foot of bike parking. 13

Melbourne, Australia, 2008
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