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AND
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EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
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Jane Parker (1st Vice Chair), Kimbley Craig (2nd Vice Chair),
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Fernando Armenta (County representative), Alejandro Chavez (City representative)

Wednesday, August 7, 2013
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55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas

***9:00 a.m.***

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 Agency Secretary 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. If you are unable to attend, please contact Elouise Rodriguez, Senior Administrative Assistant. Your courtesy to the other members to assure a quorum is appreciated.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:** Any member of the public may address the Committee on any item not on the agenda but within the jurisdiction of Transportation Agency and Executive Committee. 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 - 3.3 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 enclosed minutes from the Executive Committee meeting of May 1, 2013. – Rodriguez

3.2 RECEIVE update on federal legislative activities. – Watson

3.3 APPROVE out-of-state travel for Dave Potter, TAMC Rail Policy Committee Chair, and one TAMC staff member to attend Rail-Volution conference from October 20-23, 2013 in Seattle, Washington. – Hale

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

4. REVIEW results of the Spring 2013 survey of likely voters on transportation projects, sustainability and funding and DISCUSS next steps. – Hale/Bernstein

5. RECEIVE update on scenario development for the 2014 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. – Cook

6. RECEIVE an update on state legislative activities. – Gavin/Arriaga

7. RECEIVE report on draft agenda for TAMC Board meeting of August 28, 2013. – Hale

(Handout)

8. ADJOURN

Next Executive Committee meeting is:
Wednesday, September 4, 2013
Please mark your calendars.
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

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.
DRAFT MINUTES

TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY
SERVICE AUTHORITY FOR FREEWAYS EMERGENCIES AND MONTEREY
COUNTY REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE
JOINT POWERS AGENCY

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Members are: Jerry Edelen (Chair),
Jane Parker (1st Vice Chair), Kimbley Craig (2nd Vice Chair),
Simon Salinas (Past Chair),
Fernando Armenta (County representative), Alejandro Chavez (City representative)

Wednesday, May 1, 2013
*** 9:00 a.m. ***
Transportation Agency Conference Room
55-B Plaza Circle, Salinas

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Edelen called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. Board members present: Armenta, Chavez, Craig, Edelen, Parker and Salinas. Staff present: Cheung, Gavin, Goel, Hale, Muck, Rodriguez, Watson and Zeller. Others present: Agency Counsel Reimann, Paul Schlesinger, Alcalde & Fay Associates (via phone), Sam Teel, Monterey County Hospitality Association and Sharon Joyce, Monterey County resident.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

3. CONSENT AGENDA
On a motion by Board member Salinas and seconded by Board member Parker, the committee voted 6 – 0 to approve the consent agenda.

3.1 APPROVED minutes from the Executive Committee meeting of April 3, 2013.

END OF CONSENT
4. **RECEIVED** an update on federal legislative activities.

On a motion by Board Craig and seconded by Salinas, the committee voted 6 – 0 to receive the update on federal legislative activities.

Christina Watson, Principal Transportation Planner, reported that the President’s budget includes $73.5 billion for the ten largest budget accounts at the US Department of Transportation enacted appropriations levels are shown for fiscal years 2005-2013 and the proposed budget request level is shown for fiscal year 2014. This table shows the Administration’s budget proposal includes $500 million for Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (“TIGER”) discretionary grants, $40 billion for highway projects, $3.7 billion for high-speed rail, and $2 billion for Federal Transit Administration “New Starts” projects.

5. **RECOMMENDED** that the Board approve Resolution 2013-07 adopting the fiscal year 13/14 budget and work program and estimated budgets for fiscal years 14/15 and 15/16.

On a motion by Committee member Chavez and seconded by Salinas, the committee voted 6 – 0 to recommend that the Board approve Resolution 2013-07 adopting the fiscal year 13/14 budget and work program and estimated budgets for fiscal years 14/15 and 15/16.

Rita Goel, Director of Finance & Administration, reported that the resolution approves the final budget and work program for fiscal year 13/14, including federal, state and local grant authorizations and certifications, and out year budgets for fiscal years 14/15 and 15/16. At its February adoption of the draft budget, the Board did not have any suggested changes for the final budget. This version makes minor changes to reflect the latest information on revenues and expenditures. She noted that the biggest risk to the agency continues to be a reduction in federal and state planning funds for an extended period of time. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) has reduced the amount of Federal Highway Planning Funds provided to the Agency from approximately $280,000 in past years to $100,000. Staff will keep the Board advised of any other developments related to transportation funding and should further major revenue reductions occur, will return with potential cost cuts in both operating and direct programs.

Deputy Executive Director Muck noted that the reduction in federal planning funding levels was a decision of AMBAG to take additional funding from TAMC and Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission. Executive Director Hale noted the high cost of administering these federal funds and requested support from TAMC Board members on AMBAG for retaining a minimum of $100,000 per year in future funding years.
Ms. Goel also reported that the Agency budget separates expenditures into two types: operating and direct program. Operating expenditures include staff salaries and benefits, materials and supplies, and equipment purchases. Direct program expenditures include outside consultants, contracts, expenditures that apply to specific work program tasks such as rail program, highway projects, bicycle and pedestrian program etc. The proposed fiscal year 2013/14 operating expenditure budget is $2,520,707, a net decrease over fiscal year 2012/13 of $27,975. The proposed fiscal year current direct program expenditure budget is $9,463,524, a net decrease over fiscal year 2012/13 of $785,689.

6. RECEIVED draft fee schedule and supporting documents for the update to the Regional Development Impact Fee program, and RECOMMENDED approval of draft fees to the Transportation Agency Board of Directors.

On a motion by Board member Parker and seconded by Committee member Armenta, the committee voted 6 – 0 to receive draft fee schedule and supporting documents for the update to the Regional Development Impact Fee program, and recommend approval of draft fees to the Transportation Agency Board of Directors.

Mike Zeller, Senior Transportation Planner, reported that as part of the Joint Powers Agreement, the agency is required to update the fee program once every five years. The draft fees represent updates to the regional travel forecast model, general plan updates, project financing, and population growth projections that have occurred since the program started in August 2008. In preparing this draft, staff has met with all of the jurisdictions to update project costs and in some cases modify the projects on the list. He noted that the draft Regional Development Impact Fee program is expected to generate $142 million over the life of the program, which is substantially lower than prior estimates due to a slower expected pace of development. The draft fees per trip are slightly higher than the prior fees in most zones due to fewer forecast trips and additional projects or project cost increases in the North and South County zones. Staff has presented options showing what the fee levels would be if these projects are removed and will ask for Board direction.

Board member Chavez commented that the City of Soledad is in the process of looking at their fees and asked the TAMC be sure to coordinate with that process.
7. **RECEIVED** update on the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Priorities and Preferences Survey.

On a motion by Committee member Salinas and seconded by Vice Chair Parker, the committee voted 6 – 0 to receive an update on the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Priorities and Preferences Survey.

Sharon Gavin, Community Outreach Coordinator, reported that on April 24, 2013, the TAMC Board approved a contract with EMC Research to perform a survey on preferences for funding transportation projects. TAMC staff and representatives from AMBAG and Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission are scheduling meetings with EMC Research to put together the questionnaire; the survey will be conducted between May 28 and June 7; final results will be available in mid-June.

Executive Director Hale reported that the Agency has not done a survey for a long time, noting that should the legislature lower the voter threshold that it may need to be ready to propose a ballot measure as early as 2014. Board member Craig noted that the City of Salinas is placing a sales tax increase for police services on a 2013 ballot, and they will also be doing a survey. She noted that there could be some interactions between the proposed City tax and a potential TAMC tax.

Supervisor Armenta suggested that if the results are favorable that TAMC should consider publishing them in its 2014 Annual Report. He further noted that there may be some land use measures on the 2014 ballot that could affect results if TAMC’s measure were on the same ballot.

Public Comment:
Sharon Joyce, 156 area resident, asked if the poll could include a question about local support for tolling to pay for improvements to Highway 156.

Sam Teel, Monterey County Taxpayers Association, reported that in the past he has been personally supportive of infrastructure projects. He asked that TAMC involve the Taxpayer’s Association early in the process, noting he would like to be more pro-active in supporting the measure, noting they would like to be able to look at the survey results and even advocate for survey questions that would affect what was in the final measure.
8. RECEIVED report on draft agenda for TAMC Board meeting of May 22, 2013.

On a motion by Committee member Salinas and seconded by Board member Chavez, the committee voted 6 – 0 to receive a report on the draft agenda for the TAMC Board meeting of May 22, 2013.

Executive Director Debbie Hale reviewed the May 22, 2013 draft agenda. She reported the first item on the agenda would be a closed session regarding real estate negotiations, then reconvene to report any actions taken. The Board will also be asked to approve the real estate acquisition agreement and payment of closing costs and other related expenses. The Board will also be asked to approve the draft fee schedule and supporting documents for the update to the Regional Development Impact Fee Program. The Board will receive the results from the Tolling Traffic and Revenue Study for the Highway 156 Corridor. The Committee directed staff to place on the consent agenda Resolution 2013-07 adopting the fiscal year 13/14 budget and work program and estimated budgets for fiscal years 14/15 and 15/16. Also, the Board will be asked to approve the Project Delivery Assistance Scope of Work, and to authorize staff to release a request for qualifications with the scope of work, score the received statements of qualifications, and conduct interviews as necessary. The Board will be asked to authorize the agreement between TAMC and the City of Monterey for education and Public Outreach services for the proposed roundabout at Highways 1 and 68 near Pebble Beach, and will propose a Call Box Answering Center Contract amendment.

9. ADJOURNMENT
Chair Edelen adjourned the meeting at 10:17 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]
Eloise Rodriguez, Senior Administrative Assistant
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee
From: Christina Watson, Principal Transportation Planner
Meeting Date: August 7, 2013
Subject: Federal Legislative Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION

RECEIVE update on federal legislative activities.

SUMMARY

The focus of recent federal transportation legislative activities has been on a draft transportation appropriations bill and a new Secretary of Transportation.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Financial impact of the transportation authorization bill is unclear at this time.

DISCUSSION

Transportation Appropriations Bill
A transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year (FY) 2014 has been making its way through the legislature. Both House and Senate versions of the bill fully fund the highway and transit program levels outlined in the authorization bill, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), at $40.3 billion for federal-aid highways and $8.6 billion for transit formula programs.

The House Appropriations Committee passed the House version of the bill on June 27. In total, the House bill provides $44.1 billion in discretionary spending – a reduction of $7.7 billion below the fiscal year 2013 enacted level and $13.9 billion below the President’s budget request. This level is approximately $4.4 billion below the level caused by automatic sequestration cuts for these programs.

Also on June 27, the Senate Committee on Appropriations approved the Senate version of the appropriations bill. The Senate bill provides $550 million for the “Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery” (TIGER) grant program and $500 million for a new “Bridges in Critical Corridors” repair program; both omitted from the House bill. The Senate bill would
provide more funding for Amtrak operating and capital grants than the House bill, as well as for the New Starts discretionary transit capital program.

Neither the House nor Senate bills provide the $50 billion in immediate transportation investments called for in the White House’s FY 2014 budget proposal. Further, neither bill provides for an infrastructure bank or other new capital financing tools included in the White House proposal. Both bills will be addressed by their full bodies at a later date.

**Secretary of Transportation**

In other news – also on June 27 – the Senate unanimously approved President Obama’s appointment of Charlotte Mayor Anthony Foxx to the post of Secretary of Transportation. Secretary Foxx stated his priorities will be safety, followed by “efficiency and performance of our current transportation system, while building the infrastructure we need for future generations.” According to the DOT news release:

> Prior to his confirmation, Foxx served as the mayor of Charlotte, North Carolina, from 2009 to 2013. During that time, he made efficient and innovative transportation investments the centerpiece of Charlotte's job creation and economic recovery efforts. These investments included extending the LYNX light rail system, expanding Charlotte-Douglas International Airport, and starting the Charlotte Streetcar project.

The Washington, DC Streetsblog also notes that in his career, he has demonstrated support for light rail, streetcars, bike and pedestrian infrastructure, and transit-oriented development. In his confirmation hearing, he expressed support for the TIGER grant program.

Among the many issues that Foxx faces as incoming transportation secretary, the top issues are the federal budget sequester, the future of transportation funding, Amtrak reauthorization, distracted driving, and implementation of MAP-21.

Approved by: 
Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Date signed: 7/29/13

Consent Agenda
Reviewed by Counsel: N/A
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee

From: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Meeting Date: August 7, 2013

Subject: Out-of State Travel to 2013 Rail–Volution Conference

RECOMMENDED ACTION
APPROVE out-of-state travel for Dave Potter, TAMC Rail Policy Committee Chair, and one TAMC staff member to attend the Rail-Volution Conference from October 20-23, 2013 in Seattle, Washington.

SUMMARY
Rail Policy Committee Chair, Supervisor Dave Potter has requested approval to attend the 2013 Rail-Volution Conference. In the past, staff has accompanied Boardmembers on similar conferences. Administrative Policy No. 3 Official Travel requires Executive Committee approval for all out-of-state travel.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
There are adequate funds in Agency’s travel budget to cover the conference costs, which are estimated not to exceed $2,000 per person, for a total cost of $4,000.

DISCUSSION
The Rail-Volution Conference is an intensive four-day conference for professionals who believe strongly in the role of land use and transit as partners in developing communities. The goals of the conference are supportive of the Agency’s priority for new passenger rail service and the proposed Sustainable Communities Strategy’s emphasis on transit-oriented development. Attached is the Rail-Volution conference At A Glance schedule.

Approved by: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director
Date: 7/24/13
Consent Agenda
Reviewed by Counsel: N/A

Attachment: Rail-Volution 2013 Conference At A Glance
## CONFERENCE AT A GLANCE

### SATURDAY, OCTOBER 19
- **Depart 10/19 8:00 am**
- **Return 10/20 4:30 pm**
- 6:30 pm – 9:30 pm **Sunset Cruise**

### SUNDAY, OCTOBER 20
- **8:00 am – 12:00 pm** **MW 1** Future of Flight: Boeing Everett Plant Tour
- **8:30 am – 1:30 pm** **MW 2** Bainbridge Island: TOD with PNW Style
- **9:00 am – 12:00 pm** **MW 3** Meet Seattle's [Growing] Streetcar Network
- **9:00 am – 1:30 pm** **MW 4** Voices and Visions from Seattle's Rainier Valley
- **9:00 am – 2:00 pm** **MW 5** Capitol Hill: An Urbanist's Paradise
- **11:00 am – 2:30 pm** **MW 6** Urban Conservation Meets Light Rail
- **12:30 pm – 4:00 pm** **MW 7** Ride and Learn: Seattle's Bicycle Master Plan
- **12:30 pm – 5:00 pm** **MW 8** Surf and Turf: Water Taxi and BRT
- **1:00 pm – 4:00 pm** **MW 9** Art and Walkable Neighborhoods
- **1:00 pm – 4:30 pm** **MW 10** Seattle's Waterfront by Land, Sea and Sky
- **2:00 pm – 5:00 pm** **New Starts Symposium**
- **7:00 pm – 9:00 pm** **Welcome Reception**

### MONDAY, OCTOBER 21
- **8:00 am – 9:30 am** **Plenary Session**
- **10:00 am – 11:30 am** **8 Concurrent Workshops**
- **10:00 am – 12:00 pm** Rail-Volution 101
- **10:00 am – 12:30 pm** **MW 11** South Lake Union: Rebirth of a Neighborhood
- **12:00 pm – 1:30 pm** Lunchtime Opportunities
- **12:30 pm – 5:00 pm** **MW 12** Destination East Link
- **12:30 pm – 5:00 pm** **MW 13** Bike the Burke
- **1:00 pm – 6:00 pm** **MW 14** Downtown Tacoma Revitalization
- **2:00 pm – 3:30 pm** **8 Concurrent Workshops**
- **2:00 pm – 5:00 pm** Developers Roundtable
- **4:00 pm – 5:30 pm** **8 Concurrent Workshops**

### TUESDAY, OCTOBER 22
- **8:00 am – 9:30 am** **Plenary Session**
- **10:00 am – 11:30 am** **8 Concurrent Workshops**
- **10:00 am – 2:00 pm** **MW 15** Transit Innovations: Double-Track and Swift BRT
- **12:00 pm – 1:30 pm** Idea Exchanges
- **12:30 pm – 5:00 pm** **MW 16** Bicycle Capital of the Northwest: Redmond by Bike
- **1:00 pm – 3:30 pm** **MW 17** Light Rail Across the I-90 Floating Bridge?
- **1:00 pm – 5:00 pm** **MW 18** Planes and Trains
- **1:00 pm – 5:00 pm** **MW 19** Northgate: From America's First Mall to Urban Center Redevelopment Model
- **2:00 pm – 3:30 pm** **8 Concurrent Workshops**
- **4:00 pm – 5:30 pm** **8 Concurrent Workshops**
- **5:30 pm – 7:00 pm** Trade Show Reception
- **7:30 pm – 9:30 pm** Pecha Kucha Slam

### WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23
- **7:30 am – 11:00 am** **MW 20** Bicycle Greenways: Community Values & Infrastructure
- **8:00 am – 11:00 am** **MW 21** Union and King Street Stations: Transit Hub Transformed
- **8:00 am – 9:30 am** **6 Concurrent Workshops**
- **10:00 am – 11:30 am** **6 Concurrent Workshops**
- **12:00 pm – 1:30 pm** **Plenary Session**
- **2:00 pm – 5:00 pm** Seattle Local Session
  - Spreading Success Around with TOD
  - Making Funding Sustainable
  - Shattering Siles in Regional Equity Strategy

---

Did you know that Rail-Volution offers more than 80 workshop sessions beyond the mobile workshops? See page 2 for a preview of our 2013 topics.
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee
From: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director
Meeting Date: August 7, 2013
Subject: Survey Results and Implications for Transportation Funding

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

REVIEW results of the Spring 2013 survey of likely voters on transportation projects, sustainability and funding and DISCUSS next steps.

SUMMARY:
The survey results, presented to the regional transportation agencies in June 2013, will guide the selection of projects and financial estimates in the long-range Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan and the tri-county Monterey Bay Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Ruth Bernstein will review details of the survey results and discuss its implications for a possible future transportation sales tax measure.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
In 2012, a 1/2 % sales tax would have generated about $26 million, equal to $780 million over 30 years. The $54,500 cost of the tri-county Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Survey was funded by a state Strategic Growth Council grant.

DISCUSSION:
The Transportation Agency has long been interested in joining the 90% of Californians who belong to “self-help counties” that levy a supplemental sales tax to pay for transportation improvements. Transportation investments in these self-help counties have been far above their counterparts and have also resulted in extra state matching funds.

Monterey County has made four attempts to gain voter approval of a transportation sales tax measure, but has always fallen short of the 2/3 majority required as a special tax:
Survey Results and Implications for Transportation Funding  

- November 1989  Measure B  50% + 11 votes  
- November 1998  Measure N  53%  
- June 2006  Measure A  57%  
- November 2008  Measure Z  63%  

EMC Research has conducted several surveys (and focus groups) for the Transportation Agency over the years. Their analysis of the 2013 survey results included information comparing the 2013 survey results with survey results and elections in 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008. While transportation issues remain in the top five unprompted survey responses as areas of concern, they continue to rank fifth out of five, with crime and water leading.

Nonetheless, the results show that voter support for transportation funding has rebounded to pre-recession levels. In fact, the survey indicated slightly higher support for a ½% transportation sales tax after a range of possible projects was given (66%) than occurred in the November 2008 election (63%), and above the 2/3 voter threshold if the “lean yes” (4%) respondents were included. The conclusions were:

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

Transportation funding sources are increasingly constrained. State funding continues to remain flat, and statewide surveys indicate that there is little public support for a new transportation bond measure—which was tremendously beneficial to the Monterey County region—and federal earmarks are still prohibited. Efforts to reduce the voter threshold for transportation are stalled in the state legislature, despite our coordinated advocacy efforts with the new Aspiring Counties group. If in 2014 the Legislature placed these measures on the ballot, they would require approval by a statewide majority of voters. Waiting for a reduction in the 2/3 voter threshold may result in the sales tax capacity (with 10% as the statewide cap) being used up by the cities to meet their general fund needs, since such measures only require a 50% +1 approval.

Passage of a transportation sales tax measure under the 2/3 voter requirements remains challenging, but the recent survey results indicate that public support is rising. Staff encourages the Executive Committee to consider efforts to meet with stakeholders and evaluate the prospects for initiating a new transportation sales tax expenditure plan targeted to the November 2016 ballot. Such efforts would need to be coordinated with member agencies, including Monterey-Salinas Transit, which also is considering a transportation sales tax measure.

Approved by:  
Debra L. Hale, Executive Director  
Date signed: 7/17/13  
Regular Agenda  
Counsel Review: N/A  
Web Attachment: 2013 Survey Results of Monterey County voters
Monterey Bay Metropolitan Transportation Plan
Sustainable Communities Strategy Strategy
Priorities and Preferences Survey

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please note that due to rounding, percentages may not add up to exactly 100%.
Overall optimism appears to be on the rise.

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

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

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

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

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

- Right Direction
- (Don't know)
- Wrong Track


- 2003: 46%, 18%, 18%
- 2004: 46%, 36%, 18%
- 2005: 47%, 32%, 22%
- 2007: 43%, 34%, 23%
- 2008: 41%, 35%, 24%
- 2013: 46%, 31%, 23%
Crime is a top of mind concern in all three counties

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
<th>Monterey</th>
<th>San Benito</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime/gangs</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water shortage</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic/Transportation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless population</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation continues to be a top 5 concern in Monterey; crime mentions are on the rise.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime/Gangs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water shortage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic/Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth/Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### For each of the following items, please tell me how high a priority that item should be for Monterey County.

*Use a scale of 1 to 9, where 1 means the lowest priority and 9 means the highest priority. (Q7-14)*

*MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY*

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

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

MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY

- Improving safety on local roads and highways (Q8)
- Reducing traffic congestion on local roads and highways (Q9)
- Improving local public transit (Q11)
Many think the transportation system in Monterey has improved

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

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

58% are solo drivers

30% do not commute
12% not solo drivers

Less than 25 minutes, 1-way: 67%
25 minutes or more, 1-way: 33%

Do you go to work, school, or a volunteer position outside of your home at least three times a week or not. (Q62)
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One-third of voters in the county frequently or occasionally walk as a form of transportation

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

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at all/(Don't know)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk for transportation (Q69)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommute, or work from home (Q71)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool or vanpool (Q70)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride a bicycle for transportation (Q67)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take public transit (Q68)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudinal Questions
Nearly all in the county agree that planning should continue to accommodate drivers

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

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>(Don't know)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We must accept that people need their cars to get around and should have long term planning in our area that accommodates drivers. (Q21)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the roads and highways in our area is necessary to support our economy. (Q23)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary for the future of our economy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. (Q26)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We must accept that climate change is a problem and should have long term planning in our area that will result in people using cars less. (Q22)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority also believe that we need long term planning to reduce car use

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

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>(Don't know)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixing potholes and maintaining roads should be our highest transportation priority, even if it means putting off other transportation projects and improvements. (Q28)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary for the health of our community to reduce our reliance on cars. (Q27)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to drastically reduce our reliance on cars in our area, even if doing so is difficult for us today. (Q20)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monterey County Voters EMC 13-4879
June 26, 2013
Support for reducing reliance on cars is higher among Latinos

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

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>(Don't know)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Latino</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. District 1</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. District 2</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. District 3</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. District 4</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. District 5</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Support for reducing reliance on cars is higher among women and younger respondents

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

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>(Don't know)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Monterey County Voters EMC 13-4879
June 26, 2013)
Nearly half say they would drive a lot less if gas were significantly more expensive, and many others would drive less with other changes.

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

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

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

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

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Drive a lot less</th>
<th>Drive a little less</th>
<th>No difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If traffic gets worse (Q82)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there were more sidewalks (Q74)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there were more bike lanes (Q77)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there were safe places to store your bicycle (Q78)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your work hours were more flexible (Q81)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects and Programs
Now I’m going to read you a list of possible transportation projects in your area. For each of the following projects, please tell me whether you support or oppose the project, using a scale of one to nine where one means strongly oppose and nine means strongly support. (Q29-59)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

1-4 Oppose  5/(Don't know)  6  7  8  9-Strongly support

- **Improving roads to make driving safer (Q34)**
  - 7% 10% 9% 15% 13% 47%

- **Maintaining roads and repairing potholes (Q33)**
  - 8% 8% 8% 15% 16% 45%

- **Widening Hwy-68 between Monterey and Salinas (Q49)**
  - 17% 11% 6% 12% 12% 42%

- **Widening Hwy-156 between Castroville and Prunedale including a new interchange at Hwy-101 (Q52)**
  - 15% 12% 7% 15% 12% 39%

- **Improving highways to reduce traffic and travel times (Q35)**
  - 9% 14% 7% 19% 15% 35%

- **Improving Hwy-101 South of Salinas to increase safety and reduce traffic (Q51)**
  - 18% 15% 8% 13% 12% 34%
Now I’m going to read you a list of possible transportation projects in your area. For each of the following projects, please tell me whether you support or oppose the project, using a scale of one to nine where one means strongly oppose and nine means strongly support. (Q29-59)

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

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

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

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

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

**MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY**

- Improving transportation for seniors and people with disabilities (Q29)
  - 6% oppose
  - 11% don't know
  - 6% neither
  - 14% support
  - 15% strongly support
  - 48%

- Adding new train service between Salinas and Silicon Valley (Q48)
  - 21% oppose
  - 15% don't know
  - 6% neither
  - 12% support
  - 13% strongly support
  - 33%

- Avoiding cuts to existing bus service (Q32)
  - 16% oppose
  - 15% don't know
  - 9% neither
  - 14% support
  - 14% strongly support
  - 32%

- Expanding opportunities for carpooling and vanpooling (Q36)
  - 13% oppose
  - 14% don't know
  - 10% neither
  - 19% support
  - 12% strongly support
  - 32%

- Adding commuter train service (Q31)
  - 24% oppose
  - 14% don't know
  - 8% neither
  - 11% support
  - 14% strongly support
  - 29%

- Expanding and improving bus service (Q30)
  - 14% oppose
  - 15% don't know
  - 14% neither
  - 16% support
  - 15% strongly support
  - 27%

- Building light rail to improve travel between the Mont. Peninsula and Cal State-Mont. Bay (Q50)
  - 33% oppose
  - 12% don't know
  - 5% neither
  - 14% support
  - 11% strongly support
  - 25%
Now I’m going to read you a list of possible transportation projects in your area. For each of the following projects, please tell me whether you support or oppose the project, using a scale of one to nine where one means strongly oppose and nine means strongly support. (Q29-59) MONTEREY COUNTY ONLY

Other Projects: Farmland preservation is important to county voters

Preserving farmland and agriculture (Q39)

- 1-4 Oppose: 4%
- 5/(Don't know): 5%
- 6: 9%
- 7: 18%
- 8: 57%

Preserving open space and wildlife habitat (Q40)

- 1-4 Oppose: 9%
- 5/(Don't know): 8%
- 6: 4%
- 7: 12%
- 8: 19%
- 9: 49%

Focusing housing near jobs and services to have neighborhoods where less driving is needed (Q41)

- 1-4 Oppose: 16%
- 5/(Don't know): 16%
- 6: 12%
- 7: 13%
- 8: 12%
- 9: 31%
Transportation Tax
61% conceptually support a transportation sales tax in Monterey

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

- **Strongly disagree**: 25%
- **Somewhat disagree**: 12%
- **Somewhat agree**: 29%
- **Strongly agree**: 32%

Monterey
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Two-thirds say they would support a sales tax measure after hearing all projects

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

- Yes, approve: 66%
- Lean yes: 27%
- Lean no: 4%
- No, reject: 66%
- (Don't know): 100%
Reactions to a tax are fairly consistent with previous data

Monterey County Transportation Tax Measures: Polls and election results

Two-thirds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Lean No</th>
<th>(Don't know)</th>
<th>Lean Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 Survey</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Election results</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Survey</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Survey</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Election results</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Concept</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 After projects</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monterey County Voters EMC 13-4879
June 26, 2013
The vast majority of survey respondents drive alone and believe current transportation planning must accommodate use of cars.

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

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

- Survey results indicate continued interest in the community for: transportation safety, road maintenance, transportation for seniors, transit, and improving walkability.

- The level of support for a sales tax suggests moving forward with community building and planning for the possibility of a measure in 2014 or 2016.

- Additional research and political viability evaluation will need to be conducted.
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee

From: Andy Cook, Associate Transportation Planner

Meeting Date: August 7, 2013

Subject: Sustainable Communities Strategy Draft Scenarios

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
RECEIVE update on scenario development for the 2014 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy.

SUMMARY:
The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) will provide an update on the development of alternative planning scenarios for the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The committee will be asked to review initial scenario results identified by AMBAG, as well as two hybrid scenarios developed in coordination with staff.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:
There is no financial impact to the Transportation Agency associated with this action.

DISCUSSION:
The Transportation Agency is coordinating with AMBAG to refine a set of alternative planning scenarios for the 2014 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan for Monterey County must be consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy pursuant to California Senate Bill 375.

An evaluation of initial scenarios and two hybrid scenarios based on adopted policy goals will be reviewed at the committee meeting. A project list sorted into two hybrid scenarios is included as an Attachment. In general, Hybrid 1 represents the agency’s current draft project list, while Hybrid 2 represents an alternative with more funding for transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects and local street and road maintenance.

Approved by: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Date signed: 7/29/13

Regular Agenda

Counsel Review: N/A

Attachment: Monterey County Hybrid Scenario Transportation Project Lists
Sustainable Communities Strategy

Hybrid Scenario #1
Current Regional Priorities and Planning Assumptions

Regional Road & Highway Projects
- State Route 1 Operational Improvements (Carmel)
- State Route 1 Widening through Sand City
- SR 1 Monterey Road Interchange
- SR 68 – Access to Community Hospital (Widening)
- SR 68/SR 1 Roundabout
- SR 68 Coral De Tierra Intersection Improvements
- US 101 South County Frontage Roads
- US 101 Salinas Corridor (Widening through Salinas)
- US 101 Harris Road Interchange
- US 101 Gloria Road Interchange (Gonzales)
- US 101 Walnut Avenue Interchange (Greenfield)
- US 101 1st Street Interchange (King City)
- US 101 North Interchange (Soledad)
- US 101 South Interchange (Soledad)
- SR 156 West: Phase 1 (Widening) and Phase 2 (SR 156/US101 Interchange)
- Marina - Salinas Corridor (Widen Davis, Reservation and Imjin Roads to 4 lanes and replace Imjin Parkway/SR 1 Interchange)
- Imjin Parkway Full Widening (Widen to 6 lanes)
- Del Monte Corridor Widening (Monterey)
- Marina - Salinas Multimodal Corridor

Regional Rail and Transit Projects
- Capitol Corridor Rail Extension to Monterey County: Includes Salinas, Castroville, Pajaro and Gilroy stations
- Bus on Shoulder: Bus on shoulder improvements for SR 1 between Marina & Seaside
- Amtrak Coast Daylight: Intercity Rail service (San Francisco to Los Angeles with Salinas, Soledad and King City stops)
- Monterey Branch Line Light Rail: Monterey to Marina, Marina to Castroville
- Monterey Branch Line: Salinas River Bridge Replacement
- Marina-Salinas Multi-Modal Corridor: Bus rapid transit service between Marina and Salinas, including multi-modal corridor improvements through Marina

Group Listings
- Transit Capital and Operations funding: Based on current funding levels
- Highway Projects: Based on list of city-sponsored, non-regional highway projects
- Highway Operations, Maintenance and Rehabilitation: Based on current assumptions
- Local Streets & Roads: Based on city and county project lists
- Local Road/Streets Operations, Maintenance and Rehabilitation: Based on city and county project lists
- Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities: Based on city and county project lists
- Transportation system management projects: Based on city/county project lists
Sustainable Communities Strategy

**Hybrid Scenario #2**
Regional Priorities, Expanded Transit Corridors and Liveable Communities Focus

**Regional Road & Highway Projects**
- State Route 1 Operational Improvements (Carmel)
- SR 68 – Access to Community Hospital (Widening)
- SR 68/ SR 1 Roundabout
- SR 68 Coral De Tierra Intersection Improvements
- US 101 South County Frontage Roads
- US 101 Salinas Corridor (Widening through Salinas)
- US 101 Harris Road Interchange
- US 101 Gloria Road Interchange (Gonzales)
- US 101 Walnut Avenue Interchange (Greenfield)
- US 101 1st Street Interchange (King City)
- US 101 North Interchange (Soledad)
- US 101 South Interchange (Soledad)
- SR 156 West: Phase 1 (Widening) and Phase 2 (SR 156/US101 Interchange)
- Marina - Salinas Corridor (Widen Davis, Reservation and Imjin Roads to 4 lanes and replace Imjin Parkway/SR 1 Interchange)
- Del Monte Corridor Widening (Monterey)

**Regional Rail and Transit Projects**
- **Capitol Corridor Rail Extension to Monterey County:** Includes Salinas, Castroville, Pajaro and Gilroy stations
- **Bus on Shoulder:** Bus on shoulder improvements for SR 1 between Marina & Seaside
- **Amtrak Coast Daylight:** Intercity Rail service (San Francisco to Los Angeles with Salinas, Soledad and King City stops)
- **Monterey Branch Line Light Rail:** Monterey to Marina, Marina to Castroville
- **Monterey Branch Line:** Salinas River Bridge Replacement
- **Marina-Salinas Multi-Modal Corridor:** Bus rapid transit service between Marina and Salinas, including multi-modal corridor improvements through Marina
- **South County Regional Transit Improvements:** MST Line 23 capital improvements and 30 minute frequencies
- **Salinas Bus Rapid Transit:** Bus rapid transit on North Main Street and Alisal Corridors

**Group Listings**
- **Transit Capital and Operations funding:** Increase funding for transit operations
- **Highway Projects:** No additional funding for other non-regional highway projects
- **Highway Operations, Maintenance and Rehabilitation:** Maintain current levels
- **Local Streets & Roads:** Reduce funding for capital expansion
- **Local Streets/Roads Operations, Maintenance and Rehabilitation:** Increase local street and road maintenance funding ( & complete streets implementation)
- **Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities:** Increase Bicycle & Pedestrian funding vs. Hybrid #1
- **Transportation system management projects:** Based on city/county project lists
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee
From: Sharon Gavin, Community Outreach Coordinator
Meeting Date: August 7, 2013
Subject: State Legislative Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION

RECEIVE an update on state legislative activities.

SUMMARY

The Agency’s legislative consultant, John Arriaga of JEA & Associates, will attend the meeting and give an update on state legislative activities. The legislative bill track has been updated since the May 22, 2013 Board meeting. The Executive Committee recommended positions on state legislation at its April 3, 2013 meeting.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

It is unknown at this time what financial impact, if any, proposed legislation may have on the Agency.

DISCUSSION

Since the May 22 Board meeting the Transportation Agency submitted support letters for the following bills:

AB 60 (Alejo): The Safe and Responsible Driver Act. This bill requires the DMV to issue driver’s licenses to persons ineligible for a Social Security Number (SSN) who provide alternative specified documentation.

AB 1080 (Alejo): Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities. This bill allows local governments to establish a Community Revitalization and Investment Authority (Authority) in a disadvantaged community to fund specified activities and allows the Authority to collect tax increment.

SB 33 (Wolk): Infrastructure Financing Districts. This bill updates an existing financing mechanism for public works projects, while incorporating rigorous accountability measures to
ensure local government diligence, positive project results, and healthier community development.

SCA 11 (Hancock): Local government: special taxes: voter approval. This bill would lower the vote threshold for increasing most special taxes from 2/3 to 55%. By doing so, it would align the general requirement with that of school bonds under Proposition 39. It would lower the burden on cities, counties, and special districts to increase revenue for needed local services provided to Californians. It would apply to nearly all services, from schools, to transportation, to public safety agencies.

Approved by: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Date signed: 7/23/12
Regular Agenda

Attachments
1. Final 2013 TMC Leg Program-State

Web attachment
Transportation Agency for Monterey County State Legislative Bill List as of July 19, 2012
FINAL 2013 Legislative Program: State Issues

1S. Preserve funding and delivery schedule of priority transportation projects.

2S. Seek state funding for the Agency’s high priority projects, in priority order:
   1. State Route 156 improvements
   2. Rail Extension to Salinas
   3. MST Bus Replacements
   4. US 101 South County Frontage Roads
   5. Monterey Peninsula light rail transit
   6. Local streets and roads projects

3S. Support state legislation to ensure federal transportation authorization bill (MAP-21) implemented fairly for all regions, including maintaining bicycle and pedestrian project funds.

4S. Monitor climate change legislation implementing state law (AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, and SB 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act) as relates to transportation and seek funding through the cap and trade programs.

5S. Encourage the state to stabilize and increase transportation funding.

6S. Support proposals to lower the voter threshold for local transportation sales tax ballot measures.

7S. Raise awareness of the Highway 101 Corridor and its importance as a transportation facility of state and national significance.

8S. Monitor state proposals for budget and pension reform.

9S. Monitor state proposals for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) reform.

10S. Support efforts to improve the ability of agencies to plan and deliver transportation projects in a timely and cost effective manner, including updates to storm water runoff requirements.

11S. Monitor California High-Speed Rail project and seek funding as possible for Monterey County rail projects.

12S. Support legislation that promotes transit-oriented development, transit villages and smart growth, and support eligibility for housing bond funds.

13S. Support “complete streets” and development guidelines that integrate alternative forms of transportation, such as transit, bicycle and pedestrian commuting.

14S. Support member agencies’ requests for state funding of regionally significant transportation projects and support partner agency legislative efforts as they interface with regional transportation priorities, when they are consistent with Transportation Agency for Monterey County priorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 14</td>
<td>Lowenthal D</td>
<td>State freight plan.</td>
<td>Amended: 5/6/2013</td>
<td>7/2/2013-Read second time. Ordered to third reading.</td>
<td>This bill requires development of the state freight plan. Specifically, this bill: 1) Requires the Transportation Agency to prepare a state freight plan, with specified elements, to comply with the federal Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act. 2) Requires the agency to establish a freight advisory committee, and specifies the committee's duties. 3) Requires the state freight plan be submitted to the Legislature, the Governor, the California Transportation Commission, the Public Utilities Commission, and the Air Resources Board by December 31, 2014 and every five years thereafter.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>7S Hwy 101 Corridor</td>
<td>Draft Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 60</td>
<td>Alejo D</td>
<td>Driver's licenses: eligibility; required documentation.</td>
<td>Amended: 5/24/2013</td>
<td>7/8/2013-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR</td>
<td>This bill requires the DMV to issue driver's licenses to persons ineligible for a Social Security Number (SSN) who provide alternative specified documentation.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>14S Member agencies' requests</td>
<td>Letter Sent 7/2/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 160</td>
<td>Alejo D</td>
<td>California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013: exceptions.</td>
<td>Amended: 5/28/2013</td>
<td>5/29/2013-Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>This bill excludes certain Taft-Hartley multiemployer retirement plans, and retirement plans for public employees whose collective bargaining rights are protected by provisions of the Federal Transit Act, from the provisions of the Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA), as specified.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>14S Member agencies' requests</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 513</td>
<td>Frazier D</td>
<td>Tire recycling program: rubberized asphalt.</td>
<td>Amended: 6/24/2013</td>
<td>7/3/2013-Do pass as amended, and re-refer to the Committee on Appropriations</td>
<td>This bill establishes the Rubberized Asphalt Concrete (RAC) Market Development Act at CalRecycle to provide grants for local and state public works projects.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2S Seek project funding</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 946</td>
<td>Stone D</td>
<td>Transit buses: Counties of Monterey and Santa Cruz.</td>
<td>Amended: 6/26/2013</td>
<td>7/11/2013-From committee: Be placed on second reading file pursuant to Senate Rule 28.8.</td>
<td>This bill allows the Monterey-Salinas Transit District and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District to conduct programs for allowing transit buses to use the shoulders of certain highways, subject to the approval of the Department of Transportation and the California Highway Patrol.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>14S Member agencies' requests</td>
<td>Letter sent 4/5/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1080</td>
<td>Alejo D</td>
<td>Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities.</td>
<td>Amended: 7/2/2013</td>
<td>7/11/2013-From committee: Do pass as amended and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 8. Noes 2.) (July 9).</td>
<td>Allows local governments to establish a Community Revitalization and Investment Authority (Authority) in a disadvantaged community to fund specified activities and allows the Authority to collect tax increment.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter sent 7/5/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 8</td>
<td>Blumenfield D</td>
<td>Local government financing: voter approval.</td>
<td>Amended: 4/4/2013</td>
<td>7/10/2013-In committee: Hearing postponed by committee</td>
<td>Would create an additional exception to the 1% limit for a rate imposed by a city, county, city and county, or special district, as defined, to service bonded indebtedness incurred to fund specified public improvements and facilities, or buildings used primarily to provide sheriff, police, or fire protection services, that is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, city and county, or special district, as applicable.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1</td>
<td>Steinberg D</td>
<td>Sustainable Communities Investment Authority.</td>
<td>Amended: 5/2/2013</td>
<td>7/3/2013-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on L. GOV. (Ayes 5. Noes 2.) (July 3). Re-referred to Com. on L. GOV.</td>
<td>Would authorize local entities, either individually or collaboratively and excluding schools, to form a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority (SCIA). Participating entities agree to direct property tax increment revenues to the SCIA to invest in improvements that relieve blight in transit priority project areas, small walkable communities, and sites designated for clean energy manufacturing.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 33</td>
<td>Walk D</td>
<td>Infrastructure financing districts: voter approval: repeal.</td>
<td>Amended: 3/6/2013</td>
<td>7/3/2013-From committee: Do pass. (Ayes 11. Noes 5.) (July 3).</td>
<td>This bill updates an existing financing mechanism for public works projects, while incorporating rigorous accountability measures to ensure local government diligence, positive project results, and healthier community development.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter sent 7/2/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 788</td>
<td>Committee on Transportation and Housing</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Amended: 6/10/2013</td>
<td>6/18/2013-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on NAT. RES. with recommendation. (Ayes 15. Noes 0.) (June 17). Re-referred to Com. on NAT. RES.</td>
<td>The Senate Transportation and Housing Committee is authoring this bill as a means of combining multiple, non-controversial changes to statutes into one bill so that the Legislature can make minor amendments in a cost-effective manner. There is no known opposition to any item in the bill, and if concerns arise that cannot be resolved, the committee will delete the provision of concern from the bill. (Holman Hwy project is part of this committee bill)</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 4</td>
<td>Liu D</td>
<td>Local government transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval.</td>
<td>Amended: 5/21/2013; Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>7/9/2013</td>
<td>Would authorize a local government to impose a sales tax exclusively for transportation improvements upon the approval of 55 percent of the voters of that local government, rather than the current 2/3rds vote requirement.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>6S Lower voter threshold</td>
<td>Letter Sent 1/24/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 8</td>
<td>Corbett D</td>
<td>Transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval.</td>
<td>Amended: 5/21/2013; Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>7/9/2013</td>
<td>Would provide that the imposition, extension, or increase of a special tax by a local government for the purpose of providing funding for transportation projects requires the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the proposition, if the proposition proposing the tax includes certain requirements.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>6S Lower voter threshold</td>
<td>Letter Sent 1/24/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 11</td>
<td>Hancock D</td>
<td>Local government: special taxes: voter approval.</td>
<td>Amended: 5/21/2013; Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>6/27/2013</td>
<td>Would lower the vote threshold for increasing most special taxes from 2/3 to 55%. By doing so, it would align the general requirement with that of school bonds under Proposition 39. It would lower the burden on cities, counties, and special districts to increase revenue for needed local services provided to Californians. It would apply to nearly all services, from schools, to transportation, to public safety agencies.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>6S Lower voter threshold</td>
<td>Letter Sent 6/18/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>