

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Programming and Allocations Committee**

September 12, 2012

Item Number 4a

2013 Transportation Improvement Program

Subject: Recommend postponement of the 2013 Transportation Improvement Program adoption.

Background: The federally required Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a comprehensive listing of Bay Area surface transportation capital projects that receive federal funds or are subject to a federally required action or are regionally significant. MTC, as the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area Region, prepares and adopts the TIP at least once every four years. Federal regulations also require an opportunity for public comment prior to TIP approval.

The Draft 2013 TIP and accompanying Transportation-Air Quality Conformity Analysis, were released for public review and comment on June 22, 2012. MTC held a public hearing on July 11, 2012, and the comment period closed on August 2, 2012. A summary of the 2013 TIP comments received and staff's response, is included as Attachment A. Comments and staff's responses on the Transportation-Air Quality Conformity Analysis are included as Attachment B.

Several commenters noted the timing mismatch between the scheduled adoption of the 2013 TIP and Plan Bay Area. MTC and the other Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in California have historically followed a Caltrans directed update schedule (that is consistent statewide) to update the TIP every two years. However, staff is recommending deferral of the 2013 TIP adoption to achieve better alignment with the Plan Bay Area development schedule, with an anticipated adoption in spring 2013.

Staff will continue the Draft 2013 TIP development through the fall and winter, and make necessary changes as a result of the adoption of Plan Bay Area. The revised 2013 TIP adoption schedule will provide additional opportunities for public review.

A project that is included in the Draft 2013 TIP and received advance public comment is the Dixon West "B" Street Undercrossing Project. Staff's response is included in Attachment A. A letter from the Solano Transportation Authority related to the project is also included as Attachment C. As background, this project is currently included in the 2011 TIP, and the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) has approved additional funding for the project through the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program. As the STA has followed a project selection process that is consistent with MTC Resolution 4035 and the TIP amendment procedures, staff proposes to add the OBAG funding into the project through an administrative TIP modification. Because of the comments raised, staff is bringing this to the Commission's attention before taking this administrative action.

Issues: None

Recommendation: Since the Committee is not being asked to take any action on the proposed 2013 TIP, this item is for information only.

Attachments: Attachment A – Responses to TIP public comment
Attachment B – Responses to Air Quality Conformity Determination comments
Attachment C- Letter from Solano Transportation Authority

**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Response to Public Comments**

The following are the public comments received during the public hearing for the Draft 2013 TIP as well as those received during the public comment period, commencing June 22, 2012 and ending August 2, 2012, followed by the responses to these comments. This list does not include the project sponsor change requests. The responses to comments received on air quality conformity are included as Attachment B. The correspondence and public hearing transcript for the Draft 2013 TIP are available at <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/2013/>.

No.	Name	Agency/Organization	Received	Response
1	Mary Savage	Public	Public hearing (7/11/2012) and letter and Email (8/1/2012)	Response #1
2	Shirley Humphrey	Public	Public hearing (7/11/2012) and letter and Email. (7/31/2012)	Response #1
3	Gary Rannefield,	Public	Public Hearing (7/11/2012) and letter (7/28/2012)	Response #1
4	Robert and Ginger Emerson	Old Town Neighbors, Dixon.	Public hearing (07/11/2012) and Email (7/31/2012)	Response #1
5	Manolo González-Estay	Transform.	Public hearing (7/11/2012) and letter (8/2/2012)	Response #4, #6,#7 and #8
6	Bill Mayben	Public	Email (6/28/2012)	First paragraph of Response #8
7	Roger Bregoff	Caltrans	Email (6/29/2012)	Response #3, first paragraph of #4,# 5
8	Richard C. Brand	Public	Email (7/28/2012)	Response #2
9	Earl Heal	Solano County Tax Payers Association	Email and letter. (7/30/2012 and 8/1/2012)	Response #1
10	Leslie Earl	Public	Email (7/30/2012)	Response #1
11	Nancy C. Schrott	Public	Email (8/1/2012)	Response #1
12	Ellen Smith	Public	Letter and Email (8/1/2012)	Response #1
13	Barbara Kelsey	Three Sierra Club Chapters - San Francisco Bay Chapter, Redwood Chapter and Loma Prieta Chapter.	Letter (8/2/2012)	Response #4, #6, and #8
14	Bob Allen	Urban Habitat	Letter (8/2/2012)	Response #4, #6, #7 and #8

MTC appreciates the public review and comments provided for the 2013 TIP. The comments received were generally in the following three categories:

1. Comments related to funding and implementation of specific projects.
2. Comments regarding the 2013 TIP, including:
 - o 2013 TIP adoption schedule
 - o Structure and layout of the TIP
 - o Investment analysis
 - o Public outreach and engagement
3. Comments providing perspectives and recommendations for regional transportation investment priorities; the relationship of the TIP to RTP goals; and the project selection process.

Category 1: Responses to Comments Related to Specific Projects

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) establishes long-range investment priorities and strategies to maintain, manage and improve the surface transportation network in the San Francisco Bay Area. The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) helps carry out these strategies in the short term by committing certain funding resources to implement specific programs and project improvements that help support implementation of the RTP. MTC has developed the 2013 TIP using the currently adopted and approved Regional Transportation Plan – Transportation 2035 as the basis, as mandated by Federal Regulations.

MTC staff forwarded project specific comments to the sponsoring agencies for clarification of next steps and opportunities for input for service planning or project development for specific programs and projects. Interested parties are encouraged to contact project sponsors directly for clarification of specific project concerns.

Comment and Response #1

Several commenters raised issues on local projects in the TIP (such as the Dixon Bicycle/Pedestrian undercrossing) addressing safety, design, and operational issues.

MTC includes local projects in the TIP after the project sponsor supports, approves, and demonstrates project funding consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The decision to include a project in the TIP does not represent an allocation or obligation of funds, or final project approval. Before securing funding and approval for project implementation, the project is subject to environmental review and final approvals from federal, state, regional or local agencies depending on fund sources, and project-specific required actions.

Generally, project design details and environmental impacts are not required before the project is included in the TIP. MTC's "A Guide to the San Francisco Bay Area's Transportation Program or TIP" outlines the various opportunities available to the public and interested stakeholders to get involved in the San Francisco Bay Area's surface transportation planning and project development process (see Appendix A-

31). The guide is also available at the MTC/ABAG Library at 101 8th Street Oakland CA, 94607 and on MTC's web site.
(http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/2013/Guide_to_the_Draft_2013_TIP.pdf)

Comment and Response #2

One commenter requested that more funding be allocated to the Dumbarton Rail project.

The current RTP, Transportation 2035, only includes the Environmental and Right-of-Way phases of the Dumbarton Rail project. Therefore only those elements of the project may be included in the TIP. Pages 7-8 of the Transportation 2035 project notebook shows the funding plan for the project in the Plan. The project notebook is available at the MTC/ABAG Library and online at:
http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035_plan/T2035-Project_Notebook_web.pdf

Comment and Response #3

An inquiry was received asking how projects in the TIP comply with Caltrans complete streets policies (Directive DD64-R1). This directive requires that Caltrans staff ensure compliance for all projects on the State Route System.

With respect to the Directive, Caltrans revised its Highway Design Manual to reflect DD64-R1 requirements. Consequently at this time all projects that are on the State Route System for which Caltrans is either an implementing agency or sponsor must now process a design exception for features that are inconsistent with DD64-R1. In rare and specific circumstances design exceptions are granted for excessive cost, environmental impact and safety reasons, or a combination of the same when they are considered to outweigh development using mandatory standards. The Caltrans projects in the 2013 TIP contribute to Deputy Directive 64-R1 compliance by observing the mandatory and advisory design standards established in the Department's Highway Design Manual as recently amended.

Category 2: Responses to Comments Regarding the 2013 TIP Update

Staff received several comments, questions and suggestions on the TIP development schedule; the structure and layout of the TIP; the investment analysis; and public outreach and engagement. The responses have been subdivided to address each of the topic areas.

Comment and Response #4 (TIP Development Schedule)

Several comments were related to the 2013 TIP Development Schedule, questioning the need for a TIP update at this time – in advance of adoption of Plan Bay Area. The comments also questioned the schedule given recent federal authorization and regulation changes.

While federal regulations enacted under SAFETEA require that the TIP be updated at least once every four years, the state requires the TIP to be updated every two

years, with all MPOs within California required to submit their TIPs on the same schedule.

Acknowledging the benefits of aligning the development schedules of the 2013 TIP and Plan Bay Area updates, staff is recommending that the TIP development schedule be delayed with a new TIP adoption date anticipated in spring 2013. Staff has notified Caltrans of the revised schedule and is providing the most current 2011 TIP as part of a two-year statewide TIP submittal.

TIP updates must adhere to federal regulations and supporting documents in effect at the time. With respect to the timing of the implementation of the recently enacted surface transportation authorization, MAP 21, US DOT has 18 months to develop guidance (by April 1, 2014) and promulgate regulations for performance measures related to the TIP as well as other areas that impact metropolitan transportation planning and programming policies.

MTC staff is recommending that the 2013 TIP development period be extended to coincide with that of Plan Bay Area. This delay in the TIP adoption will afford staff more time to review recent updates to federal guidance related to metropolitan planning and environmental justice and Title VI.

Comment and Response #5 (Structure and Layout of the TIP)

A couple of questions/ comments/ suggestions concern the format of the TIP with respect to Bicycle/Pedestrian projects in the TIP and the relationship between the RTP and the TIP.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Investments -

The TIP is a listing of Bay Area surface transportation capital projects that receive federal funds, are subject to a federally required action or are regionally significant. Bicycle/pedestrian projects that are 100% locally funded usually are not included in the TIP since they are exempt from air quality conformity and generally do not require a federal action. Also, many bicycle/pedestrian projects are included as a sub-component of larger projects such as local streets and roads rehabilitation projects. Given all of the above, the total regional investment for bicycle/pedestrian improvements is not separately identified in the TIP.

Illustration of the relationship between the RTP and the TIP -

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) establishes investment priorities and strategies to maintain, manage and improve the surface transportation network in the San Francisco Bay Area. The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) helps carry out these strategies by committing certain funding sources to specific programs and project improvements that support implementation of the RTP. Under the original schedule, MTC developed the Draft 2013 TIP using the currently adopted and approved Regional Transportation Plan – Transportation 2035 as the basis, as mandated by Federal Regulations. MTC staff is recommending that the 2013 TIP development period be extended to coincide with that of Plan Bay Area

and that the TIP be further revised and recirculated for public comment in order to incorporate Plan Bay Area policies.

Appendix A-46 provides project listings of the TIP projects, with their relationship to the RTP investment categories, including Maintenance, Operations, Enhancement, Efficiency and Expansion. Furthermore, each TIP project includes an RTP identifier (RTP-ID) showing the correspondence of the TIP project to a RTP project. Details along with specific transportation goals are identified in the RTP Project notebook (http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035_plan/T2035-Project_Notebook_web.pdf). Page 37 of the overview of the TIP shows a sample project listing and the key to format is detailed on pages 36 and 37.

The TIP listings are supported by the Fund Management System, FMS, an online TIP project database. FMS is accessible to the public and has various search capabilities. One search criterion that can be used is the RTP-ID. In the case of major projects, there are likely to be several TIP listings and a search on the RTP-ID will yield all the relevant and related TIP projects.

Comment and Response #6 (TIP Investment Analysis)

Several comments critiqued the methodologies used for the 2013 TIP Investment Analysis: Focus on Low Income and Minority Communities.

- MTC adopted two different methodologies to help illustrate how the investments affect low-income and minority populations.
 - Population Use-Based Analysis: This analysis compares estimated percent of investment for low-income and minority populations to the percent of use of the transportation system (both roadways and transit) by low-income and minority populations. In order to assign investments to these communities, their travel characteristics were used based on the following factors: percent total trips; percent VMT for road trips; and percent transit trips. While this approach serves as a general yardstick to measure transportation investments, staff acknowledges that the analysis does not directly assess the benefit and burden of specific projects or programs, the survey data is from 2000 and 2006, and many of the projects will not be open to the public until after the TIP Period in 2016.
 - Access-Based Analysis: This analysis compares the estimated percent of investment in communities of concern (CoCs) to the percent of population or infrastructure located within communities of concern. For a local project, the entire investment is either assigned within or outside of a CoC based on its location. For a network/system project, like a State Highway project, a share of the investment is assigned based on the percent of transit system miles/ percent of total number of stations (transit) or lane miles (state highway, bridge, and local roads) in communities of concern. The limitation of this methodology is that it does not take into account system usage.

Even with the limitations, we believe the investment analysis is appropriate for a macro level analysis that takes into account 900 projects. For major projects with the potential for environmental / economic impacts, project sponsors are required to prepare a more detailed analysis through the project's environmental impact analysis (NEPA).

- The two reasons that the TIP investments do not match the RTP investments are as follows:
 - Subset of Projects Requiring Federal Action: The TIP investments represent a smaller set of projects requiring federal actions (i.e. funding, permits, and air quality conformity) as compared to the more comprehensive investment strategy in Transportation 2035. The TIP, therefore, does not capture significant components of the regional transportation system such as transit operations, streets and roads maintenance, and other locally funded or state-funded transportation investments that do not require a federal action. In contrast, the long-range Transportation Plan (currently Transportation 2035) is required to encompass the performance and investment levels of the entire surface transportation system in the region.
 - Four-year Timeframe: The TIP covers on the four-year period compared to the RTP 25-year planning horizon. While a total of \$56 billion is programmed in the TIP, only the \$11 billion within the four year TIP period is accounted for in the TIP investment analysis. All other funds are considered to be for informational purposes only. Hence a \$250 million project with no funds programmed in the four years is not included in the TIP investment analysis but is considered in the RTP analysis.

Comment and Response #7 (Public Outreach)

A few comments focused on the need for improvements to MTC's public participation and outreach for the TIP in order to conform to the most recent federal guidance on public engagement.

MTC has undertaken numerous outreach efforts to make the TIP accessible to the public:

- Several reports such as the single-line project listing reports (Appendix A-46) and the TIP-at-a-Glance abstracts are included to aid the public in a better understanding of the TIP.
- The TIP Overview of the TIP is available in Spanish and Chinese on the web at <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/2013/>. (The guide is not on the webpage).
- The Draft TIP is accessible to the public at various libraries including the MTC/ABAG Library at 101 8th Street Oakland CA, 94607 and on MTC's

website. During the public review and comment period, a direct link to the TIP was posted on the MTC home page.

- MTC's "A Guide to the San Francisco Bay Area's TIP", outlines the various opportunities available for the public and interested stakeholders to become involved in the San Francisco Bay Area's surface transportation project development process. The guide has a table on the evolution of a project from a project idea to implementation and lists the various stages where a member of the public can make a difference (Pages 12-13). The guide is available at the MTC/ABAG Library at 101 8th Street Oakland CA, 94607 and on MTC's web site.
- Staff has held several workshops for partner agencies and stakeholders and an overview of the TIP is included in workshops held throughout the region on the RTP update.
- The development of transportation policies and project selection criteria for MTC's funding programs are developed through an extensive and transparent outreach process. The project selection criteria and associated policies for each program that MTC oversees are to be found in the appendices to the TIP (A-10 through A-28). These efforts are complementary to the TIP update process. The TIP compiles the programs, projects and improvements that have resulted from these outreach and project selection efforts as well as local project selection efforts in support of the RTP.
- In the development of the 2013 TIP, MTC followed its Public Participation Plan which was developed in consultation with the public, MTC Advisory Council, public agencies, federal, state and other local agencies. Changes in federal requirements will be reflected in future updates to this Plan.

Category 3: Responses to Comments Regarding the Plan, the Relationship of the TIP to the RTP and Project Selection Process

Comment and Response #8:

Commenters provided individual perspectives and recommendations for regional transportation investment priorities, the relationship of the TIP to Plan Bay Area and the project selection process.

The development of a TIP or revisions to the TIP occur after planning, regional transportation policy development and project selection have been completed. The TIP is a four-year listing of projects which are ready to move to project development and implementation. Therefore, it is important to consider the development of the long-range transportation plan, the region's primary transportation policy document; the development of funding program policies that guide local decisions about which projects are selected for inclusion in the TIP; and the compilation of projects in the TIP document itself. MTC works with transportation stakeholders and transportation agencies throughout this entire process.

Many of the comments submitted about regional policies such as climate change, congestion, sustainable community strategies and other transportation goals, are addressed in MTC's Regional Transportation Plan, which is currently being updated as Plan Bay Area. In contrast, concerns regarding specific project design and environmental impacts are generally not addressed until after a project is in the TIP. Refer to "A Guide to the San Francisco Bay Area's Transportation Improvement Program" (Appendix A-31) that pinpoints the most effective opportunities to get involved in planning and project development.

As noted previously, to respond to concerns about the TIP adoption preceding the adoption of Plan Bay Area next spring, staff is recommending deferral of the 2013 TIP adoption to align with the development and adoption of Plan Bay Area, scheduled for Spring 2013.

J:\COMMITTEE\PAC\2012 PAC Meetings\09_Sep'12_PAC\Attachments for 4a\Attach_A_Responses to written public comments updated 8 27.doc

**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Responses to Comments on Air Quality Conformity Analysis**

The 30-day comment period for the draft conformity analysis began on June 22, 2012 and closed on August 2, 2012. MTC received the following comments on the draft conformity analysis. MTC staff is recommending that the 2013 TIP development period be extended to coincide with that of Plan Bay Area. MTC staff will develop a new conformity analysis for the Plan and corresponding 2013 TIP in spring 2013. Staff responses to the comments received follow.

**Commenter: Christina Jaworski, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)
(Email Dated June 29, 2012)**

Comment #1:

Do the assumptions in the draft conformity analysis for VTA's Capitol Expressway Project (SCL#050009) assume the removal of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on Capitol Expressway between Capitol Avenue and Tully Road in San Jose?

Response #1:

With the recommended delayed adoption of the 2013 TIP, VTA's Capitol Expressway (SCL050009) will be updated, consistent with the final project description and scope in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (Plan Bay Area).

Commenter: Duane De Witt, West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (Email Dated August 2, 2012)

Comment #1:

The organization West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project is concerned there will be an increase of Particulate Matter (PM) pollution due to the projected increase in traffic stated in the TIP and wants to know what measures will be implemented to decrease the amount of PM pollution in the West Oakland area below current levels in 2012. They are not experts in air pollution, but bear the effects of the chronic air pollution afflicting West Oakland due to traffic on the surrounding freeways, roadways and the diesel truck traffic at the Port of Oakland. They have requested that the conformity analysis explain how this will be accomplished and verified during the TIP period in language understandable for "lay" people.

Response #1:

Please note that with deferral of the TIP adoption, staff will be conducting a new conformity analysis for Plan Bay Area and the 2013 TIP. The Draft Conformity Analysis will be available for public comment following the release of the Draft Plan Bay Area and Draft 2013 TIP. We encourage you to review and comment on the Draft Conformity Analysis at that time.



Solano Transportation Authority

ATTACHMENT C SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Member Agencies:
Benicia ♦ Dixon ♦ Fairfield ♦ Rio Vista ♦ Suisun City ♦ Vacaville ♦ Vallejo ♦ Solano County

... working for you!

One Harbor Center, Suite 130, Suisun City, CA 94585-2473 ♦ Telephone (707) 424-6075 / Facsimile (707) 424-6074
Email: staplan@sta-snci.com ♦ Website: solanolinks.com

August 9, 2012

Scott Haggerty
Chair, Programming and Allocations Committee
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607

08-21-12A08:46 RCVD

**RE: 2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Response to Comments
City of Dixon's West B Street Bicycle/Pedestrian Undercrossing Project**

Dear Commissioner Haggerty:

At the July 11, 2012 MTC Programming and Allocations Committee meeting, four residents of the City of Dixon spoke out in opposition to the City of Dixon's West B Street Bicycle/Pedestrian Undercrossing Project. The STA is supportive of the project, does not concur with the comments that were made, and as requested, has prepared a response to each of those comments (Attached) for the Commission's review.

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) is partnering with the City of Dixon's for the West B Street bicycle/pedestrian Undercrossing Project. The Project will replace the existing at-grade bicycle/pedestrian crossing with a grade separated bicycle/pedestrian undercrossing, which would allow pedestrians and bicyclists to safely cross Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) to access other parts of the City. The Project is located between N. Jackson Street and N. Jefferson Street, in close proximity to Dixon's downtown, Anderson Elementary School, and adjacent residential areas. The current at-grade railroad crossing facilitates an estimated 100 to 150 pedestrian trips daily, the majority of which are children accessing schools on either side of the railroad track. Two fatalities have been reported at the project location since 1990.

This project has been extensively reviewed and assessed by STA and various advisory committees as part of recently completed planning studies. The project was identified as a top priority project in the STA's recently updated Solano Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, the Solano County Rail Crossing Plan and has been identified as a top priority by STA's Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee. The Project was reviewed by and received support from the Dixon City Council, STA Board, and the STA's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees. In order to be identified as a countywide priority, the project went through multiple public input processes. The Project has also received the support of the Capital Corridor and the Dixon Unified School District.

The STA has already obtained the necessary environmental clearance, completed the projects design, gained approval from the UPRR, is in the process of completing the right-of-way clearance, and has secured funding to construct the project in 2013. Given the safety concerns being addressed by this Project and the wide public support, the STA and the City of Dixon are requesting support from the MTC Commission for the West B Street project to be included in the 2012 TIP.

Sincerely,

Daryl Halls
STA Executive Director

Attachment

Cc: Jim Sperring, County Supervisor and MTC Commissioner
STA Board Members
Steve Heminger, MTC Executive Director
Jim Lindley, City Manager, City of Dixon

**Summary of Comments and Responses to
MTC's July 11, 2012 Programming and Allocations Committee Meeting
re: West B Street Bicycle/Pedestrian Undercrossing**

COMMENTS	STA RESPONSES
<p>Mary Savage 1.1) We want to delay these projects until the community is allowed an opportunity to have clear and concise input from its citizens, along with the wisdom of its elected officials, to put the Plan before its constituents before going forward and to allow for shared ideas such as the possible train stop.</p>	<p>1.1) The STA and the City of Dixon's decisions to approve plans, environmental clearance, finalize design, and fund the West B Street Bicycle/Pedestrian Undercrossing project all took place during public City Council and STA Board of Directors meetings over the last two years. Both agencies comply with the Brown Act and post agendas online and at Dixon City Hall.</p>
<p>Shirley Humphrey 2.1) Union Pacific has not agreed to a train stop in Dixon. In discussions with them, they are not expecting a stop within the next decade. Now you want to spend \$6M for a pedestrian undercrossing next to the train station where no train stops.</p> <p>2.2) We oppose this because air quality studies have been done in this area, and it has the worst air quality.</p> <p>2.3) A local gentleman has offered four acres a half mile away, where we'd have plenty of parking.</p> <p>2.4) It is not our highest transportation need. We need an undercrossing at Pitt School Rd, where more accidents have occurred than at West B St. We were promised an undercrossing at Pitt School Rd. instead money is being diverted from Pitt School Rd. to West B St.</p>	<p>2.1) The West B St Bicycle/Pedestrian Undercrossing is a separate project with bicycle and pedestrian access and safety utility independent of any future train station proposals. The project addresses safety concerns of an existing rail crossing with high frequency of existing passenger and freight rail service.</p> <p>2.2) Air quality would not be impacted by the West B Street project. The STA is unaware of any air quality studies that suggest avoiding improvements in the area due to air quality concerns. The Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District has supported bicycle and pedestrian projects in the area in the past through grants and staff planning support.</p> <p>2.3) See response 2.1.</p> <p>2.4) The Parkway Blvd Overcrossing project is a roadway overcrossing which would connect Pitt School Road with communities near SR-113. This longer-term roadway project will be funded in part by future local development impact fees.</p>
<p>Gary Rennefeld 3.1) There is widespread support in the community for the Parkway Blvd. overcrossing/grade separation. It would relieve much of the new congestion that's made Highway 113 very dangerous through parts of South Dixon because of recent growth and the new high school in that area.</p>	<p>3.1) See response 2.4. The project is being planned and designed to improve safety and to eliminate an at-grade crossing at a frequently used rail crossing.</p>

<p>3.2) The West B Street project (the “tunnel”) is an expensive, severely flawed and poorly plan use of taxpayer money.</p> <p>3.3) Although billed as a safety measure for crossing the tracks, it itself would introduce a significant safety issue of its own and would encourage pedestrians to use one of two nearby at-grade crossings where pedestrian hazards from passing trains are not addressed.</p> <p>3.4) This kind of tunnel generally becomes a dark, damp, dirty, smelly and potentially threatening situation that pedestrians would be reluctant to use.</p> <p>3.5) The proponents plan to use this “tunnel” for access to a new train platform with the addition of an elevator and stairs. I believe its use as a pedestrian tunnel would then be compromised at that point.</p>	<p>3.2) Comment noted.</p> <p>3.3) There have been two fatalities reported at the West B Street project location, since 1990. The current at-grade crossing poses a safety risk for bicycles and pedestrians. Since 2008, more students use the current at-grade crossing due to school closures and student boundary realignment. This project would eliminate an existing at-grade rail crossing.</p> <p>3.4) The West B Street project would install lighting in the undercrossing for increased safety. The City of Dixon is committed to maintaining the project.</p> <p>3.5) See response 2.1.</p>
<p>Ginger Emerson</p> <p>4.1) I represent a group of Dixon residents known as the Old Town Neighbors. We want to go on record to strongly oppose the West B St. Undercrossing. Our feedback from Dixon residents living in Old Town confirms that they consider the “tunnel” to be the most unreasonable choice for addressing the very remote possibility of any safety issues at that location.</p> <p>4.2) Most residents claim that the tunnel would create more of a safety hazard than it resolves, and they would not use it.</p> <p>4.3) The community at large is also questioning the so-called necessity of an underground passage approximately 300 ft. from a proposed vehicular and pedestrian undercrossing at West A St.</p>	<p>4.1) Comment noted and provided under public comment to the STA Board when the STA Board took action to support project.</p> <p>4.2) Comments noted.</p> <p>4.3) As studied by the City of Dixon in 2009, the West A St. Undercrossing project concept included one traffic lane in each direction and a 12-foot walkway on the north side of the street to accommodate both bicycles and pedestrians.</p> <p>Should the West A St. Undercrossing project proceed, pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle access would be limited to existing nearby crossings during construction. As part of the City of Dixon’s current West A Street project staging plan, the West B St. Bicycle and Pedestrian Undercrossing project would provide bicycle and pedestrian</p>

<p>4.4) The general public is far more sensitive that our city and county elected officials seem to be about the waste of taxpayer dollars. We argue that the local match of money for the pedestrian tunnel should never have been diverted from the Parkway Blvd. overcrossing south of town.</p>	<p>access to Downtown Dixon and nearby schools and the Parkway Blvd Overcrossing project would provide East-West vehicle connections.</p> <p>4.4) Comment noted. The City of Dixon and STA Board have both taken action to fund the project.</p>
---	--