Santa Cruz County Local Roads
A smooth path through paradise or a hell of a road?

Summary
During our investigation the Grand Jury has found that roads in the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County are in deplorable condition. Currently more than 63% of the local roads are in poor to failed condition. This has prompted almost daily complaints to the County Board of Supervisors and the County agencies responsible for road maintenance.

Chronic underfunding of roads and culverts has led to a deficit approaching one billion dollars. For decades, the County’s strategy has been to forgo spending money on the roads that are in the worst condition and concentrate on pavement preservation on roads that are already in fair to good condition. Many unincorporated roads haven’t been resurfaced for decades.

Funding of County road maintenance is a complicated subject involving local, state and federal agencies. Most of the funds are targeted and the County has little discretion on how they are spent.

One possible source of additional funding for unincorporated roads could come from Special District 9D (1-3). Overseen by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), it contains a road assessment fee that hasn’t been increased in 36 years.

Given the chronic underfunding of rural road maintenance, our local roads are becoming increasingly unsafe for daily travel and emergency access.
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Background

Ask just about anyone living in Santa Cruz County (County) what they see as the five most significant problems facing the County and they will very likely cite poor road conditions as one of these. (See examples in Figure 1 above and Figure 2 below).

Approximately one half of the County’s population live in the unincorporated areas, with much of that population living on rural and mountainous roads. Many of these roads are not a high priority in the County’s view due to their limited use and have been ignored and neglected for years. This has resulted in anger and frustration on the part of the people affected. They wonder why their road has not been resurfaced for decades. The Santa Cruz County Department of Public Works (DPW) and the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors (BoS) receive complaints about poor road conditions on a daily basis.

As borne out by metrics, our local roads have continued to get worse over the last several decades. Poor maintenance, climate change, our geographical location, and the unique coastal mountain geology and topography have created havoc with our roads. They take a real beating.

Figure 1. Laurel Road Pavement Condition Index (PCI) 10 in 2019 report.[1]
To make matters worse, our County, for reasons that will be discussed, is in poor financial straits to the point where deferred maintenance of our road network is into the hundreds of millions of dollars and climbing. The County has lacked the financial resources to fix and maintain our roads using the general budget allocation. As a consequence, the County relies on additional funding from outside sources. These include funds from Special District 9D 1-3 (1983), Measure D (2016), California Senate Bill 1 (SB1) (2017) and the most recent Measure K sales tax increase (2024). All these sources of funding help, but still leaves the County with a large funding shortfall. Most of this funding is allocated through formulas and the County has little discretion with how it can be spent.
As a consequence of this financial conundrum, the DPW has found it necessary to prioritize how its insufficient funds are spent on the road network. It is apparent that the general strategy is to spend the money on roads that can benefit from less expensive pavement preservation over ones that are poor or failed. The roads currently being maintained tend to be of high-use and require less money as they are already in fair to good condition. The reasoning is that the cost of pavement preservation is a fraction of the cost for repairing or reconstructing a road in poorer shape. This is not a formal policy on the part of the County and many residents are not aware of this unstated strategy. The BoS have input within their district on what roads get worked on with Measure D funds. However, the current maintenance strategy is one of the three described in the Pavement Management Program Update (PMP). As a consequence, most rural local roads will have little to no maintenance in the current 5-year plan.

The road network is the lifeblood of our County. The 586 miles of County roads are used every day by our citizens in one way or another. Every day, people travel on our roads to get to and from work and school. The U.S. Postal Service, sanitation, PG&E and other businesses use our roads to deliver products and services to us. Emergency services such as fire, police and ambulance services use our roads to keep us safe.

**Scope and Methodology**

The Grand Jury sought to establish the current and projected status of the road network in the unincorporated areas of Santa Cruz County. The Grand Jury also wanted to examine the role of the DPW, within the Santa Cruz County Community Development and Infrastructure Department (CDI), the maintenance and repair of the road network and the effectiveness of the programs and procedures. In addition, the Grand Jury wanted to study the budgeting and funding mechanisms relating to the maintenance and repair of the County roadways.

Our investigation included the following:

- Investigation of the DPW’s maintenance programs for County roads
- Review of the DPW’s budget and funding for maintenance and whether there is a shortfall
- Determine how often roads are surveyed and how condition is tracked
- Determine whether the current maintenance program is catching up on deferred maintenance or if the DPW is falling further behind
- Determine whether emergency access is used as a criterion for road maintenance priority

The Grand Jury examined various State, Federal and County agency documents and websites, as well as several news media articles. Interviews with CDI staff, members of the BoS, and a staff member of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) were conducted. The Grand Jury also attended town hall meetings, toured road sites and tested the complaint system.
Investigation

Maintenance of Roads

For more than 35 years, the County has used Pavement Management Program Software (PMPS) called StreetSaver. The software program is designed to provide objective information so managers could make decisions regarding maintenance of the road system.\(^9\)

In addition, every 5 years or so, the County has had a consulting company perform an independent audit of the condition of the roads resulting in a Pavement Management Update. This audit report was last released in November of 2019. Among other things, this report documents the condition of the County roads. The PCI utilizes a 100 point scale. The scale is broken down into five broad categories as shown in Figure 3 below.\(^{10}\)

![Pavement Condition Categories by PCI](image)

**Figure 3:** Pavement Condition Categories by PCI.\(^{10}\)

The road classification system goes from major arterials, minor arterials, major collectors, minor collectors to local roads. Funding sources can limit the type of roads where the funds are used.\(^{11}\)

New roads have an average life expectancy of about 15-20 years without maintenance.\(^{12}\) Primary wear happens with traffic as well as weather (sun and rain). Tree roots also cause road damage. Culverts are used to drain water away, which sometimes clog or fail. Cracks can develop in the road surface from these factors. Cracks allow water intrusion into the roadbed which contribute to pothole formation and road deterioration. Periodic sealing of these cracks, fixing potholes and clearing culverts keeps the road in good shape and can extend its life by a decade or more. More than 63% of the local roads are in poor to failed condition as noted in the 2019 PMP.\(^{13}\)
The PMP prepared by Nichols Civil Engineering (NCE) for the County in 2019 recommended that arterials be inspected every two years and that residential roads be inspected every four to five years.[14] The Grand Jury has not been able to assess if these inspections have taken place.

The DPW monitors road conditions mainly through observations made by road crews when carrying out assignments as well as feedback from the public.[15] The public can inform the County of road problems such as potholes via the “My Santa Cruz County” mobile app for phones (both Apple and Android), the “My Santa Cruz County” website https://cconnect.santacruzcounty.us/ or by phone at (831) 454-2160.[16]

Several members of the Grand Jury tested the mobile app with fairly good results once the app was loaded. Some struggled with initially loading the app when in rural areas as it seemed very sensitive to weak internet connections. Repairs were performed in as little as a week for the potholes reported during our testing of the system.

The long-term failure of the County to adequately maintain the local classified County roads has led to the current condition and failed roads. Large potholes with drivers swerving to miss them can cause accidents. Many of these rural County roads also do not meet more recent safety standards developed by the Central Fire District of Santa Cruz County for proper emergency services support in case of a wildfire. Roads shall be 20’ wide exclusive of shoulders and have an overhead clearance of 15’.[17] Safety is one criteria or mandate the RTC uses in making decisions on which projects to fund.[18][19]

Similar to a car, regular maintenance is critical for the long life of a road. Maintenance costs dramatically increase the longer a road is left to deteriorate. A failed road can take more than eight times the amount of money to rehabilitate compared to one receiving regular maintenance.[5] The estimated 2019 reconstruction costs for a road was more than $1 million a mile and that has gone up substantially in the last few years. This does not take into account the wear and tear a poorly maintained road causes to vehicles, the safety of drivers and pedestrians trying to avoid potholes and the delay in supplying timely emergency services in the time of need.[20]

Maintenance is different from failure repairs but can be related. It is well known that the Santa Cruz County mountain geology contributes to road closures due to slides, fallen trees and water washout of roads in heavy rains. In addition to normal maintenance the County must repair failures from storms and natural disasters.[21]

**Backlog of Deferred Maintenance**

Multiple disasters in recent years have caused widespread damage to Santa Cruz County roads. However, the biggest threat to our roads could be deferred maintenance (aka “unfunded backlog”). Deferred maintenance is maintenance that is needed but can’t be done because of a lack of funds. The current backlog is estimated to be around $401 million. That figure is projected to climb to $479 million by 2028.[22][23]

Santa Cruz County’s average Pavement Condition Index is less than 48 (as of 2019) which is 17 points below the statewide average. With the current funding level, it is projected to be 38 in 2024, and it is further projected to drop to 33 by 2028.[3]
The state of the culvert system is another factor in evaluating the condition of the road network. Damaged or clogged culverts are a big reason why roads get washed out. When a road washes out, it takes the roadbed with it, costing 10 times more to fix.\[^{24}\] There are approximately 6,000 culverts countywide and many are damaged or failed.\[^{25}\] Currently, the deferred maintenance of the culvert system is estimated to be around $400 million.\[^{26}\][^27] That brings the deferred maintenance total to approximately $801 million for the culverts and roads.

The more that is done sooner to maintain our roads, the less we will have to pay later.

**Pavement Preservation**

Pavement preservation was identified by the U.S. Department of Transportation as an important task for the government to facilitate in 1988.\[^{28}\] The roadways we use are important to our everyday lives. In a county like Santa Cruz, we have many different transportation systems, with roads playing an important role in society, allowing our citizens to move about with private cars, buses, bikes and even walking. All must be able to coexist for a well-functioning community.

County roads have been needed to allow movement of the population for more than 100 years and that need will continue into the foreseeable future. Paved roads have a finite life. Performing lower cost pavement preservation can more than double a road’s useful life. Similar to tires or brakes on a car, roads wear and need maintenance to preserve their ability to serve the population. Without preservation, roads deteriorate to a point where they need to be replaced or rebuilt at a higher cost.\[^{29}\]

Historically, the County has used a combination of slurry seals, rubberized chip seals, and single chip seals as well as micro-surfacing for preservation treatments.\[^{30}\] Preservation is good but it is not the whole story. Pavement preservation is no longer effective once a road has deteriorated to a PCI of less than 25. At that point the road needs to be reconstructed.\[^{31}\]

With the current practice of the County primarily performing preservation work, local roads are mostly being ignored except for an occasional pothole repair or emergency repair because of a catastrophic failure. The County fails to use a balanced approach performing road maintenance as long as the County has limited resources preventing it from doing all that is wanted or needed.

**Funding of Road Maintenance**

The 2019 PMP suggested that the maintenance program was being funded yearly in the amount of $8 million dollars.\[^{32}\]

Funding comes from multiple sources, the main ones are:

- County General Fund
- Measure D
- Special District 9D (1-3)
- SB1
- Measure K

In addition, there are several other sources of funding:
- Fuel Taxes
- Road use payments from companies with County contracts, like Greenwaste
- Vehicle registration fees
- New construction project assessments

The funding balance changes annually, with the 9D funding being the only reliable source. Major projects can also be funded through grants and programs from the State and Federal governments.

If approved, declared disaster emergency repairs may be reimbursed from the following sources: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds 75% and State funds 12.5%, with the County paying the remaining 12.5% for road repair. However, there is a catch. Even if the County follows the requirements of FEMA, funds can be reduced or delayed even after repairs have been completed. It can take as much as three to five years to get reimbursed from FEMA. Normally the County will secure the funds to perform repairs quickly when possible and then have to wait for reimbursements from FEMA and the State. This sometimes means that the County needs to take out loans that have to be repaid with interest. Currently the County is waiting for reimbursements of more than $144 million.

Some funding sources from California are distributed through the RTC. The County must apply for project funding and compete with the local cities for these limited resources. The RTC has specific criteria that must be met that may preclude the money from being used where the County needs it most, mainly on poor, very poor and failed local roads (as shown in Figure 4).

![Figure 4. Pavement Network Breakdown by Functional Classification.](image)

**Proposition 13**

No discussion of funding would be complete without some discussion of California Proposition 13 (Prop 13) as it has had a large impact on County funding. In 1978, Prop 13 fixed the property tax rate in California at 1% of the assessed value. 13.5% of the
tax collected is sent to the County of Santa Cruz to provide mandated services to its residents.\textsuperscript{37} The Santa Cruz County government receives one of the smallest percentages of all the counties within the state. The funding percentage is based on the proportionment prior to the passage of the proposition. State Assembly Bill 8 set the proportionment after Prop 13 passed.\textsuperscript{38}

**General Fund**

Primary, direct funding comes from the County General Fund. The Grand Jury was unable to find enough detail in the County budget reports to break out how much specific funding was going to routine maintenance, which is separate from general road repairs and improvements. Even with all of the funding sources, County roads are being underfunded by more than 60% every year.\textsuperscript{39} New projects like the Rail Trail, Highway 1 expansion and the “Complete Streets” project on Soquel Avenue have diverted funds that could have been used for basic road maintenance.

**Measure D**

In November of 2016 Measure D, a ½ cent sales tax increase, was approved by the voters raising approximately $17 million annually. 30% goes to Neighborhood/Local Road Projects. The expenditure plan distributes the funds to 5 categories of projects as seen in Figure 5.

![Figure 5. Allocation of Measure D Revenues.\textsuperscript{39}]

The RTC administers the expenditure of all Measure D revenues and supplies reports on completed projects and a 5-year funding plan.\textsuperscript{40}

The June 2023 Measure D updated 5-year Funding Plan shows that the Santa Cruz County District 1 Supervisor has chosen not to provide Measure D funds to the District 1 road resurfacing program. The other Districts have road work listed for in the Measure D Funding Plan.\textsuperscript{41}
**Special District 9D (1-3)**

Road repairs in the unincorporated areas of the County are also partly funded by County Service Area (CSA) Special Districts 9D (Zones 1-3). (Figure 6 below) The current flat assessments are $56.40 on improved properties and $28.20 on unimproved properties in the unincorporated areas of the County. CSA 9D funds account for over 25% of current funding for County road maintenance. [42][43]

![Figure 6. 9D Special Districts Zones](image)

CSA 9D is a Special District governed by Santa Cruz County Government Code Section 25210. Most special districts are formed by local residents with approval from LAFCO. Special District 9D was created by Resolution 366-83 in June of 1983 and Resolution #42-89 by the County BoS in December of 1988. [44][45][46]
Proposition 218, passed in November of 1996, added additional restrictions to the operations of Special Districts. All Special Districts developed prior to 1996 were grandfathered in, including 9D, and presumed to be valid. These additional restrictions limit how CSA 9D can be modified as any changes will need to adhere to the new regulations.\footnote{47}

LAFCO is required to perform a periodic review of Service Districts. The last review of CSA 9D is dated August 5, 2020. The report states that “the Board of Supervisors determined that the sub-zones’ service charges would vary based on the extent of benefit derived from such service provided to parcels within the sub-zones.”\footnote{48}

LAFCO found the County has not varied the amount of the service charge since inception. The three zones that comprise 9D generate approximately $2.7 million annually.\footnote{48} \footnote{49} Failure of the County to form the Special District with the inclusion of a range of assessment rates or a built-in inflationary adjustment, which was allowed at the time, has caused this important funding source to become inadequate over time. Average inflation over this time has been 3.45% a year. If the annual inflation had been part of the formula, a rate approximately 3.76 times the current amount would now be charged.\footnote{42} \footnote{50}

LAFCO’s report is supposed to detail revenue and expenses for the Special District with sufficient detail for the public to understand how their taxes are being used. The Grand Jury found that there was not sufficient detail in the publicly available LAFCO or County budget reports to determine how the funding was being used. The LAFCO report showed 100% of the funding coming from the property assessment taxes and 100% of the expenditure being used for “services and repairs,” but without any detail on what those services and repairs were.\footnote{51} The published budget from the County was also lacking this detail. Residents currently are not able to determine how their CSA 9D taxes were being used except in a general way. They could not determine what roads were repaired or resurfaced in their zone or what repairs were performed. There is no way to determine that the funds were used correctly in the zone, where the funding took place, and to confirm the funds were not commingled with general DPW funding. Commingling of funds is not allowed.

**SB1**

California SB1, also known as the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Act (SB1), was passed in 2017 in order to reward local communities for creating new revenue sources to fund their own transportation needs. Santa Cruz County qualified for SB1 matching funds by passing Measure D in 2016.\footnote{52}

The State designated the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission to select projects that meet the requirements set forth by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). These requirements include safety (cars, pedestrians, bicyclists), maintenance of transportation assets (roads, bridges and culverts), transportation efficiency and the reduction of the carbon footprint.\footnote{52} \footnote{53}

Currently, SB1 funds are being used as matching funds to State and Federal relief efforts responding to the devastating storms of 2017 and 2023. Due to the extensive
damage from these events, it is unlikely that the County will be able to use SB1 funds for resurfacing of local roads for the foreseeable future.\[^{54}[^{55}[^{56}]\]

The Federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021 and the State’s Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (SB1) will provide $16 million for Santa Cruz County for some much needed improvements. None of these funds will be used to fund repair of poor or failed roads. The funding will be applied to two highway projects in the County.\[^{57}\]

**Measure K Sales Tax Increase**

Measure K passed in March 2024 within Santa Cruz County, increasing the sales tax rate ½ percent in the unincorporated areas. This tax is estimated to bring in $10 million in extra revenue to the County General Fund after the first year. The tax will continue indefinitely unless changed by another measure. $1 million or 10% of the Measure K funding is earmarked for road maintenance and County infrastructure projects for the first year, per the Measure K voting materials. These funds go into the General Fund and are not guaranteed to be used for road maintenance. Even if the full $1 million annual funds were used for local roads, it could only pay for about one mile of paving of a very poor or failed road.\[^{58}[^{59}]\]

**Other Funding Sources**

Another source of revenue for local streets and roads comes from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This program is primarily funded by fuel taxes collected by the State and redistributed through STIP back to local agencies. The RTC is in charge of deciding where these funds are spent in the County following guidelines set down by the California Transportation Commission.\[^{60}\]

The fuel tax revenue received from the State is based on the number of road miles and the number of registered vehicles in the County. Unfortunately, this source of funds has become unreliable. This tax has less purchasing power due to inflation, fuel efficiency, and the increased use of electric and hybrid vehicles.\[^{61}\]

An additional funding source is the Vehicle Licensing Fees (VLF) collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV): 37.5% of these fees are returned to the County to use for road maintenance.\[^{62}\]

**Conclusion**

Local roads in unincorporated Santa Cruz County are severely underfunded and as a result are in deplorable shape. The Grand Jury feels the best opportunity to increase substantial funding is to address the deficiency in Special District 9D. The NCE’s report predicts that under the current spending level, our roads will deteriorate even further. The County cannot afford this increasing liability. Additional funding sources (e.g., Measure D and K) are helpful but wholly inadequate to address the current and projected deferred road and culvert maintenance. This leaves unincorporated County residents at a higher risk of delayed emergency response and strandings.
Findings

F1. Underfunding the road and culvert maintenance work on the 586 miles of County roads in unincorporated Santa Cruz County for more than four decades has created a backlog of deferred maintenance currently exceeding ¼ of a billion dollars which creates a hazard for residents.

F2. Due to the large shortfall in funding, Santa Cruz County Department of Public Works adheres to the accepted practice promoted by the Federal Highway Administration and RTC of prioritizing pavement preservation over pavement restoration. Much of the public lacks awareness of this practice in the absence of a formally documented policy which impacts voter choices.

F3. The County road maintenance strategy differs by Supervisory District leading to inconsistent road repair expectations among districts. This lack of a coordinated strategy leaves residents frustrated and with a sense of unfair treatment.

F4. Storms of 2017 and 2023 caused significant road failures. Contributing factors were inadequate culvert, drainage ditch, and road surface maintenance which led to culvert failures and full road washouts leaving residents stranded or incurring significant delay.

F5. The County of Santa Cruz has failed to ask unincorporated County voters to increase the funding of the Special District 9D (1-3) road assessment fee since its inception in 1988, which has resulted in a drastic loss of revenue for maintaining County roads.

F6. The County of Santa Cruz has failed to perform resurfacing maintenance on many of the smaller unincorporated local roads, resulting in higher failure rates and at least a 10 times increased maintenance cost when and if those roads are resurfaced.

F7. Santa Cruz County's neglect of unincorporated local roads for many decades has led to an average Pavement Condition Index of less than 48 (as of 2019) which is 17 points below the statewide average. With the current funding level, it is projected to be 38 in 2024, and it is further projected to drop to 33 by 2028 which will leave the County in a position to experience higher catastrophic road failures.

F8. The County prioritizes preventive maintenance of roads in fair to good condition over road repair and reconstruction due to limited discretionary funds. As a result, many residents in local road areas will have to contend with very poor/failed roads into the foreseeable future.

F9. The most recent LAFCO and County reports fail to provide detailed accounting of how 9D funds are being spent. The result is that taxpayers lack the information to ensure that generated funds are being used appropriately.

F10. Minor progress has been made in seeking and securing additional funding sources. The additional funding is far short of what is needed to maintain and repair the road network.
F11. Measure K funds go directly into the General Fund and road maintenance funding expenditures are only recommended. This may allow the funding to go to other needs.

Recommendations

R1. The Grand Jury recommends that the DPW complete a public report by December 31, 2024 which shows the prioritization of culvert and drainage ditch maintenance in order to help prevent road washouts that are more costly to repair. (F1, F5)

R2. The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors increase annual funding to the DPW to improve at least one local road segment with a PCI of less than 40 as listed in the Pavement Management report, in each Supervisorial district starting December 31, 2024. (F1, F2, F7, F8, F9)

R3. The Grand Jury recommends that the DPW supply information to LAFCO detailing expenditures in each of the three zones of CSA 9D for the years 2020-2023 by October 31, 2024. (F6, F10)

R4. The Grand Jury recommends that LAFCO issue a new County Service Area 9 Service and Sphere of Influence Review incorporating detailed data of expenditures for each 9D zone by March 15, 2025. (F6, F10)

R5. The Grand Jury recommends that the County Board of Supervisors should begin the process necessary to increase the funding in CSA 9D to an amount in line with what is needed to reduce the backlog of very poor and failed road repairs by December 31, 2024. (F6)

R6. The Grand Jury recommends that the County Board of Supervisors take steps necessary to add a consumer price index increase to CSA 9D, as allowed by law, by December 31, 2024. (F6)

R7. The Grand Jury recommends that the County Board of Supervisors continue to prioritize a minimum of 10% of Measure K funds to repair roads in the County with a PCI of 25 or less by December 31, 2024. (F10, F11)

R8. The Grand Jury recommends that the DPW formalize its policy of abandoning pavement restoration on very poor and failed Local roads into a publicly available document in order to inform affected property owners and prospective buyers by December 31, 2024. (F2, F3, F4, F7, F9)
## Required Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Respond Within/Respond By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>F1–F11</td>
<td>R1–R3, R5–R8</td>
<td>90 Days September 3, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFCO</td>
<td>F6, F10</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>90 Days September 3, 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Invited Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Respond Within/Respond By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, Community Development and Infrastructure, Public Works Dept.</td>
<td>F1-F6, F10</td>
<td>R1, R3, R8</td>
<td>90 Days September 3, 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Definitions

- **BoS**: Board of Supervisors, Santa Cruz County
- **CDI**: Santa Cruz County Community Development and infrastructure Department, includes the Department of Public Works
- **CSA**: County Service Area (Special District) formed by citizens or County to provide services paid by tax assessment on properties within the area covered
- **CTC**: California Transportation Commission
- **DPW**: Department of Public Works, County of Santa Cruz
- **FEMA**: Federal Emergency Management Agency
- **LAFCO**: Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Cruz County
- **Measure D**: 2016 Measure to fund Transportation with ½ cent sales tax measure for 30 years
- **Measure K**: 2024 Measure to increase sales tax by ½ percent in unincorporated areas of Santa Cruz County
- **NCE**: Nichols Civil Engineering
- **PCI**: Pavement Condition Index
- **PMP**: Pavement Management Program Update (NCE Nov. 2019 Final Report)[7]
- **PMPS**: Pavement Management Program software (also known as “Streetsaver”)  
- **Prop 13**: Proposition 13- “People’s Initiative to Limit Property Taxation”, 1978
- **Proposition 218**: 1996 “Right to Vote on Taxes Act”- Governing Act for Special districts
- **SB1**: California Senate Bill #1- “Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017”
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