



---

## MAMMOTH TRAILS COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, February 8, 2017 @ 3pm

Mammoth Lakes Tourism and Recreation Conference Room

2520 Main Street, Mammoth Lakes, California

[www.mammothlakesrecreation.org](http://www.mammothlakesrecreation.org) | [www.mammothtrails.org](http://www.mammothtrails.org)

NOTE: In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please call (760) 934-4932. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable MLR to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (28CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II)

NOTE: All comments will be limited by the Chair to a speaking time of five-minutes.

### ROLL CALL

Committee Members: Finlay Torrance, Dan Holler, Alan Jacoby, Heather Schaubmayer, Elise Howell, John Mueller and David Page

### PUBLIC COMMENT (On items not on the Agenda)

### ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Approval of the meeting minutes for December 14, 2017
  - a. Attachment 1
3. May is National Bike Month – MTC Involvement?
  - a. Cal Trans taking lead
    - i. Attachment 2
  - b. Good opportunity for SEMBA; Walk, Bike Ride
4. Senate Bill 5 on June 2018 ballot - Proposition 68 (Attachment 3)
  - a. MLTS currently working on getting projects “shovel ready” for potential grant application
    - i. Sherwins Trailhead
    - ii. Mill City Trailhead
    - iii. SHARP ID #6, #7
    - iv. Bridge for SHARP ID #8
    - v. Walk, Bike, Ride project development in process
  - b. These projects will need TOML Public Works pre-engineering
    - i. Get into Public Works work program ASAP
5. SHARP Environmental NEPA/CEQA Update
  - a. May 2017 - MLTS submitted SHARP Project Proposal to USFS with 28 Trail Alignment Studies (TAS)



- b. August 2017 - By recommendation of USFS and Town Manager, MLTS cut out 19 TAS's and submitted SHARP Project Proposal to USFS with 9 TAS's
  - c. January 30, 2018 - USFS SHARP Interdisciplinary Team meeting
    - i. Scope of project (re-)expanded to include all 28 SHARP TAS's
    - ii. The 28 TAS's to be sorted for Categorical Exclusion (CE) and Environmental Assessment (EA)
    - iii. CE and EA environmental review to be completed concurrently, on different timelines
    - iv. Anticipate CE construction to begin Summer 2018 with EA projects to follow
  - d. Expanded scope of project (28 versus 9) may require additional environmental review funding – TBD
    - i. Potential for April reallocation
6. Funding Strategy – MLTS Signage
- a. Need to develop consistent and reliable funding source for map and sign purchase, update, and repair
7. Opportunity for Fundraising
- a. Horseshoe Lake Timber Bridge
    - i. Attachment 4
8. Future Direction of MLTS
- a. Ribbons of Dirt
    - i. Winter programming unreliable
    - ii. Focus on trail development and implementation (SHARP, LABSS, SRIC)
    - iii. Anticipate adaptation and sustainability
9. MTC Meeting Schedule
- a. Suggested to meet every other month; alternate meeting months with MLR
    - i. MTC will meet “even” months (Feb, Apr, Jun, Aug, Oct, Dec)

## COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

## REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

---



P.O. Box 8562 • 2520 Main Street  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

**MAMMOTH LAKES  
RECREATION**

(760)-709-0620  
[mammothlakesrecreation.org](http://mammothlakesrecreation.org)

---

### ADJOURNMENT

To the next meeting of the Mammoth Trails Committee which will occur on April 12, 2018 at 3 pm. I hereby certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing agenda was posted in the Mammoth Lakes Tourism & Recreation outside showcase not less than 72 hours prior to the meeting dated as February 8, 2018.

---

Matt McClain, MLR Executive Director



---

December 14, 2017, Mammoth Trails Committee Meeting Minutes  
Mammoth Lakes Tourism and Recreation Conference Room,  
2520 Main St, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

**ROLL CALL**

Chair Page called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. at the Mammoth Lakes Tourism and Recreation Conference Room, 2520 Main St, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546.

Present: David Page, Finlay Torrance, Alan Jacoby, Ted Dardzinski , Elise Howell and Dan Holler (arrived at 3:08pm).

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Dave Harvey –**

Discussed the Southern Mono Historical Society’s successful History Trolley event this past summer. They are looking to increase the amount of History Trolleys in service during Summer 2019.

Joel Rathje accompanied Mr. Harvey to the ORMAT site where the So. Mono Historical Society leases six acres for interpretive trails. Joel has been assisting in the planning of the interpretive trails and in creating a budget for the project.

**Emily Woods –**

The Eastern Sierra Interpretive Association is hosting a Soiree at the Welcome Center tonight December 14, from 5-7pm.

**Janelle Walker –**

The US Forest Service ban on fat bikes has been lifted however the forest service and partners need to further discuss and work out the details of fat bike appropriate trails.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

1. Approval of the Agenda: The committee approved the agenda and decided to move agenda item numbers 10 and 5 to the beginning as Dan Holler needed to leave at 4:00pm.
2. Minutes from **(M, Howell; S, Holler 6-0)**
3. MLTS Data Collection Program
  - a. Joel Rathje reviewed the MLTS data collected from the trail counters.
  - b. Janelle Walker: In order to take a survey of users on Forest Service land, there is a legal process that the Forest Service needs to take in order for the survey to happen.
  - c. The Committee and Joel Rathje discussed the use and promotion of using the Mountain Hub app to get up-to-date trail and backcountry conditions from users.
4. SHARP Environmental Assessment
  - a. Joel Rathje gave an update on the SHARP Environmental Assessment.
    - i. We need additional cultural surveys for the environmental analysis of SHARP.
5. Budget Reallocations



---

December 14, 2017, Mammoth Trails Committee Meeting Minutes  
Mammoth Lakes Tourism and Recreation Conference Room,  
2520 Main St, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

- a. Joel Rathje reviewed the current budget and recommended the reallocation of funds for the Q2 budget.
    - i. They came in \$30,000 under budget from trail construction last quarter.
  - b. The Committee reviewed and approved the proposed reallocation of funds as presented. **(M, Holler; S, Finlay 6-0)**
6. MLR as Primary Fundraiser for MLTS Capital Projects
- a. Executive Director of Mammoth Lakes Recreation, Matt McClain informed the Mammoth Trails Committee on MLR moving forward as the primary fundraiser for MLTS capital projects.
    - i. MLR functions as a de-facto community foundation for recreation, arts & culture in Mammoth Lakes. MLR will also communicate to a wider audience the work of its partner and successes that are happening in the area.
  - b. First pilot project will be raising money for the bridge on the Horseshoe Lake Trail.
  - c. MLR will be looking for bigger donors to make these projects happen.
7. Winter Grooming
- a. Joel Rathje gave an overview of the Winter Trails Program.
    - i. The team is ready mobilize as soon as we see a minimum of 18 inches of snowfall.
    - ii. A five-year agreement is in place to partner with the Forest Service for grooming trails.
    - iii. The Forest Service is going through an emergency hire to train people how to groom the OSV trails during the winter.
    - iv. Committee discussed with Janelle Walker from the US Forest Service if there is a possibility to train MLTS staff to groom with the Forest Service.
8. MTC Committee Development
- a. Joel will be reaching out to each member of the Committee to discuss what they're passionate about and how they can plug into that for the Trails Committee.
9. Walk, Bike, Ride Initiative
- a. Joel Rathje gave an overview of the Walk, Bike, Ride Initiative projects.
    - i. These assignments will be worked into the MLTS project plan as presented to the Committee.
  - b. Janelle Walker commented: The Forest Service needs to know what the plan is from the get-go so that they can work these plans into their scope of work.
  - c. Elise Howell asked: Where is the money for these projects coming from?
    - i. Joel Rathje: It is coming from the MLTS reserves.



---

December 14, 2017, Mammoth Trails Committee Meeting Minutes  
Mammoth Lakes Tourism and Recreation Conference Room,  
2520 Main St, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

- d. The Mammoth Trails committee moved to approve and initiate the Walk, Bike, Ride Phase 1 projects. **(M, Howell; S, Holler 6-0)**
- 10. MTC Mill City Transit Endorsement
  - a. The Committee discussed the fiscal, recreational and environmental impacts of adding a bus stop to Mill City as an element of the SHARP Plan.
    - i. Dan Holler: Adding a stop in Mill City will increase ongoing operational costs. Ball-parked a possible cost of \$60,000 – \$80,000 more per year. It will be important to work with the neighbors in the area of the proposed bus stop as well.
    - ii. David Page: It is the general consensus of the committee that this plan for a bus stop at Mill City fits into the general SHARP plan.
- 11. Next meeting?
  - a. February 8, 2018

### FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

None.

### ADJOURNMENT


There being no further business to come before the Mammoth Trails Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Emily Woods  
Program Administrator, Mammoth Lakes Recreation

## Attachment 2

**From:** John Wentworth [jwentworth@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov](mailto:jwentworth@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov)   
**Subject:** Re: Bike month/Walk, Bike, Ride  
**Date:** January 31, 2018 at 4:07 PM  
**To:** West, Austin@DOT [Austin.West@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Austin.West@dot.ca.gov)  
**Cc:** Hitchens, Cort@DOT [Cort.Hitchens@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Cort.Hitchens@dot.ca.gov), Joel Rathje [jrathje@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov](mailto:jrathje@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov), Kim Anaclerio [kimanaclerio@mltpa.org](mailto:kimanaclerio@mltpa.org)

---

Austin -

Many thanks for reaching out - very interested in what will be coming up in May.

I've cc'd the Towns Trail Coordinator (Joel Rathje) and Kim Anaclerio (MLTPA Operations Manager) on this email to get them in the loop.

There are a number of partners up here that will be interested, I'll leave it to Joel and Kim to work with you to get everybody wrangled up.

Thanks again for all of your efforts -

john

John Wentworth - Mayor  
Town of Mammoth Lakes 760  
934 1279 Mammoth 213 309  
5637 Cel



*Disclaimer: Public documents and records are available to the public as provided under the California Public Records Act (Government Code Section 6250-6270). This e-mail may be considered subject to the Public Records Act and may be disclosed to a third-party requester.*

On Jan 31, 2018, at 3:19 PM, West, Austin@DOT <[Austin.West@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Austin.West@dot.ca.gov)> wrote:

Hi John,

I wanted to let you know about what we are trying to do here at Caltrans for National Bike Month in May. Our goal is to work with our local and regional partners to organize a number of activities and events to raise awareness about active transportation. Some of the things we are trying to put together are bike to school days, an informational booth for Earth Day, bike to work competitions, and a bike-a-thon to raise money for the Caltrans scholarship fund. I am also going to be reaching out to the County and Town to see if they are interested in being involved. Per our conversation at the LTC meeting, It also occurred to me that some of these events would be a good opportunity to raise more awareness about the goals of Walk, Bike, Ride. I am planning to bring this up at the PEDC Mobility committee meeting in about 2-3 weeks. Right now we are currently in the very early stages of planning, but we are starting to kick of some meetings with our partner agencies and organizations (i.e. school districts, BIM, east side velo bike club, etc.). My counterpart, Cort Hitchens, is taking the lead on bike month, but If you have any thoughts or ideas I would be happy to discuss them and I can involve you in future meetings as well.

Thank you,  
**Austin West**

**Austin West**

Transportation Planner

Caltrans - District 9

Office - (760) 872-0792



Report Advertisement

# California Proposition 68, Parks, Environment, and Water Bond (June 2018)

Following California's 2018 initiative process?

Subscribe to the California Counter

Get weekly updates from Ballotpedia on: actions by the state legislature, new filings, related lawsuits, breaking news emails & more.

[Click here and start your free trial.](#)

## California Proposition 68: California Parks, Environment, and Water Bond



### Election date

June 5, 2018

### Topic

Bond issues and Forests and parks

### Status

*On the ballot*

### Type

Bond issue

### Origin

State  
Legislature

**California Proposition 68, the Parks, Environment, and Water Bond**, is on the ballot in California as a legislatively-referred bond act on June 5, 2018.<sup>[1]</sup>

A **"yes"** vote supports this measure to authorize \$4 billion in general obligation bonds for state and local parks, environmental protection projects, water infrastructure projects, and flood protection projects.

A **"no"** vote opposes this measure to authorize \$4 billion in general obligation bonds for state and local parks, environmental protection projects, water infrastructure projects, and flood protection projects.

## Overview

### Measure design

Proposition 68 would authorize \$4 billion in general obligation bonds for state and local parks, environmental protection and restoration projects, water infrastructure projects, and flood protection projects. Assuming a 3.5 percent interest rate over a 30-year period, the bond issue would generate \$2.53 billion in interest, meaning the state would spend \$6.53 billion to pay off the bond issue.<sup>[1]</sup>

The measure would require that between 15 and 20 percent of the bond's funds, depending on the type of project, be dedicated to projects in communities with median household incomes less than 60 percent of the statewide average; that 60 percent threshold amounted to about \$39,980 in 2016. The largest amount of bond revenue—\$725 million—would go toward neighborhood parks in *park-poor neighborhoods* in accordance with the Statewide Park Development and Community Revitalization Act of 2008's competitive grant program. The measure would also reallocate \$100 million in unissued bonds that voters approved via Proposition 1 (2014), Proposition 84 (2006), and Proposition 40 (2002). The measure would distribute bond revenue as follows:<sup>[1]</sup>

Click **show** to expand the bond revenue table.

**Proposition 68 (2018)**

[show][show]

### Bonds on the ballot in California

In California, the state sells general obligation bonds to investors, who are in effect providing funds to the state that the state repays the investors with interest over a period of time. The state repays bondholders through revenue in the General Fund.<sup>[2]</sup> The California Constitution requires that general obligation bond issues of \$300,000 or more be referred to voters for approval or rejection. Between 1993 and 2018, voters of California cast ballots on 39 bond issues, approving 31 of them.

### State of ballot measure campaigns

As of January 27, 2018, there were five committees registered to support and zero committees registered to oppose the ballot proposition. The committees in support of the measure had raised a combined \$1.19 million. The top contributors included the Peninsula Open Space Trust (\$300,000), The Wildlands Conservancy (\$200,000), and the Save The Redwoods League (\$200,000).<sup>[3]</sup>

# Text of the measure

## Full text

The full text of the measure is as follows:<sup>[1]</sup>

SB 5, De León. California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection, and Outdoor Access For All Act of 2018.

SECTION 1. Section 5096.611 is added to the Public Resources Code, to read:

5096.611. Notwithstanding any other law, two million five hundred fifty-seven thousand dollars (\$2,557,000) of the unissued bonds authorized for the purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 5096.610, and eight hundred thousand dollars (\$800,000) of the unissued bonds authorized for the purposes of subdivisions (b) and (c) of Section 5096.652 from the amount allocated pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 5096.610 are reallocated to finance the purposes of, and shall be authorized, issued, and appropriated in accordance with, Division 45 (commencing with Section 80000).

SEC. 2. Section 75089.5 is added to the Public Resources Code, to read:

75089.5. Notwithstanding any other law, twelve million dollars (\$12,000,000) of the unissued bonds authorized for the purpose of subdivision (a) of Section 75063

## Support

Senate President Kevin de León (D-24), a candidate for the U.S. Senate in 2018, was the lead author of the bond measure in the California State Legislature.<sup>[1]</sup>

## Supporters

### Officials

- Sen. Kevin de León (D-24)<sup>[1]</sup>
- Sen. Anthony Portantino (D-25)<sup>[4]</sup>
- Rep. Eduardo Garcia (D-56)<sup>[4]</sup>

### Organizations

- California Chamber of Commerce<sup>[5]</sup>
- Association of California Water Agencies<sup>[6]</sup>
- The Trust for Public Land<sup>[7]</sup>

## Arguments

**Susana Reyes**, vice president of the Sierra Club, and **Sen. Anthony Portantino** (D-25) wrote an opinion article advocating for the measure in the *Los Angeles Daily News*. Reyes and Sen. Portantino stated:<sup>[4]</sup>

California has always been an environmental leader, and our public spaces, forests, lakes

“ and beaches are recreational destinations for millions. Five years of severe drought followed by heavy rains have magnified the lingering aftermath of the 2008 economic downturn, leaving our state with a substantial need to invest in deteriorating local and regional parks and aging water infrastructure, dams, reservoirs, and flood protection.<sup>[8]</sup> ”

**Senate President Kevin de León** (D-24), lead author of the bond measure, said:<sup>[9]</sup>

“ Clean and reliable water resources, including secure flood control systems, and access to parks and recreational space, are vital to our economy and wellbeing as a state. This bond allows us to invest in critical priorities that have been neglected for years, while lifting people up with good jobs and livable, healthy communities.<sup>[8]</sup> ”

**Mary Creasman**, California Director of Government Affairs for The Trust for Public Land, stated:<sup>[7]</sup>

“ Most importantly, it is a win for millions of California children and families, who will soon have access to a quality park within a 10-minute walk of their home. Park access should not be considered a luxury. It is a right, along with the clean air, clean water, and protection from climate impacts that result from these investments.<sup>[8]</sup> ”



## Opposition

### Arguments

- **David Wolfe**, legislative director of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, said the state should use the general fund to maintain parks, not bonds. He stated, "If you are using bond money to fill potholes, you are paying the interest off for 30 years."<sup>[10]</sup>

## Campaign finance

*See also: Campaign finance requirements for California ballot measures*

<b>Total campaign contributions<sup>[11]</sup></b> <i>as of January 27, 2018<sup>[12]</sup></i>	
 <b>Support:</b>	<b>\$1,187,536.23</b>
 <b>Opposition:</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>

As of January 27, 2018, there were five ballot measure committees registered in support of the measure. The committee *Conservation Action Fund for Clean Water and Parks, Sponsored by Environmental Organizations* had raised the most funds at \$705,000. Together, the five committees received \$1.19 million and expended \$210,778.<sup>[3]</sup>

The largest contributor to the committees was Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST), a nonprofit organization that acquires land for conservation in the San Francisco Peninsula area.<sup>[13]</sup> The organization donated \$300,000.<sup>[3]</sup>

As of January 27, 2018, there were no committees registered in opposition to the initiative.<sup>[3]</sup>

# Support

The contribution and expenditure totals for the committees in support of the initiative were current as of January 27, 2018.<sup>[3]</sup>

<b>Committees in support of Proposition 68</b>				<b>Total:</b>
<i>Updated as of January 27, 2018</i>				
<b>Supporting committees</b>	<b>Cash contributions</b>	<b>In-kind services</b>	<b>Cash expenditures</b>	<b>Total raised:</b>
				<b>Total spent:</b>
Conservation Action Fund for Clean Water and Parks, Sponsored by Environmental Organizations	\$705,000.00	\$0.00	\$196,566.63	
Committee for Clean Water Natural Resources and Parks	\$123,600.00	\$8,936.23	\$5,275.00	
California Park & Recreation Society Inc. Supporting Clean Water, Natural Resources & Parks	\$25,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Californians for Clean Water and Safe Parks, Sponsored by Conservation Groups	\$300,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Fund for a Better Future, Committee for 2018 Clean Water and Safe Parks Bond	\$25,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,178,600.00</b>	<b>\$8,936.23</b>	<b>\$201,841.63</b>	

## Donors

The following were the top five donors who contributed to the support committees as of January 27, 2018:<sup>[3]</sup>

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Cash</b>	<b>In-kind</b>	<b>Total</b>
Peninsula Open Space Trust	\$300,000.00	\$0.00	\$300,000.00
The Wildlands Conservancy	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00
Save The Redwoods League	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00
Sempervirens Fund	\$80,000.00	\$0.00	\$80,000.00
The Big Sur Land Trust	\$75,000.00	\$0.00	\$75,000.00

# Reporting dates

In California, ballot measure committees file a total of four campaign finance reports in 2018. The filing dates for reports are as follows:<sup>[14]</sup>

**Campaign finance reporting dates for June 2018 ballot** [\[show\]](#)[\[show\]](#)

## Methodology

Ballotpedia calculates campaign finance based on the political committees registered to support or oppose a measure and independent expenditures, when relevant and available. When a committee is registered to support or oppose multiple measures it is impossible to distinguish between funds used for one measure and funds used for the other.

In calculating campaign finance for supporting and opposing committees, Ballotpedia does not count donations or expenditures from one ballot measure committee to another since that would amount to counting the same money twice. This method is used to give the most accurate information concerning how much funding was actually provided to and spent by the opposing and supporting campaigns.

Ballotpedia subtracts out committee-to-committee contributions—both cash donations and in-kind contributions. Because of this, it is possible for certain committees to have negative contributions. Negative contributions mean that a committee has provided more contributions to other committees than it has received. If expenditures exceed contributions, it means the committee has accrued unpaid bills, has unpaid or unforgiven loans, or has contributed a certain amount of in-kind services to another committee.

Ballotpedia provides information about all reported in-kind donations. In-kind contributions are also counted toward total expenditures since, with in-kind gifts, the contribution and services or goods are provided simultaneously.

Ballotpedia does this to provide the most accurate information about the cash-on-hand of supporting and opposing campaigns.

## Background

### Bond issues on the ballot in California

*See also: Bond issues on the ballot*

Voters of California cast ballots on 39 bond issues, totaling \$154.829 billion in value, from January 1, 1993, through January 1, 2018. Voters approved 31 (79.49 percent) of the bond measures—a total of \$143.409 billion. Six of the measures were citizen's initiatives; four of six were approved. Thirty-three of the measures were legislative referrals; 25 of 33 were approved. The most common purposes bond measures during the 25 years between 1993 and 2018 were water infrastructure and public education, for which there were seven bond measures each. There were four bond measures related to parks or environmental conservation between 1993 and 2018, for which three of four were approved.

Prior to the election on June 5, 2018, the most recent bond issue that citizens voted on was a \$9 billion public education bond titled Proposition 51.

Click **show** to expand the bond revenue table.

[show][show] Year	Measure	Amount	Primary purpose	Origin	Outcome
----------------------	---------	--------	-----------------	--------	---------

## Bond debt in California

As of December 1, 2017, California had \$73.33 billion in debt from general obligation bonds. The state had \$31.09 billion in unissued bonds, including \$2.19 billion for natural resources and environment-related bonds.<sup>[15]</sup>

## Budgets

The state budget for fiscal year 2017-2018, which was signed into law on June 27, 2017, included \$183.3 billion in state funds. Most—\$125.1 billion—came from the General Fund and less than two percent—\$3.3 billion—came from bond funds. The 2017-2018 budget included \$3.2 billion for the state's Environmental Protection Agency and \$5.2 billion for the state's Natural Resources Agency.<sup>[16]</sup>

On January 10, 2018, Gov. Brown (D) released a \$190.3 billion budget plan for the state's fiscal year 2018-2019.<sup>[17]</sup> Around \$2.5 billion of the proposed spending would be derived from bonds. The proposed 2018-2019 budget would include \$2.9 billion for the state's Environmental Protection Agency, a 9.4 percent decrease from the prior budget, and \$4.7 billion for the state's Natural Resources Agency, a 9.6 percent decrease from the prior budget.<sup>[18]</sup> The budget requires the approval of the California State Legislature, which votes on amendments and other changes to the budget.

Gov. Brown's proposed budget would allocate \$1.02 billion of the Parks, Environment, and Water Bond in fiscal year 2018-2019.<sup>[19]</sup> As the proposed budget included allocations from the Parks, Environment, and Water Bond, rejecting the bond measure would decrease the spending on natural resources in the 2018-2019 budget, unless the budget is amended before enactment to increase spending.

## Path to the ballot

*See also: Authorizing bonds in California*


Section 1 of Article XVI of the California Constitution requires that general obligation bond issues of \$300,000 or more be referred to voters for approval or rejection. The California State Legislature is required to pass bond acts by a two-thirds vote of all the members in both legislative chambers. The governor must also sign the bond act.

The bond act was introduced into the legislature as Senate Bill 5 (SB 5) on December 5, 2016. On May 30, 2017, the California Senate passed the bill 31 to 9. The bill was amended in the California State Assembly, increasing the bond amount from \$3.832 billion to \$4 billion.

On September 15, 2017, the state Assembly voted 56 to 21, with two members not voting, to pass the bill. Three Republicans voted with 53 Democrats to approve the bill. As one Democrat abstained from voting, at least one Republican vote was needed to pass SB 5. On September 16, 2017, the state Senate voted 27 to 9, with four members not voting, to pass the final version of SB 5. In the

state Senate, the bill received just enough votes to pass as Democrats supported SB 5 and Republicans either voted against SB 5 or abstained.<sup>[1]</sup> September 15, 2017, was the last day of the 2017 regular legislative session that the state Legislature was allowed to pass bills.

On October 15, 2017, Gov. Jerry Brown (D) signed the bill, certifying the measure for the ballot in 2018.<sup>[1]</sup>

Vote in the California State Assembly <i>September 15, 2017</i>				Vote in the California S <i>September 16,</i>	
<i>Requirement: Two-thirds (66.67 percent) vote of all members in each chamber</i>				<i>Requirement: Two-thirds (66.67 percent) chamber</i>	
Number of yes votes required: <b>54</b> 				Number of yes votes req	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not voting</b>		<b>Yes</b>
Total	56	21	2	Total	27
Total percent	70.00%	26.25%	2.50%	Total percent	67.50%
Democrat	53	0	1	Democrat	27
Republican	3	21	1	Republican	0

## See also

### 2018 measures



- 2018 ballot measures
- Bond issues on the ballot
- Environment on the ballot
- 2018 legislative sessions

### California



- California ballot measures
- California ballot measure laws
- Environmental policy in California

### News and analysis



- Ballot measure lawsuits
- Ballot measure readability
- Ballot measure polls

## External links

- California Senate Bill 5



# Recent news

The link below is to the most recent stories in a Google news search for the terms **California 2018 Environment Bond**. These results are automatically generated from Google. Ballotpedia does not curate or endorse these articles.

## California Proposition 68, Parks, Environment, and Water Bond (June 2018) - Google News

# Footnotes

1. *California Legislature*, "Senate Bill 5," accessed September 1, 2017
2. *California Treasurer*, "California Bonds: 101," accessed January 15, 2018
3. *Cal-Access*, "Propositions & Ballot Measures," accessed October 25, 2017
4. *Los Angeles Daily News*, "SB5 bond measure would protect California's water and parks," November 24, 2017
5. *California Chamber of Commerce*, "CalChamber Takes Support Positions on Two Proposed Water Bond Initiatives," December 13, 2017

---

Only the first few references on this page are shown above. [Click to show more.](#)

---

Only the first few references on this page are shown above. [Click to show more.](#)

Ballotpedia includes 264,866 encyclopedic articles written and curated by our professional staff of editors, writers, and researchers. To contact our editorial staff, [click here](#). To report an error, [click here](#). For media inquiries, you can reach us [here](#). To support our continued expansion, please [contact us here](#).

# Horseshoe Lake Bridge





# **DIVISION 550 BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION**

### Cost Estimating Bridge Construction For Programming

Use the methods and unit costs shown in this section to estimate bridge costs. Cost figures include bridge superstructure and substructure costs, “curbs only” railing system (no approach guardrail), riprap, bridge removal, normal erosion and pollution control work, and nominal approach roadway work (~ 5% to 10% of bridge costs).

Currently, 90% of new or replacement bridges have a spill-thru type configuration (trapezoidal stream channel opening). For spans up to 40 feet, concrete, timber or steel bridges are all competitive alternatives. For spans above 40 feet, concrete is primarily the most competitive alternative, but steel is also being used in certain instances.

For spill thru bridge configurations, the span length (S), can be estimated if the “bankfull” dimension (BF), and height (H) from finish grade to stream bed is known. Span length will be approximately,  $S = BF + 5 + (3 * H)$ . If scour potential is low, abutments are typically concrete caps perched above the stream in the approach fill. If scour potential is high, abutments will be piling or deep spread footing founded below the stream bed.

Use the following to estimate bridge costs.

- **Spans up to 40 feet (\$/LF):**

Single Lane	Double Lane
\$2000 - \$2500	\$2500 - \$3000

- **Spans greater than 40 feet(\$/LF):**

Single Lane	Double Lane
\$2500 - \$2750	\$3000 - \$3250

- **Bridge Rail/Guardrail:** Add \$100/LF of bridge for bridge rail and \$10,000 for approach guardrail if needed.
- **Piling/Deep Spread Footings:** Needed due to high scour potential, add \$30,000 for single lane bridges and \$40,000 for double lane bridges.
- **A/E Design:** Add 15% for A/E design costs to include site surveys, preliminary report, and final design.

Costs can vary greatly depending on the general approach conditions, BMP work, and stream channel work that might be included. Questions should be directed to the Transportation Structures Group, John Kattell (406-329-3324).

### Section 551. - DRIVEN PILES

(Contract Item) - No metric conversion for Bridge Construction Items

Type of Pile	Treated Timber	Steel
<b>Furnished Pile Cost</b>	\$35/LF	\$40/LF(HP10x42)
		\$45/LF(HP12x53)
<b>Drive Cost</b> (Depends on quantity)	\$55 - 70/LF	\$55 - 70/LF
<b>Shoe Cost</b>	\$150/ea	\$225/ea

When applicable, make a subsidiary allowance to this pay item for contractor quality control.

**Section 552. - STRUCTURAL CONCRETE**

(Contract Item)

\$600 to \$1000 per cubic yard - Depending on haul and quantity

When applicable, make a subsidiary allowance to this pay item for contractor quality control.

**Section 553. - PRESTRESSED CONCRETE**

(Contract Item)

**Multi-Beams (Includes Installation)**

Tri Deck		\$60/SF
Bulb Tee	3' to 4'6"	\$60/SF
	5' to 5'6"	\$75/SF
Concrete curb		Add \$45/LF

When applicable, make a subsidiary allowance to this pay item for contractor quality control.

**Section 554. - REINFORCING STEEL**

(Contract Item)

Large jobs \$1.75/lb

Small jobs (under 1000 lbs) \$2.00/lb

**Section 555. - STEEL STRUCTURES**

(Contract Item)

**Section 556. - BRIDGE RAILING**

(Contract Item)

Timber Glue Lams	\$150/LF
Double layer flexbeam	\$ 75/LF
Single layer flexbeam w/timber	\$ 60/LF
Double box tube (Concrete Deck)	\$ 125/LF
Double box tube (Timber Deck)	\$ 125/LF
Single box tube	\$ 60/LF
Approach Rail	\$ 60/LF
Breakaway Cable End Anchorage	\$500/Ea
Buried End Anchorage	\$500/Ea
Terminal Section	\$300/Ea

**Section 557. - TIMBER STRUCTURES**

(Contract Item) or (R-1 Treated Timber Standards - Labor 45 percent of installation cost only)

**TIMBER MATERIALS**

<b>Material Description</b>	<b>\$/MBFM</b>
Solid sawn (up to 3 inches thick)	\$1750
Heavy	\$3000
Treatment	add 20%
Glue Laminated	\$3100
Treatment	add 35%
Timber Hardware	add 1.5%
Treated Structural Timber (installed)	\$4000
Treated Structural Glu-lam Superstructure (installed)	\$6000
Treated Structural Glu-lam Substructure (installed) (vertical timber wall abatements)	\$7000

When applicable, make a subsidiary allowance to this pay item for contractor quality control

*End of Division 550 Bridge Construction*