

From: [George Dondero](#)
To: [Rick Longinotti](#); [Regional Transportation Commission](#)
Cc: [John Leopold](#); [Don Lane](#); [Luis Mendez](#); [Kim Shultz](#); [Karena Pushnik](#)
Subject: RE: sales tax & highway Aux Lanes (Response)
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 4:22:04 PM

To: Regional Transportation Commission

RTC Commissioner:

Below are some responses to Mr. Longinotti's email of Nov. 15.

- The complete quotation cited by Mr. Longinotti is as follows: "Providing ramp metering and auxiliary lanes would not relieve congestion in the peak evening commute direction, although it would increase the ability of the corridor to carry more vehicles." (Page 2.1.5-16) Increasing the number of vehicles carried by the highway will reduce the duration of congestion experienced daily on Highway 1.
- In the evening, southbound freeway traffic loads up prior to the ramp metered section beginning at Morrissey (continuing south to San Andreas). Metering on-ramps will increase delays for traffic entering the freeway from Morrissey Blvd south as the highway is already operating near capacity with traffic coming from SB Hwy 17, SB Hwy 1 at River, or Ocean Ave.

Note the 2 percent increase in delay is encountered during the peak hour only. During the peak period (defined as 2 PM to 8 PM) measures of effectiveness are significantly improved:

Peak Period (2 PM to 8 PM) Measures of Effectiveness, Southbound Hwy. 1

Measure Difference	2035 No-Build	2035 TSM Build	%
Average Travel Time (minutes)	47	33	-30%
Average Speed (mph)	15	21	40%
Delay (minutes per vehicle)	35	21	-40%
No. of Vehicle Trips (per hour)	2,696	3,479	29%
No. of Persons Trips (per hour)	3,168	4,216	33%
Freeway Travel Time (VHT)	2,101	1,903	-9%

Source: *Traffic Operations Report, Table 5-7, Comparison of Measure of Effectiveness Year 2035 No-Build versus Year 2035 TSM Build Scenarios, page 5-57, April 2012.*

- The TSM Alternative is not "the current plan", but one of 2 build alternatives for the entire

corridor *currently under review*. The HOV Alternative best meets the purpose of the project “to reduce congestion, promote alternative travel modes as a means to increase transportation system capacity, and encourage carpooling and ridesharing.” (page 1-9).

High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes (HOV) restrict peak period use to vehicles with 2 or more occupants which by definition is a transit project. Labeling of the projects (3 Auxiliary Lane projects and 2 bike-pedestrian overcrossings) identified in the current draft Expenditure Plan as the TSM Alternative is not accurate. They represent a subset of the TSM Alternative.

- Under the TSM Alternative evening peak hour southbound delay will increase 2 percent, while traffic delay in the northbound morning peak hour will decrease 54 percent. In the reverse commute directions, the TSM Alternative would improve speed by approximately 24 percent in the northbound direction during the evening peak hour and by approximately 145 percent in the southbound direction during the morning peak hour. (Page 2.1.5-16) Peak period congestion would be significantly further reduced under the HOV Alternative and is projected to attract traffic off of local streets and roads.
- GHG Emissions – The Air Quality Study Report (p. 80) does show that carbon dioxide emissions would increase approximately 25% for the TSM alternative over a No-Build condition in 2035. However, the report goes on to say that,

“The GHG estimations are not necessarily an accurate reflection of what the true CO2 emissions will be because CO2 emissions are dependent on other factors that not part of the EMFAC20111 methodology such as the fuel mix....rate of acceleration, and the aerodynamics and efficiency of the vehicles.”

One reason the RTC is considering other projects for future funding in the Expenditure Plan – including keeping the option open to initiate rail transit – is to address the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Addressing the many transportation needs across the entire county with very limited resources is indeed the challenge we will address through a self-help measure in November 2016. No “silver bullet” approach has appeared however, but with cooperation among all interest groups we can collectively build a better array of transportation options for this and future generations.

George Dondero
Executive Director

From: Rick Longinotti [mailto:longinotti@baymoon.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2015 6:45 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission
Cc: George Dondero; John Leopold; Don Lane
Subject: sales tax & highway Aux Lanes

To: Regional Transportation Commission

Dear Commissioners,

I agree with your long-held desire to reduce traffic congestion on Highway 1. Congestion raises the cost of doing business in our county. Emergency vehicles get stuck in traffic. And according to sociologist, Robert Putnam, increases in commute times correlate directly with reduced engagement in family, neighborhood, and schools.

The current plan to widen the highway for auxiliary lanes from Santa Cruz to Freedom Blvd. will not succeed in reducing congestion. That is the conclusion of Environmental Impact Report on the highway widening recently released by CalTrans. The report says that the TSM Alternative (auxiliary lanes; ramp metering; etc):

“would result in a very slight improvement in traffic congestion when compared to the No Build Alternative.” (page 2.1.5-16) "Providing ramp metering and auxiliary lanes would not relieve the congestion in the evening peak commute direction."

The EIR states that the auxiliary lanes will not get cars out of the neighborhoods and onto the highway.

"The Tier I Corridor TSM Alternative would not achieve sufficient congestion relief to attract any substantial number of vehicles that had diverted to the local street system back to the freeway. Local access to, and circulation around, community facilities near these intersections would not improve relative to no-build conditions"

The EIR also reports that the TSM Alternative would raise annual greenhouse gases by 25% over No Build conditions.

This information is a game-changer. Since the highway widening project can no longer be justified as a congestion-relief measure, it should be shelved in favor of a plan for effective public transit.

Other communities are leading the way. According to this article in the SF Chronicle, in the Bay Area the highway widening approach "has all but disappeared in the rearview mirror." <http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Bay-Area-transit-projects-shift-What-it-means-6597101.php>

Please enable Santa Cruz County voters to support a sales tax measure that doesn't waste funds on widening the highway, but puts our county on a path to increase access for all.

Thank you,

Rick

*When the facts change, I change my mind. What do you do, sir? -
John Maynard Keynes*



SANTA CRUZ COUNTY GROUP
Of The Ventana Chapter
P.O. Box 604, Santa Cruz, CA 95061
<https://ventana2.sierraclub.org/santacruz/>
e-mail: sierraclubsantacruz@gmail.com

November 11, 2015

Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: Updated Comments on Proposed Regional Transportation Sales Tax Measure

Dear Executive Director George Dondero, RTC Staff, and RTC Commissioners;

The Sierra Club previously submitted comments on the proposed Regional Transportation Sales Tax Measure in April. Since then, private polling found weak support in the community for adding lanes on Highway 1, with less than 50% of prospective voters stating support for this.

In addition, the Highway 1 Draft EIR has been released. An unpaginated table in the back section of the Air Quality technical report appears to show that either of the build options (HOV Lanes, Auxiliary Lanes) would promote very substantial growth in both vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions to the design year 2035, while “no build” would not. We know new freeway lanes are very costly to build and maintain, and these public funds would necessarily be diverted from investment in more sustainable alternatives.

We now feel strongly that the RTC should take a closer look at other methods of reducing congestion on the Hwy 1 corridor as part of any Sales Tax Measure. The Campaign for Sensible Transportation (CFST) has circulated a draft “Sustainable Transportation Expenditure Plan” which aligns more closely not only with community survey data but also with our Club’s mission and goals. Poll data on the proposal shows strong support for transportation projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and we know from the vote count on Proposition 23 in 2010 that there is very high support (77%) throughout the county for climate action.

We believe the balance proposed by CFST offers not only a more sustainable long term transportation vision, but that it would also have a greater chance of passing, both among Sierra Club members and the general community at large. We therefore urge you consider this formula for the measure. We would be eager to work to engage our more than 3,300 members in passing such a measure in our Community.

Sincerely:

Greg McPheeters
Chair, Santa Cruz Group, Sierra Club

TDA & Tax Measure Allocations SC METRO and Community Bridges

	TDA Alloc %	Relative %	Annual % Share of Tax Measure	Annual Amount of Tax Measure
SC METRO	85.50%	91.05%	13.66%	2,048,722
Comm Bridges	8.40%	8.95%	1.34%	201,278
Total	93.90%	100.00%	15.00%	2,250,000

John Leopold

From: Jimmy Dutra [jimmy.dutra@cityofwatsonville.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 1:10 PM
To: John Leopold
Cc: Lowell Hurst; Zach Friend; Chase Cynthia
Subject: Self Help distribution of Funds

Dear Chair,

Please read my statement at the appropriate time on behalf of myself representing the city of Watsonville.

Thanks,

Jimmy

I am unfortunately unable to make this important meeting today because I am at the annual Victory fund conference for LGBT leaders across the country. However, I wanted to share with you my opinions on this issue at hand. I find it imperative that Santa Cruz County step up and become a self help county with obtaining transportation funds. In order to join countless other counties we will need to work hard on passing a tax or what I would like to call a self helping measure for our communities. After much talk and time put into this measure I agree that our cities and roads should receive the most funds with highway 1 following closely behind. With thousands of south county residents using the highway on a daily basis we need to ensure that we can provide to them a reasonable travel experience with an updated highway system. As a supporter of public transportation I am a huge advocate for Metro and I urge my fellow commissioners to help increase the percentage points at least 2-3%. With thousands of people visiting our county annually, many of whom rely on our public transportation, we need to make sure we are able to offer them efficient transportation services, which is Metro. It is also important to secure our existing modes of public transportation, so that our residents, many of whom are on a fixed budget and visitors can utilize those services to get around the county. I also encourage the advancement of our efforts to implement the trail system and hope one day we can all enjoy such a great creation. At this time I feel comfortable with the current support we have designated for this project. This is not an easy task for any of us and some may feel they deserve more, but this self help measure will leave all parties with funds to push forward with their transportation projects. The alternative would be nothing and that's not beneficial to anyone. I hope we can all come to an agreement for the betterment of our county and our communities. See you all in December.

**Table 2.1.5-7: Comparison of Measures of Effectiveness –
Year 2035 No Build Alternative and Tier I Corridor TSM Alternative**

Measures of Effectiveness		2035 No Build		2035 TSM		% Difference	
		AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
Northbound							
Average Travel Time (minutes)	Peak Hour	59	34	34	29	-42	-15
	Peak Period	39	22	27	18	-31	-18
Average Speed (miles per hour)	Peak Hour	12	17	21	21	75	24
	Peak Period	18	28	27	33	50	18
Delay (minutes per vehicle)	Peak Hour	48	25	22	19	-54	-24
	Peak Period	28	12	15	9	-46	-25
Number of Vehicle Trips (per hour)	Peak Hour	2,767	3,114	3,986	3,858	44	24
	Peak Period	3,129	3,157	3,645	3,546	16	12
Number of Persons Trips (per hour)	Peak Hour	3,132	3,874	4,847	4,870	55	26
	Peak Period	3,542	3,927	4,441	4,474	25	14
Freeway Travel Time (vehicle hours traveled)	Peak Hour	2,749	1,784	2,260	1,871	-18	5
	Peak Period	2,053	1,138	1,612	1,080	-21	-5
Travel Distance (vehicle miles traveled)	Peak Hour	32,646	31,138	47,030	38,582	44	24
	Peak Period	36,922	31,568	43,009	35,455	16	12
Average Vehicle Occupancy (persons/vehicle)	Peak Hour	1.13	1.24	1.22	1.23	7	1
	Peak Period	1.13	1.24	1.22	1.26	8	1
Density (passenger cars per mile per lane)	Peak Hour	115	92	76	73	-34	-21
	Peak Period	87	56	54	43	-38	-23
Southbound							
Average Travel Time (minutes)	Peak Hour	29	61	12	62	-59	2
	Peak Period	18	47	11	33	-39	-30
Average Speed (miles per hour)	Peak Hour	22	11	54	10	145	-9
	Peak Period	35	15	59	21	69	40
Delay (minutes per vehicle)	Peak Hour	19	49	2	50	-89	2
	Peak Period	8	35	1	21	-88	-40
Number of Vehicle Trips (per hour)	Peak Hour	3,101	2,475	3,873	3,091	25	25
	Peak Period	2,968	2,696	3,050	3,479	3	29
Number of Persons Trips (per hour)	Peak Hour	3,597	2,911	4,623	3,750	29	29
	Peak Period	3,443	3,168	3,638	4,216	6	33
Freeway Travel Time (vehicle hours traveled)	Peak Hour	1,498	2,523	756	3,165	-50	25
	Peak Period	884	2,101	540	1,903	-39	-9
Travel Distance (vehicle miles traveled)	Peak Hour	32,248	28,956	40,278	36,169	25	25
	Peak Period	30,863	31,544	31,715	40,707	3	29
Average Vehicle Occupancy (persons/vehicle)	Peak Hour	1.16	1.18	1.19	1.21	3	3
	Peak Period	1.16	1.18	1.19	1.21	3	3
Density (passenger cars per mile per lane)	Peak Hour	70	113	29	124	-59	10
	Peak Period	42	90	21	66	-50	-27
Peak Period – 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Peak Hour – Highest 1-hour within the peak period. Source: Traffic Operations Report, 2012.							

From: Johanna Bowen
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 8:01 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Trail now is the best choice

I strongly urge you to promote as soon as possible the removal of the rail tracks and the construction of the Watsonville to Santa Santa Cruz BIKE and PEDESTRAIN trail. A rail option is ludicrous.
Respectfully,

Johanna Bowen

From: CYNTHIA DZENDZEL
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 11:32 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: removal of railroad tracks

I am very strongly opposed to removing the rails, unless it is to install a new light rail system. This rail corridor should not be lost to public transportation. Bicycle and pedestrian trails can be established adjacent to the rails or through adjacent neighborhoods without removing the rails. We need an alternative to the gridlock on Highway 1, for future generations of Santa Cruz County residents.
It is embarrassing to see how this county has failed to establish safe bike and pedestrian routes, separate from roads and rails. We do not seem to have the community spirit necessary to support all forms of public transportation. Instead, one form of transportation is pitted against another, and there is not enough funding to do anything well. Our roads are full of pot holes and confusing intersections, and gridlock.
Please preserve the rails!

Cynthia Dzendzel

From: Jeff Schmelter
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 8:15 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Trail Not Rail

Hi RTC,
I would like to submit my support for the plan to build a fantastic bike and pedestrian trail exclusive of the proposed rail line. While I admire the ambition and intent of the rail line, I do not think it will really provide much of a valuable service to county residents or visitors and I believe the train will have negligible impact on offsetting traffic from Hwy 1. The rail aspect is also hugely expensive and complicated and our money would be best saved or used elsewhere in this transit plan. I understand that some money may be used exclusively for the rail line, but I encourage RTC to keep in mind the "sunk cost" fallacy and consider the rail option for its current and future potential and to nix the rail plan before we go any farther down that path.
Consider also the potential changes that are likely to take place with driverless cars over the next 10-20 years. These could radically change the usefulness of a train.

In addition to the above points, one of the things that helped sway my view against the train was to consider: "Would I, even as someone who generally seeks out opportunities to travel car-free and as one predisposed to like towards something like this, realistically take the train under the current proposal?" The answer was no. Cost + convenience of the train as proposed just can't beat car OR bike.

Trail without rail!!! Lets make it happen!

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeff Schmelter

Andrea Miller

Subject: Trail NOW!

To whom it may concern,

Everyday tens of thousands of people creep through traffic on Highway One; pollution spewing into the air, people's tempers boiling. I and most citizens feel this is our absolute, number one traffic issue. A train along the 32 mile corridor will not alleviate highway one traffic any time soon (or ever). Turn the tracks to trail, get local people safely on bikes or walking asap. Save the route for future rail development (rail bank). Will trail (in your current plan) be able to use the Capitola trestle? Will trail be able to use the Aptos over crossings? If not it will be an insurmountable burden to bicycle and pedestrian use of trail. Focus on widening highway one and build the trail only asap. Relieve Santa Cruz County traffic.

Best regards,

Andrea Miller

From: susannunes

Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 2:56 PM

To: info@sccrtc.org

Subject: Trail Advocacy

Hello Watsonville Chamber of Commerce -

I am a resident of Aptos/Seacliff and I work in Watsonville. I would like to state my position for a Trail only project on the RR corridor from Watsonville to Davenport. A bike and pedestrian trail would provide a healthy and safe method of transportation and recreation for the residents of all towns considered. The space is there and it seems like an obvious use of such space. Pedestrian and Bike trails have been built in numerous cities in our country and have proven to be successful and affordable. A similar trail was built in Monterey, as you may know. It has drawn tourists which thereby brings money to the city. I talk about this possible trail to fellow teachers, neighbors and other community members. Of the 50 or so people I've spoke to, not a single one wants a rail system. We all agree that we are not a metropolitan area and cannot sustain such a venture. Furthermore, it would destroy the environment on either side of the track. It would cost an exorbitant amount to build and maintain. It would create traffic jams at the multitude of intersections that run through the RR track. 70 % of the people jamming up Highway 1 are going over Highway 17 and would not be able to use a train. The train is too far from Cabrillo, UCSC, Dominican and other large companies, for people to use and get to work easily. The noise of the train would decrease our quality of life enormously. We live in this area because we have a shared interest in a peaceful, nature oriented lifestyle. The train would ruin that for all of us. The houses along the RR tracks will decrease in value if a train is put in. It would be horrendous.

The detriment of a train is exponential in my opinion, and in the opinion of those I've spoke to. On the other hand, the benefits of a trail are also exponential. It would provide a safe, healthy, reasonable priced place for locals and tourists to enjoy their enthusiasm for the outdoors and fit lifestyle. With it, we could retain the vegetation and landscape that we enjoy along the corridor. It would increase the value of peoples home. A trail would help those of us that commute locally to ride our bikes to work! It could be a gathering place for community to meet and do things that add joy and peace to our lives, rather than noise and rushing trains zooming by!

I hope you will consider these issues and thoughts as you move forward with plans for that space.

Thank you for your consideration in giving the people what we want and deserve!

Susan Moen Penprase

From: Jim Penprase

Sent: Friday, November 06, 2015 11:24 AM

To: info@sccrtc.org

Subject: Proposed use of rail corridor from Wilder to Watsonville

RTC Commissioners,

I am a resident of Aptos/Seacliff. I would like to state my position for a Trail only project on the RR corridor from Wilder State Park to Watsonville. A bike and pedestrian trail would provide a healthy and safe method of transportation and recreation for the residents of all towns considered. The space is there and it seems like an obvious use of such space. Pedestrian and Bike trails have been built in numerous cities in our country and have proven to be successful and affordable. A similar trail was built in Monterey, as you may know. It has drawn tourists which thereby brings money to the city. I talk about this possible trail to neighbors and other community members. Of the 25 or so people I've spoke to, not a single one wants a rail system. We all agree that a commuter rail system needs a sizable metropolitan area and the proposed system is not sustainable in the Santa Cruz area. Furthermore, a train would destroy the environment on either side of the track. It would cost an exorbitant amount to build and maintain. It would create traffic jams at the multitude of intersections that run through the RR track. Of the people jamming up Highway 1, 70% are going over Highway 17 and would not be able to use a train. The train tracks are too far from Cabrillo, UCSC, Dominican and other large companies, for people to use and get to work easily. The noise of the train, even so the called "quiet trains", would decrease our quality of life enormously. We live in this area because we have a shared interest in a peaceful, nature oriented lifestyle. The train would ruin that for all of us. The houses along the RR tracks will decrease in value if a train is put in. It would be horrendous. The benefits of a trail are exponential. It would provide a safe, healthy, reasonable priced place for locals and tourists to enjoy their enthusiasm for the outdoors and fit lifestyle. With it, we could retain the vegetation and landscape that we enjoy along the corridor. It would increase the value of peoples' homes. A trail would help those of us that commute locally to ride our bikes to work! It could be a gathering place for community to meet and do things that add joy and peace to our lives, rather than noise and rushing trains zooming by! I hope you will consider these issues and thoughts as you move forward with plans for that space. Thank you for your consideration in giving the people what we want and deserve!

James Penprase

From: Larry Bercovich
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2015 10:03 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Tax Measure

My wife and I live in Aptos California. We support attacks measure for transportation, but only if the funds are used to acquire and expand a bike and pedestrian trail. We are 100% against using any funds to acquire, build, expand or use the existing rail right-of-way for light rail. This right-of-way should be devoted solely to pedestrian and bike use. Larry and Ruth Bercovich

From: David Eselius
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2015 7:05 AM
To: Bruce McPherson, 5th SC Supervisorial District; Greg Caput, Distric 4 SCC Supervisor; Leopold, Supervisor District 1, SCC; Ryan Coonerty, SCC District 3 Supervisor; Zach Friend, SCC District 2 Supervisor; SCCRTC members
Subject: Highway 1 Funding

Subject: Highway 1 Funding

The federal funding of Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) transportation Highway 1 is to be determined. Based upon decades of past political performance, the SCCRTC members may "feel" their transportation planning is "OK," there is no doubt that the SCCRTC members' transportation objectives need updating. The only transportation improvements that matter to the county is "build out" of Highway 1. To understand what Highway 1 "build out" means to the SCCRTC, consult with Caltrans. The only way for the SCCRTC to receive transportation construction funding is for the SCCRTC to receive Caltrans' approval, followed by other agency approvals.

From: Joe Morici
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:35 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Please listen to the people that live in the area
Importance: High

To whom it may concern:

I live in Aptos and am against the rail...
Traffic is terrible in Santa Cruz County and we need to widen Highway 1 with HOV lanes, build rail-trail, Bus Rapid Transit and support ParaCruz / Metro buses. I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County Train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. Please do not include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective transportation investments.

Regards,

Joe Morici

From: Bob Jones
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:36 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: no train

Please abandon any plans for a train in santa cruz county.
This is not the place for a train.
I support the walking and biking trail.

Robert Jones
Aptos

From: Michael
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:37 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: No Train Station

Dear RTC,
Traffic is terrible in Santa Cruz County and we need to widen Highway 1 with HOV lanes, build rail-trail, Bus Rapid Transit and support ParaCruz / Metro buses. I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County Train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. Please do not include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective transportation investments.
Thank you!

Michael Coulson.
Resident, Santa Cruz.

From: Fay Levinson
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:39 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail/Trail Proposals

We just returned from Europe where we had the pleasure of using rail transport daily for three weeks. I would support rail here in Santa Cruz County IF:
we had a population that made it self-sustaining and took people where they needed to go. Using the underground or above ground rail systems in Europe provide both: easy, reasonable travel to work, places to do business, school, and run at all hours of the day and night. What we realized clearly is that the system proposed locally will do none of these things: we will not have immediate access to places of employment, shopping, theater; commuting will be costly and time consuming without providing the benefits of what is accomplished in a LARGE metropolitan area (such as Paris/London). The cost factor and inconvenience that would result in our County do not make a train feasible for use in Santa Cruz County. IF such a system existed for the 25,000 commuter cars (perhaps 50,000 people) to take them to Silicon Valley, perhaps that system might work to avoid Highway 17 commuter traffic. However, that is very very unlikely in today's world.
The system of a trail available to walkers, runners and bicyclists is a welcoming concept for this "GREEN" county and size of population.

Fay Levinson

From: Brian Peoples
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:42 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: No To Train & Santa Cruz Taxpayers funding Monterey Train Station

RTC,
Traffic is terrible in Santa Cruz County and we need to widen Highway 1 with HOV lanes, build rail-trail, Bus Rapid Transit and support ParaCruz / Metro buses. I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County Train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. Please do not include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective transportation investments.

Brian Peoples

From: Bill Gray
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:48 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Please stop

The rail part of your plan is foolish. We do not/and will not have the demographics necessary to drive this foolish adventure before real money is spent.

Bill Gray, PhD

From: Manuel Rosas
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:50 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: No To Train & Santa Cruz Taxpayers funding Monterey Train Station

Traffic is terrible in Santa Cruz County and we need to widen Highway 1 with HOV lanes, build rail-trail, Bus Rapid Transit and support ParaCruz / Metro buses. I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County Train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. Please do not include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective transportation investments.

Sincerely,

Manuel Rosas, PhD

From: Ed Colligan
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:56 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Monterey Train Station

Traffic is terrible in Santa Cruz County and we need to widen Highway 1 with HOV lanes, build a pedestrian trail for bikes, electric pedestrian vehicles, and walking, Bus Rapid Transit and support ParaCruz / Metro buses. I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County Train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. Please do not include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective transportation investments.

Sincerely,

Ed Colligan
From: carl casey
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:56 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: NO TRAINS

We don't need any trains in Santa Cruz county or Monterey county. lets build walking paths instead.

From: f o l e y
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:57 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: train

I do not want a new train station in Monterey.
I do not want trains on the tracks in Santa Cruz county.
Trains are noisy and costly
I want a bike path.
Bikes are quiet and inexpensive.
Thanks

Foley Weems

From: Charles Selvidge
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 9:19 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Oppostion to Spending Money on Passenger Service for Santa Cruz Rail Line

I am strongly opposed to the idea of passenger service on the Santa Cruz rail line, because I think it is a misguided use of public money. The costs for implementing this idea will enormously exceed the benefit; and it will compete with and reduce the availability of money that could be used to greatly improve people's lives.

I am not opposed to public transportation. I support and use the Santa Cruz Metro system. The Metro service provides users, who do not have or choose not to use auto transportation, access and convenient service to all points that could be served by a Santa Cruz passenger rail line. The bus service covers a much finer grid than the passenger rail could, and few people who want public transportation would choose this Santa Cruz passenger rail line service instead of the bus.

Be assured that virtually no one who presently uses an automobile on the Santa Cruz to Watsonville Rt 1 section would choose the rail line instead of their automobile. If they wanted public transit, they would be using the bus currently.

The most important transportation need in this corridor is for increases in the number of traffic lanes on Route 1 south from Santa Cruz. The Morrissey extension was a big improvement for the section that it changed but the section from Morrissey to about Park Avenue is still in daily grid lock. Because of the lack of action on expanding that section of Rt 1, about 90,000 people are miserably inconvenienced each day. The RTC should work to improve the lives of this huge number of citizens, not by pursuing a railroad project that will be provide them no consequential benefit, but rather by Rt 1 expansion. The suggestion that passenger service on the Santa Cruz line would significantly improve the lives of this 90,000 people does not make any sense. Essentially none of those people will choose to use the rail passenger service. This is because as bad as their current lot is, the inconvenience of driving a car to a train station, taking a slow moving train to a destination

not near where they want to be and arranging connecting transportation from there will be substantially worse. Since the public funds (taxes) are finite and CA already has the highest tax rates in the country, the effect of spending the hundreds of millions of dollars (or any money) on passenger train service will reduce money that could go to expanding Rt 1 and actually improving people's lives. Instead the Santa Cruz passenger rail service will add no value to these drivers. Its only contribution will be to cannibalize from the Metro bus system and thereby weaken its viability and entertain a few curiosity seekers who would not have been driving on Rt 1 any way.

I find it less than forthright that people such as Leopold keep saying the California voters "approved" this idea of passenger rail service. The reality is that a nebulous bond issue from over 20 years ago approved funding for passenger rail in general, but this cannot intellectually honestly be stated to be a voter endorsement for every specific idea that might come along. Each idea must be evaluated individually. This particular idea does not bear up to critical evaluation.

The idea that this rail line will decrease air pollution is ridiculous. Anyone who seriously wants to reduce air pollution, should be championing expansion of Rt 1. This would substantially reduce the massive waste of resources and accompanying exhaust as automobiles creep along taking 30 minutes to travel what should take 3 minutes. Energy will still be wasted at this bottle neck even in the distant future when there is a substantial percentage of electric cars.

The idea that more options to transportation is necessarily better is nonsense. More options are better only if each option provides some special benefit and is cost effective. No convincing information is provided to suggest that public transport by train is better than by bus for this corridor. In reality the bus service will be far superior to the train because it offers a much finer grid of service more cost effectively. No one can argue convincingly that passenger trains will increase property values at any location along the line. Rather it will more likely significantly reduce property values.

The idea that this rail line should be preserved because it offers lower cost delivery than trucks is ridiculous. If rail service on this line could be cost effective relative to trucks, Union Pacific would still own the line. Does anyone really believe that a public commission knows how to run railroads better than Union Pacific. It is not reasonable to think that this rail line can reduce truck transport significantly.

The notion that this passenger rail service would increase housing near train stations is pure whimsical speculation. In the days of the early west train service increased housing along the lines because the area was empty, not so today.

Passenger rail service even in the highly dense Bay corridor to San Francisco with dual rail lines does not break even on operating costs. The narrow single rail Santa Cruz passenger line would travel along with almost no one on board except an engineer and an occasional curiosity seeker. It would chew up tax dollars with negligible benefit. Claims of several thousand daily riders is unsupported and grossly exaggerated. Even if true a few thousand is insignificant compared to the 90,000 inconvenienced by the inaction on Route 1 improvement. These days people have to produce to be employed and keep jobs. They do not have time to fritter away on a slow moving passenger train that is a hassle on either end to get where they have to go. If a passenger train would significantly reduce the Rt 1 misery, it would be good. Unfortunately it will not help and only steal funds from value adding activities.

The argument was made that even bus service cannot support itself with fares. This is true, but this argues against adding another service that is not supportable by fares when that service does not produce a meaningful improvement over the bus system.

Charles Selvidge

From: Dick English
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 9:23 AM

To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Santa Cruz County Transportation Priorities

Traffic is terrible in Santa Cruz County and we need to widen Highway 1 with HOV lanes, build rail-trail, Bus Rapid Transit and support ParaCruz / Metro buses. I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County Train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. Please do not include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective transportation investments.

Dick English

From: Anita Whelan
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 9:33 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: NO re Train and taxpayer funding for Monterey Train Station

I live in Rio Del Mar and would not use rail service so I am unsupportive of measures that involve funding for a rail. I do support widening Hwy1, building out the rail line with a trail, funding Bus Rapid Transit, Para Cruz as well as Metro buses. I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County Train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. Please do not include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective transportation investments.

Anita Whelan

From: Martinelli-Jones, Theresa
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 2:29 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Really folks, a train station NOT IN SANTA CRUZ COUNTY.....

I do not want a train station in Santa Cruz County. At the same time, I do not want to pay for a train station in another county. Santa Cruz county desperately NEEDS widened Hwy 17, bus service, roads our cars do not fall into huge pot holes. WE NEED A RAILTRAIL, not train service that shuttles 12 people to Salinas at a subsidized cost of \$1,000.00 per person. 50% OF THE RESIDENTS IN Santa Cruz County will be economically impacted by a stupid train!!

Theresa Martinelli-Jones

From: Hal Stanger
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 7:58 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: Brian Peoples
Subject: No to Rail

I have never got an answer from you on the following questions.
Until then, NO to the rail.

From: Hal and Jody Stanger
To: Carey Pico
Sent: Friday, August 28, 2015 5:28 PM
Subject: Re: EXTERNAL: Re: Aptos Rail-Trail update / Sept 17 meeting

Dear Carey,

For starters, what I am asking for is an item by item itemized accounting for:

- 1) cost breakdown on what money's have been spent thus far on this project
- 2) the source of those funds
- 3) the future itemized option cost breakdown of completing in total the project
- 4) the source of those completion funds
- 4) if completed, the itemized ongoing cost of operation with expected inflation costs.
- 5) the source of those operating funds

If the above is posted, please give me URL. I would like to share for review with the neighbors, family and friends.

At a later time, I will be asking for the environmental studies, security, liability, and safety mitigation plan and costs if not in the above.

Thanks for your respectful and timely response.

Respectfully,
Hal

From: Robert Hull
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2015 8:43 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Comments for 11/19 mtg

RTC,

Traffic on CA-1 in Santa Cruz County is unacceptably congested. We need to correct the problems on CA-1 and CA-17 before building passenger train and train stations. I recommend adding an HOV lane to CA-1, Auxiliary lanes to CA-17 & CA-1, metering lights for CA 1 interchanges and improvements to CA-1 North of CA-17.

Robert Hull

From: KEITH SCHULER
Sent: Saturday, November 14, 2015 6:07 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission
Subject: route one

Dear Transportation commission.

I can just hope you all have to drive on route 1 from Soquel ave to anywhere close to Watsonville from time to time or daily like i do to get the message that we need to widen this highway! Sometimes I travel all over the bay area with my business. Right now we are commuting to Mill Valley to my home to Capitola. Its all great until we get to state route 1 and Morrissey Blvd where we slow to a crawl starting at 2:30 pm! And there we are left choking on our own exhaust fumes, so close to home. For the love of god please do something about this stretch of highway! What a nightmare. If I was in your position of

authority, I would do whatever it took to get this done! I'm sure i speak for a lot of other people in santa cruz county who value their quality of life and don't want to spend their precious hours sitting in bumper to bumper traffic on such a small stretch of highway. Really, I don't care what it takes to get this done. If you have to raise taxes or whatever - omg please do it!

Thank you, Keith Schuler
From: Branwyn Wagman
Sent: Saturday, November 14, 2015 7:17 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 2016 Transportation Tax Measure

Traffic is terrible in Santa Cruz County, which is fueling economic inequality and harming our quality of life. We need to widen Highway 1 with HOV lanes, build rail-trail and bus rapid transit, and support ParaCruz / Metro buses. I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. Please do not include a Monterey County train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective transportation investments.

Branwyn Wagman

From: Gina Colfer
Sent: Saturday, November 14, 2015 7:49 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org

Subject: Train

Good Morning,

I would like to let you know my view of the proposed train in our small community. First of all, our community does not have the population to support a commuter train, most commuter trains are for a population centers of more than one million people, and we are no where near that, and hopefully, never will be.

Second, please drive all of the surface streets where a train would have to pass over where arm bars would have to be put, and imagine the backlog of traffic each time those arms went down and cars would have to wait for the train to pass, what a nightmare!!

Third, with those arm bars in mind, one car every 3 hours in the US has a collision with a train from trying to cheat around the arm bars because they don't want to wait. The car never wins and our community would add to that statistic!

The infrastructure to build this train to get people to commute is another beaurocratic money sink hole with no common sense involved.

Build a first class trail and more people will get on their bikes to commute than hop on a train.

I have never taken up a cause before, but if you try to move forward with this idiotic idea of a commuter train, look out, this community is never going to go for it!

Be smart and use our tax money wisely and tear out the tracks and build a world class trail that will increase tourism and make our communities more desirable, not a train that no one, or very few would ride.

Thank you very much.

Gina Colfer

From: Dean Cutter
Sent: Saturday, November 14, 2015 11:09 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission

Cc: Lauren Cutter
Subject: Re rail trail tax measure proposal

Dear RTC Staff,

Please read this at the November 19th meeting. Thank you.

I am a life long resident of Santa Cruz. I live a block from the tracks on 41st Avenue, walk to work daily on the RXR trestle over Soquel Creek (illegally I guess), and often walk the corridor to Seacliff from New Brighton. I have walked many stretches of the corridor with my wife and kids between Davenport and Manresa.

I am staunchly AGAINST any tax that supports a train. I am strongly in FAVOR of a tax that supports ONLY a bicycle/pedestrian path.

A train will deter use by cyclists and pedestrians. A heavy train cannot make sudden safety stops. A train moving at any speed is dangerous to walkers and bicyclists. So, to prevent this, a substantial barrier will need to be installed that will take up the meagre space available for walkers and cyclists. Trains are imposing, loud, scary, and ugly. By necessity, trains, barriers, bikes and pedestrians will be sandwiched too close for comfort, safety, and enjoyment. It is ironic, that, in trying to create a green environment with a train, we could deter foot and bike use.

I am concerned that the planning and development process could go on for many years before ANYONE can use the corridor. Some of the bridges will require huge investments of time and money that may be very long in coming. In the meantime, I suggest this: Since the tracks need to be pulled up before a new train system can be installed, why don't we do that now and worry about the train later? If voters 20-30 years from now decide a higher use of the path would be a train, they could do so.

The location of the tracks is impractical. The great majority of shops, residences, and workplaces are situated too far from the tracks to walk. A jury-rigged network of short busses could be cobbled together for this, but seems redundant given that we already have a Metro Bus system such folks can use from door to door.

A train is too expensive. We have so many competing needs for our tax dollars, it doesn't make sense to spend them on a dubious train project.

A local concern: The RXR trestle over Soquel Creek needs to be opened to bicycles and pedestrians so they can bypass downtown Capitola-by-the-sea. Currently, 750 children commute to nearby New Brighton Middle School. Recent polls show that most parents of New Brighton children do not allow their kids to walk, bike, or skate due to the dangerous roads in Capitola. It is illegal for kids to skate in Capitola-by-the-sea after an elderly person was killed when a skater attempting the steep descent into the town lost control. 2 weeks ago my son was bicycling home from New Brighton Middle School into Capitol near Depot hill and was hit by a car performing an illegal turn. He went over the hood and sustained minor injuries. The bicycle was ruined. He would have used the rail bridge over Soquel Creek but it is illegal at this time (trespassing) and is unsuitable for bicycles.

New Brighton students coming from the south have been hit by cars. Consequently, the City is considering substantial changes to parking and bike access lanes to combat this problem, which has the community in an uproar. This problem could be greatly reduced if kids could use the rail corridor that parallels Park Avenue.

A community resource: In many communities train tracks have been replaced with bicycle/pedestrian trails with great success. Locally, one need look no further than the corridor from Marina to Pacific Grove. The path is a huge attraction to locals and out of towners. My family carts our bikes to Monterey to use their path. It makes for a fantastic day. Planners there realized a train in the mix would not have been practical, and would have completely undone the character of the resource they were trying to develop.

On our side of the bay, a well-planned bicycle/pedestrian path from Davenport to Watsonville could become a resource beyond imagining. Locally, parents and kids could walk/bike safely to school, shopping, and recreation. Visitors from afar would be attracted to the beauty and unique character of our area made accessible by such a corridor.

In closing, no tax that includes a train. A huge Yes to the bike/pedestrian trail. I support a tax that only funds a bike/pedestrian trail.

Sincerely, Dean Cutter

From: Tim Brattan
Sent: Saturday, November 14, 2015 3:45 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Monterey Co. Train Station

Dear SCCRTC,

Traffic continues to worsen in Santa Cruz County, and while I support widening Highway 1 with HOV lanes, a trail only corridor where rail lines exist through the county, Bus Rapid Transit and ParaCruz/Metro buses, I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County Train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor.

Please do NOT include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective lower cost transportation investments that support healthy lifestyles, environmental preservation (including reduced noise and diesel pollution) and a separate, safe and wider bike/pedestrian/non-motorized trail through the county.

Sincerely,
Tim Brattan

From: Robert Jones
Sent: Saturday, November 14, 2015 10:26 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail Lunacy

RTC Members,

The idea of building a train station NOT in our county with our county funds and then running 60 commuter trains a day between Santa Cruz and Watsonville is ill advised to say the least and insane in the extreme. Studies by YOU have demonstrated that such an idea will lose money and in no way reduce traffic on Hy 1. We all know that one way or another the RTC will subsidize this rail service no matter how bad the ridership is. With traffic and infrastructure the biggest transportation issues in our county, to squander limited funds on money losing rail projects is the height of irresponsibility.

Robert Jones

From: Buzz & Jennie Anderson
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2015 7:46 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail corridor

To committee members, I would like to voice my strong opposition to the rail trail plan. Rail ridership will NEVER reach expectations. The community would be better served by

returning the earmarked money and removing the tracks, thereby allowing for more technological modes of transportation. To continue to go forward with rail type transportation is a colossal waste of taxpayer money. Sincerely, Frank D. Anderson

From: David Faulkner
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2015 9:37 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: new Monterey train station - yes!

Research has proven that adding lanes to increase hwy capacity will only make traffic worse. I want my tax dollars to pay for a Monterey County Train station to better increase the viability of a passenger train along our newly acquired rail corridor. Please include a Monterey County Train station and funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective transportation investments. Please increase passenger rail capabilities and do not add more lanes to Hwy 1!

Thanks,
Dave Faulkner

From: Kyrrha Sevco
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2015 11:32 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Message for your Public Meeting on November 19

RTC,
I want enough funds to build a majority of the Rail Trail, to further study the feasibility of passenger rail service, protected bike lanes. In addition, I want youth bike safety education for all fifth graders.
Thank you,
Kyrrha Sevco

From: Pamela Morgan
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2015 12:03 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Widening Hwy 1

To whom this may concern:

Traffic is horrendous in Santa Cruz County and we need to widen Highway 1 with HOV lanes, build rail-trail, Bus Rapid Transit and support ParaCruz / Metro buses. I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County Train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. Please do not include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure.
Based on my experiences with the Hwy 1 widening to Soquel Avenue, it did not resolve the problem. The traffic seems worse than ever. We need effective transportation investments.

Thanks,

Pamela Morgan

From: Rick Longinotti
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2015 6:45 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission
Cc: George Dondero; John Leopold; Don Lane
Subject: sales tax & highway Aux Lanes

To: Regional Transportation Commission

Dear Commissioners,

I agree with your long-held desire to reduce traffic congestion on Highway 1. Congestion raises the cost of doing business in our county. Emergency vehicles get stuck in traffic. And according to sociologist, Robert Putnam, increases in commute times correlate directly with reduced engagement in family, neighborhood, and schools.

The current plan to widen the highway for auxiliary lanes from Santa Cruz to Freedom Blvd. will not succeed in reducing congestion. That is the conclusion of Environmental Impact Report on the highway widening recently released by CalTrans. The report says that the TSM Alternative (auxiliary lanes; ramp metering; etc):

"would result in a very slight improvement in traffic congestion when compared to the No Build Alternative." (page 2.1.5-16) "Providing ramp metering and auxiliary lanes would not relieve the congestion in the evening peak commute direction."

The EIR states that the auxiliary lanes will not get cars out of the neighborhoods and onto the highway.

"The Tier I Corridor TSM Alternative would not achieve sufficient congestion relief to attract any substantial number of vehicles that had diverted to the local street system back to the freeway. Local access to, and circulation around, community facilities near these intersections would not improve relative to no-build conditions"

The EIR also reports that the TSM Alternative would raise annual greenhouse gases by 25% over No Build conditions.

This information is a game-changer. Since the highway widening project can no longer be justified as a congestion-relief measure, it should be shelved in favor of a plan for effective public transit.

Other communities are leading the way. According to this article in the SF Chronicle, in the Bay Area the highway widening approach "has all but disappeared in the rearview mirror." <http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Bay-Area-transit-projects-shift-What-it-means-6597101.php>

Please enable Santa Cruz County voters to support a sales tax measure that doesn't waste funds on widening the highway, but puts our county on a path to increase access for all.

Thank you,

Rick

From: Diana Adamic
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 1:08 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org

Subject: proposed plan to fund a new Monterey County Train Station

No to trains, yes to trails.

I love trains. Or, I used to. Moving a lot of people with one device makes sense in some places but not all. Here in this coastal area a large, loud, train is not the answer. It will simply not offer needs to enough people. I don't know of one person who would ride it. Where does it go to and from? I can't shop with it, I can't take family or dogs or surf boards or food or beach supplies. I won't be able to take it to the movies or to UCSC or any other school. It won't help any traffic going to 17. How will it help H-1 traffic? How will it help any traffic? Who will ride it? Who will be able to afford it?

The bike trail makes sense. I can use the trail for a mile or 10 miles. And it is cheap. Don't let our nostalgia over trains keep you from thinking about how the future is changing. We are getting driverless cars. That is the future. Not trains. Build the bike trail now with an eye on the future with the new cars.

Diana Adamic

From: Caren Dix
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 8:50 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Pedistrian/ bike trail with passenger Rail

Hi,

I want to ask for your support n funding the trail along the rail line. this is a great thing for SC County, for our families to bike/ walk safely and promote alternative transportation. I also think it will bring more tourists to our community to enjoy a great outdoor activity. thanks for listening

Caren Dix

From: Eric Richter
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 9:49 AM
To: INFO@SCCRTC.ORG
Subject: I support a sales tax for Rail Trail and other programs

Hello, Honorable Members of the Regional Transportation Committee
As a near-lifelong resident of Santa Cruz County, I'm writing in support of the Sales Tax Proposal to help fund local infrastructure and program development.
Specifically, my top priority is to see a public path along the county's rail corridor that provides a scenic route for bicycle riding, jogging and walking separately from cars, as well as safer routes to schools and local businesses for my friends and family.
To support this, I hope to see a proposal that includes:

- Funding to build a majority of the Rail Trail within 5 years.
- Funding to further study the feasibility of passenger rail service along the corridor with connections to other rail services.
- Funding for protected bike lanes & youth bike safety education.

Thank you in advance for your work and support of this initiative,
Eric Richter
Soquel, CA.

From: Conrad Seales
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 9:53 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 11.19 Meeting on Sales Tax Measure

Dear RTC:

As you consider the sales tax measure, I would like for you to emphasize bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements. These will be the most cost-effective way to improve transportation in the county.

I know many people who live a reasonable bicycle ride away from their destination but who drive instead because they feel unsafe on a bicycle. This is a solvable problem.

Conrad Seales, CPA

From: Victor Aguiar
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 10:00 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 11.19 Meeting on Sales Tax Measure

Friends — I support taxation for sustainable transportation, not for highway widening. Even if road widening did ease congestion or provide an economic boost (which I believe it does NOT), science and common sense both dictate that this is what humanity needs to do: halt the expansion of infrastructure for motor vehicles, repair the infrastructure that exists, and direct our taxation, subsidy, regulation, land use planning, and public works toward sustainable transportation based on clean energy. One day the personal automobile WILL be history. How smooth that transition goes is our choice.

I support taxation for local streets and roads, transit service for the elderly and disabled, upgrades to the rail line and further study of passenger rail service, and construction of a significant portion of the rail trail. I don NOT support taxation for additional lanes on Hwy 1 or anywhere else.

Thank you.

Victor Aguiar

From: Kevin Karplus
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 10:02 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission
Cc: Kevin Karplus
Subject: 11.19 Meeting on Sales Tax Measure

I would support a sales tax measure for maintenance of local roads, for upgrades to the rail line, for adding bike lanes, for pedestrian improvements, for road diets, and for transit. I would emphatically not support a sales tax measure for widening Highway 1.

Kevin Karplus

From: Elizabeth Sanoff
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 10:04 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 11.19 Meeting on Sales Tax Measure

NO TAXES. NO NEW TAXES, NO EXTENSION OF TAXES. WE SANTA CRUZ CITIZENS ARE BEING TAXED TO DEATH. I'M A DECADES LONG SANTA CRUZ CITIZEN. Continuing to increase taxes will drive many citizens out of town.

From: Caroline Lamb
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 10:18 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 11.19 Meeting on Sales Tax Measure

Greetings,

I've been asked to weigh in on a sales tax measure to fix our transportation issues. I was at an RTC meeting a few years ago where I watched multiple speakers get up and plead for money to fix their roads. And then the RTC revealed that their minds were already made up, that they'd made careful studies, and decided that the best use of the money was to fund studies for widening Highway 1.

If you really made studies, you would be aware that there are already studies showing that widening a highway does not cure traffic congestion. In fact, you need look no farther than Mission Street. With considerable expense and inconvenience, causing several local businesses to close, Mission was widened from Swift to the highway. Traffic has not improved.

A sales tax is a regressive tax. It falls most heavily on the poor. It falls most heavily on those of us who do not drive. We are 1/3 of the residents of Santa Cruz County.

If I were to vote for such a tax, I would ask how it benefitted me. Widening the highway would offer very little benefit. The amount of time I'd waste in the jams while construction went on would take at least a decade to gain back, assuming that widening the highway did improve congestion, which I doubt. What it has done in the past is move the bottlenecks. What we need is decent public transportation. When I moved to where I live now, there were buses I could take every 20 minutes to go downtown, or home from downtown. And the 42 night bus would take me home if I was out late. Now two of those daytime buses are gone, and the third, the 3, takes at least 35 minutes to get downtown from my house. I can walk downtown in 45 minutes; if I count the time it takes to walk to the bus stop, there's no real gain from taking the bus. And the night bus is gone; even though I never saw it run even close to empty, none of the people who rode it could have made it to one of your meetings to protest.

But I am told that our bus system must cut back 25%, unless this tax is passed. There's nothing left to cut. It's already a captive system, one that no one with other choices will use. (The exception is UCSC students.)

I'm not excited about HOV lanes. There won't be any buses to put in them. And anyway, what matters to bus riders is frequency of service, not speed. These days I can spend 45 minutes downtown to transfer from one bus to another; no amount of speed will make up for that.

I can't vote for a tax to widen highway 1, an undertaking in folly. I must have more public transportation, and more and more of us will need it as the population ages.

Would you please reexamine your priorities?

Thank you,

Caroline Lamb

From: Philip Boutelle
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 10:54 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 11.19 Meeting on Sales Tax Measure

Hello RTC,

I recently read the report regarding the sales tax measure to fund transportation projects in our county. I would support this even more if the highway widening was removed from the project, and if the major bike infrastructure (bike/ped bridges) were not coupled with widening.

I also think the measure needs to do more to address the impact of people who commute over the hill: aside from widening, which can induce additional traffic and even development, how can we build transit that actually serves commuters? Also, the widening might provide short-term congestion solutions, there are no cities that have built their way out of traffic congestion with additional road capacity only. It takes a robust public transit system, and I don't see that as a central part of this conversation yet. I think I'm talking about considering Santa Cruz as a part of the Bay Area, and trying to integrate into their systems as much as possible, including single fare payment platforms (clipper card), and maybe even restarting the conversation about rail over the hill. At a minimum, the 17 bus service should be expanded to have direct service from the WS and places as far south/east as Aptos or even Watsonville, and then have expanded destinations. The 17 service hasn't really changed much in a decade or more, aside from adding frequency and increasing fares, and having huge ridership numbers. This bus conversation is crucial if the tax measure is approved with the HOV lane option.

Oh, and one other thing: as long as the Boardwalk has huge parking lots onsite, the associated summer traffic will continue to be terrible. How much does the Seaside company pay to offset the impact of all the traffic they bring, in terms of transportation fees? What kind of alternatives are available to get tourists to the beach? I again lean towards rail service over the hill, connecting to BART in SJ, CALTrain, etc., as a long-term solution.

I have read a lot lately about Seattle's Prop 1, their huge transportation measure, and it is pretty inspiring; why can't we achieve that here?

Thank you,

-Phil Boutelle

From: Laura Cook
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 11:05 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Funding for Rail Trail

Hello,

I wanted to let you know that I want to see a RTC proposal that includes:

- Funding to build a majority of the Rail Trail
- Funding to further study the feasibility of passenger rail service
- Funding for protected bike lanes & youth bike safety education.

Thank you,

Laura Cook

From: Ryan Sarnataro
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 11:22 AM

To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Sales Tax Measure

To whom it may concern

As a long time Santa Cruz resident I strongly support a temporary increase in local sales tax to fund transportation infrastructure.

My priorities are:

Funding local street maintenance, expanding the bike rail trail and widening Highway 1.

I do not support spending anything on studies or implementation of passenger rail service.

I understand politics is about compromise. Even if it is voted to "waste" tax dollars pursuing a passenger rail service that would serve few at great cost I still support the tax measure.

Ryan Sarnataro
Santa Cruz, CA.

From: Peter Goodman
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 11:36 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject:

Dear Sirs,

Please make it your priority to widen Highway 1 with HOV lanes and please build up the Metro bus system. I DO NOT want my tax dollars paying for a commuter train that will only be used by a few people but will disrupt the whole county with train whistles and track noise for those who live within a few blocks of the tracks, like me. The feasibility study said 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. That would totally change the character of our county and helps only a little bit with traffic. Please return the prop 116 money, pull up the tracks and build the trail now. Please do not include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure.

Thanks,

Peter Goodman, Rio Del Mar

From: Anne Mark
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 11:59 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Santa Cruz rail trial and the ballot

I would like to comment on the RTC finalizing a proposed 2016 sales tax for a ballot measure with funding allocations planned for local transportation projects. I support this project and want to see a proposal that includes:

- Funding to build a majority of the Rail Trail
- Funding to further study the feasibility of passenger rail service
- Funding for protected bike lanes & youth bike safety education.

I am a tax payer and have lived in Santa Cruz my entire life (43 years) and plan on raising generations here.

Thank you for considering my vote and wants for this project,

Anne

From: Steve Piercy - Website Builder
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 1:35 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Sales Tax Measure

Dear RTC,

I oppose taxes to widen the "Great Wall of Santa Cruz County", more commonly known as Highway 1. This barrier divides our communities, constrains our mobility, and reduces our options to choose healthy, active, or less-polluting modes of transportation. It discriminates against young people and those with disabilities who cannot drive a car, as well as people who cannot afford to own a car. Supporting highway widening reduces equity in transportation for the people of Santa Cruz County.

I would strongly support any effort to remediate decades of automobile-dominated transportation and undo the damage it has caused. That would include pedestrian and bicycle bridges or tunnels across or under Highway 1 to re-establish severed connections between our communities, provided such bridges are built independently of highway widening.

Steve Piercy

From: Allison Livingston

Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 1:39 PM

To: info@sccrtc.org

Cc: Piet Canin; Ecology Action

Subject: Yes, I want you to fund Rail Trail, Youth Bike Safety Training and Safe Routes to School improvements!

These programs are very important to me, a bike commuter and mother of two children.

I want as much money as possible to go to the Rail Trail, Youth Bike Safety Training for all local 5th graders, Safe Routes to School improvements, continued passenger rail studies and other bike projects.

Sincerely,

Allison and Dave Livingston

From: Kimberley Hughes

Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 1:44 PM

To: info@sccrtc.org

Subject: We should fund non-automobile transportation in Santa Cruz County

Hello,

As a committed bike commuter and outdoor enthusiast and a Santa Cruz county resident, I am writing to advocate for a ballot measure to support bike and pedestrian pathways in our locality. Well maintained, contiguous routes will promote healthy activity and safer neighborhoods while providing practical alternatives to using our cars for errands and trips around town. The Arana Gulch bike path has been a smashing success linking the east and west sides of town. That bikeway, along with the improved bike lane markings along the Broadway/Laurel corridor have made it my preferred route to and from work at the University. On the weekends, it is my link to shopping, visiting, classes and downtown entertainment.

Carving out territory for pedestrians and bikes creates awareness of their presence and supports non-car travel as a valid and vibrant part of our culture. I am willing to pay a percentage of sales tax to support this important infrastructure. Let's fund it so we can build it well and maintain it to keep it functional, beautiful, and safe, because I hope to be using it for the next 40 years or so.

Thank you very much,

Kimberley Hughes

From: Richard Nolthenius
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 1:47 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: RTC decisions on Hwy 1 widening

Dear RTC,

I strongly support the rail-trail as an alternative to spending large money on widening Hwy 1 yet again. Don't turn Santa Cruz into another Orange Country, regardless of what business interests may say. Increase motivation for people to take alternatives - healthy cycling, pedestrian and rail along the Rail-Trail! I teach astronomy and climate at Cabrillo College, and studies show that widening freeways only has a very temporary effect in lowering congestion, before the new lane fills up just as badly. I gave up on Hwy 1 in my commute from downtown SC to Cabrillo many years ago, and bike. But biking Soquel is not nearly as safe or pleasant as the Rail Trail would be. Think about the future, and don't live in the past or limited-thinking from entrenched interests. Look at the envy most feel towards places such as Portland Oregon, and many cities in western Europe.

Dr. Richard Nolthenius

From: Susan Cook
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 2:02 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 11.19 Meeting on Sales Tax Measure

I am a Santa Cruz resident who supports a sales tax increase (1 percent) to fund more bicycle infrastructure. We also need more sidewalks in my neighborhood on the Westside. Thank you,
Susan Cook

From: Cheryl Otto
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 2:37 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Please fund the Rail Trail

Attn: RTC

This email is to inform you of my interest in sustainable transportation options in Santa Cruz County. With that in mind, I urge you to provide enough funds to build a majority of the Rail Trail, upgrade the rail line and fund further study and design of a passenger rail service. Thank you,

Cheryl Otto
Resident, La Selva Beach, CA

From: Barry Scott
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 2:44 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Transportation Sales Tax

Dear Commissioners,

Road and highway maintenance costs should be paid using existing funding streams; NEW funding like the 2016 tax measure should be used for NEW types of mobility and infrastructure.

We must create and support alternatives to highways and motor vehicle dependency. To this end let us please fund the passenger rail project and more bike infrastructure.

Priorities for moving forward with the most sustainable solutions, consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan goals, include:

1. Eliminate the "narrow points" that confound plans for full implementation of the Monterey Bay Scenic Sanctuary Trail, and build dedicated bike crossings over highway one at Aptos Village, near Cabrillo College, and consider a crossing parallel to the railway over Soquel Creek in Capitola.
2. Dedication of 20-30% of the transportation tax measure to provide passenger rail service along the Santa Cruz Branch Line.
3. Funding construction of passenger rail infrastructure, including a station in Monterey County that connects us with other rail systems.
4. Expansion of bike lanes and trails, especially those that become part of the MBSST.
5. Future funding Metro Bus service routes that will enhance the passenger rail experience and encourage ridership.

We are at a fork in the road, a point at which we can choose to continue funding a broken and increasingly obsolete automobile paradigm, OR chose to use our vision and the experience of cities around the world and provide clean and efficient alternatives to our current dependency on the automobile.

Warm regards,

Barry Scott

From: Thomas P. Onan
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 3:14 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 11.19 Meeting on Sales Tax Measure

I want SCCRTC to know I support a plan for a 2016 sales tax measure that does include funding for local streets and roads, transit service for the elderly and those with disabilities, upgrades to the rail line and most importantly, to me, construction of a significant portion of the rail trail. The funding for streets and roads will also include, for my continuing support, bike lane improvements, better stripes (green).

I would be willing to support a sales tax increase of whatever amount SCCRTC, with studies, deems reasonable in our economic climate. I don't support additional lanes on Highway 1. We need to get away from increasing use of, and dependance on, the combustible engine for transportation.

Adding more lanes to Highway 1 will not discourage use of the fossil fuel engine for transportation, it will encourage more use.

Sincerely,

Thomas P. Onan

From: Trician Comings
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 3:40 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Proposed Sales Tax Measure

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

If you are planning to put a sales tax measure on the November ballot next year, we need to know up front what the money is going for.

What I (and most people I know) really want is the funds to complete the Rail Trail quickly rather than more highways. It will connect Santa Cruz for car-free transportation which will benefit our health as well as the environment and traffic congestion.

The Seabright to Live Oak section of the Rail Trail should be the TOP priority! I'd also like to see funding for rail line upgrades and passenger service.

Thank you,

Trician Comings
Santa Cruz

From: David Farberow
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 3:51 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Re

I would like to put my voice forward recognizing the need for increased expenditure for Santa Cruz bike advocacy. I would like to see more money spent in improving all biking conditions and safety concerns. Thank you, David Farberow

From: Tim Hawkins
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 3:56 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail Trail

To whom it may concern,
Please do what you can to build a majority of the Rail Trail, upgrade the rail line and fund further study and design of passenger rail service.

Thank you.

From: Samara Foster
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 4:41 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Comments for the RTC

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing with a letter nearly identical to that sent by Barry Scott as I agree with all of his points and urge you to use the new funding streams for new infrastructure, particularly rail and bike trail that allow us to move away from automobile dependency in this county. I know my life would be much improved if my daily commute from Aptos to UCSC was made by rail rather than sitting in my car in traffic two times per day. It's a waste of time, and it's bad for my health and the environment. Furthermore, I would enjoy biking/walking in the community to the train stations, for recreation, and to run errands in the county if it were safe. As it is, I feel very unsafe for biking, and this is a very un-walkable place! Please use this moment as an opportunity to make our county better and provide us with the transportation infrastructure to bring us into a less automobile-reliant future and aligns us with many east coast communities.

Most road and highway maintenance costs should be paid using existing funding streams; NEW funding like the 2016 tax measure should have a strong focus on NEW types of mobility and infrastructure.

While maintaining existing assets, we must create and support alternatives to highways and motor vehicle dependency. To this end, let us please fund the passenger rail project and more bike infrastructure.

Priorities for moving forward with the most sustainable solutions, consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan goals, include:

1. Elimination of the "narrow points" that confound plans for full implementation of the Monterey Bay Scenic Sanctuary Trail, and build dedicated bike crossings over highway one at Aptos Village, near Cabrillo College, and consider a crossing parallel to the railway over Soquel Creek in Capitola.
2. Dedication of 20-30% of the transportation tax measure to provide passenger rail service along the Santa Cruz Branch Line.
3. Funding construction of passenger rail infrastructure, including a station in Monterey County that connects us with other rail systems.
4. Expansion of bike lanes and trails, especially those that become part of the MBSST.
5. Future funding for Metro Bus service routes that will enhance the passenger rail experience and encourage ridership.

We are at a fork in the road, a point at which we can choose to continue funding a broken and increasingly obsolete automobile paradigm, OR chose to use our vision and the experience of cities around the world and provide clean and efficient alternatives to our current dependency on the automobile.

Sincerely,
Samara Foster

From: Rebbie Higgins
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 4:43 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Tax measure funding allocation

Dear RTC,

I am so excited to have the opportunity to help raise money for the Rail Trail, Youth Bike Safety Training for all local 5th graders, Safe Routes to School improvements, continued passenger rail studies and other bike projects. The proposed sales tax will be an easy way for all of us to contribute to much needed bike infrastructure improvements in Santa Cruz. Thank you! Yours, Rebbie Higgins

From: Batya Kagan
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 6:03 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 11.19 Meeting on Sales Tax Measure

To the Members of the RTC,

I have looked over the proposed tax measures. I am wondering why we would be funding a highway expansion at a time when it is obvious that we need to be moving towards exclusive funding of public transportation at a time when all nations are soon coming

together to try to ameliorate greenhouse gas emissions. I will not support a tax measure that is still skewed to support the automobile. Instead, I ask that we give full funding to the rail/ trail and upgrade of the rail line so that we can be a wave of the correct future, not a future that may eliminate most life on the planet.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

Batya Kagan
Santa Cruz, CA

From: Joanne Noce
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 6:43 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Bike Money Support

Dear RTC:

I ride my bike to work most days and would love to see the next generation do the same. I'd like to see as much money as possible go to the Rail Trail, Youth Bike Safety Training for all local 5th graders, Safe Routes to school improvements and continue passenger rail studies and other bike projects.

Thank you for your efforts to this matter.
Joanne Noce

From: BRANNA BANKS
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 7:08 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: More funds for Bike resources in Santa Cruz County

Hello there,

I want as much money as possible to go to the Rail Trail, Youth Bike Safety Training for all local 5th graders, Safe Routes to School improvements, continued passenger rail studies and other bike projects. I think that we need to reduce the carbon footprint, traffic and the demand from more gasoline/fossil fuels. It is expensive to live in Santa Cruz, plus obesity is on the rise, so we need to improve bike safety in Santa Cruz County to encourage people to get out of their cars and ride their bikes!
Thank you so very much for your consideration.

Gary and Branna Banks

From: Dave Stoltz
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 7:28 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Fund the Rail Trail

I support using enough funds to build a majority of the Rail Trail, upgrade the rail line and fund further study and design of passenger rail service.

Sincerely, Dave Stoltz

From: Mollie Behn
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 8:13 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Support bike and pedestrian improvement projects

Good Evening,

I am writing to encourage you to include as much funding as possible to go towards the Rail Trail, Youth Bike Safety Training for all local 5th graders, Safe Routes to School improvements, continued passenger rail studies and other bike projects through the upcoming sales tax measure. Funding will go a long way in supporting a healthy and safe community for us to live in. Thank you!

Sincerely,
Mollie Behn

From: Kent Robinett
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 8:50 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: Kent Robinett
Subject: Santa Cruz Rail Trail

Dear RTC,

Please approve the November 2016 Sales tax ballot measure to make sure enough funds are available to build the Rail Trail. The Rail Trail is a critical piece for improving our transportation in Santa Cruz and would be a huge benefit to the community. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Regards,

Kent Robinett

From: Sharon Parker
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 9:09 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Funding for Bike and Pedestrian Improvements

Dear Regional Transportation Commission Members:

Please consider funding community transportation needs with the monies generated by the proposed 2016 sales tax ballot measure. In particular, I urge you to consider the Rail Trail, Youth Bike Safety training for all local 5th graders, safe routes to school improvements, continued passenger rail studies, and other bike projects. These improvements to our community will have a positive impact on the quality of life in Santa Cruz. Many of them have the potential to reduce the amount of traffic on our streets. This will improve air quality for all of us. Sincerely,

Sharon Parker

From: Brian Corser
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 9:12 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail Trail Support

Dear RTC Commissioners,

I writing to you today in support of providing enough funds from the proposed November 2016 sales tax ballot measure to build a majority of the Rail Trail, to upgrade the rail line and to fund further study and design of passenger rail service. This project is a remarkable opportunity and needs the funding to get it done in our lifetime - please support it!
Thank you,

Brian Corser

From: Jess B
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2015 9:35 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Bike/Rail Trail Allocation from November 2016 sales tax ballot measure

Greetings!

I am writing as a multi-decade resident, a local public school teacher, and a property owner in Santa Cruz County. As I adore our area and have invested heavily in our community as a teacher and a home owner, I am writing to urge you to do the same by investing as many funds as possible into the Rail Trail and bicycling and pedestrian infrastructure. You don't need me to explain the social and physical health benefits of safe walking and bicycling infrastructure in communities. You don't need more studies showing that funding walking and biking infrastructure is a moral imperative when it comes to obesity and climate change. You don't need me to explain that our buses aren't enough. You just need to move on the issue every time it comes up and make sure the funds are where they need to be--in long term infrastructure projects. This community loves being outdoors! We will use whatever is in place or we will continue to risk our lives dodging SUV's and delivery trucks on Soquel and elsewhere. Please continue to make Santa Cruz more livable, healthy, and desirable as a tourist destination by funding the Rail Trail. Thank you for your consideration and your investment in Rail Trail and other bike and pedestrian infrastructure.

Jessica Bender

11/17/2015

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commissioners and Staff,

From the moment I heard about your attempt to create a sales tax measure, I was both dubious about the potential to do so and supportive of the good work the staff and Commissioners have done to move us forward towards consensus on transportation in Santa Cruz County.

At the moment it doesn't seem to me that our community has sufficient consensus on either highway widening or a train to support a sales tax measure that attempts to reach a compromise by including both of these measures. While I remain open to such a compromise, what I am seeing in the current draft plan is fairly vague and significantly underfunded when it comes to a modern train and trail system. This makes me feel less than excited about supporting a compromise including highway widening. And I know that you are hearing even less supportive comments from those who oppose a train. These leaves me feeling empathetic to the bind that the Commission is in with regard to coming up with a local funding source so as to be able to compete with the other urban counties in California. I am acutely aware of this problem and would like to be supportive of resolving it in a way that does not run the risk of worsening our transportation system. From polling and conversations it appears that we do have a fair degree of support, and no opposition, for some transportation projects. I would be happy to support a tax measure that does not include my favorite project- rail, if it could further the good work of the Commission without worsening our transportation system by widening the Highway. In this spirit I would like to introduce Measure C (for Consensus): Measure would be funded by a ¼ cent sales tax or a ½ tax for 15 years to be determined by polling. It would raise 225 million dollars to be distributed as per the following: 50%- 112.5 million, for Neighborhood Projects including road rehab, as defined in the current proposal including the Specific Designated Projects. 20%- 45 million, for Mobility Access as defined by the current proposal 30%- 67.5 million for Active Transportation with a focus on Safe Routes to School: This money would fund trail work with an emphasis on two priorities: construction of the rail trail and construction of safe routes to school. Particular emphasis would be given on projects that fit both of these parameters Again, I submit this compromise proposal in the spirit of cooperation and respect for your efforts. Whatever the SCCRTC decides to do with regard to a sales tax measure, I will continue to work towards a trail and trail system that will really create a sustainable future with regard to transportation via its effect on land use.

Sincerely,

Micah Posner

From: Therese Kilpatrick
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 6:17 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: funding for FORT

Dear Sir or Madam,
I would like to voice my support for FORT and encourage the RTC to fund Rail Trail, Youth Bike Safety Training for all local 5th graders, Safe Routes to School improvements, continued passenger rail studies and other bike projects. Future use of the rail trail by local people of all ages, who will cycle, walk, and otherwise enjoy amenities associated with a rail trail, requires a group of policy makers to follow progressive precedents by building and maintaining cycling/walking infrastructure, and other sustainable transportation choices for the overall environmental good and for health and happiness of the local population and tourists.
Regards,
Therese Kilpatrick

From: James Barrett
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 8:02 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail corridor

I do not want my tax dollars paying for a Monterey County Train station or 60 trains a day along the rail corridor. Please do not include a Monterey County Train station or funding for a train along the rail corridor in the 2016 Transportation Tax Measure. We need effective transportation investments, and I don't think there will be enough ridership to sustain a train service. I would like to see a bike/pedestrian path similar to what is in Monterey County from Fort Ord to Lover's Point. I think many county residents and tourists would use a bike/pedestrian path daily, some for commuting, some for pleasure, some for healthy exercise.

Thank you,
James Barrett

From: Bill Malone
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 10:12 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Re: November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure - In the Long Run, Adding Lanes IS Bad Public Policy

I am in favor of a sales tax measure that helps provide a variety of transportation options in our county.

I am opposed to any sales tax measure that wastes millions more tax-payer dollars on more Highway One widening projects. (BTW, I am not the only one that holds this sentiment.)
[In the Long Run, Adding Lanes Does NOT Relieve Highway Traffic Congestion \(It Makes It Worse!\)](#)

Conventional Wisdom thinks that adding lanes to a freeway reduces traffic congestion. But scientific studies have shown that Conventional Wisdom is wrong. Adding more lanes actually induces more cars to get on the newly widened highway. Traffic congestion may be reduced for a year or two, but then traffic clogs up again as more drivers crowd on the highway.

There are many examples around the Nation of this observed circumstance. Fortunately (or unfortunately), we have a classic example of this with our own Highway One. The RTC spent many hundreds of millions of dollars on TWO widening projects and with both projects traffic congestion quickly got as bad (or worse) than it was before. We can see with our own eyes that adding axillary lanes has not improved traffic congestion on Highway One. Why are RTC Commissioners going to continue with this failed idea? Even CalTrans has concluded than adding more lanes does not effectively reduce congestion. Instead, CalTrans is now recommending spending money on alternative means of transportation.

[In the Long Run, Adding Lanes DOES Increase Greenhouse Gasses and Global Warming](#)

Another reason for NOT widening the Highway that will lead to more cars traveling the Highway, is that it will increase Global Warming. We all know that automobiles are a major source of greenhouse gas emissions. Encouraging more cars to travel the Highway means more greenhouse gasses. Which means worsening Global Warming. Greenhouse gas emissions may be reduced for a few years following the opening of the new axillary lanes, but as more new drivers use the Highway, greenhouse gasses will be worse than before. The scientific studies that conclude that adding additional highway lanes induces more cars and traffic congestion also point out that adding lanes produce more greenhouse gasses after a few years.

California government agencies (including SCRTC) have a state mandate to lower

greenhouse gasses below 1990 levels by 2050. Adding more cars traveling on the Highway will INCREASE greenhouse gasses NOT lower them. You are making the job more difficult for some future SCRTC commissioners who will have to get serious and deal with the task of lowering greenhouse gasses.

Why don't YOU RTC Commissioners get serious about Global Warming and stop doing projects that will increase greenhouse gasses emissions. It is the right thing to do. Be leaders - don't just do the easy thing by pandering the Highway widening advocates to pass your sales tax. Provide more alternative modes of getting people around Santa Cruz County not just more car travel.

In the Long Run, Adding Lanes IS Bad Public Policy

Don't repeat past failures. Do the right thing: Spend your (actually, OUR) money on more alternative transportation methods (including passenger rail service all the way from Santa Cruz to Watsonville). In the Long Run, that is GOOD public policy.

From: Emily G.
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 10:38 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: In Support of Sales Tax Measure

Dear RTC,

I am writing in support of the proposed sales tax measure that would help fund important transportation projects. I am primarily in support of the funds being used to build a majority of the Rail Trail, upgrade the rail line and fund further study and design of passenger rail service. I am also interested in some funds being used to support youth bike safety education programs, protected bike lanes and green lanes in high traffic areas. I see this sales tax measure as being an opportunity to fund critical sustainable transportation projects that are so often not prioritized due to lack of funding. Best Regards,

Emily Gomez

From: Josh
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 10:55 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: re: Nov 19th public meeting

re: this thursday's public meeting and the proposed November 2016 sales tax ballot measure with funding allocations for local transportation projects
just wanting to let you know know that i'd like you to allocate enough funds to build a majority of the Rail Trail, upgrade the rail line and fund further study and design of passenger rail service!

thanks,
josh salesin

From: Karen Kefauver
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 11:04 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Funding bicycle projects, yes, more please

Thanks for all you do at SCCRTC. Please hear that loud and clear because I know there are a LOT of complainers out there. One of the things I appreciate so much is your spectacular support on bicycle related projects and the stellar Rail Trail in development. I could not be prouder. To that end, please consider my letter:

Dear RTC,

I'm writing in support of the proposed November 2016 sales tax ballot measure that would help fund important transportation projects. I'm primarily in support of the funds being used to build a majority of the Rail Trail, upgrade the rail line and fund further study and design of passenger rail service.

I am also interested in funds being used to support youth bike safety education programs, protected bike lanes and green lanes in high traffic areas.

I see this sales tax measure as an opportunity to fund critical sustainable transportation projects that are so often not prioritized due to lack of funding.

Sincerely,
Karen Kefauver

From: Forest Monsen
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 11:46 AM
To: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Subject: Funding for local transportation projects

Dear Regional Transportation Commission Members,

I understand that you all are considering a sales tax ballot measure for November of next year, and that local transportation plays an important role.

Santa Cruz is becoming a bike-friendly town. This is important, as by doing so, our city is actively fighting climate change, promoting healthy lifestyles, supporting local businesses, and supporting cheaper family transportation.

I ask you to please allocate most of the received funding to bike projects, such as the Safe Routes to School improvements, the Rail Trail, and Youth Bike Safety Training for all local 5th graders.

Thank you for improving our community.

Regards,

Forest Monsen

From: b w
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 12:09 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail Trail funding

Good afternoon,

Please allow enough funds to build the Rail Trail. The rail trail is healthy for our community.

Thank you.

From: Eric Horton
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 1:09 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Sales Tax Proposal

Dear Honorable Members of the Regional Transportation Committee,
As a resident of Santa Cruz County, I'm writing in support of the Sales Tax Proposal to help fund local infrastructure and program development.

Specifically, my top priority is to see a public path along the county's rail corridor that provides a scenic route for bicycle riding, jogging and walking separately from cars, as well as safer routes to schools and local businesses for my friends and family.

To support this, I hope to see a proposal that includes:

- Funding to build a majority of the Rail Trail within 5 years.
- Funding to further study the feasibility of passenger rail service along the corridor with connections to other rail services.
- Funding for protected bike lanes & youth bike safety education.

Thank you in advance for your work and support of this important initiative,

Eric Horton

From: Jessica L. Klodnicki
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 1:29 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: Amelia Conlen
Subject: Rail Trail Funding

I am the General Manager for Bell, Blackburn and C-Preme brands, a cycling helmet and accessories business based here locally. Our company, BRG Sports, has over 150 employees in Scotts Valley, a large percentage of whom live in Santa Cruz and Santa Cruz County. www.brgsports.com We are a cycling oriented business that wants to ensure our current and future employees can enjoy new transportation alternatives. As a cycling focused business, we are particularly interested in building more, safe bike infrastructure.

I am also the Founder of Girls Rock – a women's mountain bike group representing over 330 women that live in the local area. www.girlsrock-mtb.com. This is a group of active, outdoor enthusiasts that also would support more cycling and walking alternatives.

And, I am on the Board of Directors of People for Bikes, an organization representing over 1 million people in the US and a bicycle industry coalition that supports providing more safe places to ride bicycles. www.peopleforbikes.org

For all of these reasons, I am extremely passionate about providing safe cycling alternatives for family, fitness and transportation. I am writing to express my support for the local Rail Trail project as you consider funding allocations for local transportation projects. We want to make sure there are enough funds to build a majority of the Rail Trail, upgrade the rail line and fund further study and design of passenger rail service.

As a business leader and local resident of Santa Cruz, I would love to see our town be a world class destination in regards to transportation alternatives, particularly as it related to cycling. I hope that you will make this a priority for our community. Thank you!

Jessica Klodnicki,

From: Mark Woodhead
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 1:56 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail Trail

I want to give you my support for the rail trail in Santa Cruz County. As a bicyclist, I watch drivers closely as I ride around Santa Cruz, and the biggest problem we face today, beyond the usual inattention to bicycle riders, is the number of people who feel it is fine to text and drive. That number is going up constantly, and close calls are getting ever more common. I want to see funding put in place to build the majority of the rail trail bicycle corridor. I want to see further study on the feasibility of passenger rail service, and I also want to see more funding for protected bike lanes. Some additional safety education for newer riders would help a lot, too. Thank you for your efforts on behalf of all cyclists, and keep up the good work.

Mark Woodhead

From: Cruzio Email
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 3:21 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Support Measure for Tax to Widen Hwy 1

We urge you to implement a tax measure on the ballot to secure the needed funds to widen Hwy 1. Hwy 1 is a major California artery and it's the local leader's responsibility to build the infra structure needed for not only local people but to the millions of tourists that come through Santa Cruz. Again, we urge you to secure a tax measure to fund the widening of Hwy 1 as a basic infra structure needed in this County. Thanks,

Karl Heiman

From: Michael Pisano
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 3:50 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: sales tax measure on the ballot for 2016

Hello Santa Cruz County as the Regional Transportation system,
Raising \$450 million for transportation over the next 30 years;
Plan Synopsis;
30%, or \$135 million, of the tax measure would go towards maintaining local roads.
25%, or \$113 million would go towards widening Highway One with 3 auxiliary lanes between on ramps and off ramps from the Eastside of Santa Cruz to State Park Dr. in Aptos.
15%, or \$68 million would go towards "improving the rail tracks and building a station in Pajaro/ Watsonville to connect to a statewide system.
Another 15% would build a substantial part of the rail trail but is not enough money to build all of it, which is a concern for those of us who are committed to the trail.
With the final 15% would go towards the part of the bus system serving the disabled and elderly.
My Opinion;
I agree with the 30% going towards maintaining Local Roads!

I don't agree with 25% going towards widening Highway 1!
I agree with 15% going towards improving rail tracks & building a station in Pajaro/Watsonville!
I don't agree with 15% going towards the Rail Trail – to low of a percentage!
I don't agree with 15% going towards the Bus System – to low of a percentage!
My Opinion Changes;
30% going towards maintaining local roads (add rail crossing at Shaffer Road).
5% going towards building a station in Pajaro/Watsonville.
15% going towards improving rail tracks – to help quicken the use.
5% Start a Rail Trolley between Santa Cruz Downtown, Boardwalk, Santa Cruz Harbor & Capitola Villages.
20% going towards the Rail Trail.
15% going towards the Bus System for disabled & elderly.
10% going towards the Bus System for general use improvements;
Add GPS tracking to Buses to improve ridership with Smartphone App.
Better Timing Intervals (Route#3 with Route#15,16,&19) (Route#71 & Route#91x with Route#20 & Route#35).
Signage Improvements.
Park & Ride Buses with the ability to have a \$2 Quick Shuttle to Scotts Valley (Cavallaro Transit Center).
Add WiFi to Transit Centers & Routes71,91x & 69 Buses.
Add Electric Busses.
Add Double long busses on popular routes (71, 91x, 16 & 19).
Add Double Decker Hwy 17 Buses.

Thank you for the opportunity

From: Daniel Spelce
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 4:46 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Develop mass public transit--trains, buses, shuttles, bicycles

Good afternoon, members and staff of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

Please undertake a focused, determined development of an integrated mass public transportation system, comprising trains, buses, shuttles, and bicycles. As many residents can testify, having visited communities in Europe, Asia, and Latin America, various forms of train travel are relevant to our county and Monterey Bay region. Complimented by buses and van shuttles, hubs along core routes and spurs off hubs, and micro-routes into commercial districts and neighborhoods can address a wide range of transportation needs effectively.

Another widening of Highway 1 constitutes a wholly unsatisfactory waste of precious public resource. Additional auxiliary freeway lanes will prove as ineffective as the first two installments. The full economics and health dynamics of automobile-centric travel plead for a committed embrace of an integrated mass public transit system. The ecological implications of persisting with auto-driven transportation compel humanity, including our local communities, to transition swiftly to a sound, integrated mass public transit system. Thank you for summoning your talents, capacity for innovation, and courage to meet severe challenges to move our county in an ecologically-wise transportation direction promptly. Please avert temptation to tax the populace for ever more car-centric infrastructure. Maintain what exists. Build an integrated mass public transportation system. With appreciation for your deep thinking and heartfelt care, Daniel Spelce

From: Jesse Frey
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 4:56 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Transportation Tax Measure

Dear SCCRTC;

While I feel that a sales tax measure is a promising way to fund transportation infrastructure, I do not support the existing proposal as as I understand it. In 2008, Santa Cruz County voters agreed with transportation experts that widening the freeway is an enormous waste of money. Some of the merge-lane additions which have been completed have improved the safety and efficiency of freeway traffic flow without inducing too much additional freeway use. but \$113 million is far too much money to spend on freeway. While partial funding for track and right-of-way improvements for a rail-trail and future passenger train service through Watsonville/Pajaro is a worthwhile step toward long-term transportation improvements, the fact that it is deliberately incomplete funding makes me suspect that I will be asked again in ten years to vote to fund even more freeway widening in order to fund the next step toward a very important transportation project which I believe is already at least ten years too late. In conclusion, I accept that tens of millions of dollars must be spent on maintaining our roads, but I am not willing to allocate \$250 million to auto-based transportation which can not possibly meet our long-term transportation needs without clearly defined commitments to our more-sustainable rail and bicycle transportation infrastructure.

Jesse Frey

From: Gail Michaelis-Ow
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 5:13 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Widen Highway One soon!

Dear Friends, We strongly support widening Highway One between Santa Cruz and Aptos. We walk to work and ride our bikes most of the time, but we still have to drive once in a while and Highway One is a nightmare. We also feel for our friends who have to commute to jobs in Santa Cruz, but are forced to live in Watsonville due to less expensive housing costs there. These are mostly lower income workers who deserve the chance to not spend two to three hours a day in their cars commuting to work. Widen the Highway! It is way past time to do so. Sincerely, Gail and George Ow

From: Sheila Carrillo
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 5:57 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: my input

Hello,

I am leaving town Thursday morning or I would for certain be at the meeting that is taking place on funding our transportation systems. It is my understanding that adding freeway lanes invites added traffic traffic and thus more air pollution and results in traffic congestion just a very short way down the road. Not the right direction for Santa Cruz County or the well being of the planet. I would redirect the widening money toward finishing the rail trail, improving our bus service, and speeding up the progress of our rail service. I would like to ride the train to Watsonville before I die! Let's take climate leadership!

Sheila Carrillo

From: Margaux J. Elliott
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 6:25 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Support Letter

Dear Rail Trail Committee,

I have made this area my home and plan to stay here for the rest of my life. The rail trail project and other transportation projects supported by the committee are something I am extremely supportive of for this community. I want to see the rail trail developed so that members of this community can enjoy this amazing space even more than already possible and turning non functional and dangerous areas into beautiful community spaces. Not only that, but it's easy for anyone to agree that the rail trail would provide safer and more direct transportation for pedestrians and cyclists alike. As our community grows in number, this should be a high priority and appreciate the committee advocating for it. Of course, this will make the area even more appealing for tourism and the benefits that come with that as well. Passenger rail service would be an exciting addition to the transportation options in the area. I was lucky enough to live in Florence when they opened the light rail system and it brought communities together that would have otherwise been disconnected by distance, traffic, etc. I support passenger rail service in our county if done properly and additional studies on this would benefit us for many reasons. I urge you to look further into this. As a cyclist, occasionally commuting from Aptos to and from Scotts Vally, and my boyfriend commuting EVERY DAY from Aptos to the West Side of Santa Cruz...I am a HUGE advocate for bike lanes and cannot support this effort enough. Bike lanes make a huge difference to cyclists and drivers alike. With today's distractions, I don't think it has ever been so dangerous to be a cyclist and protected bike lanes could not only save lives but encourage more cyclists to ride their bikes instead of driving their cars — moving towards a solution of our major traffic problem and more importantly our environmental impact. Thank you for your time and good luck advocating for these incredibly important topics.

Best regards,
Margaux Jo Elliott

From: David Zweig
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 7:33 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: Micah Posner
Subject: Sales Tax / Transportation

I would vote for a sales tax increase that included WIDENING HIGHWAY 1 and BUILDING A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF THE RAIL TRAIL. No train, just trail for biking and walking.

Dave Zweig
From: Tom & Suzanne Davis
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 9:31 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail Trail Funding and Sales Tax

Dear SCCRTC,

I fully support the funding and immediate construction of the entire "Rail Trail." I believe that, when completed, The Rail Trail will be the most used, and most important public works project of many generations. It will be the crowning jewel of this amazing place that we live; a gorgeous, safe, and ecologically sound way to see and enjoy our fabulous coast, while providing the only significant option to traditional car-based means of transportation. It perfectly compliments the natural beauty of our area, with virtually no down side. As a bike

commuter of 30 years, the rail corridor turned Rail Trail will transform my life. I have had countless close calls with cars, and one accident, in my years of biking Santa Cruz County streets. With the advent of cell phones and texting, the dangers have gotten much worse. The Rail Corridor is perfectly situated to connect the most people with the most destinations. It could not be better. It will be a huge boon to the local economy. It will create a destination recreational feature that will attract thousands of visitors every year. The Rail Trail is a Win-Win. I am personally donating hundreds of dollars to see this become a reality. While I tentatively support the idea of a sales tax to fund this project, I will vigorously oppose such a proposal if it includes funding for the widening of Highway 1. The people of Santa Cruz county have been very clear on this issue. Measure J failed decisively. These two transportation issues must be dealt with separately and on their own merits. Rolling them into a single funding option is confusing at best, and amounts to extortion of those folks opposed to one of these projects. Please ensure that any tax/ funding proposal is specific to each of these issues. How about a local gasoline tax for all road and highway funding, and a general sales tax for the Rail Trail?

Sincerely,
Tom Davis

From: sharon borrege
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 10:50 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 11/19/15 public meeting

Opposed to allocating any future transportation funds to widening SCR 1 (aka auxiliary lanes) within Santa Cruz County, preferring that the priority should be given to 1) pedestrian overcrossing with bicycle lanes, *designed to accommodate emergency vehicle load and accessibility*, at 17th Avenue, 2) rehabilitation of existing structures, and) short- and long-term investment in public transportation alternatives to the gasoline engine.

From: Judi
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 11:53 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Highway 1 widening

Dear Commissioners: I am opposed to spending such vast sums on the widening of Highway 1 because it will provide only minimal improvements in traffic flow. I say this as someone who has experienced the painfully slow commute on Highway 1 South anytime after 2 pm, when I travel from the west side of Santa Cruz to Watsonville for my evening shifts at the Watsonville Library (4 - 8 pm). I often take Soquel Ave until Aptos, but that is not much faster. I also have experienced even worse traffic on Soquel Dr. when I travel to Live Oak around 5 pm for a class there. Santa Cruz County's geography doesn't offer many options. (unless someone proposes a high-speed boat route from the harbor to perhaps Seascape during the spring/summer/autumn months). An auxiliary lane between Soquel Dr. and 41st Ave. may alleviate some of the traffic, but after that it will just slow down again. HOV lanes may be the only solution for autos, but investing in light-rail should be looked into. It would be better environmentally. Bicycles are not a solution for everyone or every situation. If bus routes were faster than auto travel then bus ridership might increase. If they are stuck in the same traffic with everyone else, there is no point. Those who wish to build more housing must realize that that will only make traffic worse. There is a limit as to how many people can be jammed into our little bit of paradise before it is ruined for everyone. No to Highway 1 widening. Promote alternate times of work to alleviate rush hour traffic jams.
Judith Grunstra