

# Chapter 4      Comments and Coordination

---

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process. It helps planners determine the necessary scope of environmental documentation and the level of analysis required, and to identify potential impacts and avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures, and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including Project Development Team meetings; interagency coordination meetings; formal letter requests for information and coordination; meetings with public and resource agency staff; distribution of flyers, newsletters, and public notices with project information and updates; and public meetings. A public hearing also will be conducted during the public review period for this document. This chapter summarizes the results of Caltrans' efforts to fully identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination.

## **4.1 Early Public and Agency Consultation (Scoping Process)**

Early public and agency consultation was performed through the distribution of a Notice of Preparation, stakeholder interviews, and public information meetings to present the project purpose and need, funding, scheduling, project alternatives, and potential impacts, and obtain public and agency input regarding these matters or any additional issues that should be addressed.

### **4.1.1 Notice of Preparation**

On March 29, 2004, a Notice of Preparation to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment was sent to all appropriate local, state, and federal agencies and other interested parties and is included in Appendix L (Note: The National Environmental Policy Act document is not an Environmental Impact Statement; no Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement was published in the *Federal Register*). A Notice of Preparation is the California Environmental Quality Act Notice that an Environmental Impact Report will be prepared for the project. Appropriate agencies are those that would potentially provide a project permit or approval, or that have jurisdiction for areas or resources that might be affected by the proposed project. The Notice of Preparation was distributed to California State agencies through the Office of Planning and Research. The Notice of Preparation was sent separately to federal and local agencies.

The following agencies responded to the Notice of Preparation:

- Aptos/La Selva Fire Protection District
- Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District

- Santa Cruz County Sanitation District
- Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
- Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- California Coastal Commission
- Santa Cruz Consolidated Emergency Communication Center
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services
- County of Santa Cruz Planning Department
- Santa Cruz County Fire Chiefs' Association
- University of California, Santa Cruz
- Federal Emergency Management Agency

#### **4.1.2 Stakeholder Interviews**

As part of the initial public outreach effort and prior to any public informational meetings, RTC conducted one-on-one stakeholder interviews in January 2004 with local community leaders, businesses, environmental advocates, and other interested groups in the project area. This included representatives of the cities of Aptos, Capitola, Live Oak, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, and Soquel, as well as Santa Cruz County. The interview presented stakeholders with a series of questions to assess their general knowledge of the project and enable them to comment on what they viewed as key project issues, benefits, and concerns. Interviews were conducted by phone and generally lasted between 30 minutes and 1 hour.

The goal of the interviews was to identify and discuss project concerns, anticipated impacts, questions, and interest in the Santa Cruz Highway 1 HOV Lane Project with local community leaders and representatives. Key issues identified during the interviews included potential project benefits to commute times and congestion, potential environmental impacts, project alternatives and funding, and public outreach/participation.

#### **4.1.3 Community Open House and Scoping Meetings**

Two Community Open House (Project Scoping) Meetings were offered for the general public on April 26 and 29, 2004. The April 26 meeting was held at the Best Western Seacliff Inn in Aptos from 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. The April 29 meeting was held at the Simpkins Family Swim Center in Santa Cruz from 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. Holding two meetings at different locations provided better corridor coverage than a single meeting and enabled community members to attend the meeting that was closer to their home or work location. Attendees included property owners, residents, businesses, community groups, elected officials, and local, state, and federal agencies. A total of 156 people attended both meetings; 26 comment cards were received during and immediately following the meeting and approximately 225 verbal comments were recorded. A court reporter was not present at the meetings.

Both of the meetings addressed project development, purpose, need, and alternatives. Display boards with project information, maps, schedules, costs, and preliminary alternatives were presented at the meetings. A PowerPoint presentation, which summarized the project and current activities, was also provided. Attendees were given the opportunity to ask questions and provide comments to project staff on a one-on-one basis during the Open House portion of the meetings. Following the Open House and presentations, participants were divided into smaller groups where each group assembled its own list of key issues and concerns. Each group then reported its results back to the full assembly.

Comment cards also were distributed for participants to complete at the meeting. Follow-up comments by e-mail or letter were also requested. Key issues identified during the meeting included traffic congestion; pedestrian and bicycle access; noise impacts and mitigation; visual impacts and mitigation; air quality impacts; environmental impacts; viable alternatives; land use and property value impacts; and project funding.

## **4.2 Other Public Agency Consultation and Coordination**

This section covers project organization, which involves a variety of public agencies, and the status of agency consultations required by various environmental laws. Many federal, state, regional, and local agencies were consulted, either as part of the early public and agency consultation process or in conjunction with environmental laws. See Chapter 6, Distribution List, for a detailed list of agencies noted for distribution of this environmental document. Section 4.5, Chronology of Coordination, provides a chronology of meetings, workshops, and hearings that reflect ongoing public agency consultation and coordination.

### **4.2.1 Project Organization and Related Agency Coordination**

The Federal Highway Administration, Caltrans, and RTC are cooperating in preparing the environmental studies and environmental document for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier I and Tier II Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment. The Federal Highway Administration is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act, Caltrans is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, and RTC is the local agency sponsor.

#### ***Project Development Team***

The Project Development Team comprises RTC and Caltrans and Federal Highway Administration staff; representatives of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the County of Santa Cruz, Cities of Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Capitola, and Scotts Valley; and members of the project consultant team. The Project Development Team meets periodically to provide technical and policy guidance throughout development of the project.

### ***Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission***

RTC is the local agency sponsor for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier I and Tier II Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment. RTC is responsible for delivering a full range of safe, convenient, reliable, and efficient transportation choices for the community. With a focus on long-term sustainability, RTC plans, funds, and implements transportation projects and services. RTC has 12 voting members, including all five members of the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors; one member from each of the cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, and Watsonville; and three appointed members from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro) Board of Directors; Caltrans participates with a non-voting member. The Commission meets monthly to set priorities for transportation capital improvements; pursue and allocate transportation funding; adopt transportation policies; plan for future transportation projects; and inform the public about transportation resources and transportation systems management.

RTC has taken formal actions to adopt the preliminary project purpose and need statement (on January 8, 2004) and identify the initial alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the environmental document (on January 20, 2005). It also hears public testimony on a range of issues related to the project. Staff and the consultant team debrief RTC on a quarterly basis to report on project progress, including the status of preliminary design, alternatives development, environmental studies, public outreach, and the project schedule.

### ***Highway 1 Construction Authority***

The Highway 1 Construction Authority was established in January 2004 through a Joint Powers Agreement between the cities of Capitola, Scotts Valley, and Watsonville; Santa Cruz County; and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District. The Highway 1 Construction Authority was created as a single-purpose agency to take the lead role in Highway 1 project implementation. The Highway 1 Construction Authority suspended meetings in 2008 and directed that RTC retain management of the project. If funds are secured for project design and construction, the Highway 1 Construction Authority may resurrect its role to manage implementation of the project.

### ***Transportation Funding Task Force***

The Transportation Funding Task Force was a broad-based committee with 77 members representing community groups, business interest, environmental groups, seniors and disabled individuals, transportation partners, medical interests, safety groups, neighborhoods, schools, visitors, agriculture, and minorities. The Transportation Funding Task Force was charged with developing a package of transportation projects and funding that had a wide base of support throughout the community. The Transportation Funding Task Force met throughout 2006 and 2007, including community workshops held in various locations throughout the county, to craft a draft plan for presentation to RTC. In November 2007, the

Transportation Funding Task Force adopted a Mobility Plan calling for a ½-cent transportation sales tax for a 35-year period to increase mobility and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. RTC received the Mobility Plan; however, plans to advance a sales tax initiative were put on hold in early 2008 due to the projected downturn in the economy at that time. The Transportation Funding Task Force has ended its work and no longer meets.

#### **4.2.2 Consultations under Endangered Species Acts**

Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Service under the Federal Endangered Species Act §7 and with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife under the California Endangered Species Act is required if the project would likely adversely affect threatened, endangered, or candidate biological species.

Pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act § 7, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service may be necessary for potential impacts of the Tier I Corridor alternatives to the following federally listed species: marsh sandwort, Monterey spineflower, robust spineflower, Santa Cruz tarplant, tidewater goby, California tiger salamander, Santa Cruz long-toed salamander, California red-legged frog, and least Bell's vireo. Consultation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries may be necessary for potential impacts to central California coast steelhead. Section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be conducted as portions of the selected Tier I alternative are advanced to Tier II environmental review. For the Tier II Auxiliary Lane Alternative, Section 7 consultation will be completed prior to the approval of the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment for potential impacts of this alternative to tidewater goby and California red-legged frog.

Informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was initiated in 2003. On July 14, 2003, a letter was sent to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, requesting a species list. Caltrans also requested a field visit and a meeting with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Since 2003, consultation has been ongoing. Meetings and phone calls have been held to determine the presence/absence of species in certain locations, and potential mitigation. Updated lists of species relevant to the Biological Study Area have also been obtained from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, most recently on October 20, 2014.

Biological Assessments will be required for future Tier II projects as they are advanced to environmental review. A Biological Assessment is currently required for the Tier II Auxiliary Lane Alternative and will be submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the NOAA Fisheries during a consultation process to determine if a federal Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement would be required for the proposed project.

A Section 2081 Incidental Take Permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to comply with the California Endangered Species Act may be necessary for potential

impacts to marsh sandwort, Santa Cruz tarplant, San Francisco popcorn flower, and least Bell's vireo. Incidental take cannot be authorized for Santa Cruz long-toed salamander or white-tailed kite due to their Fully Protected status. Permission to relocate the several California Species of Special Concern that may be encountered during construction may also be required, in the form of a letter of permission from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

#### **4.2.3 Consultations Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act**

##### ***Consultations Regarding Archaeological and Historical Resources***

Surveys were conducted within the Area of Potential Effects for archaeological and architectural resources that are listed on, or eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places and/or the California Register of Historic Resources, or that have historic significance locally.

Letters on behalf of the project sponsor were sent to organizations and agencies with a known interest in historic period resources within the general project area. The following entities were contacted: Santa Cruz County Historic Resources Commission, Santa Cruz Historic Preservation Commission, Santa Cruz Historical Society, Scotts Valley Historical Society, Pajaro Valley Historical Association, Aptos History Museum, Capitola Historical Museum, and the Museum of Art and History. Only one letter was received in return. The City of Santa Cruz provided copies of the City's historic resources inventories, as well as a historic context report completed for the City.

A Preliminary Archaeological Survey Report, a Historic Resources Evaluation Report, and a Preliminary Historic Properties Survey Report were prepared and submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation on December 13, 2010. On March 17, 2011, the State Historic Preservation Officer concurred in the eligibility findings; a copy of the State Historic Preservation Officer's letter is provided in Appendix J, Agency Correspondence.

The State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with the determination that 78 architectural history properties and 3 archaeological properties within the Area of Potential Effects are not eligible for the National Register. Three archaeological sites remain unevaluated for their National Register eligibility. Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration have determined the necessity of delaying Phase II testing on these three sites until the final preferred alternative is selected to avoid unnecessary impacts to site portions that would not otherwise be disturbed during project construction. Following identification of a preferred alternative, subsurface investigations will be conducted in coordination with the State Historic Preservation Office and Native American contacts to determine whether the portion of the sites within the direct impact areas meet the criteria for National Register eligibility. As such, a supplemental Historic Properties Survey Report will be submitted based on the

findings. If the preferred alternative would result in effects on an eligible property, a Finding of Effects will be prepared and submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation for concurrence. In the unlikely event that adverse effects are anticipated, a Memorandum of Agreement, setting forth conditions and measures for avoiding harm to the resources, will be prepared for execution by Federal Highway Administration, Caltrans, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and State Historic Preservation Officer. These investigations and consultations will form the basis for avoidance and mitigation measures to minimize harm to resources during project construction. State Historic Preservation Officer concurrence in the eligibility determinations and effect findings and execution of the Memorandum of Agreement by all agencies will conclude consultations under the Historic Preservation Act.

### ***Tribal Coordination***

The Native American Heritage Commission was contacted to perform a Sacred Lands file search. Contacts provided by the Native American Heritage Commission were requested to share information, express concerns, and make recommendations regarding this project. Native American consultation was conducted during 2005 over the course of several quarterly meetings with the Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe. The draft Archaeological Survey Report was submitted for review by the Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe during 2005. No ongoing concerns have been expressed.

Consultation with the Native American representatives of the Ohlone groups is continuing. Once a preferred alternative is identified, interested Native American individuals will be offered the opportunity to attend a site tour and will be able to fill out a form if they are interested in monitoring during archaeological Phase II testing. Within 15 working days following completion of any test excavations, representatives of the Ohlone community will be provided with copies of Native American monitoring logs and a preliminary letter report describing the initial test findings. All interested parties will receive and be able to comment on the draft test report, and the final report will be provided to those individuals who request a copy.

## **4.2.4 Consultations under Other Laws**

### ***California Coastal Commission***

The project corridor from San Andreas/Larkin Valley Road to Morrissey Boulevard is located in the Central Coast District (California Coastal Commission Web page, <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/address.html>) of the Coastal Zone, where the California Coastal Commission retains permanent coastal permit jurisdiction over proposed development. The California Coastal Commission has designated three Critical Coastal Areas near the proposed project area, which include the San Lorenzo River Critical Coastal Area, the Soquel Lagoon Critical Coastal Area, and the Aptos Creek Critical Coastal Area. On January 16, 2007, and March 19, 2008, Caltrans, RTC, and consultants met with the California Coastal Commission

to discuss the project and coastal zone resources. Consultation with the California Coastal Commission is ongoing pursuant to obtaining the required Coastal Development Permit (Santa Cruz County) and federal coastal consistency determination (California Coastal Commission).

### ***Federal Emergency Management Agency and Santa Cruz County Planning Department***

Gregor Blackburn, Senior Natural Hazards Program Specialist with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and Jessica DeGrassi, Resource Planner for the Santa Cruz County Planning Department, were contacted to discuss proposed project impacts to the watershed and floodplain. Due to the encroachment on the regulatory floodways, the Santa Cruz County Planning Department will review project documentation after selection of the preferred alternative to determine if floodplain map revisions are necessary. The Location Hydraulic Study will also be reviewed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Santa Cruz County Planning Department during public circulation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment to evaluate impacts to the affected watershed and floodplains, and identify required permits. It is not anticipated that a floodplain map revision is necessary. Upon identification of the final design alternative, necessary permits will be obtained.

## **4.3 Ongoing Public Participation**

Caltrans and RTC prepared a Public Involvement Plan on March 25, 2004, that created a public outreach approach for the Santa Cruz HOV Project, as it was known at that time. The public involvement plan defines outreach objectives; identifies key interested parties and issues; and sets forth an approach that will ensure timely and effective dissemination of information, promote two-way communication between lead agencies and the community, fulfill California Environmental Quality Act and National Environmental Policy Act public involvement requirements, and ensure comprehensive documentation of public input. Methods identified to encourage public participation include the scoping meetings, other public information meetings, focused workshops, development of a project Web page, newsletters and press releases, and public hearings to obtain public comments on the draft environmental document.



### 4.3.1 Public Information Meetings

Three Public Information Open House Meetings were conducted on September 20, 26, and 27, 2006, from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. The purpose of these meetings was to update the community on the ongoing studies; obtain their input on the proposed project, refinement of alternatives and environmental issues; and clarify the relationship between the proposed project and other related projects in the vicinity. The September 20 meeting was held at the Best Western Seacliff Inn in Aptos. The September 26 meeting was conducted at Watsonville High School in Watsonville. The September 27 meeting was held at Senior Citizens Opportunities, Inc. in Santa Cruz. Multiple meetings were designed to provide better corridor coverage and convenience to prospective attendees.

The public information meetings were announced through an informational flyer that was mailed to 10,000 property owners, residents, and businesses within 500 feet of the project area, and to approximately 2,000 special interest groups, agencies, and elected officials. A display ad was also used to invite participation and was placed in the *Santa Cruz Sentinel*, *Register Pajaronian*, *Good Times*, *Metro Santa Cruz*, *Aptos Times*, *Mid-County Post*, and *Scotts Valley Banner/Valley Post*. In most cases, the ad ran twice in each newspaper. RTC also translated it into Spanish for placement in *La Ganga*. In addition to the direct mailer and display ad, sandwich boards promoting the two meetings were strategically placed along the corridor, often near on ramps to Highway 1; people on RTC's e-mail distribution list received notification electronically. Personalized invitations were also mailed to elected officials. Attendees included property owners, residents, businesses, community groups, elected officials, and local, state, and federal agencies. Based on the meeting sign-up sheets, a total of approximately 130 people attended all three meetings.

Display boards with the project description/map, schedule, alternatives, project purpose and need, environmental review process, updated traffic information, cost and funding, and the right-of-way acquisition process were available for viewing. Attendees could ask questions and provide comments to project staff on a one-on-one basis. Comment sheets were distributed for participants to complete at the meeting. Follow-up comments by e-mail or letter were also requested. Key issues identified during the meeting included project need; design and operation; traffic congestion and circulation; right-of-way acquisition; noise impacts and mitigation; visual impacts and mitigation; air quality impacts; potential flooding due to project construction; environmental impacts; viable project alternatives; project scheduling and funding; land use and property value impacts; public outreach and participation opportunities; and project relationship to other transportation projects.

### 4.3.2 Bicycle/Pedestrian Meetings

Meetings were held on May 19 and May 24, 2005, to enable the community to participate in determining the appropriate location of three proposed pedestrian/bicycle crossings of

Highway 1. Attendees included property and business owners, residents, community groups, elected officials, and state and local agency representatives. Information provided at the meetings included overall project development and design alternatives, as well as alternative locations being considered for the pedestrian/bicycle overcrossings. Key issues identified during the meetings included accessibility needs, transportation connections, traffic movements, safety, environmental impact concerns, and design alternatives. Locations were identified for the new bicycle and pedestrian crossings at Mar Vista Drive, Chanticleer Avenue, and Trevethan Avenue, which have been incorporated into the project alternatives. In recent actions, on February 13, 2012, and March 11, 2013, RTC presented the Chanticleer Avenue bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing plans to the RTC Bicycle Committee.

### **4.3.3 Coordination with Union Pacific Railroad**

On October 12, 2012, RTC acquired right-of-way from the Union Pacific Railroad for the stretch of rail line that extends from Davenport to Santa Cruz, known as the Santa Cruz County Branch line. The facility will be used to provide commuter and recreational user rail service between those points. Prior to the acquisition of right-of-way, the project team engaged in extensive coordination with the previous owner, the Union Pacific Railroad, to identify those aspects of the project that would affect services during construction.

### **4.3.4 Newsletters**

RTC issued the first project newsletter on April 15, 2005. It presented the preliminary project alternatives, project schedule, and briefly described the environmental studies that were planned to be conducted. The newsletter was directly mailed to property owners, residents, businesses, community groups, elected officials, and local, state, and federal agencies. RTC issued another newsletter in summer 2007, updating the community on the progress of the studies. RTC plans to issue a third newsletter just prior to the circulation of the Draft Environmental Document, anticipated in 2015, that will describe the alternatives evaluated in the Tier I/II DEIR/EA and summarize the range of studies conducted and the schedule of public hearings to be held on the Tier I/II DEIR/EA. RTC may issue a fourth newsletter, following the release of the Final Environmental Document, to notify interested parties of the identification of the preferred alternative, the outcome of the studies, and the next steps to implement the project.

### **4.3.5 Press Releases**

Several project press releases and public service announcements have been issued by Caltrans and RTC for publication in local newspapers and community newsletters, and airing on community-access broadcast media. Press releases were issued on March 31, 2003, April 19, 2004, and April 21, 2004, prior to the Community Open House/Scoping Meetings in April 2004. These press releases included project information, purpose and need,

scheduling, funding, current activities, and public meeting times and locations. In addition to the press releases, a letter was sent to local elected officials on April 5, 2004, providing project and upcoming meeting information.

Press releases were also issued to local newspapers, radio stations, and local TV stations on September 14 and 22, 2006, prior to the Public Information Open House Meetings held in September 2006. On September 13, 2006, a letter was sent to local, state, and federal elected officials, providing project and open house meeting information.

A similar public notification and community outreach effort will be undertaken with release of the Tier I/II DEIR/EA. RTC is planning on conducting three public Open Houses/ Public Hearings geographically spread across the county in recognition of the importance of this project to the mobility needs of the community.

#### **4.3.6 Project Web Site**

RTC maintains a Santa Cruz Highway 1 HOV Lane Project Web site at <http://www.scrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/1hov/>. The Web site offers updated information and graphics on the project purpose and need, alternatives, ongoing studies, emerging issues, and schedule. Information on upcoming project events, such as community information meetings or upcoming public hearings, is posted on the Web site. Members of the community may use the Web site to contact RTC with issues or concerns about the project.

#### **4.3.7 Public Hearings**

The Tier I/II DEIR/EA will be circulated for review to elected officials, and federal, state, and local agencies and other interested parties as shown in Chapter 6, Distribution List. A Notice of Availability will be provided through the Office of Planning and Research (State Clearinghouse). It is anticipated that at least one public meeting will be held within the project corridor during the public circulation phase. Advance notice of the date, time, and locations of the meeting will be provided through direct mail notification, publication of notices in newspapers of general circulation, and press releases and public service announcements to local media and community newspapers and newsletters. A summary of the proceedings of the public meeting, along with written responses to all of the comments received at the meeting and other written comments provided during the public comment period, will be included in the Final Environmental Document.

### **4.4 Comments and Response to Comments**

Comments on the Route 1 Tier I and Tier II Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment will be solicited from public agencies, interested parties, and the public at large as described in the previous subsection. Written responses to all substantive comments

received at the public hearings and in writing during the public comment period will be published in the Final Environmental Document.

## 4.5 Chronology of Coordination

Table 4-1 presents a chronology of coordination meetings held to date as part of the proposed project.

**Table 4-1: Chronology of Coordination Meetings  
September 2008 – Present**

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Meeting Objective</b>
4/3/2008	Project Progress Report	Brief RTC on the progress of the project.
9/4/2008	Project Progress Report	Brief RTC on the progress of the project.
9/9/2008	Speaker's Bureau Presentation to the Freedom Rotary Club, Pajaro Valley	Present project, including project overview, description of project alternatives, information on environmental analysis, and a question and answer session.
9/18/2008	Speaker's Bureau Presentation to the Santa Cruz County Business Council	Present project, including project overview, description of project alternatives, information on environmental analysis, and a question and answer session.
9/26/2008	Presentation to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro)	Present project, including project overview, description of project alternatives, findings of the <i>Transit Market Analysis</i> , and a question and answer session.
10/1/2008	Presentation to Santa Cruz Sentinel Newspaper Editors and Reporters	Present project, including project overview, description of project alternatives, information on environmental analysis, and a question and answer session.
10/20/2008	Presentation to California Highway Patrol, Santa Cruz Area Commander and Patrol Supervisor	Present project, including project overview, description of project alternatives, information on design elements including California Highway Patrol enforcement areas on freeway ramps and the mainline, proposed interchange design, and a question and answer session.
10/24/2008	Follow up to presentation to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro) on 9/26/2008	Respond to questions regarding operational restrictions of the proposed Santa Cruz Highway 1 HOV Lane Project and the <i>Transit Marketing Analysis</i> .
10/28/2008	Presentation to the Santa Cruz City Council	Present project, including project overview, description of project alternatives, information on environmental studies and the <i>Transit Market Analysis</i> , and a question and answer session.
11/6/2008	Project Progress Report	Brief RTC on the progress of the project.
1/8/2009	Project Progress Report	Brief RTC on the progress of the project.
5/7/2009	Project Progress Report	Brief RTC on the progress of the project.

**Table 4-1: Chronology of Coordination Meetings  
September 2008 – Present**

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Meeting Objective</b>
5/18/2009	Presentation to RTC's Bicycle Advisory Committee	Provide an overview of the project with a focus on the methodology and conclusions of the <i>Bike Lane Feasibility Study</i> .
6/30/2009	Presentation to Santa Cruz County Supervisor and Staff	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the Soquel Avenue interchange, and the 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue and Bay Avenue/ Porter Street couplet design options.
7/7/2009	Presentation to Capitola Mayor, City Manager, Public Works Director, and Community Development Director	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue and Bay Avenue/Porter Street couplet.
7/9/2009	Presentation to Santa Cruz County Public Works, Community Development & Planning, and the Redevelopment Directors and Staff	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue and Bay Avenue/Porter Street couplet, and the Soquel Avenue interchange.
7/13/2009	Presentation to City of Santa Cruz Public Works and Community Development Directors and Staff	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the Morrissey Boulevard interchange.
9/3/2009	Project Progress Report	Brief RTC on the progress of the project.
11/5/2009	Project Progress Report	Brief RTC on the progress of the project.
3/4/2010	Presentation to the Monterey Bay Chapter of the American Society of Civil Engineers	Present overview of the project, including description of project alternatives and performance measures, and proposed work in the development of the Sustainable Access Rating System.
3/24/2010	Presentation to the Monterey Bay Chapter of the American Public Works Association	Present overview of the project, including description of project alternatives and performance measures, and proposed work in the development of the Sustainable Access Rating System.
4/1/2010	Project Progress Report	Brief RTC on the progress of the project.
4/12/2010	Presentation to Santa Cruz County Supervisor and Director of Public Works Agency and Staff	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the State Park Drive, Rio del Mar Boulevard, and Freedom Boulevard interchanges.
4/12/2010	Presentation to Santa Cruz County Supervisor and Director of Public Works Agency and Staff	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the Soquel Avenue interchange.
4/12/2010	Presentation to Santa Cruz County Supervisor and Director of Public Works Agency and Staff	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the Morrissey Boulevard interchange.
5/3/2010	Presentation to the City of Santa Cruz Mayor, Deputy City Manager, and Directors of the Public Works and Community Development Agency	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the Morrissey Boulevard interchange.

**Table 4-1: Chronology of Coordination Meetings  
September 2008 – Present**

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Meeting Objective</b>
5/4/2010	Presentation to the City of Capitola Mayor, City Manager, and Directors of the Public Works and Community Development Agency	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue and Bay Avenue/Porter Street couplet, and Park Avenue interchanges.
6/9/2010	Presentation to Santa Cruz County Supervisor and Director of Public Works Agency and Staff	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue and Bay Avenue/Porter Street couplet interchange.
6/15/2010	Presentation to the Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce	Present overview of the project, including description of project alternatives and performance measures, and proposed work in the development of the Sustainable Access Rating System.
6/23/2010	Presentation to Santa Cruz County Administrators and Directors of Public Works and Redevelopment Agency and Staff	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives for the Soquel Avenue interchange.
6/28/2010	Presentation to Santa Cruz County Administrators and Directors of Public Works and Redevelopment Agency and Staff	Present overview of the project with a focus on the proposed design alternatives from the 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue and Bay Avenue/Porter Street couplet interchanges and subsequent interchanges down the corridor to the south.
8/5/2010	Project Progress Report	Brief RTC on the progress of the project.
1/13/2011	Project Progress Report	Brief RTC on the progress of the project.
1/19/2011	Presentation to the Action Pajaro Valley - Growth Management Committee	Present project, including project overview, description of project alternatives, information on environmental studies and the <i>Transit Market Analysis</i> , development of the Sustainable Access Rating System, and a question and answer session.
2/13/12	Presentation at meeting of the Regional Transportation Commission's Bicycle Committee	Information on the proposed pedestrian overcrossing was presented and discussed with the committee.
3/11/13	Presentation at meeting of the Regional Transportation Commission's Bicycle Committee	Information on the proposed pedestrian overcrossing was presented and discussed with the committee.