The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m.

1. Introductions

Members present:

Jacques Bertrand                      Aileen Loe (ex-officio)
Ed Bottorff                           Bruce McPherson
Sandy Brown                           Patrick Mulhearn (alt.)
Trina Coffman-Gomez                   Randy Johnson
Tony Gregorio (alt.)                  Andy Schiffrin (alt.)
John Leopold

Staff present:

George Dondero                       Grace Blakeslee
Luis Mendez                           Shannon Munz
Yesenia Parra                         Brianna Goodman
Sarah Christensen                     Fernanda Dias Pini
Ginger Dykaar

2. Items to be discussed in closed session

Closed session was not held.

6. Oral Communications

Jack Nelson, Campaign for Sustainable Transportation, discussed the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) special report on the impacts of global warming and urged the Commission to plan transportation sustainably and to keep in mind the dangers of climate change.
**Brett Garrett**, Santa Cruz County resident, proposed incorporating a “yield to bus” sign in front of METRO buses and commented that other communities have yield to bus laws.

**Gail McNulty**, Greenway, stated that the RTC needs to prepare for transportation modes that will be adaptable to climate change, and if the RTC incorporates new technological developments to its plans, it may incentivize emerging technology business to move to the area.

Commissioner Alternate Mulhearn noted that the October 4, 2018 Sentinel Article, “Santa Cruz County RTC corridor study decision may be Dec. 6”, incorrectly reported the details of the Progressive Rail contract with the RTC.

7. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agenda

Handouts for Item 10.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin moved and Commissioner McPherson seconded the motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Bertrand, Bottorff, Coffman-Gomez, Johnson, Leopold, McPherson, and Commissioner Alternates Gregorio, Mulhearn, and Schiffrin voting “aye”.

8. Approved resolution to maintain bicycle signage within Caltrans right-of-way *(Resolution 07-19)*

9. Approved Bicycle Advisory Committee membership appointment

**REGULAR AGENDA**

10. Unified Corridor Investment Study-Draft Step 2 Scenario Analysis Discussion – Oral Report *(Ginger Dykaar and Grace Blakeslee, Sr. Transportation Planners)*

Commissioner Brown joined the meeting.

George Dondero, Executive Director, introduced the item and outlined public outreach events held by the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) team. The UCS team is comprised of RTC staff Ginger Dykaar and Grace Blakeslee, Kimley-Horn consultants Fredrick Venter, Michael Schmitt and Darryl dePencier, and Strategic Economics consultant Sarah Graham.

Commissioners posed questions relating to the UCS report and discussed the need for clarification of data sources; greater explanation of the
methodologies used in the data analyses and the statistical significance of some of the scenario comparisons.

Commissioners commented on the report revisions; peer review; revenue streams to support proposed projects in the scenarios; inclusion of the 3 Highway 1 auxiliary lanes projects in the report; need to include the State Rail Plan in funding considerations; the costs and schedule of the proposed passenger rail; impact of rail on vehicle miles traveled reduction and Highway 1 congestion; UCS decision timeline.

Commissioners requested a list of projects approved already listed in the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan and included in the UCS scenarios; clarification of assumptions on local costs versus state and federal funding.

**Jack Nelson**, Campaign for Sustainable Transportation, stated that the UCS should consider induced travel effects resulting from the Highway 1 auxiliary lanes in its analyses.

**Mark Mesiti-Miller**, Friends of Rail and Trail, supports Scenario B because it is safer, less costly, will reduce vehicle miles traveled, carbon emissions, and it performs the highest in the economic measures out of all of the scenarios. Mr. Mesiti-Miller stated that UCS should consider integration of the California State Rail Plan in its funding analyses.

**Tina Andreatta**, Santa Cruz County resident, supports Scenario B because it is the most inclusive of the disabled, elderly, south county residents, and it provides greater access to mass transit.

**Brett Garrett**, Santa Cruz County resident, posed questions about the bus vehicle miles traveled figures in the different scenarios, and stated that personal rapid transit should have been included in the UCS analysis.

**David Van Brink**, Santa Cruz County resident, asked the Commission to not deviate from the previously established UCS decision process.

**Cary Pico**, Santa Cruz County resident, said that figures included in the report are skewed, that it does not account for needed transportation infrastructure, and that it needs to compare public transit travel times versus personal vehicle driving. Mr. Pico supports lane widening.

**Sally Arnold**, Santa Cruz County resident, supports Scenario B but would exclude ramp metering, auxiliary lanes from the scenario, would change the focus on Mission Street to greater pedestrian and bicycle improvements, and would add freight service.

**Bud Colligan**, Greenway, stated that the scenarios proposed seem to be a vast improvement from the no build scenario. Mr. Colligan supports bus on shoulder on Highway 1, bus rapid transit along with buffered bike lanes on Soquel and Freedom Avenues, and trail only on the rail corridor. Mr. Colligan stated that the RTC should use technological advances and shared mobility
services to provide transportation solutions for the county, and he asked that a decision on the UCS be prolonged and for a peer review of the report.

**Jack Carroll**, Santa Cruz County resident, stated that a train would be expensive and that it would not alleviate Highway 1 congestion, and that the trail only cost figures seem to be incorrect. Mr. Carroll noted that Scenario B does not clearly state that it requires the train tracks to be replaced, and asked for the report to be revised.

**Marty DeMer**, North Coast resident, asked that the UCS provide a clear cost comparison between all of the scenarios. He also asked that public comment be allowed after Commissioners make their final comments on an agenda item.

**Piet Cannin**, Ecology Action, requested that in the trail with rail scenarios that a trail in the Capitola Bridge Train Trestle be included because it offers greater safety to pedestrians and cyclists. Mr. Cannin also requested that the UCS team increase the number of protected bike lanes along the Soquel and Freedom corridors because they are safer and generate a greater number of new bicyclists when compared to buffered bike lanes.

**Ron Goodman**, Santa Cruz County resident, stated that bus rapid transit (BRT) was not fairly evaluated in the UCS, and that BRT is a more cost-effective and flexible option than rail.

**Gail McNulty**, Greenway, commented that the proposed scenarios do not do enough to reduce CO2 emissions, and that the RTC should enact transportation policies to curb climate change.

**Janneke Strause**, Bike Santa Cruz County, supports consistent investment to infrastructure that improves bicyclist safety and promotes public transit and encouraged the RTC to implement the scenario that results in the greatest increase of bicyclists and transit riders.

**Sean Shrum**, Advocate for the Special Needs Community in Santa Cruz, stated that a train would provide a safe and reliable option that would address the needs of the disabled and special needs community, school kids, and the elderly, and that a trail only option would exclude that community. Mr. Shrum stated that the RTC should consider the needs of, and consult with, Watsonville residents when making a decision on the UCS.

**Manu Koenig**, Santa Cruz County resident, said that the report would be more transparent if it is organized according to transportation modes and if it provided a mode comparison chart. Mr. Koenig stated that the UCS analysis should consider the net present value of each scenario, the max capacity of the system, and he asked for a peer review of the report.

11. Next meetings

The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 1, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main St., Ste. 450,
Watsonville, CA.

A special SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 15, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main St., Ste. 450, Watsonville, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, December 20, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA.

The meeting adjourned at 11:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Fernanda Dias Pini, Staff

Attendees:

Tina Andreatta  Friends of the Rail and Trail
Sally Arnold  Santa Cruz County Resident
Piet Cannin  Ecology Action
Jack Carroll  Santa Cruz County Resident
Bud Colligan  Greenway
Marty DeMer  Santa Cruz County Resident
Rebecca Downing  Seacliff Improvement Association
Brett Garrett  Santa Cruz County Resident
Ron Goodman  Third Trail
Manu Koenig  Santa Cruz County Resident
Matt Marquez  Santa Cruz County Resident
Gail McNulty  Greenway
Mark Mesiti-Miller  Friends of the Rail and Trail
Jack Nelson  Campaign for Sustainable Transportation
Cary Pico  Santa Cruz County Resident
Sean Shrum  Shared Adventures
Stanley Sokolow  Santa Cruz County Resident
Janneke Strause  Bike Santa Cruz County
David Van Brink  Santa Cruz County Resident