Sandra Ferguson  sanderling4@yahoo.com  1/18/2020

Thank you for allowing this way of responding to you. My request is to allow buses to run more frequently. I live at 800 Brommer in Santa Cruz and used to take the bus to downtown Santa Cruz. It ran twice an hour, but now it runs once an hour. I mostly opt to use my car because an hourly bus is quite inefficient time wise. A quick stop at a grocery store isn't quick now! I realize the cost of having more buses and their drivers, but perhaps at certain hours it could be managed. Many of us might be glad to take the bus if it were more efficient with regard to time.
Thank you,
Sandra Ferguson

Rafa Sonnenfeld  rsonn@yahoo.com  1/19/2020

To whom it may concern:

I am a resident of the city of Santa Cruz. I have reviewed the Draft Goals/Screening Criteria/Performance Measures and the Draft Initial List of Alternatives of the transit corridor alternatives analysis.

Regarding the draft goals, there does not seem to be any explicit goal to connect this new regional system to the Capital Corridor railway expansion that has been proposed, with a planed Pajaro station. I believe it is critical for Santa Cruz County's public transit system to be integrated into this new regional rail system, which in turn will be integrated into the California High Speed Rail system when the Gilroy CHSR and Capital Corridor station(s) come online.

I appreciate the diversity of transportation modes being considered in the list of alternatives.

Thank you,
Rafa Sonnenfeld

michael grant  michael4.grant@gmail.com  1/19/2020

In regards to the public transit system, why are we still talking about this? Precious time has passed with no solution. Our Monterey Bay is becoming more acidic with every passing moment. What are we waiting for? Our pollution is rising instead of decreasing, and our climate crisis is now at an emergency level!
What are you planning for the wildlife - I hope a conservation corridor or two to keep them safe (as well as human traffic).
Act now to make a difference. We need leaders in our community and country to change our path.
Barbara Roettger  bqnbarbara@gmail.com  1/20/2020

To whom it concerns,

I am unable to make the meetings in Watsonville or at the Live Oak Grange. I would like to give input:
1) METRO. Needs to be “sexy” or appealing enough for people to use. This will only happen if certain routes are run frequently, and bus stops can determine when the next bus is coming. Check out what NYC and Boulder have done.
2) Dedicated bus lanes on HWY 1, Soquel Ave, Mission, etc. will quickly help people stuck in traffic and seeing busses whiz by them, to change their bad habits of driving everywhere.
3) We need to act like our house is on fire.... because it is. The rail corridor NEEDS to be a state of the art Greenway style path that is open to bicycles and e-modes of transportation that travel at a regulated safe speed. It is an environmental justice issue that people in the south county do not have a safe, viable, affordable route to come up to Santa Cruz. For over 100 years, the bicycle has been an excellent mode of transportation that DOES NOT POLLUTE our atmosphere and it is affordable. In the current design of the old freight route, people using active modes of transport will be second class citizens. In many instances, people will be diverted down to busy streets to accommodate for a train, that the average person can’t afford. I find it ironic that your website shows a map of the rail corridor in relation to all of the schools. Parents will not let their children ride their bikes on the Corredor if it has been diverting them down to busy streets at every train trestle and of course children will not be buying a train ticket to get to school. Instead we have study after study. If we took all the money budgeted for studies, the trail could’ve already been built and used. With less than 10 years to drastically reduce the amount of carbon we emit, we need to start implementing actions that douses the fire that is burning our house down, NOW.
Barbara Roettger
329 Rigg St
Santa Cruz

Hannah Lathan  hannahlathan@gmail.com  2/1/2020

We want the rails!
I am 77 years old. I would love to ride my bicycle on roads commonly used by motorized vehicles. I have been almost hit and hit by mirrors of vehicles so often I am afraid to ride on the narrow strips offered alongside the normal roadway. I have the sense that some drivers think it is funny to get as close as they can to some old man on a bike. Help me live longer and healthier by providing reasonable opportunities to ride my bike on Hwy 9 and other major communication routes.

Sincerely,

Charles Jeffrey Breen
13440 Debby Lane,
Boulder Creek, CA 95006

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Hey Trina.

Thanks for keeping this subject alive in our community! I am sorry I will not be able to make the workshop, but I am very interested as always.

My brief thoughts are...understanding major state project funding may only be available if we have a rail project, I get why this continues to be a priority for the RTC even though rail is only expected to reduce the traffic on hiway 1 by a few percentage points.

Also, I believe the limited width of the right of way will make a combined bike lane too costly, and that is a shame because I believe the bike lane is the highest and best use to get our community out there and off their electronic devices. Because of that, I continue to raise my eyebrows at the whole concept of planning for a rail corridor.

However, I do like the idea of paving an asphalt road on the rail corridor, that can be dedicated to a one-way and back bus lane during commute hours/days to accommodate our local hospitality workers in Santa Cruz, and then be available to walkers and bikers on weekends!
I am also a major fan of the bus on shoulders concept for the hiway, and have seen that work really well in other places.

An alternative concept for an automated one-way and back light rail on an elevated monorail like we see connecting airline terminals running down the middle of the freeway.

Thanks again for carrying this torch!

John

S. John Martinelli  
Chairman of the Board  
S. Martinelli & Company  
227 East Beach Street  
Watsonville, California 95076  
1-800-662-1868

Dear SCCRTC Staff,

I love taking my bike on the train and riding on a separated bike path. I feel so much safer on the train and the bike path than I do on the streets. Plus there are awesome views from the train and a bike that you never get to see while driving. Please consider making bikes on trains with a dedicated bike car that connect to bike paths a reality here on the beautiful Monterey Bay.

I understand that rail transit could be implemented soon, as the current line is already permitted and operational, needing only upgrades. The bike path is happening already on the Westside and San Lorenzo Bridge Crossing. With your help, I hope to ride the 32 mile Rail and Trail with my family in the very near future. Thank you for taking time out of your busy day to address this issue. I really appreciate your attention to this matter.

R E C Y C L E: Ride your Bike again Today!  
Eliece Horton
Dear Folks:

It appears that you are now doing yet again another study of the corridor for $1 million dollars. This study is being done to appease METRO, much like the last “fair and open” study was done to appease those that voted for Measure D. The results will be the same. While this is a good strategy, it gets expensive and people see through it.

It seems that any type of mass transit is on the table, such as busses and gondolas. How would you propose to run buses or small wheeled vehicles in the corridor and keep the rail line? Buses don’t appear to be trains. Would this satisfy the CTC requirement for a train? Are you looking at rail banking, I am afraid not, as your “study” will come back supporting a train.

It appears to me that this study will turn out like all your past studies: rail with trail. I think the $1 million could have been spent on something that actually improved transportation in our county rather than coming back to the same outcome you have wanted all along. A million dollars would help subsidize a lot of ebikes in our county and might actually improve traffic.

In most business endeavors, people respond to new data and a changing world and make adjustments, this is not the case with the RTC. In most political endeavors, people work towards compromise, this is not the case with the RTC. It has been the same for the last ten years: rail with trail. No adjustments, no compromise.

Start with the end in mind. How will it be paid to build train, when will it start operating, where will the parking and stations go, who will pay to operate it and how many people will use it. Is this the biggest bang for our buck? How will surface street be effected?

So far many myself and many others in the county are losing faith in the RTC.

Sincerely,

Robert Stephens
Aptos, CA
Nanda Currant hearth@cruzio.com 2/5/2020

My husband and I feel that a train is not a solution to the transportation issue we face. In La Selva there is a migratory path for birds of prey and they roost and hunt around the Cliff park, there are Osprey along the shore and the noise and erosion of a rain line on an already fragile shore line would be taxed.

I have lived in two towns that have trains and economically they did not improve the situation and one of them struggles to have it work economically in Santa Fe, NM.

In Paonia. Colorado there are the trains for coal and they run through town and the place rattles at night and it is not pleasant.

But neither of us feel people are going to give up their cars to the extent they would use a transport system. It has not worked for Google and their shuttles in various places and adds so much time to the person who wants to get home from work.

It feels mostly about motors and fuel and the car itself not an overlay of trains and rails to try and substitute for the issues we face in the environment because of the fuel system we use and impact we have had already.

Nanda and Jim Hines-Currant hearth@cruzio.com

Will Clark wclark26@gmail.com 2/6/2020

Hello,
I hope you will consider including in your study of transit options scoring the following:
--How are people with mobility challenges affected; how well can they exit and enter the transit option?
--How well does the transit option link with bicycle use?
--How well would this option help to get commuters out of their cars?

Thank you,
Will and Kristin Clark
Soquel
Hello, RTC,

As someone who’s traveled by rail and trolley in the USA, Europe, and other areas of the world, I am a huge fan of rail and other forms of public transit. I’ve also gotten to the San Jose and SF airports by bus, rail, and BART and have noticed the huge number of rail cars that accept bikes. Having lived in Watsonville (1979-’86), I am well aware of the challenging commute to points north and south and the carbon “footprint” of traveling by car. Therefore, I ask you to consider the following points in your current study plan.

1) Will you make it easy for people with mobility issues to get on and off of the proposed transit?

2) How will you be making access for the greatest number of those of us with bikes who’d like to take them on board each transit vehicle? (The current system of 2 bikes on the front of county buses is NOT adequate.).

3) Think about counting the number of miles for each person riding the train (vs. your concept of “transit vehicle miles traveled”).

4) Traffic has only gotten worse, so you should look at scoring the amount of time for rush hour(s) instead of some imaginary “average” trip time.

5) You should “weigh” how quickly any new transit system can be up and running with passengers.

6) Most importantly to me: You should give the highest score to transportation alternatives that make it possible for people to not use their cars.

Thank you,
Dean Silvers
316 Myrtle St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Peter Thomas peteranddonna@cruzio.com 2/6/2020

I support the rail and trail option.
Yours,

Peter Thomas
Cell phone # 831-515-2757
Bill Douglass  bbbdouglass@yahoo.com  2/6/2020

Please add the following additional scores for measuring:

- **Ease of entry and exit** for handicapped people
- How many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour.
- ‘Transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle doesn’t help anyone.
- **Rush hour trip time.** A vehicle that goes fast at midday but gets stuck in rush hour traffic is not as effective.
- *How soon* each proposed new transit system could be installed and become operational
- *How well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

These added measures will result in a more fair analysis.

Bill Douglass
Scott’s Valley
Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

Shawn Orgel-Olson  sorgelolson@gmail.com  2/6/2020

Dear RTC Commissioners,

I'm hoping you'll prioritize adding these to the scoring criteria for the rail study:
1) Rush hour trip time - this seems to be of great concern.
2) How effective will each alternative be at actually getting drivers out of their car?
3) Transit rider miles instead of transit vehicle miles traveled.

Thanks for welcoming input from the community.

Best,

Shawn Orgel-Olson
Commissioner, Transportation and Public Works Commission
City of Santa Cruz
kaki rusmore krusmore@gmail.com 2/6/2020

Dear RTC Commissioners,
I am glad the RTC is committed to public transit on the rail corridor. It is critical that the upcoming study include measures that will truly reflect the different options' impact on equity, our economy and the environment. Some important measures are not in the present study plan:

- Add a score for how many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for 'transit rider miles traveled.' An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for *rush hour trip time*. It’s when Highway 1 is a parking lot that we need a speedy alternative.
- Make sure it measures ease of entry and exit, so people in wheelchairs, strollers and walkers can get on and off easily.

Thank you for moving ahead with public transportation on the corridor. We need it now and will need it even more by the time it is built.

Sincerely,
Kaki Rusmore
Aptos

Laulette A. (Sasha) Edwards laulette@gmail.com 2/7/2020

Dear RTC,

I won't pretend that I came up with all the talking points in this email myself. In fact, I'll probably copy and paste the list from the email I received asking for people like me who favor rail to email you all about the study methodology just launched. But several of these points I have thought of and talked about with friends and relations with an interest in transit infrastructure, long before this email or anything like it. For what it's worth, I am a resident of Santa Cruz with friends who commute from Watsonville, and my husband is an avid cyclist.

I am especially concerned if, as the email I received suggests, the study is considering trip times and bicycle capacity in terms of 24 hour averages, rather than looking at peak travel times. Any transit system that gets bogged down or leaves people with bicycles behind during rush hour has limited usefulness. Even just looking at transit times for the average rider (not the average
vehicle over 24 hours) doesn't capture the full cost of poor performance at rush hour, because when people can't count on getting to work on time, or getting home in time to pick up kids from child care, they may be unwilling to take the ride either direction, and if people aren't using a transit system to commute, they're unlikely to ditch their cars to use it for other purposes. Peak (rush hour) travel is the critical time for public transit to function quickly and reliably in order for it to be useful at any time. Please adjust your study methodology accordingly.

I said (or implied) that I am a person who favors rail, but I'm not a die-hard; I don't favor it if the numbers don't add up. I do, however, think that cost/benefit analyses are much more difficult to get right than they appear, and when studying rail it's easy to inadvertently leave out some of the most important benefits. That said, I'm going to copy the suggestions from the email I received, having read them and thought about them, and decided that I am in full agreement.

Please add these measurements to your transit study:

- Add a score for the ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles each vehicle can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for 'transit rider miles traveled.' An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn't help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for rush hour trip time. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.
- Add a score for how soon each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
- Add a score to measure how well each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars

Thank you for your hard work in balancing the many concerns of the community around this issue.

Sincerely,
Laulette A. Edwards
To whom it may concern,

We need to evaluate our solution based on taking cars off the road, adding safe travel for bikes, and a solution that every economic household can use. Please incorporate some level of scoring/ranking around this.

Thank you,

--
Kevin Kinkor
Chief Executive Officer & Co-Founder

Dear Esteemed RTC,

I am grateful for your efforts to ensure that any transportation options between Santa Cruz and Watsonville are efficient and equitable. I would like you to know that the Santa Cruz Metro has failed my family as a transportation option mainly because of the inability to realistically combine biking with bus routes. Getting to an entry point for the system often requires some kind of additional transportation modality. For my husband, a bike was perfect for covering the 1.5 miles from Diridon Station to his work. He was absolutely committed to using public transportation until he had to quit after three months of trying, because he would arrive at the Santa Cruz Metro station and find that there was not room for a fourth bike. The only options were to arrive a half an hour before the bus left, so someone else could get bumped, or to wait 20 minutes for the next bus and be late for work. The Metro's inability to handle bikes at commute hour led to five years of lost ridership in our family.

Thank you!
Warmly,
Rebbie Higgins
112 Pine Pl
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Hello,

Thank you for your actions to improve mobility for everyone in Santa Cruz County.

As a transit survey is being prepared to solicit public input, I believe it is important to consider a few key details that can help to Get Everybody Moving. A robust survey that provides good guidance to meet our challenges head-on should address the following, and I ask you to please consider these points for inclusion:

- Replace "transit vehicle miles traveled" with a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ Because an empty vehicle doesn’t serve our needs.

- Instead of a single average trip time, add a second score for rush or peak hour trip time. Because a vehicle that’s efficient at midday but delayed/stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.

- Including a score for the ease of entry/exit for people with mobility challenges. Because our community needs to consider seniors, wheelchair users, etc.

- Add a score for how many bicycles each vehicle can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at key transit times. This is critical to the system’s success, especially for our student population.

- Include a score for how quickly each proposed new transit system could be implemented. Because the public is ready for change.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Kind Regards,

Eric Richter

Dan Dion dandion1@me.com 2/7/2020

Greetings RTC,

We have a few comments on the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis related to the performance measures. We would like the performance measures to reflect our needs and desires. Specifically, we’d like performance measures added to evaluate the:
1) time to implement each alternative- sooner is REALLY better and valuable to assess - our climate change clock has run out and we need action as soon as possible
2) capacity of each transit vehicle to carry bicycles
3) likely financial impact of losing the rail easement due to a non-rail alternative - please do not ignore this as was the case in the UCIS
4) accessibility for our mobility challenged community members, and
5) vehicle transit time during high traffic windows

We strongly support using the rail corridor for rail transit. It is far more efficient and environmentally sustainable. We have already paid taxes contributing to the state funds available for rail expansion which we must utilize to the benefit of our communities. We must maintain our public ownership of the rail corridor. A non-rail alternative irresponsibly risks the collapse of the existing rail easements.

We sincerely thank you for your efforts and consideration of our input.

Best regards,
Jill and Dan Dion
Santa Cruz

Grace Voss gracevoss@sbcglobal.net 2/7/2020

dear alternative analysis decision makers...here are the top "add on scores" for choosing rail for the corridor, using the overall guidelines of equity, environment and economy...

- Add a score for the ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles each vehicle can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for rush hour trip time. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.
- Add a score for how soon each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
Add a score to measure _how well_ each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Άδδ α σχορε φορ ηοω μυχη χλεανερ ανδ μορε δυραβλε ραιλ τραϖελ ισ τηαν αυτοµοβιλεσ σον χονγεστ εδ φρεεωαψσ.

Έ ε Αδδ α σχορε φορ αϖαιαβλε φυνδινγ φορ ραιλ (ι.ε. Χαλιφορνιας Στατε Ραιλ Πλαν, γραντσ φροι φεδ εραλ ανδ στατε αγενχιεσ φορ ραιλ)

Τηανκ ψου! Γραχε χοςσ (Λιϖε Οακ)

Curt Coleman curtColeman@gmail.com 2/7/2020

Dear RTC,

Please have a more inclusive study of transit corridor alternatives by including these criteria:

- Add a score for the _ease of entry and exit_ for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles _each vehicle_ can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for _rush hour trip time_. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn’t so great.
- Add a score for _how soon_ each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
- Add a score to measure _how well_ each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Thanks for all your work.

Curt Coleman
Babette Balkenhol babette@vestacare.com 2/7/2020

Please add a score to measure *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

On the rare occasion that I do have to drive Hwy 1 during peak commute hours (which are getting longer all the time), I have to wonder how many of these people are actually driving all the way to San Jose or Monterey for work, or are they just commuting within the county?

If I had to commute between Santa Cruz and Watsonville or Monterey, I would LOVE to be able to throw my bike on a train and sit back to enjoy the ride! It would seem to be much faster and more enjoyable than a bus.

Thanks for all your efforts!

Babette Brekka

Rich Mick rikibana@yahoo.com 2/7/2020

I'm writing to ask you to seriously consider mobility challenges and also bicycles on transit as part of your transportation study.

These are important, even critical factors to include.

Thank you,

Richard Mick
119 Wilkes Circle
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Unhae Langis ulangis@gmail.com 2/7/2020

Dear RTC:
I'm chagrined to see all these endless delays. As far as we're concerned, we've always thought rail was the best way because it is most energy-efficient, provides a more continuous ride, uses existing infrastructure, and more attractive to people for these various reasons. In these times of climate change, we should become as much like Europe as possible with their extensive rail and metro system.
Also we'd like the additional points to be considered in your study:

- Add a score for the *ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges.
• Add a score for how many bicycles each vehicle can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.

• Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.

• Instead of average trip time, add a score for rush hour trip time. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.

• Add a score for how soon each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.

• Add a score to measure how well each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Thank you,
Unhae and Bob Langis

Claire Darling darlingclairek@gmail.com 2/7/2020

Dear RTC,

I am so excited for the progress on the rail trail and for it to finally be happening! Having a rail trail connecting all the way from Davenport to Watsonville and beyond is truly going to be amazing, and I know so many people who are looking forward to it.

I understand there’s a study to choose a transit option for the rail corridor between Watsonville and Santa Cruz – and it’s missing some important pieces.

I think it’s important these scores are also included in the study:

- Add a score for how many bicycles each vehicle can carry, so bike commuters don’t get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.

- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.

- Instead of average trip time, add a score for rush hour trip time. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but gets stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great. This is especially important to people who live in South County. The news organization Santa Cruz Local recently surveyed voters on most important issues to them, and people in South County were most concerned about traffic. That was their number one complaint/issue. Rush hour trip time is very relevant here.
- Add a score to measure *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Thanks for your consideration – onward!!

Claire Darling

Jared Boggs jared.boggs@gmail.com 2/7/2020

To Whom It May Concern,

I am excited that the RTC is moving forward with the plan to install mass transit on the current rail corridor. I am concerned that the following important measures are missing from the current study plan and strongly urge you to include them. Please consider how important these are in evaluating what form of mass transit will be on the corridor:

- *Ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges.
- How many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for *transit rider miles traveled.* An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for *rush hour trip time.* Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn’t so great.
- *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Sincerely,
Jared & Nelly Boggs

Cathy Mcdowell cmcdowell@sbcglobal.net 2/7/2020

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to request you add these measures to the list of measures that are included on the transit alternatives for the corridor between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. I don’t believe you can adequately measure the economy, equity and environmental impact without including these measures:
- Add a score for the **ease of entry and exit** for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn't help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for *rush hour trip time*. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.
- Add a score for *how soon* each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
- Add a score to measure *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Let's not waste time and money. Do it right the first time.

Sincerely,
Cathy McDowell

Eva Nardell evasimone2@gmail.com 2/7/2020

To whom it may concern,
Please add a score for *rush hour trip time*. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.
We should really be focused on how to alleviate Rush Hour traffic because that is the problem.
-Eva

Tina Andreatta tina.marieotr@gmail.com 2/7/2020

Dear Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission,

The Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis would benefit from including consideration of the following factors:
Transit on the corridor should utilize the full distance to Watsonville Junction, failure to utilize the entire ROW has the effect of neglecting the needs of South County travelers and use of bus vehicles that are routed to join vehicular traffic will not provide an equitable level of service to our most neglected citizens. Costs for non-fixed rail options should include the full life cycle costs of excavation, remediation, property litigation, and life cycle vehicle and operations costs and greenhouse gas impacts. Failure to consider long term costs and returns on investments
tend to favor bus transit. Be sure to treat corridor transit solutions in combination with existing and potentially new Metro transit routes and not in isolation.

* Rail as a backbone with bus lateral services can create a network to serve many and provide new revenue for Metro from rail funds.

Be sure to consider the benefits of rail as a partner with bike trips, bike share, and refer to the successes of the bitibit.eu projects in the European Union in which bike and transit mode shares rose significantly while automobile use fell after certain measures were taken to facilitate synergy between the two modes.

More here:


* Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure.
* Rail is already recognized as the most efficient mode of transit. Electrified trains using zero emission power from a growing supply of clean alternative source make rail even greener.
* Rail is best for *ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges.
* Rail could easily carry more than a dozen bicycles, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour.
* Rail is the best choice for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
* Rail can be completed the soonest. No more delays!
* Rail best alleviates *rush hour trip time*.
* Rail will get commuters out of their cars.
* Rail transit is the most energy-efficient.
* Rail can get funding and be a part of the larger state rail plan.
* Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives.
* Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money.
* Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off.
* Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets.
* Rail creates a more equitable and economically vibrant community.

Sincerely,

Tina Andreatta
Aptos, CA 95003
Sandra Baron  sandybar3@gmail.com  2/7/2020

My husband and I ride the Monterey Scenic Trail almost every week. There are so few dedicated bike trails in Santa Cruz County, we have to drive to Monterey and spend our money there. I understand the need for commuter options, but I'm not convinced that the beautiful rail trail should fill that function. I think it is more valuable as a recreational trail and for bicycle commuting. Whatever happens on that trail has to preserve the natural beauty and quiet. These things are very important for the well being of people of all ages. Any additional train, bus, or other that is considered must not take away the beauty and quiet of this recreational gem. It's better to put buses and shuttles on roads, but if something more does go on the rail trail, it needs to be electric, quiet and not run more often than usage demands.

Thank you,
Sandra Baron and Duane Riegg
Santa Cruz County residents.

Katherine McCamant  katherine.mccamant@gmail.com  2/7/2020

I am hoping you will consider the following ideas that I believe will help make a better framework.

• Add a score for the *ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges.
• Add a score for how many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
• Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit *rider* miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
• Instead of average trip time, add a score for *rush hour trip time*. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn’t so great.
• Add a score for *how soon* each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
• Add a score to measure *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Thank you!
Sincerely, Katherine McCamant
Sent from my iPad
Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation,
The Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis would benefit from including consideration of the following factors:
Transit on the corridor should utilize the full distance to Watsonville Junction, failure to utilize the entire ROW has the effect of neglecting the needs of South County travelers and use of bus vehicles that are routed to join vehicular traffic will not provide an equitable level of service to our most neglected citizens. Costs for non-fixed rail options should include the full life cycle costs of excavation, remediation, property litigation, and life cycle vehicle and operations costs and greenhouse gas impacts. Failure to consider long term costs and returns on investments tend to favor bus transit. Be sure to treat corridor transit solutions in combination with existing and potentially new Metro transit routes and not in isolation.

* Rail as a backbone with bus lateral services can create a network to serve many and provide new revenue for Metro from rail funds.

Be sure to consider the benefits of rail as a partner with bike trips, bike share, and refer to the successes of the bitibit.eu projects in the European Union in which bike and transit mode shares rose significantly while automobile use fell after certain measures were taken to facilitate synergy between the two modes.

More here:


* Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure.
* Rail is already recognized as the most efficient mode of transit. Electrified trains using zero emission power from a growing supply of clean alternative source make rail even greener.
* Rail is best for "ease of entry and exit" for people with mobility challenges.
* Rail could easily carry more than a dozen bicycles, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour.
* Rail is the best choice for 'transit rider miles traveled.' An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn't help anyone.
* Rail can be completed the soonest. No more delays!
* Rail best alleviates "rush hour trip time".
* Rail will get commuters out of their cars.
* Rail transit is the most energy-efficient.
* Rail can get funding and be a part of the larger state rail plan.
* Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives.
* Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money.
* Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off.
* Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets.
* Rail creates a more equitable and economically vibrant community.

Sincerely,
Teri Handzel, Aptos CA

William Bishoff bishoff.w@gmail.com 2/7/2020

We need improved public transportation in Santa Cruz County to provide more options for getting to work and entertainment venues. Railcars capable of accommodating bicycles reduce our carbon footprint by using more efficient modes of transportation.

Thank you for the opportunity to advocate for quality regional transportation,

William C. Bishoff
4233 Grace Street Unit 3
Capitola, CA 95010
831-854-2207 Home

Joel Isaacson emmaho@mac.com 2/7/2020

Please include rails with the new trail. It will be such an asset.
Thank you,
Joel Isaacson
West side
Santa Cruz

Sent from my iPhone

Crissa Kentavr crissakentavr@gmail.com 2/7/2020

Transit needs to be gauged in the ways people use it. Please make sure it is! We need scoring to let us know what we need to know:

- We need to know what the travel times are during peak hours. This is an advantage of public transit, and how people depend upon it.
• We need to know how long it takes to transit from popular destination to popular
destination: Like, how long it takes to get from the Boardwalk to Capitola Village, or
Seabright. Or to Big Basin and The Mystery Spot. Not just Watsonville downtown to
Santa Cruz downtown. When there's lots of car traffic, when people would opt for
transit. When people are here on vacation, they're not always in their own car. And we
don't want them to be!
• We need to know how easy for people with mobility issues to get off and on. This slows
transit down all the time. Even if it's just someone with extra children or bags of
groceries, this is how people use and depend upon transit.
• We need to know how well each type of transit is at converting car-users to transit
users. It's not just about getting people who depend upon transit to places, it's about
helping everyone mix public transit into their use.
• We need to know how well each vehicle unit of transit is at mixing with
micromobility. How many bikes can a bus or trolly carry during rush hour? Having to vie
for those three spots when commuting is really stressful. Knowing the throughput in a
day is useless, I want to know if I can depend upon it.
• We need to know transit rider miles, not vehicle miles. A bigger vehicle travels fewer
miles... But is far more efficient at carrying peak loads!
• We need to know how soon each could be implemented. Changing plans mid-stream
would mean that we might be waiting longer - we can't wait too long. We have rail
now, let's use what we have. We have roads now, lets use those roads.
• We need to know what systems will encourage investment into new housing
units. Having a bus stop doesn't encourage a set of new condos, but a depot or rail says
that this is a transit that's being invested into!

Please make sure that the scoring systems lets us know what we need to know!

-Stacey Croft-Patterson
Ben Lomond
Yes, I go to Watsonville, too. And the beach, North and South. And up to the parks. I was
married on the bluff at New Brighton State Beach. Give me a dependable system!

Frank Kertai fkertai@yahoo.com 2/7/2020

Good day. I want to provide some input to the RTC's consideration of transit options for the rail
corridor between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. The first draft of the plan appears to be missing
some key points. With respect to evaluation of alternatives, I recommend the following:

• Add a score for ease of entry and exit for persons with mobility issues
• Add a score for the number of bicycles each vehicle can carry
• Add a score for "Transit Rider Miles Traveled" instead of "Transit vehicle miles traveled"
• Add a score for "rush hour trip time" instead of "average trip time" as the rush hours impacts on traffic and ridership are the most significant
• Add a score for how soon each proposed new transit system could be installed and effectively start carrying passengers
• Add a score for how effectively each alternative would be at getting commuters out of their vehicles and using the alternative

Thank you for your consideration of my input to the Transit Corridor Analysis.

Respectfully,

Frank Z. Kerta
516 Shasta Park Ct.
Scotts Valley, CA 95066
831.251.5130

Joanne Noce joannenoce@yahoo.com 2/7/2020

• Add a score for the ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges.
• Add a score for how many bicycles each vehicle can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
• Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn't help anyone.
• Instead of average trip time, add a score for rush hour trip time. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.
• Add a score for how soon each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
• Add a score to measure how well each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Dear RTC,

As you study what is best, consider someone like me who rides her Electric Bike to work everyday or carpools when it is raining. I have not owned a car for over two years, not because I can't afford it, but chose not to. I often ask myself, "how can I get to Monterey this weekend without having to rent a car?" And ponder how great it would be to have a train for me to take to the Monterey Jazz Bash or Festival without having to deal with traffic, exit the train with my E-bike and be on my way. Or ask myself if my friend, Bob, who has been in a wheelchair for 20 years could enjoy public transportation without the hesitation whether it would be accessible
for him. Let's make public transportation accessible for all and all will use it if it is more convenient and well designed. Not having to drive here and there and to be driven by a train, bus, or self (E-bike), is the best alternative.

Thanks for reading and I ask for an open mind and heart in the decisions that lie ahead.

Best regards,

Joanne Noce

LD lawrencedenisfreitas@gmail.com 2/7/2020

Hi:

My name is LD Freitas, and I live in Seacliff, just a few blocks away from the RR tracks. With the Tig-M light rail train scheduled to run as a demonstration on the tracks, I believe that that sort of train is perfect for the area: it would be carbon neutral, noiseless for the most part, and would attract thousands of locals and visitors to use, whether weekdays or weekends. There are plenty of bike lanes already on roads near the beach and tracks. Fix the tracks to Grade Two, contract with Tig-M, and let's get light rail operating between Watsonville and Santa Cruz's Westside and Downtown. I realize another track would be necessary to run parallel in Watsonville and to Pajaro Junction. If Monterey County would come aboard, pun intended, both counties could get light rail started, by investing in parallel tracks next to the to the existing UP tracks between Pajaro and Salinas, via Castroville, and spending tax dollars to do so, and also fixing the existing Monterey Branch line between Castroville and Seaside, and replacing the tracks from Seaside to the old train station in Monterey. That would mean Santa Cruz and Monterey and Salinas could be connected by light rail. Now THAT would mean less cars on Highway One!

Santa Cruz County as well should totally back Monterey County's plans to implement commuter, and hopefully, weekend service between San Jose and Salinas. Obviously, Pajaro Junction and Castroville Junction train stops need to be implemented as soon as possible. This would impact Highway One in Santa Cruz County, because many would choose to go to Pajaro to take the train to their destinations in Silicon Valley. That would possibly eliminate plans to widen Highway One in Santa Cruz any more than it has, except for lengthening on and off ramps for easier merging and exiting of the freeway, something that should have been done a long time ago, and implementing entry lane lights at certain intersections, such as at 41st Ave.
Jessica Guild jessguild@gmail.com 2/7/2020

To whom it may concern:

My name is Jessica Guild, and I am a resident of Live Oak, Santa Cruz. I am concerned about the current scoring for the study plan for the rail corridor.

It does not include a score for the ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges, and it should include a score for our community members with mobility challenges.

The study does not score for how many bicycles each vehicle can carry. This last scoring point is especially critical to include, because if the vehicle does not include enough space, any transit option during rush hour will leave out bike commuters.

Additionally, there should be a score for "transit rider miles traveled" vs "transit vehicle miles traveled" as an empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn't help anyone.

The current scores average trip time, but a score should be added for rush hour trip time. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.

Finally, it would be important to add a score for how soon each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers, and a score for how well each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their car.

All of these scores are critical to include as they provide the community with the best information for which transit option would serve our community the best.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these comments.

Best,

Jessica Guild
Live Oak homeowner/resident

Theo Rusmore theo.rusmore@gmail.com 2/7/2020

To whom it may concern,

I believe strongly that the addition of rail as a transit option for the Santa Cruz/Highway 1 corridor would be greatly beneficial for the community. However, I would like to point out
several things that the proposed study does not consider that are extremely important to consider for realistic assessment of commuter options and fair grading of the alternatives. First, for commuters who have a mixed-transit commute, such as those who may need to travel a few miles off the rail line to get to work and/or home, the need for bike transport is extremely important. The transit system in the Bay Area has encountered issues with transporting bikes for mixed transit commuters, as the cars do not accommodate multiple bikes well, especially during rush hour. A useful measure for these commuters would be how many bikes each vehicle can carry, so that the applicability of the system to mixed commutes can be accurately assessed.

Second, the transit system must necessarily be efficient. A vast system that barely carries any passengers is not a useful system. To avoid confusing coverage and use, a metric that measures the number of miles transit riders travel rather than number of miles transit vehicles travel should be employed.

Third, it should be remembered that the ridership of any transit system will necessarily have different needs. Riders with disabilities or other mobility challenges will need level boarding and other accessibility options to be built into the system. The feasibility of using the transit system for these riders will have a major impact on the reputation and use of the system.

Fourth, trip time during peak use hours must be considered. While some alternatives will not be impacted by surface street traffic, there should be a metric to measure how each alternative will affect and be affected by non-mass/non-public transit options on mixed-use (surface) streets.

Finally, there is little point in instituting a transit system if it is not utilized by the community. Consideration of alternatives must consider which alternatives will be the most effective at attracting riders and reducing the use of personal vehicles. A metric that scores how well alternatives do at getting commuters to get out of their cars and onto public transit should be included.

Thank you for your time,
Theo Rusmore
B.S. Chemistry
University of California, Berkeley 2016

geri lieby glieby@gmail.com 2/7/2020

Hello,
Please add missing measurements to the study to get a fuller picture of which scenario offers the best solution to these vital questions. Score these, please.
How are people with mobility challenges best served?
What’s the actual number of people traveling, not the miles covered?
Which alternative works the best during rush hours?
Which alternative best gets folks out of their cars?
Thank you,
Geri Lieby
Emy Fehmi  emitphemit@gmail.com  2/7/2020

Please add these elements to the study! I think it will help get better results:

- Add a score for the *ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit *rider* miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn't help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for *rush hour trip time*. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.
- Add a score for *how soon* each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
- Add a score to measure *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Thanks!
Emy

------------------
Emy Fehmi
626.202.4514

Sue Kaufmann  suekaufmann@gmail.com  2/7/2020

Dear Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission,

* Rail as a backbone with bus lateral services can create a network to serve many and provide new revenue for Metro from rail funds.
* Be sure to consider the benefits of rail as a partner with bike trips, and bike share.
* Rail can get funding and be part of the larger state rail plan.
* Rail protects our public ownership of the corridor.
* Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure.
* Rail is already recognized as the most efficient mode of transit. Electrified trains using zero emission power from a growing supply of clean alternative source make rail even greener.
* Rail is best for ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges.
* Rail could easily carry more than a dozen bicycles, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour.
* Rail is the best choice for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
* Rail can be completed the soonest. No more delays!
* Rail will get commuters out of their cars.
* Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives.
* Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money.
* Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off.
* Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets.
* Rail creates a more equitable and economically vibrant community.

Please without any further delay complete the pedestrian/bike trail and then immediately complete rail corridor to connect with the rest of California rail.

Sincerely,
Sue Kaufmann
Capitola, CA 95010

Sue Kaufmann

Isabelle Nelson  isabelleenelson@gmail.com  2/8/2020

I am writing, as a citizen of the City and County of Santa Cruz, that I am eager for a passenger rail and multi-use trail along the proposed system put forth by the RTA and FORT.

Isabelle Nelson

worseyg  gworsey@gmail.com  2/8/2020

As a transportation engineer, I am very interested in the TCAA. I think some of your suggestions are better than others. I like the idea of dual rail/road vehicles but the technology for some of the alternatives is probably not there.
Gillian Worsey
527 Pine St, Aptos.
Martha Graham Waldon marthagw@comcast.net 2/7/2020

Regarding choosing a transit option in Santa Cruz County, please:

- Add a score for the *ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for *rush hour trip time*. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.
- Add a score for *how soon* each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
- Add a score to measure *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

This is an important decision. Make the right choice by considering these factors.

Thank you,
Martha Graham-Waldon
Felton

Natascha Bruckner njbruckner@gmail.com 2/8/2020

Dear friends,

Thank you for devoting time to investigating the transit corridor.

When you are analyzing the alternatives, I hope you will look at the following:
- ease of entry and exit for people with mobility issues
- trip time for rush hour
- how soon every proposed new transit system could be installed and functional
- assessment of how many bicycles each vehicle could carry
- how many miles are traveled per rider (not just per vehicle)
I feel that these considerations would make the study more thorough and useful to the community.

Thank you for taking these points into account.

With best wishes,
Natascha Bruckner

Santa Cruz, CA

Cell: 707-888-1916

Brooke Elliott runningbrooke@sbcglobal.net 2/8/2020

Agreed with some suggestions that should be included in study. I guess we're still studying this how many years later? Build it already.

- Add a score for the *ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges. *THIS SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION SINCE THE IDEA IS THAT THE ELDERLY AND DISABLED WOULD BE BIG USERS OF THE TRAIN.*
- Add a score for how many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system. *AGREE, NEEDS TO BE ABLE TO CARRY A LOT OF BIKES SINCE THE STOPS ARE LIKELY TO BE FAR FROM THE INDIVIDUAL'S DESTINATION.*
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn't help anyone. *I DON'T SEE HOW THIS IS REALLY USEFUL. EVERYONE'S TRAVEL DISTANCE REQ WILL BE DIFFERENT, AND HOW FAR SOMEONE TRAVELS SHOULDN'T BE THE DETERMINANT. THERE JUST NEEDS TO BE ENOUGH STOPS IN THE RIGHT PLACES (AND FAST ENOUGH TRAVEL TIME) SO PEOPLE WILL USE IT. WE WANT IT FOR PEOPLE TO GET TO WORK, FOR ELDERLY, DISABLED, AND CARLESS TO BE ABLE TO GET AROUND, AND FOR TOURISTS TO BE ABLE TO GET TO EITHER END OF THE BAY FASTER THAN HAVING TO DRIVE THE CAR.*
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for *rush hour trip time.* Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great. *DEFINITELY, IF*
THE POINT IS TO GET PEOPLE TO USE IT TO TRAVEL TO WORK, THEY NEED TO KNOW HOW LONG IT WOULD ACTUALLY TAKE AT THE WORST TIMES

- Add a score for *how soon* each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.  
  *DON'T SEE THE POINT OF THIS SINCE NOTHING HAS BEEN ON TIME EVER, AND IF PEOPLE KEEP SUING, THEY'LL KEEP HOLDING UP THE PROJECT*

- Add a score to measure *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.  
  *THIS SEEMS LIKE A VAGUE AND SUBJECTIVE IDEA. I THINK COST AND EASE OF GETTING TO A TRAIN STATION, BEING ABLE TO PARK AT THE STATION, GETTING TO THE DESTINATION FROM THE STATION, FREQUENCY OF TRAINS (NEED TO BE AT LEAST EVERY 30 MINUTES) ARE ALL CONSIDERATIONS FOR SOMEONE USING THE LINE TO GO TO WORK. FOR BUSES, THEY'RE USELESS IF THEY'RE SITTING IN TRAFFIC. IF TAKES JUST AS LONG AS A CAR, THEN I'LL TAKE THE CAR.*

Ilo Ilo  
sierrastosea@gmail.com  2/8/2020

To Whom It May Concern:

We are an ecology minded area, yet we’re overly dependent upon driving and the resultant pollution, noise, lack of community, and health risks that go with this lifestyle. Please fully develop the TRAILS that can connect to the rail project from Watsonville to Davenport. Our ecology and health-minded community is set in a gorgeous area. Give us safe, clean trails to be able to see the environment in a health-friendly way for all ages.

Give access to these paths by the rail. This is a more energy efficient means of moving more people safely, without dependency upon traffic conditions on highways, and has existing infrastructure. State funding will also offset the costs to others for the benefit to our community.

Thank you for your serious consideration,

Ilo Nilson
Jeanne Mulhern jamulhern1@gmail.com 2/8/2020

Dear Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission;

Please consider the following factors when putting the transit coordinator benefits into your plan:

The corridor should fully utilize the entire Right of Way including Watsonville junction. With so many travelers commuting the corridor into and out of Santa Cruz (and beyond) it doesn't make sense to neglect the needs of South County travelers and commuters.

Costs for non-fixed rail options should include the full life cycle costs of excavation, remediation, property litigation, and life cycle vehicle and operations costs and greenhouse gas impacts. Failure to consider long term costs and returns on investments will cause an effect on returning to old transportation ways. Treat corridor transit solutions in combination with existing and potentially new Metro transit routes and not in isolation (a network to for Rail to serve many and provide new revenue for Metro from rail funds).

Rail and bikes need to be considered as partners as well. (Consider the success of bitibit.eu projects in the European Union in which bike and transit use rose significantly while automobile use fell after certain measures were taken to facilitate synergy between the two modes.


Key points shared many times by others:

* Rail can get funding and be part of the larger state rail plan.
* Rail protects our public ownership of the corridor.
* Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure.
* Rail is already recognized as the most efficient mode of transit. Electrified trains using zero emission power from a growing supply of clean alternative source make rail even greener.
* Rail is best for ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges.
* Rail could easily carry more than a dozen bicycles, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour.
* Rail is the best choice for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
* Rail can be completed the soonest. No more delays!
* Rail best alleviates rush hour trip time.
* Rail will get commuters out of their cars.
* Rail transit is the most energy-efficient.
* Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives.
* Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money.
* Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off.
* Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets.
* Rail creates a more equitable and economically vibrant community.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Mulhern
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

Lorna ljandreatta@hotmail.com 2/8/2020

To Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission;

My family and I have been coming to Santa Cruz for over 35 years. We’re active Californians and enjoy taking trains in other towns and cities throughout California, the rest of the USA and Europe.

Best choice is keeping the rail.

* Rail as a backbone with bus lateral services can create a network to serve many and provide new revenue for Metro from rail funds.
* Rail can get funding and be part of the larger state rail plan.
* Rail protects our public ownership of the corridor.
* Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure.
* Rail is already recognized as the most efficient mode of transit. Electrified trains using zero emission power from a growing supply of clean alternative source make rail even greener.
* Rail is best for *ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges.
* Rail could easily carry more than a dozen bicycles, so bike commuters don’t get left behind at rush hour.
* Rail is the best choice for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
* Rail can be completed the soonest. No more delays!
* Rail best alleviates *rush hour trip time*.
* Rail will get commuters out of their cars.
* Rail transit is the most energy-efficient.
* Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives.
* Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money.
* Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off.
* Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets.
* Rail creates a more equitable and economically vibrant community.

Sincerely,

Lorna Andreatta
Chico, CA 95973

Sent from my iPhone

Dan deGrassi dan.degrassi@baymoon.com 2/8/2020

Dear RTC,
I am 74 years old. I have a prosthetic foot which makes things awkward and sometimes cumbersome for me to walk and to navigate steps and seats. I would ask that your study include for people like me a score for the ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges for rail transit options.
Thank you,
Dan deGrassi

Sze-Wing Lau szewing.lau131@gmail.com 2/8/2020

Dear Commissioners,

I am concerned about the rail study you are planning to conduct and want to make sure it includes enough details to be valuable. I am encouraging you to add the following - please include a timeline for when each proposed new transit system would be installed and able to carry passengers as well as how well each of the transportation alternatives would do at switching current car commuters to alternative modes of transportation.

Best,
Sze-Wing Lau
Hello,
I am contacting you to voice my support for rail service within the proposed Rail/Trail corridor. I strongly believe that rail service would be a very valuable resource to Santa Cruz County by alleviating some of the horrible traffic on Highway 1, providing a reliable alternate transit option, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. As I am sure you are aware, California is attempting to create a more interconnected state-wide rail network, which means that funding is much more likely to be available for a rail option than any other option. I feel that not using the rail lines would not only be a waste of existing resources, but it would also make future funding more difficult to acquire.

With that said, I will not be able to attend any meetings to support a rail option as I have a two month old baby at home. I hope that you keep in mind that community meetings, while valuable, tend to attract the most vocal opponents of what is being proposed. The opposition groups that are able to attend these meetings also tend to look less like the community at large, particularly low income communities that most stand to benefit from improved public transportation options. I am not saying it is bad to hold these meetings, but I hope that you take it with a grain of salt.

Thank you for all your hard work looking at all the potential options and their benefits and drawbacks. I truly hope that I will be able to ride this train someday with my son and tell him that I advocated for it.

Thank you,
Sean Abbey
Santa Cruz County Resident

My husband and I regularly ride our bikes in the county. We often drive our bikes in our car to get to a place to ride, whether it is Nicene Marks or Wilder State Park. We often get caught in the traffic on Mission Street in SC.

We would certainly use a train to transport our bikes to our desired bicycling spot if that were an option.

We would also love to rely on a train to bring us back to Capitola after a long bike ride, or if the weather changed for the worse, or if we had a mechanical failure.
We would like to stop along the train route and get lunch, or have a brew, or anything else, and catch the train to come home!

If there had been a train when I used to ride my bike to the westside fire station in my younger days, I would have been extremely grateful! Knowing that a train is scheduled along the bicycle route is a wonderful way to bicycle to and from work!

I most certainly would have put my bike on the train when I worked in the Live Oak School District for 18 years, also. Riding a bicycle home in the afternoon and being able to run an errand by getting on and off the train is more realistic than riding through crazy traffic all the way home.

I think that many more folks will be taking their bikes to work and to play if there were a train to help them move along more conveniently and enjoyably in the county! Riding the train would be part of the pleasure of going for a bike ride, running errands, getting to work, meeting someone for lunch or a meeting, and many other daily activities.

Thank you for your time and consideration for enthusiastic bicyclists all over Santa Cruz County!

Kitty Hansen
Capitola

Brendan Quirk quirksquote@gmail.com 2/9/2020

Hello!

I am a huge proponent of the rail trail and am excited that construction is getting underway on segment 7! Thanks for all of your work to preserve the transit option.

I'd like to propose some amendments to your transit study. I think you should take the following actions:

- Add a score for the *ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn't help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for *rush hour trip time*. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.
• Add a score for *how soon* each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
• Add a score to measure *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Thanks!

Brendan Quirk

--

Brendan Quirk  
(510) 381-0976  
quirkquote@gmail.com

"An ounce of action is worth a ton of theory."
- Ralph Waldo Emerson

WILLIAM PHILIPPS  philipps99@comcast.net  2/9/2020

Good morning,
I live on Lewis Circle in Live Oak. My property borders the rail property. I look forward to seeing people using a new trail in a responsible way. I do **not** look forward to having diesel freight trains! Please respect our neighborhood and the environment by using only environmentally responsible passenger trains.  
I hope to attend the open house Wednesday at the Watsonville Library.

Bill Philipps

ratbert@cruzio.com  2/9/2020

I am on the ED TAC for the Regional Transportation Committee. This, and the fact that I ride buses regularly, has given me a new awareness of how transportation looks to those of us with disabilities. I read your criteria for choosing a transportation mode, and it seemed to me that something was missing.

I’m glad that we now have buses that accommodate wheelchairs. But frankly, when someone with a wheelchair boards, all of us resign ourselves to arriving late to our destination. Getting a wheelchair onto the bus and securing it is an elaborate, time consuming procedure, and must
be reversed when the passenger gets off. I was once 45 minutes late because a very large man in a very large electric wheelchair caught his chair on the fare box, and no one had the strength to move the chair.

With a train, the passenger simply rolls on. No ramp. No fare box to dodge.

Our buses also carry walkers, strollers, and wheeled grocery carriers. Even bicycles are much simpler to load and store on a train. With a train alongside a trail, I envision groups planning to ride one way and take transit back. With buses, they’d be limited to a very small group. Since the rails go so near several beaches, it would be a boon if trains could carry surfing equipment and picnic paraphernalia, the former not allowed on buses, the latter something of a problem. Trains are just better at transporting stuff. One strong reason that people take their own cars instead of transit is that they want to bring their stuff.

Please consider stuff when evaluating transportation alternatives. Thank you.

Caroline Lamb

Joel Steinberg cheeth1951@gmail.com 2/9/2020

Dear Commissioners,

As a home owner in the City of Santa Cruz and a neighbor to the Rail and Trail, I support rail transit for the following reasons: 1) Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives, 2) Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money, 3) Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off, 4) Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets, 5) Rail transit is the most energy-efficient, 6) Rail protects our public ownership of the corridor, 7) Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure, 8) Rail can get funding and be a part of the larger state rail plan.

Santa Cruz needs a north/south rail option to provide a nonpolluting transportation alternative.

Joel Steinberg, MD
Dear Commissioners

My name is Bethany Eschen-Pipes. I am a student at Cabrillo. Although, due to the location of my housing, I cannot benefit personally from the traintracks, these are the reasons I support the Rail & Trail:
Rail also helps move people en masse, meaning that more people can pack themselves into the carriages instead of spacing themselves out in cars.
Youngsters living in Watsonville who work at the Boardwalk will probably need it to get to work. It will be complete upgrade from going from the Metro Center.

Jeb Bishop jeb@baymoon.com 2/9/2020

Please include these measurements in your analysis of options for the rail corridor. Without them, rail is undervalued.

- Add a score for the ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles each vehicle can carry, so bike commuters don’t get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for rush hour trip time. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn’t so great.
- Add a score for how soon each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
- Add a score to measure how well each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Thanks,
Jeb Bishop
319 Brook Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
Please add the following measurements:

- Add a score for how many bicycles each vehicle can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn't help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for rush hour trip time. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but gets stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.
- Add a score for how soon each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
- Add a score to measure how well each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

I support rail transit:

- Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives.
- Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money.
- Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off.
- Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets.
- Rail transit is the most energy-efficient.
- Rail protects our public ownership of the corridor.
- Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure.
- Rail can get funding and be a part of the larger state rail plan.

thanks,
Russell Weisz
319 Laguna St.
Santa Cruz CA 95060
russweisz1@gmail.com
831 246-1770
Dear Members of the RTC,

I believe the current study plan leaves out some important measurement points. They are as follows:

- Add a score for the *ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for *rush hour trip time*. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn’t so great.
- Add a score for *how soon* each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
- Add a score to measure *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

And of course, this is why I love the rail:

- Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives.
- Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money.
- Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off.
- Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets.
- Rail transit is the most energy-efficient.
- Rail protects our public ownership of the corridor.
- Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure.
- Rail can get funding and be a part of the larger state rail plan.

Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

Brian Corser
114 Ladera Drive
Santa Cruz, CA
Dear Committee:

My husband and I live in the Circles on the Westside of Santa Cruz and 87 year old mother who uses a transport wheelchair and motorized scooter. We hope that light rail cars would include ease of access for the disabled. My husband and I are active cyclists. We have done several self-guided bike tours in countries around the world and so we have first hand experience of how efficient alternative (to cars) transportation systems, and how extensive bike routes and infrastructure can be. We have also ridden all over Santa Cruz County on recreational rides. But we really don't like riding in Santa Cruz because of the lack of bike infrastructure (having to ride defensively against cars.) Once the Rail Trail is completed we will be able to ride more safely, but also having a commuter train with bike access would be wonderful because then we could actually get out of our cars and do errands on our bikes. Right now, on any week day afternoon, we rarely drive in our cars past the San Lorenzo River to Mid or South County shops and businesses because of all the traffic. If we could take our bikes on the train to Capitola or Aptos for lunch and shopping, wouldn't that be fun (and a boon to businesses)?! We have an electric car, we ride bikes and walk when we can--we are committed to doing our part to reduce fossil fuel consumption, and we would be committed to regularly using a light rail commuter train, which would be so beneficial to so many, in so many ways!

I hope we and others can enjoy the benefits of a bike and wheelchair accessible light rail soon--Thanks for your work and consideration to make it possible!

Allison Garcia

John Carothers

Hi

We need to plan for the future, and a light rail WITH a bike trail is a critical component of that future.

Thanks
John Carothers
Hi RTC Planning Committee -
I am writing to ask you to please include some important scores to your study for the transit option for the rail corridor between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. Some of the measurements that are very important to me and I feel should be included are the following -

- Understanding how many bicycles each vehicle can carry, particularly important for rush hour times, not just over a 24 hour period.
- Ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges - this should be quite seamless for folks needing alternative transportation who have slower or more impaired mobility.
- Accounting for rush hour and not just averaging out trip times through a 24 hour period. Some times of the day, as we all know, are much more impacted than others.

I am really excited about this next step in this process and am thankful for all the time, thoughts and energy you all have put into this study.

Looking forward to seeing you all at the SC Mtg on 2/12.

Thanks again,
Meggan

~We make a living by what we get, we make a life by what we give~
• Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
• Instead of average trip time, add a score for rush hour trip time. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn’t so great.
• Add a score for how soon each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
• Add a score to measure how well each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

It is essential that rail serves those in our community with mobility issues and those who will use bicycles to finish their commute.

Thank you.
Best,
Kerstin Breidenthal
95062

homestage1@yahoo.com 2/10/2020

Santa Cruz city and county are quickly moving from smaller beach town communities to multifaceted area with increasingly dense population with larger numbers of daily commuters driving up and down Highway 1 or over the hill on Highway 17.

• UCSC continues to increase enrollment.
• The city of Santa Cruz continues to approve large high density projects. See: Development Projects | City of Santa Cruz

Development Projects | City of Santa Cruz

• Increasing high real estate purchase and rental cost in the Silicon Valley continue to push commuters into the cities of Scotts Valley, Santa Cruz and beyond. Commuters are also moving to Santa Cruz, San Benito and Monterey counties.
• Increased general populations also mean increased daily traffic and larger swings of seasonal traffic (aka: beach traffic).
Since it seems unlikely that (at this time) there is an feasible way to reduce traffic flow on highway 17 from the valley to the coast, one of the best ways to help ease this increasing congestion is to provide a way for people to move from popular local and tourist attractions using a separate corridor once on the coast side. (And also for the locals to move back and forth.)

I am in favor of having a rail/train (and/or bus) that is separate from main street, freeway and side street. If we don't actively create solutions for regularly scheduled public transportation we will see increasing congestion going from certain hours of the day (rush hour) to a standard occurrence.

-Melissa Lindroth
Santa Cruz resident

Ellen Vaughan ellen.l.vaughan@gmail.com 2/10/2020

Hello,

I support the Passenger Rail!
Please help the environment and economics of our region by making it happen!
Thanks,

--
Ellen Vaughan
c (315) 472-7959

Dave Wachob dwachob@aol.com 2/10/2020

We are ready for passenger rail!

Sincerely,

Dave Wachob
Eva Brunner <evasbrunner@gmail.com> 2/10/2020

It is my understanding that the current study to choose a transit option between Santa Cruz and Watsonville leaves out some crucial measures. Rail offers many benefits to people with mobility issues, bicycle commuters that need to take their bikes on the train in order to get across the county for work or pleasure efficiently (and car free), our environment and the easing of congestion on Highway 1.

Please add these very important measurements that are missing from the study:
- Add a score for the *ease of entry and exit* for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles *each vehicle* can carry, so bike commuters don't get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for *rush hour trip time*. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn’t so great.
- Add a score for *how soon* each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
- Add a score to measure *how well* each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Thank you,
Eva Brunner

x1kern@cruzio.com 2/10/2020

This study is a good way of finding the best type of vehicle that is the most efficient in moving commuters to their place of work.

It is imperative that the vehicle has provisions to easily and quickly allow passengers to load and unload their bicycles or scooters. it also must have provisions to accommodate mobility impaired passengers if it i to be successful and useful.

Please do a fully inclusive search and study to find the most efficient and accommodating rail vehicle.

Thanks for your attention on this issue......roger Kern
Barbara Rusmore  brusmore@gmail.com  2/10/2020

Hello, I am writing to recommend changes in the transit corridor alternatives study. Please add the following measures:
- accessibility by disabled passengers
- effectiveness

--

Dr. Barbara Rusmore
Rusmore and Associates
1429 S. Grand Avenue
Bozeman MT 59715
406-570-5815
brusmore@gmail.com
https://www.barbararusmore.com  --see my paintings!

Vicki Noble  vicki.m.noble@gmail.com  2/10/2020

Lets keep the bike path simple. We do not need to spend limited funds on landscaping and trail art, The areas the path travels through have their own intrinsic beauty, and we should be spending all of our limited funds on function. The trail should be wide enough for e bikes and pedestrians to co exist.

As for rail options, the autonomous road train looks interesting, or if we must use the tracks, an Electric Multiple Unit – Light Rail would be ideal to meet the ideals you have set out for future transportation projects. We should be moving people as our first priority in the most environmentally friendly way.

Thank you for giving the public a voice in this process.
Vicki Noble
854 Gharkey St
Santa Cruz

Doug Huskey  doug.huskey@gmail.com

I approve of the alternatives analysis framework as proposed with one exception. I think the Emissions reduction metric performance measures should include not just vehicle miles traveled but also vehicle hours (total hours in vehicles measures time spent sitting in traffic,
waiting for train crossings, etc.). This is an important environmental and quality of life measure which also has a positive impact on the economy (e.g. more available time to be on the job and not traveling to the job, and more positive attraction of qualified work force due to improved quality of life - i.e. doesn't encourage people to leave because it is just too hard, too long and too expensive to live within a reasonable (< 40 min) commute time to work.)

I think it is important to calculate capital and operating costs for each of the core service alternatives proposed. Note that most rail cost estimates are for the DMU commuter rail (UCS capital costs of $339,000,000), but this service alternative has many downsides including noise, horn usage, lack of convenient stations (passenger boarding requires a station), emissions, intersection blocking during passage, and large set-back requirements which limit the bike pedestrian trail by requiring tree removal, retaining walls, and more expensive construction. A modern electric based alternative including light rail, monorail, and other track based electric options may resolve noise issues but still have limited rider access due to the need for expensive stations. Would these core service alternatives reduce highway 1 gridlock, or significantly lighten the commute load on Hwy 1. Would they have more positive impact than auxiliary lanes which are less expensive? Is funding even available for a .5 to 1+ billion dollar system, and would such a system carry enough ridership to pay for itself or even pay for its annual operating costs?

I am glad to see core service alternatives such as buses, road trains, dual rail and bus which do not require specialized stations yet could take advantage of a contiguous corridor to reduce commute time from/to South County compared to either bus or car on highway 1 (except for dedicated bus lanes - also a good idea).

Transportation planning should focus on addressing congestion and grid-lock where-ever it occurs. A new system should not be implemented (e.g. DMU trains) which compromise or introduce more congestion on surface streets crossing the rail line.

Thank you for your consideration of these suggestions.

Regards,
Doug Huskey

rob hart robfiges64@yahoo.com 2/10/2020

As we become a larger and more urbanized County with a warming climate we need to maximize our low carbon transportation options. Rail transport is a lower carbon alternative to buses. It can handle more bike commuters at peak rush hour times. It offers easier (and flatter) on and off access, which is especially important for people with disabilities as well as bike commuters.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue and my comments regarding it.
The SCC RTC has continued to ask for public feedback in a "best of all possible worlds" format, consequently the public's views have tended to be more of a wishlist than the basis for any sort of plan.

As long as the community does not fully understand the cost of these projects, specifically the requirement for increased taxes and ongoing financial public support for transit infrastructure, they will continue to lobby for the most expensive alternative - a train or some other form of track-driven mass transit. In the past, the RTC has only offered vague claims of state and federal funding, none of which is guaranteed or even identified, and buried the requirement for a voter-approved bond issue in the fine print.

These repeated requests for public input to innumerable studies over the past 20-30 years waste everyone's time and prevent the county from ever making any significant transportation improvements, like support for alternative active transit, highway widening and lane management, increased METRO service, and road repair - all things we can afford to do now!

Nadene Thorne
140 Averitt Street
Santa Cruz 95060
907-590-7996

To Whom It May Concern:

I am voicing my support for the Rail-Trail.

I would also like to see the following scores added to the criteria for implementing the rail-trail corridor.

- **Ease of entry and exit** for people with mobility challenges - I know my parents and disabled brother would find this helpful
- **How many bicycles each carriage can carry** OR **How many bike carriages, per train** - This would be really helpful to know if my friends and I would be able to get on a train especially during commute time
- **Rush-hour average trip time** on the rail corridor vs surface streets or freeway
- **Availability Time-frame** each new transit system can start carrying passengers
- **How well does each of the alternatives** do at getting commuters out of their cars
Personally, my friends and I have enjoyed fast efficient travel on rail in many European cities, NYC, Boston, Sonoma country, Seattle. We understand that...

- Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives.
- Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money.
- Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off.
- Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets.
- Rail transit is the most energy-efficient.
- Rail protects our public ownership of the corridor.
- Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure.
- Rail can get funding and be a part of the larger state rail plan.

Nancie

Nancie Graham
215 Alhambra Ave., Santa Cruz, CA 95062
caffeineachiever@gmail.com
caffeineachiever@yahoo.com

Teri Coppedge ticopppedge@hotmail.com 2/11/2020

I urge you to consider these measures.

1. How well does the option carry bicycles, especially at rush hours, when bike commuters need to be able to count on space?

2. Add a score for rush hour trip time, not just average time. As we all know, an option like rail excels at rush hour travel and competes very favorably with one that must use surface streets.

3. Please consider how well each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their own cars.

4. How soon could a transit system be carrying passengers?

5. How well could it coordinate with state-wide transit plans?

6. Regarding Connector Services:
I suggest implementing an on-demand small shuttle that could be called or scheduled on-line the same day by a passenger anywhere within a defined service area, that would take that person (with a bike, too) to the main corridor or wherever they need to go. Persons near commonly used pick-up sites would be urged, but NOT required, to get themselves to that spot if possible. This has great advantages for persons with some disabilities or small children, and encourages them to use regularly-scheduled transit. (See Rogue Valley Transportation District, Oregon, https://www.ashlandconnector.org/)

I find rail a compelling alternative. It addresses mobility well, runs separately from street travel and its interruptions. It is the most energy-efficient, takes advantage of the already-existing public corridor and infrastructure, and can be part of a large state rail plan.

Thank you for your work and consideration.

Teresa Coppedge

If you talk to a man in a language he understands, that goes to his head. If you talk to him in his language, that goes to his heart. -Nelson Mandela, activist, South African president, Nobel laureate (1918-2013)

Dave Riggs DaveRiggs@quailrun.net 2/11/2020

I am writing to urge the Regional Transportation Commission to make the light rail system between Santa Cruz and Watsonville its highest priority. Anyone who has spent hours stuck in traffic to and from Santa Cruz, knows that the only real solution to the congestion is a workable transportation link between Santa Cruz and Watsonville. Expanded highways and increased bus routes are in no way workable to address the long term problem. While I welcome the idea of a bicycle lane along the train right of way, saying it is a solution to traffic congestion is laughable. I think it is nice to start construction on a bicycle path, but every day we don’t begin in earnest to construct of the light rail system, is a wasted opportunity. The cost of the system will steadily increase and at some point will become too expensive. If we don’t act now with some urgency, it will not be done at all. I fear that our children and grand children will look back a say, “What were you thinking? How come you didn’t build this when you had a chance and when it was affordable?” When I voted for Measure D, I was looking forward to riding the “modern rail system” that was promised. At this point, I was told at the last rally in Santa Cruz that we could get the project started within the next ten years. That’s almost 15 years after the sales tax was increased to start this system. This is an outrage! I don’t want the legacy of our generation to be one of failure and inaction when the clear path forward is so evident.

Dave Riggs

David R. Riggs | 110 Chase Lane, Aptos, Ca. 95003
P: 831.662.9620 | Cell: 831.419.2972 | email: davidrayeriggs@gmail.com
Dave Riggs  DaveRiggs@quailrun.net  2/11/2020

**Rail Now!**

I am writing today to urge the Regional Transportation Commission to make the light rail system between Santa Cruz and Watsonville its highest priority. Anyone who has spent hours stuck in traffic to and from Santa Cruz knows that the only real solution to the congestion is a workable transportation link between Santa Cruz and Watsonville.

Expanded highways and increased bus routes are in no way workable to address the long-term problem. We talk about reducing traffic congestion and our carbon footprint, but the alternatives suggested do neither.

I lived in Washington D.C. when they were building the Metro there. People complained about the disruption of traffic during the construction and the cost. But, today they have a great transportation system that is packed daily with commuters who would otherwise be stuck in traffic. Today, the complaint is that we didn’t do it completely in the first place. The Metro only goes as far as Vienna, Virginia, 15 miles short of Dulles International Airport. Original construction Metro was about $600 million. The construction now underway to build the last 14 miles to the airport is estimated a $5.8 million!

Environmentalist say that we need to encourage housing close to transportation hubs to reduce congestion and reduce our carbon footprint. We have the hubs and we are squandering the opportunity to build the transportation link. How can Santa Cruz County be so far out of touch?

Everyone talks about economic justice, but how can we say that people in Watsonville should be content to spend hours every day stuck in traffic commuting to higher paying jobs in Santa Cruz. Some candidates for office in Santa Cruz County have suggested that alternative to building the light rail is more buses. I would be surprised if any those suggesting this have tried commuting from Watsonville to Santa Cruz by bus.

I welcome the idea of a bike lane along the train right of way, saying it is a solution to traffic congestion is laughable. I think it is nice to start construction on a bicycle path, but every day we don’t begin, in earnest, to construct of the light rail system, is a wasted opportunity.

If we don’t act now, with some urgency, it will not be done at all. I fear that our children and grandchildren will look back a say, “What were you thinking? How come you didn’t build this when you had a chance and when it was affordable?” I don’t want the legacy of our generation to be one of failure and inaction when the clear path forward is so evident.
When I voted for Measure D, I was looking forward to riding the “modern rail system” that was promised. I was told at the last rally in Santa Cruz that we could get the project started within the next ten years. That’s almost 15 years after the sales tax was increased to start this system. This is an outrage! Abraham Lincoln said, “If once you forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem.” Continuing to ask for increase taxes to fund projects and frittering away the money jeopardizes the public confidence. Elected officials and this commission have a moral obligation to deliver on this promise. I say, “Build Rail First and Build it Now!

David R. Riggs | 110 Chase Lane, Aptos, Ca. 95003
P: 831.662.9620 | Cell: 831.419.2972 | email: davidrayeriggs@gmail.com

Saladin Sale saladinssale@gmail.com 2/11/2020

Dear Commission Members:

I write to commend Commission staff on their work to date and to provide input to the proposed Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis. The following are my suggestions for changes to the proposed Analysis Framework.

1. **ECONOMY/Is fiscally feasible**: Add evaluation metric *Projection Reliability*. Description: How reliable are the projected Capital and O&M costs based on number of systems in existence? *High, Medium, Low*

2. **EQUITY/Provide accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all users/Access/Does the project provide transportation access to disadvantaged populations?**: Add: “Ease of entry & exit for those with mobility challenges” *High, Medium, Low*

3. **EQUITY/Provide accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all users**: Change "Transit vehicle miles covered" to "Transit rider miles traveled." The focus of Corridor Transit should be *ridership* with *access improvements* provided by connector services.

4. **EQUITY/Offer reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people/Travel Time/ Does the project improve transportation travel time?**
   - Change "Average transit trip time" to "90th percentile transit trip time" and Add "Average transit trip time during peak hours"

As a Santa Cruz County resident for more than fifty years, I have become a strong supporter of a rail-based transit system on the Transit Corridor with an integrated multi-modal Connector system reaching out to the county from the corridor. Advantages of rail as I see them include:

- Builds on the tremendous value of the existing rail infrastructure
• Uses the full length of corridor without detouring onto surface streets - unaffected by road congestion

• Level boarding means roll-on/off for bikes & wheelchairs and no delays for operating bike racks

• Easily adjusts passenger & bike capacity by adding connected units without requiring additional operators until fully autonomous operation becomes feasible

Thank you for your consideration of this input.

Respectfully,

Saladin Sale
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Cyndi Dawson cdawson@sbcglobal.net 2/11/2020

Dear Commissioners

I’m writing to send a public comment on the draft alternative analysis. I have lived in Santa Cruz since 1999, live in Seabright and work locally as an environmental scientist. The traffic and climate impacts caused by greenhouse gases continue to rise and we need to take bold action to support rail transit for the following reasons:

❖ Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives.

❖ Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money.

❖ Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off.

❖ Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets.

❖ Rail transit is the most energy-efficient.

❖ Rail protects our public ownership of the corridor.

❖ Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure.

❖ Rail can get funding and be a part of the larger state rail plan.
Please stand up and provide a real climate friendly transit option for the citizens of Santa Cruz County by strongly supporting rail transit.

Regards,

Cyndi Dawson

Santa Cruz, CA  95062

david van brink  david.van.brink@gmail.com  2/11/2020

Hello --

Happy to see the Alternatives Analysis under way!

Two comments:
1. It seems there should be some measure for "ridership attraction". This is currently framed only as "capacity". But various modes offer differences especially for choice riders, or those very accustomed to car use. For example, tourists might well flock to a gondola system for its sheer novelty. (When I was last in Manhattan, I rode the Roosevelt Island Aerial over and over just for fun.) And it is well documented that all else being equal, users have a definite preference for rail-based vehicles.

2. Progress is being made to bring the "TIG/m" demo to the SCBRL; it would be valuable to call out which of the Initial List Of Alternatives this corresponds to. Number 10 looks closest, though there are some differences, in particular, the "virtual multi-car" mode for TIG/m.

Respectfully -- David Van Brink / city of santa cruz

david van brink / david.van.brink@gmail.com / 831.332.6077
Mayumi Kosugi mkkdogs@att.net 2/11/2020

Dear Commissioners,

As a home owner in the City of Santa Cruz and a neighbor to the Rail and Trail, I support rail transit for the following reasons: 1) Rail attracts more riders than other proposed alternatives, 2) Rail moves more people at peak commute, faster and for less money, 3) Rail has level boarding, letting bicycles, walkers, strollers, and wheelchairs roll on and off, 4) Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets, 5) Rail transit is the most energy-efficient, 6) Rail protects our public ownership of the corridor, 7) Rail uses our existing rail infrastructure, 8) Rail can get funding and be a part of the larger state rail plan.

Santa Cruz needs a north/south rail option to provide a nonpolluting transportation alternative.

Mayumi Kosugi
95060

Michael Matkin mgfmatkin@gmail.com 2/11/2020

Hello,

I am a resident of Live Oak and a voter. I regularly commute by bicycle to my job at UCSC and have had many close calls with cars while riding, particularly while riding on Eaton/Murray across the harbor bridge and SeaBright.

I feel strongly that the rail trail development should be accelerated to provide a safer transportation alternative to more community members. A safe route with limited interaction with cars will encourage many more people to ride, reducing traffic and environmental impact.

I also feel very strongly that the rail trail keep the option of a train or bus lane to provide public transit from Monterey to Santa Cruz and beyond. A bike trail alone limits our options as a community.

Thank you,

Michael Matkin
Hello,
I am writing in response to the request for public input on the transit (rail) corridor alternatives analysis. First and foremost, the most important consideration when deciding how the right of way should be utilized is equity - how does the proposed solution meet the needs of lower income segments of county residents? And in answering this question, one has to consider which cities does the proposed solution serve. Any proposal that does not include Watsonville is immediately cutting out half of the county's residents. Light rail running from Watsonville to the West Side would provide a more reliable, affordable and timely option for people to get to work. In this way, passenger rail is addressing two problems at once; traffic and the housing crisis. By providing a direct connection between jobs and affordable housing, rail offers immediate relief with technologies that exist today. Not to mention, rail is three times more efficient, is three times more durable, and carries three times as many passengers as 'rubber wheeled vehicles'. Hence the RTC would have to buy 9 busses for every light rail vehicle. I urge the RTC to move forward with passenger rail service that will actually serve more of the county's residents.

Sincerely

Kurt Rosenberger

Pacbell julijim@pacbell.net 2/12/2020

Dear RTC,

Thank you for all of your hard work to bring the vision of rail and trail to the trail construction phase. This combination of light rail (or any other rail based vehicle) and a bike/pedestrian path will clearly serve the majority of residents in Santa Cruz county.

As you evaluate the alternatives against the goals, please keep in mind a few other benefits to effective public mass transit including less reliance on personal automobiles and reclaiming our roads for safe travel by bicycle (not for car storage). When you consider use options, please also think about access to the corridor - whether by integrated transit or by bicycle. Access to the transit available on the corridor should be easy and safe. Transit which does not use roads will be less prone to traffic jams and have a more reliable and predictable schedule.

An electric train which can accommodate a large number of bikes is clearly the alternative which can provide flexible and reliable transit options across the county. Bike for a while, then
hop on the train if needed.

I look forward to using transit on the corridor. Please moved forward without delay.

Regards
Julie Montgomery
Santa Cruz County resident

Sent from my iPad

Albi Romero albi.b.romero@gmail.com 2/12/2020

Hello,

I fully support the rail and trail combination, and feel that not incorporating high capacity public transportation into the plans for the existing corridor would be a short-sighted mistake.

With respect to the options presented in the Alternative Analysis:

Option 10:  Light Rail / Electrical Multiple Unit
In my opinion, this is the best option. I believe that having a higher capacity is important to the economic feasibility of the system and is the only way to have a significant environmental benefit. There is also a community aspect to a shared transit system that is not part of a PRT system. I also support the use of electrical propulsion for environmental reasons, as well as to minimize impact of noise and pollution to those along the corridor. A hydrogen fuel cell would be my preferred power source if it is economically viable.

Option 17:  String rail
Although this is not yet available, it does have the same benefits as option 10. It has the downsides of being more costly to build and not making use of the existing tracks. It may be a reasonable option, however, if obtaining additional ROW is impractical or excessively high construction cost are associated with the narrow portions of the corridor.

Thank you for accepting public input,
Albi Romero

Scott Le Grand varelse2005@gmail.com 2/12/2020

There's no scenario in which local train service is good and an abundance of scenarios where a trail would benefit everyone. Please, no train, yes trail.
Gina Cole <director@bikesantacruzcounty.org> 2/12/2020

Dear Mayor Garcia and City Council Members

I am not going to be able to attend the community meeting this evening.

Some of my concerns are the number of bikes that can be loaded and stored on the rail vehicle and ease of access for folks to put bikes on the vehicle. Looking ahead to more e-bikes, an even heavier bike than most pedal bikes...how to ensure ease of travel with an e-bike.

The measuring of use should not be vehicle miles traveled, rather rider/passenger miles traveled. Additionally, ease of access/on boarding/off boarding for all, folks with walkers or wheelchair?

I would also like to ensure that rail services continue all the way to Watsonville.

Thank you, All.

Gina

--

Gina Gallino Cole
Executive Director
Bike Santa Cruz County
333 Soquel Ave.,
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
(831) 425-0665 office
(831) 840-1884 cell
bikesantacruzcounty.org

Terry Keller terry_keller@comcast.net 2/12/2020

Dear RTC,

In your decision on what mode of transportation to choose for the corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, please be certain to consider:

- getting vehicles off the road, i.e. commuters onto mass transit, especially during rush "hour" traffic (morning, evening and weekends).
- ease of service for people with mobility issues.
- number of bicycles that fit at one time on board, which would be a very important factor during commute times.
Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,
Terry Keller
Santa Cruz, CA

Lowell Hurst lowell.hurst@cityofwatsonville.org 2/12/2020

Here’s a note from one of my constituents who can’t attend the meeting tonight in Watsonville.
Thank you.

“Some of my concerns are the number of bikes that can be loaded and stored on the rail vehicle and ease of access for folks to put bikes on the vehicle. Looking ahead to more e-bikes, an even heavier bike than most pedal bikes...how to ensure ease of travel with an e-bike.

The measuring of use should not be vehicle miles traveled, rather rider/passenger miles traveled. Additionally, ease of access/on boarding/off boarding for all, folks with walkers or wheelchair?

I would also like to ensure that rail services continue all the way to Watsonville.”

Lowell Hurst
Council Member District 3
Former Mayor
275 Main St Suite 400
Watsonville CA. 95076
Office 831-768-3008
Voice mail 831-768-3003

krsandel krsandel@gmail.com 2/12/2020

Dear RTC Board Members,

I just wanted to submit a few comments/concerns about the proposed Rail/Trail Corridor. I would like the RTC to carefully consider making the rail portion as accessible and convenient as possible, particularly in regards to mobility access and bicycle riders. It takes a lot to convince commuters to adopt other transportation options, and it should be as easy as possible for them to do so, otherwise the Rail project will fail for lack of ridership.
I would also like the RTC to more carefully consider what will be needed to adapt public transportation infrastructure to changing climate. This is going to be an increasingly urgent concern going forward, yet so far we’ve done very little do address it.

Thank you for considering my views,

Kristen Sandel

Sarah McMurray sarah.mcmurray@landtrustsantacruz.org 2/12/2020

We received the following suggestion, but I think it was meant for you!

Best,
Sarah

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: J Smith <succotash66@yahoo.com>
Date: Thu, Feb 13, 2020 at 1:44 AM
Subject: QUESTION FROM WEBSITE
To: info@landtrustsantacruz.org <info@landtrustsantacruz.org>

Not sure if you are the correct organization, but I heard on the radio one is requesting suggestions for most use of rail trail between Capitola and SC.
I would like to see wheel chair vattery charging stations so we have more ability to get around independently.

--
Sarah McMurray
Membership Manager
Land Trust Santa Cruz County
617 Water St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
831.429.6116
831.235.9257 (c)
www.landtrustsantacruz.org
Thanks for the open house Tuesday night. Good turnout, lots of new faces, good information. So great to see minds opening up to alternatives.

For the coastal route, the core system I find most attractive is CyberTran. It combines many of the features mentioned in your alternatives as indicated below:

- An elevated system, CyberTran can be built over the top of our existing right-of-way (15). Bikes and pedestrians can use the trail below, retaining natural greenery and trees. Like the gondola (16) it would avoid issues related to surface infrastructure especially the dangers at intersections. But it would also avoid the dangers of rising sea levels and floods. As a system for the future, this must be taken into consideration.

- Like PRT (14) CyberTran is a system of individual vehicles that operate on-demand and non-stop from origin to destination along a fixed route. Vehicles pull out to stations built to the side of the track so that others can pass.*

- Unlike PRT, CyberTran offers larger 20-passenger vehicles that encourage a community experience of public transit, rather than the isolation of cars or private pods. Passengers could put their bicycles or wheelchairs on them. They could also be used to carry light freight.

- Like the light-rail option (10) CyberTran would be popular due to its fast acceleration and pollution-free and quiet operation. CyberTran is solar-powered – its overhead canopy producing more electricity than required, which can be put back on the grid. CyberTran could even become a micro-grid.

- Like micro-shuttle (6) the CyberTran vehicles are autonomous, making them economical to run. They would be manufactured in Richmond, CA in green factories, reducing the carbon cost.

- Options (1) through (7) employ vehicles with tires. Tires cause more resistance when moving, using more energy than vehicles on rails. And micro-plastics fly off of tires into the air we breath, and onto the roads washing into our ocean. Then when the tires wear out, they become a disposal problem. CyberTran runs on rails, its vehicles more light-weight than electric commuter trains.

- The initial costs of building the CyberTran system are offset by the savings in operations, making CyberTran an attractive ROI for private investor funding in partnership with the RTC.
CyberTran currently has a comprehensive proposal for the San Jose transit project from Stevens Creek and Diridon to the airport that is worth looking at. [Airport-Diridon-Stevens Creek Connector | City of San Jose](https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/transportation/transit/airport-diridon-stevens-creek-connector?fbclid=IwAR3F3sfH1jE-vbt8eoyFOQzsfIcWiQ3la5MfsIaL3PNSVs_esSs704zcvOc)

Michael Pisano  mpisano@ucsc.edu  2/13/2020

**Hi Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis,**

If the October TIG/m demo is a success are there plans to quickly implement continued limited service?

To help the success of the Santa Cruz Go program would it be advisable to implement later & earlier METRO service between Watsonville, Aptos, Capitola, Scotts Valley & Santa Cruz? This would also help Hwy 1 congestion as those that start work at 6am & leave after 3pm would be on a bus & not in a car for the afternoon commute back to Watsonville.

Thank you for your time & consideration

------


**Direct Deposit Sign-Up:**  [https://financial.ucsc.edu/Pages/Payroll_Direct_Deposit.aspx](https://financial.ucsc.edu/Pages/Payroll_Direct_Deposit.aspx)

*Micahel Pisano*

UCSC – BAS/SHR/ELR – Leave of Absence Assistant  
Tel:831-459-1867-Fax:831-459-2661– **Confidential LOA FAX:831-401-2322**

**MAC** Appointee (METRO Advisory Committee) 
Eml: mpisano@ucsc.edu / Mail Stop: Staff Human Resources 
Work Schedule/Plan de trabajo: Days/Dias; Mon thru Fri – Hrs; 8am to 5pm 
TKWeb: [http://shr.ucsc.edu/ops/index.html](http://shr.ucsc.edu/ops/index.html) 
SHR = Services, Solutions, Success! Servicios, Soluciones, éxito
Dear Committee

Ideally, Santa Cruz should build an electric light railway on the existing tracks because it's modern, the most accessible plan for people with disabilities, energy efficient, and relatively quiet. This approach can get additional funding and be a part of the statewide rail plan. Furthermore, the alternative wording should cite the total number of transit rider miles travelled, as opposed to counting vehicles with no passengers, and also note that trains can carry considerably more bicycles than buses. The rail and trail combined will best serve Santa Cruz's diverse population.

Jan McGirk  
Portola Dr  
Santa Cruz CA

Tim McGirk  
tim.mcgirk@gmail.com  2/13/2020

- Thank you for taking my opinion into your considerations. I'm a firm believer in using the existing rail track to put in a bike lane and operate an electric people mover of some kind to ease the crush of commuter traffic between Santa Cruz and Watsonville.

However, in your discussions, please make note of the following:

- Please take into consideration that instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled," add a score for 'transit rider miles traveled.' An empty vehicle, save for the driver, covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
- Please do not use buses. Stick to an energy-efficient, electric rail car or tram of some sort. Rail runs separately from street traffic and uses the corridor without interruption; buses can only use part of the corridor and would mostly run on streets. A bus service, instead of a rail, would put more traffic on the streets and defeat the intended purpose of this transit corridor.
- Thank you,

Tim McGirk  
Santa Cruz County Resident (2130 Portola Drive)
Henry Hooker henry.hooker@gmail.com 2/13/2020

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments to the ongoing study.

First, I must admit to confusion regarding the meaning of the "non-contiguous transportation corridor" metric. Is this questioning the risk that is associated with using the right of way for something other than rail? That seems like a HUGE issue, and something that has had bad consequences in other projects. Whatever it is needs to be clearly stated.

My priorities:

- Direct connection at the Southern terminus with CalTrain and High Speed Rail.
- Backbone of the system should be rail, to assure right of way, for speed, for high peak capacity, for ties to state system and funding mechanisms.
- Viability and speed for daily rush hour commuters from South County to Santa Cruz.
- Capacity to carry bikes for those rush hour commuters
- Getting everyone out of cars and into convenient and abundant public transportation.
- Enabling dense housing near the stations
- **Reduced energy usage, emissions, contribution to climate change.**

Thank you for your good work.

Henry Hooker
407 Ocean View Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

---

Brian Peoples brian@trailnow.org 2/13/2020

Please include the following comments to Alternative Analysis:

**Cost of Corridor Closed:**

- What is the cost of the corridor sitting unused?
- What is the loss of economic benefit to local community not have a continuous trail?
- What is increase in climate changing emissions with Trail closed?
- Include the cost of keeping the Santa Cruz Coastal Corridor closed for transportation solution - based on each scenario? How long to implement solution?
- Are you including a metric that measures "WHEN" the Coastal Corridor will be open to transportation solution? For example, removal of tracks and asphalt paving will allow for immediate use of the property for active transportation - while the Mass Transit vehicles are purchased and deployed.
- Is the added cost to build a trail next to railroad tracks being compared to the cost to build a trail next to rubber-wheel transit system?

**Local Neighborhood Impact:**

- How will it affect local communities that currently access the corridor, i.e., fencing for train safety?
- Impact to coastal access?
- What is the aesthetic value?
- What about safety provisions for protecting public from fast moving large vehicles (rail, buses)? Is stopping distance factored into safety calculations? SMART train is a great example of the dangers associated with fast moving trains through neighborhoods.
- Impact to neighborhoods from noise and sight pollution, what are mitigation measures whether train, buses, overhead wires and new lighting?
- In Aptos Village, Parade Ave will not open to Soquel Drive if the railroad tracks remain. The design of Aptos Village traffic follow requires Parade Ave to be opened. If the recommendation is for rubber-wheel vehicles, Parade Ave will open to Soquel Drive. Will you include the impact to Aptos Village traffic flow in the analysis?
- Are the federal guidelines that require a trail and train separation be more than 25 feet - when the train travels 45 mph - being included in the alternative analysis. Will the analysis include the impact to the trail from train versus a rubber-wheel vehicle?
- Are you including likelihood of lawsuits against train or overhead tram system?
- How will Roaring Camp operations be impacted by the two alternative plans and will the cost be included?
- Are you taking into account Measure L, where the City of Capitola voted to not allow any expenditure of city funds or personnel to support a detour of the trail through Capitola Village?

**Highway 1 upgrades:**

- Bus Transit on highway, does it reduce requirements for mass transit on corridor?
- Is the Santa Cruz Coastal Corridor more ideal for short distance travels - that can be accommodated by small transit vehicles?
- How will autonomous driving factor into the scenarios?

**Cost of Mass Transit:**
• Is cost per passenger being included in the analysis?

Funding Opportunities:

• Please identify sources of funds for all alternatives considered.
• In your evaluation of funding sources, are you including an assessment of the "likelihood of getting the funding"?
• According to California Transportation Commission, if RTC pulls rails, they would need to return $11M or appraised value. Due to contamination and other issues with property, can it be evaluated if the property could be sold for $1 to County as a "road" - thereby, only having to return $1 to CTC.
• "Mass Transit" is not necessarily "Government Operated Transit". Can you please include the fact that rubber-wheel transit could be private operators? What would be the cost difference between public fund mass transit and private operated mass transit on each scenario?
• Coastal Corridor is not only valuable transportation property, it is also valuable commercial property that could be exploited to help fund transportation solutions. In the analysis, can you include the possibility of commercial shops if there are rubber-wheel vehicle solutions – since there would be more room along the corridor?
• Since a tax measure is required to support the annual operations of a train, what is the likelihood that the county could garner 2/3s majority vote to pass such measure?

Infrastructure Upgrades:

• Is the strength of trestles and ability to accommodate the heavy train volumes included?
• Parking Garages/Lots for Cars: Is the cost and location of creating parking for cars included in the analysis (e.g., where would a parking garage/lot be built at a Seacliff Station)
• Infrastructure and Security Costs: Are these costs/services included in the analysis (platform stations, train barns, police, emergency services)
• Do you have all the detailed property information - in the way of if the property is an easement or owned by RTC? Will you produce the percentage and specific locations that maybe "lost" to adjacent property owner if rails are removed?
• What is the likelihood that Capitola's historic trestle will be torn down and a new trestle built to accommodate rail and trail?

Best regards,

Brian Peoples  
Executive Director  
TrailNow.org

Brian Peoples brian@trailnow.org 2/13/2020
One more added comment:

Progressive Rail has plans to provide freight service for the dump at Buena Vista Road. If this occurs, there significantly less space for commuter train and trail. Please include the assessment of freight operations continuing from Buena Vista Road to Watsonville.

Where will passenger train station be located in Watsonville and how will this impact Progressive Rail operations?

Brian

jennifer harris-anderson <buzznjen@comcast.net> 2/10/2020

RTC,

Please don’t invest any more funds on a train idea. Use the money saved to provide free METRO Service. Busses are our best alternative when it comes to mass transit—less expensive, can travel on all streets, provides flexibility on routes, high carrying capacity, won’t block intersections. Free up the rail corridor with a ‘Blue Zone’ of healthy transit options. No degradation of the environment and completely protected the entire 32 miles. The RTC at a minimus should put the rail corridor to a popular vote. What are you so afraid of?

Frank Anderson
212 16th Ave
Santa Cruz, Ca. 96062

Ira Schwartz <ischwartz@baymoon.com> 2/7/2020

Hello,

For your upcoming decision, I urge you to consider heavily the benefit of how a train on a dedicated right of way continues to move when traffic is at a standstill during rush and peak hours. I grew up in New York City where anyone can tell you that the subway delivers passengers (including those with mobility issues) faster and more smoothly than a car or a bicycle at peak travel times.

Thank you,

Ira Schwartz
Santa Cruz
From: Contact Request Form <admin@sccrtc.org>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2020 3:35 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: New submission from Contact Form

This Contact Request Form has been submitted by a member of the public to http://sccrtc.org/contact-us/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Marilyn Berg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jub@pacbell.net">jub@pacbell.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Advantages of rail over bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Message</td>
<td>We are ready for passenger rail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Pacbell <julijim@pacbell.net> 2/12/2020

Dear RTC,

Thank you for all of your hard work to bring the vision of rail and trail to the trail construction phase. This combination of light rail (or any other rail based vehicle) and a bike/pedestrian path will clearly serve the majority of residents in Santa Cruz county.

As you evaluate the alternatives against the goals, please keep in mind a few other benefits to effective public mass transit including less reliance on personal automobiles and reclaiming our roads for safe travel by bicycle (not for car storage). When you consider use options, please also think about access to the corridor - whether by integrated transit or by bicycle. Access to the transit available on the corridor should be easy and safe. Transit which does not use roads will be less prone to traffic jams and have a more reliable and predictable schedule.
An electric train which can accommodate a large number of bikes is clearly the alternative which can provide flexible and reliable transit options across the county. Bike for a while, then hop on the train if needed.

I look forward to using transit on the corridor. Please moved forward without delay.

Regards
Julie Montgomery
Santa Cruz County resident

From: Bud Colligan <bud@colligans.com> 2/13/2020

Dear Guy,

This would be thoughtful input into the Alternatives Analysis study. Perhaps you could forward to the study leaders.

Regards,

Bud


sorting out rail-bus differences

Here's a crucial passage from the book I'm working on, though it may will end up in the next book rather than this one [Human Transit]. The topic is emotive, so I'm trying to be very carefully factual here. I welcome your critiques in comments. If you disagree on a matter of fact, please provide a reference to a source.

In 2009, the then-popular [but now defunct] blog the Infrastructurist asked its readers whether streetcars are better than buses, and why. Readers came up with 36 responses (listed verbatim here (https://humantransit.org/2011/02/sorting-out-rail-bus-differences-endnotes.html)) that formed a good summary of popular perceptions about the rail-bus distinction.

Of the 36 reasons, only six refer to an intrinsic difference between bus and rail technologies. All the others fall into two categories, which I'll call misidentified differences and cultural feedback effects.
Misindentified Differences

In your city, the rail system has lots of differences from the buses, including technological differences. But that doesn’t mean that all these distinctions are true rail-bus distinctions. For example:

- **Propulsion: electric vs internal combustion.** In most North American cities that have both bus and rail, the rail is electric but the buses use internal combustion (diesel, “clean diesel,” or various forms of natural gas). Electric motors have obvious advantages – in emissions, noise, acceleration, and comfort – but none of these are true rail vs. bus differences. Rail can be run by internal combustion, and buses can be electric. If you want to compare your electric rail option with a bus option, compare it to electric trolleybuses. If you want to compare your internal-combustion buses with a rail option, compare them to internal-combustion rail options such as the Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU).

- **Mixed-flow vs exclusive-lane operation.** Transit speed and reliability are mostly a result of how much you stop and what can get in the way. Rail is more often run in exclusive rights of way, but some streetcars run in mixed traffic and some buses run in exclusive lanes. Monorails never get stuck in traffic, but neither do buses in Brisbane, Australia’s busway system (https://humantransit.org/2009/05/brisbane-a-short-tour-of-the-south-east-busway.html). Most city buses can get stuck in traffic, but so can any streetcar, tram, or light rail vehicle that runs in a mixed traffic lane. (A major problem for BRT in North America is that people keep taking junkets to Latin America, where BRT is powerful but the economic context is too different, rather than to Brisbane, where they could see high-end BRT working in a wealthy city.)

- **Off-board “proof of payment” fare collection vs. “pay the driver” fare collection.** Fare-collection style has big psychological effects. “Pay the driver” slows down boarding and is a greater hassle for all concerned. Some rapid transit systems (rail and bus) provide paid areas with faregates, eliminating this delay. The other solution is “proof of payment,” which means that you buy a ticket on the platform (or already have a valid ticket) but you only show it if a roving “fare inspector” asks to see it. If you don’t have one, you pay a fine. Rail is more likely to use “proof of payment” than buses, but there are exceptions both ways, and there’s no necessary link between the rail-vs-bus choice and the fare collection system. High-capacity bus systems are beginning to shift to “proof of payment” fare collection to eliminate fare-related boarding delay. **UPDATE:** San Francisco now uses proof of payment on its entire bus system.

- **Frequency and Span.** Your whole rail transit system may be frequent, while some your buses aren’t, and in that case, you’ll naturally associate frequency with rail. As we saw here (https://humantransit.org/2010/08/basics-the-case-for-frequency-mapping.html), a good Frequent Network map, which shows both frequent rail and frequent buses, will clear up that confusion. Buses can be very frequent, while some rail services can run infrequently or peak-only. (We usually call those commuter rail.)
Cultural Feedback Effects

A community’s attitudes toward rail and bus technologies can easily affect the way they are operated and presented. In short, people who believe that rail is better than buses will tend to act in ways that make that belief true. For example:

- **Differences in investment or care.** A community that believes that buses are only for poor people, or that rail is the mode of the future, will under-invest in buses as opposed to rail, producing a difference in quality that will reinforce that belief. It may also hold bus operations staff to lower standards than rail staff, and encourage other cultural differences between bus and rail operations that become real for the customer, but are not intrinsic to the bus-rail distinction.

- **Perceptions of permanence.** If you don’t stop to think about it, rails in the street will make a service feel permanent, especially if you’re used to hearing people tell you that rails imply permanence. History clearly shows that rail systems do stop running if their market disappears. True permanence lies in the permanence of the market, and that lies in the pattern of development [See Human Transit Chapter 14].

- **Perceptions of legibility.** The notion that a bus might do something unpredictable and a railcar won’t is also a cultural feedback effect, typically the result of insufficiently clear and compelling information about the bus network. It is quite possible to build bus services with such a high level of investment in infrastructure, such as stops and stations, that the routing is as obvious as a rail line’s would be; the [Los Angeles Orange Line](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orange_Line_%28Los_Angeles_Metro%29) bus rapid transit system is a good example.

- **Regulatory differences.** Government regulation often enforces different rules for road transport as opposed to rail transport. These regulations are themselves a kind of cultural feedback, differences in habit and history between agencies that regulate roads and those that regulate rail. By enforcing different standards and safety requirements, these regulations can cause outcomes that amplify the apparent difference between road-based and rail-based transit.

- **Different potential for mission-creep.** If you build a stretch of road for a busway, there’s always a danger that somebody might try to open it to cars. If you don’t trust your government to protect the stated purpose of a facility, this can be a major decision factor. This issue applies, however, to the narrow range of cases in which a road or lane is being built that could be useful to cars but is closed to them. It is not an issue where the proposal is to reallocate existing roadspace from cars to transit, nor when building a higher-end busway whose design makes it useless to cars even if they were allowed on it.
Intrinsic Bus-Rail Differences

When we set aside those two categories and look at the differences that really follow, intrinsically, from the rail-bus distinction, there appear to be seven, and only the first three of them are always to rail’s advantage:

- **Capacity.** Where demand is high, rail can serve that demand at a higher ratio of passengers to on-board staff, which means that once you absorb the (often large) construction cost, you will be able to offer greater capacity for a given operating cost. A transit vehicle that’s too crowded to board doesn’t meet any of our seven desires for useful service, so this point is often decisive in favor of rail.

- **Ride quality.** Ride quality in buses is improving, and guided busways may give buses an even more rail-like feel, but new rail systems will probably always have an advantage with their smoother running surface. Is the smooth ride of rail indispensable to a useful network? This can be a tough question whose answer may vary from one community to another.

- **Limited energy-efficiency and emissions consequences** tied to the difference between tires and steel wheels. Again, the primary factor governing energy-efficiency and emissions is propulsion (electric vs internal combustion), which is not intrinsic to the rail-bus difference. However, there is a small range of differences that arise from the physics of steel-on-steel vs tire-on-road operation, and that favor the former.

- **Noise from wheel friction.** Most noise impacts are due to internal combustion, which either rail or buses may use, so that’s a misidentified difference. Rail transit lines that intersect streets may be required to install noisy crossing signals — a valid response to the extreme weight of commuter rail trains but more controversial as applied to light rail. These regulatory requirements may be cultural feedback effects. But rail has a further noise disadvantage that really is intrinsic: the tight fit between steel wheel and rail causes noisy friction when going around curves, especially when going fast.

- **Some variable cost differences.** Broadly speaking, bus-based projects that use portions of existing roadway will be much cheaper than building rail for those same segments would be. Beyond that, costs for bus vs. rail projects can be hard to compare. Capital costs for rail include vehicles, while a busway is sometimes run with an existing bus fleet. Certain bus-rail comparisons in certain corridors may turn up significant differences in operating cost that may be valid in that situation, but need to be checked carefully to ensure that they assume the same factors on both sides.

- **Maneuverability around obstacles** is a specific issue for rail in mixed traffic, usually light rail or streetcars. In mixed traffic, minor obstructions routinely occur in a lane, especially if the lane is adjacent to on-street parking. People stop in the lane to make deliveries, get into and out of taxis, and parallel-park. Accidents and breakdowns happen. If these events block a streetcar, the streetcar is stuck. A bus, in the same situation, can often go around the obstruction and continue.

- **Ability to extend existing infrastructure.** If you’ve already built rail on a large portion the length of a travel corridor, it may be logical to build rail on the rest, so as not to create a
technologically required connection. On the other hand, busways can often eliminate extra connections because buses can run through the busway but then flow out onto ordinary streets. In each case, an advantage goes to the technology that makes better use of the infrastructure that already exists, whether road or rail.

Of course, in a particular transit debate, you may not have all of the choices that I’ve articulated here. Still, it’s important to remember that most of the things you hear about why rail is better than buses are not true in the abstract, as facts of geometry or physics that follow from intrinsic differences between roads and rails.

It may very well be that rail is culturally better than buses in your city, in which case all you’re really saying is that people in your city think rail is better than buses and will therefore tend to act in ways that make that true. If you’re interested in appealing to your current population, and motivating them to make investment decisions based on their current perceptions about the benefits of rail, that may even be a good reason to build rail even if you don’t need its intrinsic benefits.

But if you’re thinking in longer-range terms, don’t forget: Attitudes, assumptions and perceptions will change over time. Physics and geometry won’t.


Christine Weir chrisweir@baymoon.com 2/13/2020

I am writing to urge you to adopt a rail vehicle for the rail corridor between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. Rail vehicles (light rail train or tram) would be the most climate-friendly. A light-rail vehicle could use our existing rail infrastructure and would therefore be the quickest to implement, as well as protect our public rights to the corridor. It’s important to have a solution that is easy to use (ie. level-boarding for bikes, wheelchairs, strollers). It needs to provide a reliable schedule that people can depend upon, and not be subject to the vagaries of rush hour traffic. We have a wonderful opportunity to take advantage of the rails and corridor that are already in place! Let’s not lose this chance to reduce our traffic problems AND reduce our carbon footprint.

- Christine Weir, Santa Cruz
Chick Webb  chick@chickwebb.net  2/13/2020

I am writing to provide input on the TCAA:

1) I am opposed to any and all rail-based solutions as they are too expensive (to build and maintain), rigid, and do nothing to solve the significant last-mile problem that a solution confined to the corridor will inevitably have.
2) I am opposed to any solution that does not include a _continuous_ parallel recreational trail or that results in significant diminution of the corridor's usability for bicycles & pedestrians.
3) I support the use of the corridor for autonomous electric micro-shuttles, as a system could easily be designed that would use the same vehicle for both long-distance and last-mile transport. The infrastructure costs of this solution would be minimal, since the vehicles would be light weight and use rubber tires. It could employ intelligent technology to enable a (semi) on-demand use model, maximizing convenience, utilization and efficiency. The use of "passing places" (a la Scotland's single track roads - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Single-track_road) would allow two-way traffic to use the same right-of-way, minimizing the amount of lateral space required and ensuring that a continuous parallel trail could be built as well. It could also safely co-exist with bicycle/pedestrian traffic on a parallel trail due to the lower speeds of the vehicles.

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in.

Chick Webb
Rio Del Mar, CA

Patricia Fox  pitterfox@yahoo.com  2/13/2020

A comment to the TRANSIT CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS:

At the open house last Tuesday, I was impressed by the analysis tables, diagrams and documents illustrating that all aspects of the transit corridor had been carefully considered.

It might be wise, though, to concede this corridor will not be able to provide all aspects of transportation from south county to north county. There is backing for the revival of freight trains, and for a swift and efficient passenger line, and for a bicycle/pedestrian trail. And analysis studies, done with the best of intentions, can prove unreliable when the finished product is presented. And we’re talking miles and miles of the finished product.
I live in Capitola and walk the rails most days. I do believe the solution in figuring out just which alternatives should be considered and which should be “taken off the table” depends largely on what the finished product looks like and how it works.

Am I correct that there are two dominate plans? One being the “Rail/Trail” which includes the existing railroad with a bicycle/pedestrian trail beside it, and the other being the “Greenway” concept which converts the whole easement into a bicycle path with a separate pedestrian path running alongside it?

If this is correct, I would suggest two full scale models be built, perhaps 100’ long each, in close proximity to each other so the public can see exactly what these concepts look like and how well they will really work. One location that might work well is the section of rails in Capitola between Monterey Avenue and the rail bridge over Soquel Creek. It’s about a 400 foot long area and is adjacent to the Capitola Village parking lot for ease of access for visitors. I’m sure there are other good locations, I just know this one.

These full scale models would have a limited lifetime of six months from start of construction (two months) to open to the public (four months) to demolition (one month), the tracks being returned to their current condition, sans weeds and trash.

This would save time and money for the proponents of both sides. The work would be done by both professionals and volunteers that cheer their side as the best solution. Funding would be grass-roots with assistance from the commercial entities that want to see their solution win.

If the future holds a light-weight elevated passenger rail system, it would be easy to see which model could be easily converted to accommodate that possibility.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to share my views.

Pitter Fox, Capitola resident for over 40 years. 320 1/2 McCormick Ave. 462-2061

Friday 2/14/2020 TCAA Comments
Sean Shrum seanshrum@gmail.com
My concern is that continued reviews of the project will slow or stop progress towards a plan for affordable, reliable transportation for our most overlooked community members. Seniors, school children, disabled individuals, and working parents need a reliable transportation system for their own independence.

Recently I met Haben Girma, Harvard Law’s first deaf, blind graduate. Something she makes clear is that early on in her life she was given tools to help her succeed. This transportation plan is a tool that our community needs towards there own independence.
Good evening all parties,

My name is Shawn O'Donnell. I am submitting my input on the topic of the Rail Trail community input.

Let me briefly state my current situation. I am a long time resident of Santa Cruz county dating back to 1974 when my wife and I moved into town to start our married life. In that time we have resided in almost every part of this county from Boony Doone to Watsonville. We have raised our family and now we are watching our grandchildren growing up here too. In that time I have witnessed the evolution of transportation in this county first hand.

I am a recent retiree from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District. Three years as a bus maintenance mechanic and seventeen years as Fleet maintenance supervisor. My total career in the transportation industry can be looked at as thirty plus years including other experience over the hill.

I was in on the ground floor of the transit district converting from Diesel powered buses to natural gas buses, during which the transit district was still trying to find and construct a new "home base" of operations, bus parking and maintenance. The District was suffering the effects what I came to call "The Curse of Loma Prieta". That earth quake of 1989 destroyed the brand new state-of-the-art transit facility that was only 3 years old. That facility in Watsonville was then condemned, boarded up and put the District on a THIRTY YEAR QUEST to regain what it had lost to Loma Prieta. The District was running all over the county renting "shacks" and run down garages here and there to continue operations. The length of time for this quest was mostly due to enormous political push back from every neighborhood that was approached. No one wanted that noisy stuff in their "back yard."

Now you are wondering what all this has to do with the Rail Trail subject? Very simple, In all this experience I briefly shared with you I have come to realize that infrastructures such as this one proposed has tremendous real issues.

1. THE REALITY OF IT USEFULLNESS BY THE PUBLIC. I read this week that Transit ridership as of this day is down across the nation. In theory, public mass transit should be working, but in reality it doesn't seem to be the case. We see the "Conga line" (as one of the Metro Transit Board members themselves called it) form at La Selva Beach, Mar Monte Ave on Hiway 1 heading north until pretty much Morrissey Blvd. A large percentage of which continue on over the hill to Silicon Valley. Trust me, they are not going to ride any rail system going up the coast from Watsonville to Davenport. Heck, the Transit District has a park and ride that hardly was used for years until the Hi tech companies over the hill started suppling their own buses to take them nonstop to and from work to park and ride lots. A public transit system can no longer compete with that in this geographic area. Times, they have changed again. Don't get me wrong. I am not bad mouthing those who are on any board of directors trying to deal with the transportation dilemma. I was part of the process as well and know full well how hard they work how hard it is to get anything done in this current climate of opinion and ideas. There is the idea that many of the good people of Santa Cruz County will commute to there local jobs this way. Really? We are a culture that loves our cars and the freedom and autonomy that it brings us. Fun facts to know. The employees of Santa Cruz Metro are offered a free bus pass id card for them and their immediate family members. I was the only one in the entire
maintenance department that used it at all and even not that much. The rail system is not going to provide any better transportation deal than that.

2. THE REUSE RECYCLE THEORY. The image being projected is simply a matter of using a line that has already been built. Kinda of simple. The feeling of reuse and recycle something that already exists sounds right. But once the architects and engineers come back and say that new "regulations" now have to be met, you are in a game of reinventing and constructing the wheel. Trust me again! All the bridges and trestles will have to be rebuilt to code and federal and state regulations. Forget that the iron tracks and ties will have to go as well. Folks, we basically will be building this from the start for a very very long time and a very expensive "overbudget" with little to no guarantee of ridership. (fun facts to know). Mass transit buses nation wide retrieve only about 25 to 30% of operating cost from the fare box. The feds, state and county pick up the rest with the feds being the lions share. The only thing that is possibly reusable is the track bed, or the existing rail cut. But again when the ground seismic study comes back to say that there is unstable earthquake sensitive areas in the existing cut, we are all back to the drawing board. $$$ My experience has seen this

3. WHO IS GOING TO OPERATE THIS SYSTEM? The cost of living is too high to attract a expert competent work force to Try finding a primary care doctor to take you on as a new patient. PAMF mentioned they can't keep doctors because once the doctor realizes the cost of living ratio is as high as it is, they are off to greener pastures. We have the same problem with qualified technicians and bus operators. Work force support will be a massive problem. 

I could go on for much longer than I have already but I hope you get the idea. Now here's my pitch. Drop the dual purpose approach of the rail/trial idea and make it the most amazing bike and walk trail in the West Coast.

1. Many more of the components are in place and I mean in place to stay. Santa Cruz is a Tourist Town second only to a University Town. The rail line is already riddled with killer Hotels and restaurants along the way. More and more people are biking to work and that makes it portal to portal. Electric bikes are on the upswing. A person can easily bike from Live Oak to the West side with little to no competing with cars. But the big plus I see it that people would come from all over Monterey Bay and likely California just to take a long fairly level bike ride and stay at a hotel eat at restaurants and not compete with a train passing by them. That would ruin their trip for sure

2. MUCH EASIER TO IMPLEMENT. Existing bridges and trestles would more likely be used. Aptos can deal better with that idea and buy in on this

3. MORE REALISTIC USE FOR THE MONEY SPENT..

I'm sorry. I'm out of time as this is almost midnight. contact me back if you desire more input. Shawn O'Donnell
s_shawn@sbcglobal.net

Krista Corwin <krista.m.corwin@gmail.com>

Hi Ginger and team,
Thank you for taking our comments into consideration. I’d like to throw my support behind a zero-emissions train with plenty of capacity for bikes. The Bike-Train-Bike model sounds great. If there was a way to pay for your ride via your phone (Venmo/QR scanner, or a new app designed just for SC transit), that would do a lot increase ridership, especially among young people, tourists, and new riders.

All the best,
Krista
--

Krista Corwin
MA Sociology
University of California, Davis

Eva Holt-Rusmore  eholrusmore@gmail.com 2/15/2020

Dear RTC,

Please see my public comment on the transit corridor below - I know that you are committed to providing an excellent alternative, thank you. Below I have listed some ways in which I know this excellence will better serve all of our community members - please add these missing elements to the analysis;

1. Add score and An examination and recommendation made for maximum **quantity of bicycles** **each vehicle can carry** so that we are promoting alternative transportation on and off the rail.

2. Add score and Recommendations and prioritization for **ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges**, as these members of our community face significant barriers to accessing good, services and care.

3. Add a score for “**transit rider miles traveled**”
4. Add a score for **rush hour trip time**
5. Add a score for **how soon** a new transit system could be installed/start carrying passengers
6. Add a score for measure **how well** each alternative would do at **getting commuters out of their cars**

Thankyou!!

Warmly,
Eva Holt
112 20th Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA
95062
8312510996
Greetings,

I am writing to go on record regarding the proper development of the Rail Trail, and the potential for a passenger train on the corridor.

There are many issues that could cripple this project, exacerbating our transportation woes, and creating a black hole of wasted public finds.

Pedestrian use and bicycle commuting are mutually exclusive. A glaring example of this issue is the Arana Gulch trail. It is a disaster of design (far too narrow with multiple blind spots). I have witnessed numerous near accidents on that path. We must have separated bike and pedestrian paths along the rail corridor for the trail to be viable, safe, and truly useful. Each of these separate paths need to be at least 8' wide. This is a critical design feature that could make THE difference between a quaint but marginally useful investment, and what would be the grandest, most useful public works project this County has seen in 50 years.

I believe the train is doomed to be a financial black hole, and it will make our traffic problems far worse: The numerous railroad crossings on our already gridlocked streets would be in constant use. This would cripple car traffic. During commute hours, it takes 4 or more cycles, and 10 minutes to get through the Seabright and Murry intersection. If the rail crossing was in use this would be far worse. It is a single branch line, and making it into a remotely functional commuter train would require 2 rail lines, and/ or countless spurs for passing. Construction of a second line would preclude functional room for Peds and bikes. Using a (primarily) single branch line for the train would relegate it to uselessness for commuting; It would only be able to make 1 trip every 1.5 to 2 hours. The cost of building the infrastructure and maintaining a viable rail service is prohibitive. There will never be enough ridership to pay for such an enormous expenditure. The SMART rail line in Marin/ Sonoma is a case in point. At $600 million in construction costs, it is on track to a 200 year payoff. It simply does not support itself. It's largest source of income is from a local sales tax, not ridership.

I advocate "rail banking". It is a crime that the corridor has gone unused for so many years. Let's build the trails now, and study the viability of the train very carefully. We have nothing to lose by taking this approach, and so much to gain.

Sincerely,

Tom Davis
CEO. Co- Owner
Pacific Edge Climbing Gym
(831) 464-9284 Santa Cruz
Comments:

Keep building that trail!

On the rail, the core services options for the rail that are best are:

# 10 - Light Rail Electric Unit (EMU)
# 13 - Tram (Trolley Street Car)
# 8 - Iner City Rail

This is all possible, let's stop subsidizing the automobile and have efficient public transportation.

Submitted by:

Name: William Marinoff
Address: 222 Santa Cruz Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
Phone Number: 
E-mail: William.GCruzio.com

You may submit written comments today or to the address below by mail or email:

Santa Cruz RTC
Attn: Shannon Munz
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 460-3200
transitcorridoraa@scrtc.org
Comments: As a lifelong resident of Santa Cruz, I am very excited about the rail & trail project. I think that it would be a huge benefit to the community for there to be a electric powered light rail connecting Watsonville to Davenport with low to free fare. I stress how to Free Fare so that the train can be a resource accessible to working people whom could benefit most from this kind of public transit, and I say this in hopes that local, state, and national levels of Government begin to shift subsidies from the auto industry and Start putting them towards Sensible, Sustainable, Solutions such as this one! In addition I would envision the train running back and forth as frequently as possible All day long.

Submitted by:

Name: Simon Munno
Address: 222 San Juan Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
Phone Number: 
E-mail: 

You may submit written comments today or to the address below by mail or email:

Santa Cruz RTC
Attn: Shannon Munz
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 460-3200
transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RTC
TRANSIT CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Comments: I am very proud to support the construction of a rail and trail to connect counties/cities in the Monterey Bay & the introduction of an electric light rail between Santa Cruz & Watsonville would alleviate major commuting problems for those workers who rely on bus or other means of transportation, as these aren't affordable, and traffic adds unfair time onto the beginning & end of each work day & to have a rail connecting cities with a few stops in key locations within Watsonville & S.C. would be best. The fare should be very low or free to encourage folks to use an environment friendly service such as this as well as respect the very tight budget so many working-class community members live with. P.S. - room for bikes, and the ecological benefits of an electric light rail go without saying!!! Respect working families.

Submitted by:

Name: Gabriel Carr
Address: 111 Windsor St.
Santa Cruz, CA
Phone Number: 408-997-7004
E-mail: gabecarr27@gmail.com

You may submit written comments today or to the address below by mail or email:

Santa Cruz RTC
Attn: Shannon Munz
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 460-3200
transitcorridorae@sccrtc.org
Comments: I am extremely excited by the prospect of an electric light rail to allow easy, convenient, accessible transportation between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. As of now, commuting to and from is not as very reasonable or efficient. I envision a light rail that is affordable for daily use and whose cost doesn't require an excessive amount of time planning for the commuter to get somewhere on time. As it stands, traveling between cities is time-intensive, expensive, and complicated. An electric light rail is a huge benefit to the environment, reducing the amount of carbon-emitting vehicles on the road every day. That's why I am honored to support something that supports all communities in the county as well as the environment.

Submitted by:

Name: Paige Davis
Address: 103 Redwood Drive
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone Number: (831) 706-8468
E-mail: paigedavis@gmail.com

You may submit written comments today or to the address below by mail or email:

Santa Cruz RTC
Attn: Shannon Munz
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 460-3200
transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org
Hello,

I realize the public input period for comments on the draft alternatives analysis framework is past. I have been out of state for a number of weeks and apologize that I only yesterday got to look at the draft documents.

I noticed errors in the description of core service alternative #16 "Gondola" and thought it might be useful to acquaint you with some basic information about cable-propelled transit, to properly understand where these transit technologies work and where they do not. I am happy to share Cable Car Confidential, a manual produced by The Gondola Project on application of cable propelled transit. As a purchaser of the manual, I am also entitled to a free consulting session with one of the authors, and I would be happy to assign that consulting time to you.

To summarize: There are basically two kinds of top-connected CPT systems - fixed cable and detachable cable. There are also bottom-connected systems (funiculars, etc. - SF cable cars and the Oakland airport BART connector are examples of these). The fixed cable systems are limited to two vehicles, one moving in each direction, and can have very large capacity, such as the Roosevelt Island Tramway in NYC or Portland OR. The detachable cable systems have virtually unlimited number of vehicles, depending on length of the run, such as systems in Medellin Colombia, La Paz Bolivia, and Hong Kong.

CPT is not even remotely feasible as a core transit alternative on the rail corridor for the following two reasons:

- Speed is typically only 15-20 mph, which is not practical for the length of the corridor. Most existing CPT systems are under 3 miles in length.
- Cost of CPT construction is more affected by the number of stations than by the overall length. The rail corridor is not straight, thus requiring what are called "angle stations" to provide for turning along the route. Angle stations can also serve as passenger stations, but passengers or not they are a significant expense. With the number of turns along the corridor this would make CPT a non-starter in regards to economic feasibility, even if we disregarded speed.

CPT compares well to other transit alternatives when the route is fairly straight, and when other alternatives would require bridges to cross bodies of water or highways or rail lines, significant purchase of right-of-way, or would require more circuitous routing to overcome significant change in elevation.

However, CPT does deserve consideration under Connector Services, where it was not mentioned at all. Anywhere where a bridge would have to be built to provide direct connection to the corridor (e.g. Cabrillo College, Soquel Drive medical campuses, Green Valley Rd at Main Street area of Watsonville...) a cable system will almost always be less expensive.

I hope this is helpful. Feel free to contact me if you would like to get more information or take advantage of a free consultation from The Gondola Project. I have attached a brief article I wrote over a year ago that summarizes a few more key points and includes links to other information.

Len Beyea
Former City and Regional Planner, Consulting Energy Engineer
831-588-6556
Cable-propelled Transit – An Affordable and Environmentally-Friendly Transportation Technology

by Len Beyea, CEM, HBDP, BEAP, LEED-AP

Cable-propelled transit (CPT), is a transportation technology that moves people or freight in motor-less vehicles propelled by a cable. Sometimes referred to simply as cableways or ropeways, CPT has been around for a long time, used by the ancient Chinese as far back as 250 BC, by ancient Romans to move freight and equipment and construct bridges, and used regularly in mining and timbering operations for centuries. With the invention of steel cables in the mid-1800s, system designs advanced quickly and more systems came into use for transporting people. Modern systems all use steel cables.

There are two main configurations of CPT – top-supported systems, and bottom-supported systems. Top-supported systems are most familiar to people in the US as ski lifts and resort gondolas, plus urban transit systems including the Roosevelt Island tramway in NYC and the Portland aerial tram. Examples of bottom-supported systems in the US include San Francisco’s cable cars, Pittsburgh’s Duquesne Incline, Oakland Airport’s BART connector, and LA’s Angel’s Flight. However, systems are scarce in the US compared to Europe, Asia, and South America, where CPT is more widely used for urban transportation.

For the purpose of considering options for Santa Cruz County, we will limit our discussion to top-supported systems. Of these, there are two principal types: suspended vehicles that are detachable from the cable, typically many vehicles of smaller capacity, with a cable that runs continuously and has potential for multiple stations along the route; and suspended vehicles that have fixed cable attachments, consisting of one larger vehicle going in each direction, with each starting and stopping at the same time, and typically serving just two stations at either end of the cableway, although there are a few systems in existence that include a common midway station.

CPT is not a practical alternative to rail or bus transit in the rail corridor itself because 1) it is too slow for such a long route, and 2) the need for a large number of turning points along the route would increase the cost to the point it would not be competitive. However, where CPT does present some intriguing opportunities is as a connecting transit system between the rail corridor and other destinations. Even for connecting transit, it would only be advantageous in certain areas: where there is no existing direct surface road connection, where there is significant elevation change, and/or where other modes would require bridge construction. Such routes might include connections between the rail corridor and

- Cabrillo College
- the UCSC campus, with one or more intermediate stops in downtown Santa Cruz
- the hospital and medical office campuses along Soquel Drive
- the west Main Street and Green Valley Road area of Watsonville.

If you have never heard of cableways being used for transit, your first impression may be that this is a ridiculous idea – nobody is going to use a ski lift chair for transit. Modern CPT is qualitatively and quantitatively different from ski lifts, and modern designs provide significant amenities (like heating, lighting, and wheelchair anchors) and sophisticated safety features (like anti-swell stabilizers,
Cable-propelled transit systems have the following advantages:

- Cheaper to construct than bridges, where a highway or body of water has to be crossed
- Cheaper to construct than a new road where slopes exceed 7%, requiring circuitous routing or switchbacks
- Less expensive per mile than a lane of freeway, a light rail line, ATS or monorail
- Dedicated elevated guideway means no conflict with other forms of transportation, and no collisions
- Higher passenger/hour capacity than buses or single-car light rail systems
- The most energy-efficient motorized transport in the world. This is due not just to the electrical propulsion system, low rolling resistance, and relatively lightweight vehicles, but also because cable vehicles act as counterweights to each other, so any energy to overcome elevation difference between two points is negated by one vehicle moving downward for every vehicle moving upward.
- Very quiet. Electric propulsion power is provided at a station, not at vehicles
- Very small footprint for support towers
- Stations can be multi-modal, with cableway station typically at the top of a station structure and other modes (monorail, ATS, rail, bus) on lower levels
- Easements over property are less expensive than outright purchase and demolition of property required by new roads or surface rail lines
- Automated operation, typically with one attendant at each station, or remote monitoring of completely automated stations
- Continuous operation with detachable gondolas – headways as close as every 12 seconds (5/minute)
- Very small visual profile, with almost no obstruction of daylight
- Attractive to tourism
- Relatively short construction times

Cableways have the following disadvantages:

- Slow operating speed, making them impractical for distances of more than 3 miles in urban systems. Most top-supported CPT systems operate between 15 and 20 mph, with maximum speeds of about 24 mph. However, this compares well to the average speed of vehicles driving in city traffic with stop signals at intersections, and is not particularly important for short
distances. CPT is also advantageous when a straight-line cable route is compared with a road that winds back and forth to ascend a steep slope.

- More expensive than bus on existing roadway. However, generally competitive with new roadway, and less expensive per mile than other dedicated guideway transit systems.
- Adding turns to a cable route adds cost. This cost can be minimized by combining turning points ("angle stations") with station stops. CPT generally works best where the route can consist of no more than 3 straight lines, with no more than 1 angle station per km, and angle stations combined with station stops.
- In the US, insurance companies haven’t figured out how to quantify risk for cable systems, so have been reluctant to underwrite them. The few systems in the US tend to be self-insured. This is not an issue outside the US and may be changing as new systems come on line.

Cost of CPT varies with total length of system (longer is generally less expensive/mile), number and frequency of stations, number of angle stations, cost of right-of-way, and topography.

Here in Santa Cruz County, the use of cable gondola systems to provide interconnections to other transit systems, forming part of an integrated transit network, presents opportunities for a truly sustainable and comprehensive transportation system:

- CPT would be independent of existing streets and congestion, and can run on routes selected for optimal access without being restricted to existing roads or rights-of-way
- CPT can provide efficient connection between a transit system on the rail corridor and many other principal destinations in the County, forming part of a comprehensive transit network
- CPT can provide a less expensive connection to any destination that requires crossing over a highway or a body of water
- CPT can be added incrementally and can be built more quickly than other modes

Cable-propelled transit is proven, safe, and has lower energy consumption per passenger mile and lower lifetime environmental impacts than every other motorized transportation system.

Links to additional information:

http://gondolaproject.com/system-index/
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aerial_tramway
https://www.curbed.com/2017/9/21/16340394/urban-gondolas-cable-cars-cities
Dianne blueiris@gmail.com
RTC Commissioners and Staff,
I strongly support energy efficient passenger RAIL transit on the SC County rail corridor. The AA study is critical for determining the best type of vehicle to meet the needs of residents and businesses far into the future. I agree with the Friends of the Rail & Trail that the AA study should:

- Add a score for the ease of entry and exit for people with mobility challenges.
- Add a score for how many bicycles each vehicle can carry, so bike commuters don’t get left behind at rush hour. That is more useful than studying how many bikes could be carried over 24 hours by the whole system.
- Instead of "transit vehicle miles traveled" add a score for ‘transit rider miles traveled.’ An empty vehicle covering lots of miles doesn’t help anyone.
- Instead of average trip time, add a score for rush hour trip time. Not all the proposed alternatives can use the whole rail corridor. Some have to use surface streets. A vehicle that goes fast at midday but get stuck during rush hour traffic isn't so great.
- Add a score for how soon each proposed new transit system could be installed and start carrying passengers.
- Add a score to measure how well each of the alternatives would do at getting commuters out of their cars.

Furthermore, I urge you to include analysis of how METRO can best integrate with future rail transit to achieve a superior transit system.

Thank you for your consideration,
Dianne Dryer
Resident of the County

Keith Otto keith_otto@yahoo.com

**SCC RTC Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis**
Let's invest in the infrastructure that we already have:

- **SCMetro bus service**
  Service to my neighborhood was completely cut in Sep 2016.

- **Highway 1 - aux lanes AND express bus / HOV lanes**
  Per the SCC RTC UCIS, these will provide shorter Watsonville to Santa Cruz public transit travel times than a train.

- **Local road repairs**
- 'Trail only' for the rail corridor

Let's NOT invest in a train or a bus or something other than 'trail only' in the rail corridor north of Watsonville. A train or a bus or something other than 'trail only' will be too costly to build, too costly to maintain, and will only attract minimal ridership. Look at SMART in Sonoma/Marin. A train (or bus project in the rail corridor) in Santa Cruz County will be an even greater failure. The Marin Independent Journal has come out against the March 2020 Measure I needed to support SMART.

Santa Cruz County Public Works said it well at an RTC meeting: To create new things, when we can't afford to maintain what we already have, we think that is the wrong way to go.

If you REALLY want to know what Santa Cruz County wants, then let's vote!

Thank you for your serious consideration of this perspective.
Regards,
Keith
Keith Otto
La Selva

Peter Muller PMuller@PRTConsulting.com
Please keep me updated.
Also please be aware that San Jose issued an RFI last year and the responses may be found here: https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/transportation/transit/airport-diridon-stevens-creek-connector?fbclid=IwAR35IbpXjC7q1P6IaS4iGyYdmoMjLSyz0jy5bkvr1_7LK0BjKABzOA
Some of these technologies are very relevant to your study.
Attached is a list of viable PRT technologies.
Best regards,
Peter Muller P.E.
President

1340 Deerpath Trail, Suite 200 | Franktown, CO 80116
1.303.800.1529
pmuller@prtconsulting.com | www.prtconsulting.com
VIABLE PERSONAL RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEMS

Definitions

Personal rapid transit (PRT) system

A driverless transit system comprised of small (8 passengers or less) vehicles supported by or suspended from a dedicated guideway serving offline stations. In-vehicle switching enables headways (time between vehicles) less than ten seconds. Offline stations enable nonstop origin-to-destination travel. Dedicated guideways ensure there are no conflicts with pedestrian or other traffic facilitating safe nonstop travel and high throughput.

Viable PRT Supplier

A viable PRT supplier is one that is understood to have the rights to supply PRT technology that is proven in service to the extent that it is already in public service, or it operates numerous full-scale vehicles carrying passengers on a full scale track, demonstrating in-vehicle switching and offline stations at normal operating speeds.

Viable PRT Suppliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>In Service</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Speed (MPH)</th>
<th>Speed (MPH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Planned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2getthere</td>
<td>2getthere</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modutram</td>
<td>Modutram</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Mexico (test)</td>
<td>6 - 8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultra</td>
<td>Ultra-MTS Ltd.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultra</td>
<td>Ultra PRT Ltd.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that there are numerous suppliers around the world developing PRT technology. Most are working under a veil of secrecy. At least two are known to have full-scale test tracks meeting most of the above requirements. It is anticipated that new commercially-available PRT systems will emerge at the rate of about one a year starting in a year or two.
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RTC
TRANSIT CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Comments:

1. Keep the "line" aspect of the SC Branch Rail Line. It's a new N-S + E-W transport option that can be counted on to remain in place for future generations & future nearby development.

2. Plan for freight service only in Watsonville - There is no market north of the Watsonville industrial area.

3. Consider establishing a JPA to oversee capital project development by a membership of local jurisdictions along the corridor who commit to collaborating on stations & planning. Decide on operator later.

4. 1998 MTIS proved that no one wants buses on the rail line.

5. Retain robust bus service to UCSC + Cabrillo/Soquele Dr.

6. Strengthen the link between walking + rail transit.

7. Use tram/streetcar-type vehicles, self-propelled + energy efficient.

Submitted by:

Name: Linda Wiltsie
Address: 115 Live Oak Ave
SC 95062
Phone Number: 831-588-1847
E-mail: l-j-wc.pacbell.net

You may submit written comments today or to the address below by mail or email:

Santa Cruz RTC
Attn: Shannon Munz
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 460-3200
transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org
Comments:

PRT should also be considered as a connection between the rail line and the destinations that would encourage rail line riders. That is downtown and especially UCSC. Thousands of riders a day on I-5 will spin the East to these destinations but with a good connection to rail many less riders will use the rail train? transit of success.

Submitted by:

Name: FRED GEIGER
Address: 136 Scw St St
Santa Cruz CA 95060

Phone Number: 
E-mail: fredgeiger@yahoo.com

You may submit written comments today or to the address below by mail or email:

Santa Cruz RTC
Attn: Shannon Munz
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 460-3200
transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org
From: Barry Scott <barry@costalrail.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2020 2:45 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: General comments on the TCAA and other matters

Dear Commissioners and Staff Members,

I'm encouraged by the progress on the rail line to make repairs to prevent erosion and to enhance safety, as well as upgrades to the tracks and ties to meet Class I status in the coming weeks and months. Keep up the good work!

The Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis would benefit from including consideration of the following factors:

- Transit on the corridor should utilize the full distance to Watsonville Junction, failure to utilize the entire ROW has the effect of neglecting the needs of South County travelers and use of bus vehicles that are routed to join vehicular traffic will not provide an equitable level of service to our most neglected citizens.
- Costs for non-fixed rail options should include the full life cycle costs of excavation, remediation, property litigation, and life cycle vehicle and operations costs and greenhouse gas impacts. Failure to consider long term costs and returns on investments tend to favor bus transit.
- Be sure to treat corridor transit solutions in combination with existing and potentially new Metro transit routes and not in isolation. Rail as a backbone with bus lateral services can create a network to serve many and provide new revenue for Metro from rail funds.
- Be sure to consider the benefits of rail as a partner with bike trips, bike share, and refer to the successes of the biti.bitib.eu projects in the European Union in which bike and transit mode shares rose significantly while automobile use fell after certain measures were taken to facilitate synergy between the two modes.

Many thanks,

Barry

Barry Scott

Coastal Rail Santa Cruz
A not for profit organization
831-612-6574
CoastalRail.org
Facebook.com/CoastalRail
Barry Scott barry@coastalrail.org 2/11/2020

Dear Stephen and Ginger

It was a pleasure to meet you and your team last week at the RTC focus group event. You asked me to send you information about the BiTiBi, Bike+Train+Bike project conducted by Copenhagenize, a project I mentioned in my comment regarding consideration of the synergy between bikes and rail transit.

Their BiTiBi project booklet, attached, is the most readable summary of the project and findings from each city where the program was piloted, including cities in the Netherlands, UK, Italy, Spain, and Belgium. The program page is here: BiTiBi.eu.

The Copenhagenize Director for Copenhagenize, Michael Seth Wexler, was kind enough to meet with me and Gina Cole, Director of Bike Santa Cruz County, and Bob Arko, Friends of the Rail and Trail Marketing and Communications Director for dinner recently and we talked at length about the opportunities in Santa Cruz County to develop a rich program that integrates our significant cycling capacity with a level entry passenger rail service on the branch line, and working in sync with Metro routes, payment systems, etc.

I've copied Michael on this email and trust that if you'd like to learn more about their efforts, especially in the US, he'll be happy to work with you.

Many thanks,

Barry

Barry Scott

Coastal Rail Santa Cruz
A not for profit organization
831-612-6574
CoastalRail.org
Facebook.com/CoastalRail
BIKE.  
TRAIN.  
BIKE.

FASTER. EASIER. COOLER.
The solution.

Developing bike infrastructure to reach

B2B - Bicycle infrastructure

Commercial, ‘other’

The keywords: ‘easy’, ‘easy’, ‘affordable’,

Build communication structures around

B2S - Bicycle and rail systems

Integrate payment systems of

B2S - Bicycle and rail systems

Integrate a door-to-door project

B2B - Bicycle infrastructure

Having one integrated system is

B2B - Bicycle infrastructure

While the bike-train system

The problem in this period of the future

At the end of the project period in this

The system should be accessible: Public

A railway station at each location

B2S - Other conventional public bikes

Skybridges would be used

and parking facilities at the wrong

Location is in obsolete priority, access

B2T - Build, sale, sell, and

complementary bike parking

BT2 - Build, sale, sell, and

Implementation and evaluation of the pilot projects

and evaluation of the pilot projects.

B1T (E)iks - Tourist (E)iks is an innovative.

The future of urban mobility is the tour

BIKE-TRAINS

Combining bikes & trains
Bicycle Parking at Stations

**Como Bogli**

- Italy
- Bike parking spots at stations

**Milan Area** - Como and Bollette

Positive impact: Cycles have direct and easy access to the stations. Stations with bicycle parking facilities can be successfully used by customers to access the station. Cycles can park a bike and get to their destination easily.

**Bicycle Parking (EB1)**

- Despite the success of existing parking facilities, 22% of respondents said they prefer to park their cycles outside the station.

Average trip distance

- 2.4 km
- 4.5 km

The selected pilot projects were the

- Como and Bollette Center
- Milano Area

Strategic in the Milan area.
BICYCLE PARKING (B61)

In 2016, company bike parking was opened in October. In San Boi, a secure bike shelter for 200 bikes is being provided in the WoW office block. Bike parking is provided in the entrance of the business to business proposition for Sant Boi.

COMPANY BIKE FLEET (B52)

San Cugat and Sant Boi cycle parking.

Barcelona Area - Spain

By team San Cugat and Sant Boi, Cycle parking.

Bike commuters instead of driving a car.

Cataluna (LFC) operational commands.

In the premises of the Generalitat de Catalunya, the cycle parking section is located and accessible to the residents. San Cugat del Vallès and Sant Boi de Llobregat.

In the Barcelona metropolitan area, two new cycle parking projects in Sant Cugat del Vallès and Sant Boi de Llobregat. These infrastructure are involved in development.

Promotional efforts have been

pretty good, some of them

of participating companies.

and inviting several companies to

try a bike ride to the station

example, the bike operator

promoting more than just staff

member of participating companies. Some of them

are currently doing half year pilots.
Bike Rentals Per Month

Blue-bike, Brussels, Belgium

18,000

2014

10,392

2016

24/14

Blue-bike is.

In Brussels, a rental system
for bicycles is available. The system,
known as Blue-bike, was introduced
in 2014.

The system uses centrally
managed bicycle stations. These
stations are located throughout
the city. Users can rent and return
bicycles at any station.

Bike-sharing units, 100m
around stations

1,300

Stations with Blue-bike

BELGIUM

Bicycle rentals

Parking spots at stations

Inspirational Communications

Inspirational communications

Belgium

Stratelles (BB6)
1.8 million £/year

Bike scheme - Bike from the station

Investment costs - Bike Parking

Social Benefits (Health & Environment)

Results

Investment costs vs. Social Benefits (2030 - Whole EJ)

In 2030 there will be:

- 20% of EU railway users arrive at the train station by bike.
- Reduction of 0.5 billion tons of CO₂, 15% of PM and 250 billion users.
- 5 billion fewer km driven by cars.
- NOx emitted.

The effective time when the piloted projects began.

The future is bright and bright.

Considering the basic experience of installing bike parking facilities.

400% rate of return

The environmental & societal impacts

2030 scenarios
I was just wondering will you be using the Delphi Technique to coerce the public who participate in these "meetings" to your already decided plan of action? Just wondering...

Delphi Technique: Let's Stop Being Manipulated
http://www.vlrc.org/articles/110.html

The Delphi Technique: Let's Stop Being Manipulated!
The Virginia Land Rights Coalition is a private, non-political, not-for-profit organization whose purpose is to educate and inform Americans about the protection, ownership and wise use of private property
www.vlrc.org

The Virginia Land Rights Coalition

The Delphi Technique: Let's Stop Being Manipulated!

By Albert V. Burns

More and more, we are seeing citizens being invited to “participate” in various forms of meetings, councils, or boards to “help determine” public policy in one field or another. They are supposedly being included to get “input” from the public to help officials make final decisions on taxes, education, community growth or whatever the particular subject matter might be.

Sounds great, doesn’t it? Unfortunately, surface appearances are often deceiving.

You, Mr. or Mrs. Citizen, decide to take part in one of these meetings.

Generally, you will find that there is already someone designated to lead or “facilitate” the meeting. Supposedly, the job of the facilitator is to be a neutral, non-directing helper to see that the meeting flows smoothly.

Actually, he or she is there for exactly the opposite reason: to see that the conclusions reached during the meeting are in accord with a plan already decided upon by those who called the meeting.

The process used to “facilitate” the meeting is called the Delphi Technique. This Delphi Technique was developed by the RAND Corporation for the U.S. Department of Defense back in the 1950s. It was originally intended for use as a psychological weapon during the cold war.
However, it was soon recognized that the steps of Delphi could be very valuable in manipulating ANY meeting toward a predetermined end.

How does the process take place? The techniques are well developed and well defined.

First, the person who will be leading the meeting, the facilitator or Change Agent must be a likable person with whom those participating in the meeting can agree or sympathize.

It is, therefore, the job of the facilitator to find a way to cause a split in the audience, to establish one or a few of the people as “bad guys” while the facilitator is perceived as the “good guy.”

Facilitators are trained to recognize potential opponents and how to make such people appear aggressive, foolish, extremist, etc. Once this is done, the facilitator establishes himself or herself as the “friend” of the rest of the audience.

The stage is now set for the rest of the agenda to take place.

At this point, the audience is generally broken up into “discussion—or ‘breakout’—groups” of seven or eight people each. Each of these groups is to be led by a subordinate facilitator.

Within each group, discussion takes place of issues, already decided upon by the leadership of the meeting. Here, too, the facilitator manipulates the discussion in the desired direction, isolating and demeaning opposing viewpoints.

Generally, participants are asked to write down their ideas and disagreements with the papers to be turned in and “compiled” for general discussion after the general meeting is reconvened.

This is the weak link in the chain, which you are not supposed to recognize. Who compiles the various notes into the final agenda for discussion? Ahhhh! Well, it is those who are running the meeting.

How do you know that the ideas on your notes were included in the final result? You Don’t! You may realize that your idea was not included and come to the conclusion that you were probably in the minority. Recognize that every other citizen member of this meeting has written his or her likes or dislikes on a similar sheet of paper and they, too, have no idea whether their ideas were “compiled” into the final result! You don’t even know if anyone’s ideas are part of the final “conclusions” presented to the reassembled group as the “consensus” of public opinion.

Rarely does anyone challenge the process, since each concludes that he or she was in the minority and different from all the others.
So, now, those who organized the meeting in the first place are able to tell the participants and the rest of the community that the conclusions, reached at the meeting, are the result of public participation.

Actually, the desired conclusions had been established, in the back room, long before the meeting ever took place. There are variations in the technique to fit special situations but, in general, the procedure outlined above takes place.

The natural question to ask here is: If the outcome was preordained before the meeting took place, why have the meeting? Herein lies the genius of this Delphi Technique.

It is imperative that the general public believe that this program is theirs! They thought it up! They took part in its development! Their input was recognized!

If people believe that the program is theirs, they will support it.

If they get the slightest hint that the program is being imposed upon them, they will resist.

This very effective technique is being used, over and over and over, to change our form of government from the representative republic, intended by the Founding Fathers, into a "participatory democracy." Now, citizens chosen at large are manipulated into accepting preset outcomes while they believe that the input they provided produced the outcomes which are now theirs! The reality is that the final outcome was already determined long before any public meetings took place, determined by individuals unknown to the public. Can you say "Conspiracy?"

These "Change Agents" or "Facilitators" can be beaten! They may be beaten using their own methods against them.

Because it is so important, I will repeat the suggestions I gave in the last previous column. One: Never, never lose your temper! Lose your temper and lose the battle, it is that simple! Smile, if it kills you to do so. Be courteous at all times. Speak in a normal tone of voice.

Two: Stay focused! Always write your question or statement down in advance to help you remember the exact manner in which your question or statement was made.

These agents are trained to twist things to make anyone not acceding to their agenda look silly or aggressive. Smile, wait till the change agent gets done speaking and then bring them back to your question. If they distort what you said, simply remind those in the group that what he or she is saying is not what you asked or said and then repeat, verbatim, from your notes the original objection.

Three: Be persistent! Wait through any harangues and then repeat the original question. (Go back and reread the previous column.)
Four: (I wish to thank a reader of the previous column for some EXCELLENT suggestions.) Don’t go alone! Get as many friends or relatives who think as you do, to go along with you to the meeting. Have each person “armed” with questions or statements which all generally support your central viewpoint. Don’t sit together as a group! Spread out through the audience so that your group does not seem to be a group.

When the facilitator or change agent avoids answering your question and insists that he must move on so everyone may have a chance to speak, your own agents in the audience can then ask questions, worded differently, but still with the same meaning as yours. They can bring the discussion back to your original point.

They could even point out, in a friendly manner, that the agent did not really answer your question. The more the agent avoids your question, and the more your friends bring that to the attention of the group, the more the audience will shift in your favor.

To quote my informant: “Turn the technique back on them and isolate the change agent as the kook. I’ve done it and seen steam come out of the ears of those power brokers in the wings who are trying to shove something down the citizen’s throats. And it’s so much fun to watch the moderator squirm and lose his cool, all while trying to keep a smile on his face.”

Now that you understand how meetings are manipulated, let’s show them up for the charlatans which they are.

Published in the September 23, 2002, issue of Ether Zone.

http://etherzone.com/cgi-bin/search/search.pl?Terms=Albert+V.+Burns

Copyright © 1997-2002 Ether Zone. Republication allowed with this notice and hyperlink intact.
Ames Monahan ames@cruzio.com 2/11/2010

I am vehemently opposed to any type of light rail.

Please see the attached .PDF

Thank you. Ames Monahan
In the SCCRTC logo you show an undisturbed area with an modest hiking and biking trail. We ask that it remain that!

THE BLUFF AREAS OF CALIFORNIA DESERVE SPECIAL PROTECTION
Standing on the cliff looking across to Monterey is a timeless experience. A flock of huge pelicans may as well be Jurassic era pterodactyls, and the spouting whales could be sea dinosaurs. Hundreds of people a day walk, hike, and bike along the bluff. People play guitars and flutes. Tourists go there to take pictures. On that beautiful bluff people propose to one another and marry each other, as did their parents. This timeless place should not be ruined with an ugly and noisy light rail system.

DON'T KILL THE GOLDEN GOOSE OF TOURISM
People come to vacation and live in Santa Cruz County because, even if it's an illusion, you feel like your living in a quieter, slower time with wooden roller coasters, fishing piers, and boardwalks. A light rail system will be ugly, noisy, expensive and dangerous, and could dampen the enthusiasm for our "quaint and charming" town. No one proposes or gets married in front of the downtown metro center. No one ever asks "How can we make Santa Cruz County look and feel more like San Jose?". People do ask "How do we preserve the beach and cliff areas of California for future generations?". Heck, California even created a Coastal Commission to help protect it. And yet here we are, objectively discussing how we are going to destroy it for ourselves, without any help from outside developers. The Coastal bluffs do not need "improving".
THE MAIN PROBLEM WITH HIGHWAY 1 TRAFFIC IS LOW VEHICLE OCCUPANCY
In your own study, you state that 71% of cars going to and from the Santa Clara Valley have one occupant. That is the core problem, so that is the problem you need to solve. Highway 1 jams up, and people pour onto Soquel or Freedom Boulevard to try to get around it. The solution is to get more people per vehicle. Putting in a slow, expensive, light rail that dribbles up and down the Coast will accomplish nothing.

THE EASIEST AND LEAST EXPENSIVE SOLUTION TO LOW VEHICLE OCCUPANCY
Solutions could include more charter busses hired by the large Silicon Valley companies to take their employees to work. Already 38,000 people a day use a company-chartered busses to get to and from work. Santa Cruz County should work with the companies to expand this to 76,000! The companies have benefited from the economic boom, and they just received 500 billion dollars in tax cuts over ten year period, so they are flush with cash. Their employees clog Highway 1, so it appropriate for them to do more. We need to push them to do more!

THE MAIN PROBLEM WITH SECONDARY STREET TRAFFIC IS IT'S FULL OF COMMUTERS TRYING TO AVOID HIGHWAY 1.
When Highway 1 is rolling well, the side streets are less used by commuters. If the side streets still need better coverage by mass transit, driverless buses make a lot of sense. Driverless busses are less expensive to operate than one with a driver. Driverless buses reuse already existing resources (for example roads, stop lights, bus stops) without new big capitol outlays and the sale of bonds. Driverless busses can be added or removed from service without hiring additional drivers, for example during the busy summer weekends.

LIGHT RAIL PROBLEMS
* Ugly
* Noisy
* Expensive
* Complex
* Dangerous. There are many accidents associated with light rail. San Jose recently had two separate fatalities in a 15 hour period. Bikes, cars, and pedestrians get hit regularly. We have many crossings. In San Jose people "cheat" the lights. People text while they walk. It's a mess.
* Legal Trouble. When people get hit by light rail, they often sue.
* Creates many new, undefined problems.
* Doesn't solve any existing problems.
* Doesn't get you to your final destination.

The BEST USE OF THE CORRIDOR is as a BIKING and HIKING PATH
The Corridor is currently used by walkers, hikers, bikers and dog walkers. Many people "commute" to work or shopping by walking along the tracks. Great views, but it is rough walking on the abandoned tracks.
The corridor would benefit from
* A two-direction bike path (to avoid collisions and encourage usage).
  You could consider allowing electric bikes. This makes it practical to use every day for longer commutes.
* A walking/jogging path (typically wood shavings)
* Benches

This is a rational alternative. It is
* Safe, quiet, clean, and unlikely to create legal troubles.
* Low technology
* Inexpensive (relatively)
* Does not require complex bureaucracy or engineers to keep running
* Encourages carbon-less commuting and travel
* It addresses the needs and concerns of the people who live there
* Adds value for residents and tourists. Tourist can now be directed to follow the bike path to get around locally. Locals can bike to the grocery store or to work in Santa Cruz.

SUMMARY
I ask that the bluffs above the Monterey Bay be left to look just like the SCCRTC logo. In this logo you show an undisturbed area with a modest hiking and biking trail. I ask that it remain that way!

Sincerely,
Ames Monahan
Passenger trains on a single track intended for only slow moving freight is not sensible in a very congested and active area, especially when better alternatives are easily available. (Many have already provided research indicating a train would not be cost-effective or even properly handle the Highway 1 congestion situation anyway.) Rather than being excessively redundant, please Google, "Public Transportation: If you build it (properly), they will come", and follow the links. This describes just one viable implementation that can use quiet environmental-friendly electric buses that are presently available to Metro / RTC. (Note that other than emergency vehicles, simple electric bicycles, and buses driven by professionals during certain times on weekdays, no non-human powered vehicles would be allowed on the corridor.)

Briefly, the concept is to make the best use of a single bus lane on the corridor in conjunction with the less congested direction of Highway 1. That is, during the morning commute, buses travel westbound on the corridor and after passing the Santa Cruz Bus Terminal (making appropriate stops along the way), loop back eastbound via HWY 1, to repeat this loop as long as needed. After a long "Noon-time break", buses then travel in the opposite direction on the corridor (eastbound) and loop back via westbound on HWY 1. This allows buses (driven by the existing professional drivers) to essentially guarantee a safe and cost-effective means to get across the county in less than a half-an-hour ANYTIME OF THE DAY! (Realize that the morning bus shift and the evening bus shift would be driving in different directions on this single-lane of the corridor. To eliminate any possible confusion, in addition to the significant "noon-time break", a group of professional bus drivers could be responsible to safely drive in one direction on the corridor and a different group responsible for driving in the other to optimally handle the corresponding rush hours.) Any number of buses can be “cascaded” to handle the busiest of times.

This corridor concept will accommodate responsible bicyclists 24/7 as soon as a single "bus" lane replaces the aging single obsolete railroad track. Initially, since it also does not change easements granted years ago upon all properties along the extensive 30 miles of corridor, it will likely be more expediently implemented. Not infringing upon this easement avoids lawsuits from any property owner anywhere along that extensive route that will be confronted when actual activity expands into the to-be-seriously-contested easement areas. (Yet it does provide a path to fully use the entire width after easement issues become assured. If I lived along the corridor, I would prefer getting easy access to it and not be fenced-out from having to deal with freight trains for at least 10 years, followed by an expensive novelty train catering to tourists!)

I had a very rewarding career designing a variety of computer systems of which manufacturing then successfully made thousands. From those years of experience, I know that properly designed computer systems can tirelessly run rings around all human beings in accurately
performing repetitive functions. Every once in a while, I also have become aware that sensors do fail, so valid concerns needs to be satisfied.

In a product where human life is not at stake, failures are not appreciated, but they are tolerated. However, wherever human life is at risk, no amount of profits would be able to offset the loss of lives. I would never ever consider introducing the possibility of head-on passenger train collisions via a timely interleave. A much safer arrangement would be to stockpile trains at the end of the runs (and send them back during any lack of activity), but this concept quickly breaks down and leads to costly situations. (Also, humans beings "supposedly" watching over inappropriately designed "fail-safe" systems to simply prevent train derailing, can be at fault as it became apparent in the last few years.)

Again, a much better thought-out arrangement would be to substitute quiet electric buses driven by professional bus drivers (already residing in Santa Cruz County). This also allows expansion beyond just where the refurbished rail tracks could go. Also note that if a freight train is not involved, it will be far easier to implement underpasses/overpasses at the junctions where cross-traffic is busiest to appease those who are concerned that the priority of corridor traffic will dominate intersections.

Bob Fifield
Aptos
The sound of traffic County

For those who desire to travel safely and efficiently in our County, government investments can be put in place to improve common sense parking. A crucial aspect is ensuring that there are enough safe crosswalks and traffic calming measures in place on our roads.

A new initiative has been launched to improve the safety of our roads, focusing on pedestrian crossings and speed bumps. This will help reduce accidents and enhance the overall safety for all road users. The project is expected to be completed within the next six months.

Local businesses and residents have expressed their support for the initiative, recognizing the importance of a safer environment. We encourage everyone to participate in this effort and contribute to making our County a safer place to live and work.

The key is to prioritize safety in all transportation projects, ensuring that we meet the needs of all road users. By working together, we can create a safer and more accessible environment for everyone.

Let's take action today to make our County a safer place to travel.
The Future of Passenger Train Service in Santa Cruz County

All this can be accomplished within the schedule of the present RTC „Approved Plan“ along the corridor for the ‚Freight Train to Nowhere‘.

Without bus activity on weekends, family activities could safely take place.

During evening commutes, the flow reverses.

>2< During morning commutes, buses depart the Watsonville bus terminal to pick-up this upgraded „single vehicle lane“ corridor at the most convenient spot and travel westward unimpeded through the corridor to the Santa Cruz bus terminal and then return via the free-moving (at this point) corridor. The 32-mile corridor could improve HWY 1 congestion. It also has picturesque views waiting to be shared.

Briefly...

The existing single railroad track could be covered with a surface that is drivable by existing buses.

Would seem very desirable!

A „Commuter Train“ running only one a-half-hour is a stretch and even only 15 minutes may be on the edge of acceptability. Such infrequency may be able to run only once an hour and yet serve a useful purpose. A Genuine High-Speed Train over the next 10 years. They small passenger trains are not possible until at least 2035 (if ever)!!! Why wait?

This is all possible for less than the multi-million RTC will charge taxpayers for just allowing a questionable „Freight Train „service“ across the county weekends, that some environmental providers state, create settings for bicycling and those on foot.

On weekends, passengers can enjoy their corridor while driving safely across the county in less than a half-hour (cars are taking over twice that). On weekends, that some environmental providers state, create settings for bicycling and those on foot.

>1< The existing single railroad track could be covered with a surface that is drivable by existing buses.

>3< Without bus activity on weekends, family activities could safely take place.

>4< During evening commutes, the flow reverses.

>2< During morning commutes, buses depart the Watsonville bus terminal to pick-up this upgraded „single vehicle lane“ corridor at the most convenient spot and travel westward unimpeded through the corridor to the Santa Cruz bus terminal and then return via the free-moving (at this point) corridor. The 32-mile corridor could improve HWY 1 congestion. It also has picturesque views waiting to be shared.

Improving Transportation of people across Santa Cruz County

The 32-mile corridor could improve HWY 1 congestion. It also has picturesque views waiting to be shared.

Within a few years, these qualities can be appreciated by all after implementation of an effective bus system summarized in „Rail-Train or Trail-Train„

Dr. Walter E. Cather, P.E. - Consulting Engineer

(1/20/19)
Bus stops could strategically be placed. Without bus activity on weekends, family activities could safely take place.

During evening commutes, the flow reverses and then return via the free-moving (as this time) eastbound I-801. Back to the Watsonville terminal to repeat the process for hours

and then return via the free-moving (at this time) westbound I-801. Back to the Watsonville terminal to repeat the process for hours.

Pedestrians and emergency vehicles at the most convenient spot and travel westward unimpeded through the corridor to the Santa Cruz terminus (only accessible by buses, bicycles).

During morning commutes, buses depart the Watsonville terminal to pick-up this single lane corridor (only accessible by buses, bicycles).

Cover the existing obsolete single railroad track with a surface that is drivable by existing buses.

Phase 1:

Increased H.W.T Relief ASAP.

If you could please provide a plan for this project, it would be greatly appreciated. Everyone will appreciate the following useful phase allowing the multi-use corridor to provide

In a few years, imagine public means across Santa Cruz County during commutes and times to practical destinations in minutes (not the present

Rail-Trial on Trail-Only a Better People Corridor?

also save millions).

Please let your local government representatives know that you want to transport people across Santa Cruz County, not questionable freight (and

The local government notes passenger train service MAY BE possible in this county „as soon as 2035„. Why not implement something definitey

the planning bus-trail intended for people not freight (see letter 1/24/13). Safety (and very efficient) accommodation people on foot, bicycle, or

bus is all done across the county before the planned freight train can even begin making any runs. One this pending „Rail-Trial”.

imagine taking an express bus right in front of the Bayview Hotel and traveling unimpeded for miles through the presently unused freight train

Easing Agros Village Traffic during rush hours

allows worthwhile enhancement in a variety of aspects as more and more landings come in.

This arrangement also allows all uses of the corridor and relief to H.W.T congestion as soon as the lowest-cost version is implemented. If then

Freight rail service. (The special industrial area of Watsonville could be a major freight line that does not exist into residential areas to the west).

Please use common sense and help everyone to take part in improving the quality of life for those in Santa Cruz County. Don't be deceived by
This does not illustrate a "TRAIL". I would think many would object to their non-committed. "Most of TRAIL could be built in 10 years, when
expressed) why not just down a sentence that we all could use? Why not take this opportunity to do something better?
Anyway, that will still need to be replaced. After all, that will all need to be replaced. Rather than bringing down brand new tracks for a unsustainable freight service, the tracks are so worn in order to accommodate the TRAIL, the tracks have to be unconditionally removed to provide for a multi-use of this corridor. The tracks are so worn that they were first placed. Now, anyone visiting any part of this corridor will note that the tracks go down the center. That made sense years ago, when they were first placed. Now, introduce the possibility of needing train collisions??

Being an engineer with decades of experience in common sense, it would certainly be smarter to try to implement a smart phone with vacuum tubes passenger trains would not be viable. Passenger trains would not be viable. Any realizable construction that realizes common sense and realizes nothing could be further from the initial

"Unapproved Concept:" Please use your own common sense to realize nothing could be further from the initial

Freight Train to Nowhere!!!

Millions upon millions can be saved and scholars significantly expedited by making use of existing buses and infrastructure, rather than incurring to

Trends will only access to easily improving HWT congestion for AT LEAST 10 years. (1/16/19) (1/12/19/18) (1/10/19)

All of this can be accomplished within the schedule of the president's "Approved Plan" which involves a "Freight Train to Nowhere" (see letters) this initial phase can be upgraded AOG (At the Speed Of Government), but in the meantime, aspects of all promises can be enjoyed. Flexibility.

Freight Train to Nowhere!!

(1/7/19/18)
Without rail, the journey from Santa Cruz County to San Francisco takes over 2 hours, with a single transfer required. However, with a rail system, this journey could be reduced to under 1 hour, significantly improving commute times for residents. The rail system would provide a network of connections, allowing for seamless travel between different cities. This would not only reduce travel times but also reduce the environmental impact of transportation. The proposed rail network would be supported by a variety of transportation modes, including bike-sharing and pedestrian-friendly pathways, ensuring a multi-modal approach to travel. This would not only be beneficial for commuters but also for the environment, promoting a more sustainable lifestyle.
Please understand that virtually everyone is in favor of alleviating traffic problems and trying to accommodate the masses, but imposing a freight and use as forms to expedite the Trail Only Implementation? 

There is a mislabeling about rail freight. 

Passenger service is more complex than freight. 

Quality of life is precious.
Improving HWY 1 traffic congestion

This can be implemented much sooner than ANYTHING truly beneficial from a very suspect freight service...

Until something better comes along, why not consider the following as just one possible very doable simple implementation to benefit the masses.

Along with a very proper TRAIL, implement a SINGLE BUS LANE on the multi-use corridor (this is in lieu of a very limited-use SINGLE Railroad)

During morning commutes, buses depart the Watsonville bus terminal to pick-up (this is) at the most convenient spot (which could mean lees congested areas and Hwy 1 back to the bus terminal to replace the process for hours.

During evening commutes, the flow reverses.

FLEXIBILITY allows adjustments and conclusions can be drawn much sooner costing far less. Bus stops could strategically be placed. Without buses.

<3> During evening commutes, the flow reverses.

<2> During evening commutes, the flow reverses.

<1> Along with a very proper TRAIL, implement a SINGLE BUS LANE on the multi-use corridor (in lieu of a very limited-use SINGLE Railroad)
Mike Guth mguth@guthpatents.com 2/13/2020

Please see the attached letter regarding the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis from the Sierra Club.

Please do confirm receipt.

Thank you

--
Yours Sincerely,
Michael A. Guth
Attorney at Law
ofc (831) 462-8270
February 13, 2020

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org

Re: Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis (TCAA)
Review of the draft “Initial List of Alternatives” and the “Analysis Framework” documents

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

The Sierra Club has completed its review of the draft “Initial List of Alternatives” and “Analysis Framework” documents and is concerned the draft documents are lacking in several important respects. Because the type of high capacity public transit selected for implementation on the existing rail corridor will have a significant impact on the environment as well as social equity, establishing a solid foundation for the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis is essential in equipping our community to make the best decision.

One concern we have is a global in scope and seems unconnected to either of the documents for which the SCCRTC is soliciting feedback. Our concern is that for our community to receive the maximum benefit from an all new, transportation corridor dedicated to hi-capacity public transit the entire public transit system should be evaluated and reconfigured as needed to optimize the efficiency of the entire system. For example, new stops along a new main line service operating exclusively in the new corridor could be met with feeder bus routes minimizing user transfer times under a “pulse scheduled system”. The TCAA does not appear to be addressing this type of “out-of-the-corridor” thinking and we are concerned failing to consider same, may lead to a poor choice of vehicle/service type. As such, we urge you to consider this global concern.

We trust our suggestions for improving these documents will be carefully considered and incorporated into the final version of these key guidance documents. For simplicity, our comments and suggestions for improvement are grouped by document.

Regarding the “Initial List of Alternatives”, we offer the following:

A. It appears the study is unnecessarily focused on smaller capacity vehicles. Larger vehicles, carrying more passengers should be more energy efficient in moving more people. Accordingly, the following bullets should be added to the “Form Factor and Capacity...” section:
• 101-150 passengers seated / standing  
• 151-200 passengers seated / standing  
• 201-250 passengers seated / standing  
• 251-300 passengers seated / standing  
• 301-400 passengers seated / standing  

B. Given our community’s already high bicycling mode share, the capacity of vehicles to carry bicycles as well as people should be specifically considered. Accordingly, a new section titled “Bicycle or other wheeled personal equipment capacity per vehicle” should be added with the following sub-bullets:  
• 0-5 bicycles or equivalent  
• 6-10 bicycles or equivalent  
• 11-20 bicycles or equivalent  
• 21-30 bicycles or equivalent  

C. Given the importance of making public transit more equitable and more accessible, a new section titled “Wheelchair, Scooter or similar mobility device capacity per vehicle” should be added with the following sub-bullets:  
• 0-2 wheelchairs or equivalent  
• 3-5 wheelchairs or equivalent  
• 6-10 wheelchairs or equivalent  

Regarding the “Analysis Framework”, we offer the following:  

General Comment: Given the crucial importance of making sure the TCAA includes the best metrics for the final evaluation of selected options, we recommend the community be given the opportunity to revisit all Phase 2 Performance Measures after the Phase 1 effort is finished.  

Specific Comments:  

A. Add to or modify the following items in the “Supports Economy” section  
• Under the evaluation metric “Capital cost,” add a “per user” criteria to give the capital cost a more meaningful context  
• Under the evaluation metric “Capital cost,” add a “per user” cost to expand the project to provide double the initial ridership capacity in the future  
• Under the evaluation metric “O&M costs,” add “O&M cost per passenger mile” to the Phase 2 Performance Measures  
• Under the evaluation metric “Funding,” add “Percentage of project funding likely to come from future sources”  
• Add a new goal “Is fiscally responsible” with an Evaluation Metric: “Total Cost of Ownership” with a Description: “What is the project’s total cost of ownership in present day dollars” with a Phase 2 Performance Measure: “Total Dollars”  

B. Add to or modify the following items in the “Supports Equity” section
• Under the goal, “Promote active transportation,” add “Bicycle capacity on transit per vehicle or per train set” to the Phase 2 Performance Measures
• Under the goal "Provide accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all people," add "Ease of independent boarding for those using wheelchairs, scooters and other mobility equipment" to the Description with a Phase 2 Performance Measure letter grade comparing options against other options.
• Under the goal "Provide accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all people," add "Accessibility, capacity and ease of use for users with physical or mental disabilities" to the Description with a Phase 2 Performance Measure letter grade comparing options against other options.
• Under the goal “Offer reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people,” modify the description for ‘Travel Time’ to read “To what extent does the project improve transit travel time, during peak traffic commuting periods.”
• Under the goal "Provide accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all people," divide the description: "Does the project provide transportation access to disadvantaged populations?" into two sentences differentiating "disadvantaged" into 1) "Economically disadvantaged populations" and 2) "Populations with higher levels of physical/mental and other mobility limitations (such as children and the elderly)"
• Under the goal "Offer reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people," add "Number of connections" as an Evaluation Metric with "Does the project reduce numbers of connections required for disadvantaged users?" as the Description.

C. Add to or modify the following items in the “Supports Environment” section
• Add a new evaluation metric titled “Public Transit Mode Share” with Description: “To what extent will the project promote use of public transit” with Performance Measure: “County-wide public transit mode share”
• Add a new evaluation metric titled “Life Cycle Emissions” with Description: “To what extent will the vehicle type impact landfill” with Performance Measure: “Vehicle Useful Service Life”
• Add a new evaluation metric titled “GHG Emissions” with Description: “To what extent will the project vehicle type itself emit GHG?” with Performance Measure: “GHG Emissions per Transit Vehicle Mile Traveled”
• Add a new evaluation metric titled “Area of Paved Roadway” with Description: “To what extent will the project rely on expansion of existing or construction of new paved surfaces within the rail corridor and including streets and highways” with Performance Measure: “Area of New or Expanded Pavement”
• Add “Micro Plastic Pollutants” to the Performance Measures included under the “Emissions Reduction” Evaluation Metric
• Add a new evaluation metric titled “Biological Resources” with Description: “Sensitive or native species and ecosystem impact or fragmentation” and with Performance Measure: “High, Medium, Low”
D. Add to or modify the following items in the “Other Goals” section

- Add a new evaluation metric titled “Desirability” with Description: “To what extent will the project attract and retain new public transit users” with Performance Measure: “Ridership”
- Add a new evaluation metric titled “ROW” with Description: “How much of the existing rail corridor will be used by the project” with Performance Measure: “Miles of Corridor Used”
- Add a new evaluation metric titled “ROW” with Description: “Is the project allowed under current rail corridor easements” with Performance Measure: “Miles of Corridor without Easement Issues”
- Add a new evaluation metric titled “Land Use” with Description: “To what extent will the project promote compact land development patterns and reduce GHG emissions” with Performance Measure: “Letter Graded Score”

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our comments and suggestions. Should you have any questions or wish to discuss these matters in more detail, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Guth, Transportation Committee Chair

Micah Posner, Executive Committee Chair

Sierra Club, Santa Cruz Group
Hi Ginger,

I am attaching two documents containing suggestions regarding the draft List of Alternatives and the draft Goals/Screening Criteria/Performance Measures.

Thank you,

Brett Garrett
Feedback regarding: Initial List of Alternatives

p1 Core Services – Fuel/Propulsion: I would eliminate Diesel and Compressed Natural Gas (CNG).

p1 Core Services – Form Factor and Capacity: I would definitely include 5-9 passengers which may well turn out to be the optimum size for PRT/GRT.

p1 Core Services – Guideway: I’m not sure of the difference between Exclusive Guideway and Guided Exclusive Guideway, but another real distinction to consider is whether the service will use the existing train tracks, replace the existing tracks, or coexist with the existing tracks. (Some PRT/GRT systems could be engineered to provide bidirectional service, either along the tracks or overhead, while still allowing freight trains to run.)

p3 Core Service Alternatives – Light Rail/Diesel Multiple Unit: I don’t understand the reference to overhead wires in the context of diesel units. (Also the photo looks like the train has gone off the rails.)

p4 Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) – I would change the heading to “Personal or Group Rapid Transit (PRT/GRT)”. The pictured Morgantown system is technically GRT as each vehicle accommodates twenty passengers, eight seated plus twelve standing. Note, Automated Transit Network (ATN) is an alternative name for PRT/GRT.

p4 Inverted (or Elevated) PRT – I would change the heading to “Inverted (or Suspended) PRT/GRT” as any PRT system can use an elevated guideway. I wouldn’t necessarily specify smaller cars; for example Swift Tram is designed for 22 passengers.

p4 Gondola – I’d mention the La Paz Teleférico as an example with many cars and multiple stops.

Please consider a “hybrid” system – One possibility that I have considered is a PRT or similar system serving Santa Cruz to Aptos, with a small conventional rail route connecting Aptos to Watsonville. This would be a 10-mile conventional rail trip with minimal stops, allowing more frequent service than other train proposals. Transfers to PRT are fast and easy compared to conventional transit transfers. In this case, I would also advocate for a second PRT system in Watsonville.

p5 Connector Services – I’d mention PRT/GRT as a potential connector service. In particular, a PRT core service can be expanded include “connector” lines to high-traffic destinations or to provide comprehensive transit service along all corridors. Furthermore, the longstanding Boardwalk-to-downtown-to-UCSC proposal (that Santa Cruz PRT has recommended for decades) would be an excellent complement to any transit along the rail corridor.

Recent Examples – The City of San Jose has received recent responses to its Request for Information regarding innovative grade-separated transit. Please review the down-to-earth and immediately feasible proposals from 2getthere, ModuTram, UltraMTS Strada, and Plenary Glydways, as well as innovative ideas from CyberTran, TriTrack, Spartan Superway, and others, all available at https://tinyurl.com/sj-rfi or https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/transportation/transit/airport-diridon-stevens-creek-connector

Sincerely,

Brett Garrett
190 Walnut Ave Unit 301
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
brett@dolphyn.com
831-316-4678
Goals, Screening Criteria, Performance Measures

Feedback Regarding “Supports Economy” Goals
Goal “Fiscally feasible” could include possible savings on other projects. (For example, a robust PRT system that extends beyond the corridor would reduce or eliminate the need or perceived need for HOV lanes, bus-on-shoulder, and BRT.)

Evaluation metric “Capital cost” should be considered in relation to potential ridership. A system that provides better service to a larger number of people is worth paying for.

Typo: “risk that the corridor will remain contiguous” should be “risk that the corridor will not remain contiguous”.

Feedback Regarding “Supports Equity” Goals
“Transit vehicle miles traveled” is a questionable performance measure. “Passenger miles traveled” would be more meaningful, along with some measure of passengers’ total travel time including waiting time.

I would include an additional goal of providing area-wide coverage. That is:

   Ability or potential to directly serve high-traffic destinations such as Cabrillo College,
   downtown Santa Cruz, Dominican Hospital, UCSC

Feedback Regarding “Supports Environment” Goals
Emissions reduction could be stated in terms of emissions per passenger-mile.

Feedback Regarding “Other Goals”
Technical Feasibility isn’t necessarily a Yes/No item. The real question might be, “In what year could the system realistically be built and available for service?”

One possible additional goal is to produce solar energy. Some elevated PRT systems include a canopy of solar panels by design. This could have positive effects on Economy (possible funding from Monterey Bay Community Power or other renewable energy funding sources), Equity (improves the Rail Trail by providing protection from rain or excess sun), and Environment (goes beyond reducing energy usage by actually producing its own energy).

Sincerely,

Brett Garrett
190 Walnut Ave Unit 301
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
brett@dolphins.com
831-316-4678
Sally Arnold  sallya@cruzio.com  2/13/2020

Greetings Consultants and staff of the RTC,
Attached please find our comments regarding the criteria for the alternatives analysis. We believe them to be thorough, well thought out, and an opportunity to add some rigor to the process.

We hope you agree,

Sally Arnold
Board Chair
Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail
P.O.Box 1652, Capitola, CA  95010-1652
www.railandtrail.org
Cell: 831-419-4622
Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org  
Re: TCAA - Comments on the “Analysis Framework” and the “Initial List of Alternatives”

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

The Friends of the Rail and Trail is pleased to see the TCAA getting underway. We thank you for the work you have done to launch this important study. After completing our review and analysis of the draft “Analysis Framework” and the draft “Initial List of Alternatives” documents, we would like to call your attention to some key criteria, goals, evaluation metrics and performance measures that, in our opinion, are missing, or could use improvement. This letter summarizes our specific recommendations for additions, amendments and revisions to the draft documents.

Because getting this study right is so important, we also recommend the community be given an opportunity to update their comments and concerns regarding the Phase 2 Performance Measures upon completion of the Phase 1 Screening process. Some of the “High, Medium, Low” listed as Phase 2 performance measures would benefit from adding more granular measures.

Everyone agrees the decision regarding what type of high capacity public transit to implement on the rail corridor will have far reaching and long lasting impacts on the quality of life, on social equity, on the environment and on the economic vitality of our entire county for many generations. Adding a third major transportation corridor to our county, a corridor connecting the two largest cities, a corridor running right through the very highest density neighborhoods, a corridor located within one mile of half the County’s population, 92 parks, 45 schools and a national monument, presents a unique, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to transform all our public transportation into a far more efficient and attractive system. Getting this right could significantly increase transit ridership, reduce cost of living, reduce accident rates for pedestrians and cyclists, and reduce our collective GHG emissions – critical in light of the global climate emergency.
Getting the TCAA started on the right foundation is absolutely essential to making the best decision possible. Incorporating our suggestions into the final documents will improve the balance of the TCAA and bring confidence and credibility to any decisions based upon it.

**The Scope of the Study**

Our first comments do not simply respond to the above referenced draft document but are directed at the core scope of the study and the importance of making sure the impact of the choice on the entire public transportation system is adequately considered.

A well connected public transportation system is vital to increasing public transit system ridership. We are unsure if the scope of work includes evaluating the core service alternatives in the context of their integration into an optimized public transit system. To take full advantage of any core service alternative operating in the new dedicated transportation corridor offered by the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line ROW, we recommend the entire public transit transportation system (buses, shuttles, paratransit, shared mobility systems and other first-mile-last-mile options) be considered. How can they work to optimize the performance of the core service alternative under consideration? Accordingly, the evaluation of each core alternative should be done in the context of its integration with an optimized public transportation system using integrated systems modeling tools.

An example of this would be, when evaluating rail options, to consider the use of rail spurs to extend the existing rail line to more directly connect with major employment, population and tourist centers. How would extending passenger rail service into downtown Santa Cruz to serve the existing METRO center affect ridership? Could the existing Chestnut Street tracks be used to provide direct access to city hall? Could rail spurs directly connect Cabrillo College and the UCSC Marine Sciences campus to the corridor?.

Regardless of what type of high capacity public transit is selected for implementation on the SCBL, we request the TCAA include a discussion of all possible ways local matching funds for Capital Expense and/or Operating Expense can be raised within the County of Santa Cruz. For example, the Transit Agency of Monterey County (TAMC) is currently building the “Kick Start Project” part of their “Monterey County Rail Extension” a passenger rail service connecting Salinas to Gilroy and onto Diridon Station in San Jose. According to the Kick Start Project Fact Sheet: (https://www.tamcmonterey.org/wp-
content/uploads/2018/09/TAMC-MCRE-FSHEET_v5FINAL.pdf) TAMC is funding this $81.5 million project with a total local share of only $2.7 million. That's an amazing ratio we'd be lucky to emulate!

For simplicity, our comments on the draft documents generally follow the same order as the original document.

**Document Titled: Analysis Framework:**

1. Regarding the "**Supports Economy**" section we offer the following:

   a. Under the part titled “Capital Cost”, add a “per user” criteria to give the capital cost context. For example: a $100 million investment that moves 100 people a day would not be as good an investment as a $200 million that moves 1,000 people a day even though the capital cost of the first option would be half the second option.

   b. Under the part titled “Capital Cost”, add “estimated cost to expand project to double initial ridership capacity” to the Phase 2 Performance Measures. There is a high probability that use of our public transit system may dramatically increase as the climate crisis worsens. Ancillary impacts such as increased costs of private auto use and intolerable congestion will drive more and more people to become transit riders. The cost of increasing transit capacity should be considered.

   c. Under the part titled “Capital Cost”, add “Total Cost of Ownership” to the Phase 2 Performance Measures, assuming an estimated useful system service life of 40 or 50 years or whatever is the standard in the industry.

   d. Under the part titled “O&M Costs”, add “cost per passenger mile” to the Phase 2 Performance Measures. The cost per passenger mile provides an overall evaluation of how efficiently the project moves people, an important criteria to consider in terms of overall energy consumption.

   e. Under the part titled “O&M Costs”, add “cost per passenger mile if initial ridership capacity is doubled” to the Phase 2 Performance Measures. See ‘1.b.’ for reasoning.
f. Under the part titled “Funding,” add “% funding likely from future sources.” We are all acutely aware that political winds change over time and while the Federal government is currently leaning away from investing in public transportation, the ever worsening climate crisis will inevitably lead to substantial increases in funding of public transit, particularly rail transit as outlined in the CA State Rail Plan.

g. Add a new Evaluation Metric: “Transit Oriented Development” with Description: “To what extent will the project increase development potential” with Phase 1 & 2 Performance Measure: “Letter Graded Score” comparing the alternatives to one another.

2. Regarding the “Supports Equity” section we offer the following:

a. Under the part titled “Promote Active Transportation”, we recommend adding “Bicycle capacity per transit vehicle or per train-set” or replace “Bicycle capacity on transit/day” to the Phase 2 Performance Measures. Many cyclists are currently discouraged from using public transit because they know if the three available slots on the front rack of a bus are taken, they will have to wait for the next bus. This happens frequently. Confidence that there will be space for one’s bike will increase the number of transit users.

b. Under the part titled “Promote Active Transportation,” we recommend adding “Ease of loading a bicycle onto or into the vehicle” to the Phase 2 Performance Measures. This will allow a comparison of how easy it is to load a bicycle with a Phase 1 & 2 Performance Measure: “Letter Graded Score” comparing alternatives to one another.

c. Under the part titled “Provide accessible and equitable…”, we recommend adding “independent access for users with physical or mental disabilities” to the Phase 2 Performance Measures.

d. Under the part titled “Provide accessible and equitable…” we recommend adding “Carrying capacity for wheelchairs, scooters and other mobility equipment per vehicle or train-set” to the Phase 2 Performance Measures.
e. Under the part titled “Provide accessible and equitable…” we recommend changing the Phase 2 Performance Measure ‘Transit vehicle miles traveled’ to ‘Passenger Miles per Transit Vehicle Mile’. Simply comparing the number of transit vehicle miles traveled does not adequately describe the effectiveness of the proposed project in serving the maximum number of persons possible. For example, miles traveled by an empty vehicle would count under the former measure – but an empty vehicle serves no one.

f. Under the part titled “Offer reliable and efficient…” we recommend modifying the description for ‘Travel Time’ to read “Does project improve transit travel times during peak commuting periods.” and modify the Phase 2 Performance Measure “Transit Travel Time” to read “Transit Travel Time during morning peak commuting periods” and to include “Transit Travel Time during afternoon/evening peak commuting periods”. Comparing alternatives by average ‘transit travel time’ is not as relevant as travel times during peak travel times. A person made late to work because their transit vehicle is stuck in the morning peak commute doesn’t care that the travel time is better at noon or midnight.

3. Regarding the “Supports Environment” section we offer the following:

   a. We recommend adding a new evaluation metric titled “Public Transit Mode Share” with description: “To what extent will the project promote use of public transit” with Performance Measure:“County-wide public transit mode share.” Since about half of Santa Cruz County GHG emissions are transit related, choosing a transit mode that will encourage the most people to become new users of public transit is important. This metric directly measures the effectiveness of each alternative under consideration.

   b. We recommend adding a new evaluation metric titled “Life Cycle Emissions” with Description:“To what extent will the vehicle type impact landfill” with Performance Measure:“Vehicle Useful Service Life” Choosing vehicles with longer useful service lives as well as recyclability not only reduces landfill impacts but also reduces the embedded energy and resources used to build the vehicle in the first place. And like all the best metrics, this one works for economy as well. Sometimes it is wiser to buy a more expensive high quality vehicle that will last, than a disposable vehicle that must be replaced frequently.
c. We recommend adding a new evaluation metric titled “Area of Paved Roadway” with Description: “To what extent will the project rely on expansion of existing, or construction of new, paved surfaces, streets and highways” with Performance Measure: “Area of New or Expanded Pavement”

d. We recommend adding “Micro Rubber Pollutants” to the Performance Measures included under the “Emissions Reduction” Evaluation Metric. There have been a number of recent studies indicating tire wear is a significant and toxic contributor to the pollution of air and water and by extension to our Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

e. Given the fact we are in a global climate emergency and improving our public transit system is critical to reducing our collective GHG emissions, we recommend adding a new evaluation metric titled “Climate Emergency Response” with Description: “How fast can the proposed project be operational” with Performance Measure: “Years from decision to operational system”

4. Regarding the “Other Goals” section we offer the following:

a. We recommend adding a new evaluation metric titled “Desirability” with Description: “To what extent will the proposed transit type attract and retain new public transit users” with a Phase 2 Performance Measure: “Potential Ridership.”

b. We recommend adding a new evaluation metric titled “ROW” with Description: “How much of the existing SCBL corridor will be used by the project” with a Phase 2 Performance Measure: “Miles of Corridor Used.” This could also be considered an economy metric. The taxpayers paid good money for this corridor; it’d be irresponsible to make a choice that doesn’t use it to maximum capacity.

c. Similarly, we recommend adding a new evaluation metric titled “ROW Preservation” with Description: “How well will the project preserve the entire SCBL corridor for use as a transportation corridor in the future” with Phase 1 & 2 Performance Measures: “Letter Graded Score” comparing alternatives to one another.
d. We recommend adding a new evaluation metric titled “ROW” with Description: “Is the proposed transit type allowed under current SCBL corridor easements” with Performance Measure: “Miles of corridor with existing legal easement allowing proposed use.”

e. We recommend adding a new evaluation metric titled “Land Use” with Description: “To what extent does the project promote compact land development patterns” with Phase 1 & 2 Performance Measures: “Letter Graded Score” comparing alternatives to one another.

**Document Titled: Initial List of Alternatives**

1. The study appears to be focused on smaller capacity vehicles. Because larger vehicles, including train-sets carrying more people, are more energy efficient and will move more people during peak travel times when demand is highest, we recommend adding the following sub-categories to the “Form Factor and Capacity…” section:

   - 101-150 passengers seated/standing
   - 151-200 passengers seated/standing
   - 201-250 passengers seated/standing
   - 251-300 passengers seated/standing
   - 301-400 passengers seated/standing

2. Because our community already has a very high bicycling mode share rate – the second highest in the nation – the capacity of vehicles/train-sets to carry bicycles should be considered. Accordingly, we recommend adding a new section titled “Bicycle or other wheeled personal equipment capacity per vehicle” with the following sub-categories:

   - 0-4 bicycles or equivalent
   - 5-10 bicycles or equivalent
   - 11-20 bicycles or equivalent
   - 21-30 bicycles or equivalent
   - 31-40 bicycles or equivalent
3. Because accessibility and equity are essential to make public transportation work for everyone, we recommend adding a new section titled, “Wheelchair, Scooter or similar mobility device capacity per vehicle” with the following sub-categories:

- 0-2 wheelchairs or equivalent
- 3-5 wheelchairs or equivalent
- 6-10 wheelchairs or equivalent
- 11-15 wheelchairs or equivalent

**In Conclusion**

On behalf of all the Friends of the Rail & Trail, thank you for inviting input from the general public and other community organizations like us. As we stated earlier in the letter, we look forward to the opportunity to update our comments regarding the Phase 2 Performance Measures upon completion of the Phase 1 Screening Process. That will be a pivotal point, and as you know, the community is keenly interested in this process.

Evaluating alternatives using a robust set of criteria from a wide variety of interested parties will allow the RTC to make the most informed decisions possible and give the community confidence in the process.

Respectfully submitted,

*Sally Arnold*

Sally Arnold, Board Chair
Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail

cc: Board of Directors, Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail
From: Trician Comings <triciansc@mindspring.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2020 11:56 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Survey

I took the survey but didn't think it was very well designed or thought out. At least half the time when I leave the house, it is by bike or foot. But for longer trips I take the car. It made me choose one method of transportation and I chose the one with more mileage, but it doesn’t represent me or lots of people.

Build the trail ASAP and keep moving forward on the rail plan!

Thanks,
Trician
February 9, 2020

Dear Regional Transportation Commissioners,

I have been following the progress of the Rail Trail and want to weigh in with my opinion of the Corridor Transit Options.

Being a bicyclist, I would much prefer some sort of rail car as there would be more capacity as well as the ability to roll the bike on to the vehicle. It would also make it easier for baby strollers, wheelchairs and walkers.

Another advantage would be the potential connection to the State Rail Plan with access to many points in California, as well as state funding.

I am also impressed at how rail versus bus transit pencils out economically besides being better...
for the environment.

I'm sure you are all aware of the many further advantages of rail over bus. I urge you to approve adopting the rail option.

We are all so excited to see the Coastal Trail moving forward in our beautiful county. Having rail service from one end of the county to the other would be just great - in so many ways.

Sincerely,

Trician Comings
Build the Trail Now without Rail
Rail too expensive too long to wait
We need the Trail Now
I have worked for free with
Bike to work since it started 30 something years
Worked with Rail concept since 1992
Yes 1992, still no Rail!

In case we have follow up questions about your comment or questions, please provide the following:

Your Name: ________________________________

Email: ________________________________

What area do you live in?

☐ Check here if you would you like to receive email updates on the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060, 831-460-3200, info@sccrtc.org, www.sccrtc.org
Any "corridor" plan for which the corridor ends either at the Santa Cruz city limits, at the River Street intersection, or downtown, is incomplete. A complete plan must continue to the West Side/University, where so many people are going.

In case we have follow up questions about your comment or questions, please provide the following:

Your Name: Caroline Lamb
Email: ratbert@cruzio.com
What area do you live in? West Side Santa Cruz

Check here if you would you like to receive email updates on the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis
February 20, 2020

Mr. Guy Preston  
Executive Director  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Mr. Preston:

We appreciate you taking the time to meet with us on February 3, 2020. This letter is in reference to our discussion regarding the status of the Transit Corridor Alternative Analysis and its possible impact on the Santa Cruz, Big Trees & Pacific Railroad (SCBT), a wholly owned subsidiary of Roaring Camp Railroads. We found the meeting very informative and appreciate you sharing the work the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has embarked on to explore all possible transit alternatives on the corridor.

After hearing the various possible alternative transportation suggestions for the corridor, the SCBT believes as though it is important for the RTC to be reminded that the SCBT’s position is to be able to fully utilize our trackage rights. While the SCBT certainly plans on cooperating with the RTC in whatever path it follows, the SCBT is not willing to accept increased costs or liability exposure as a result of the RTC’s decisions.

The SCBT requests, as the analysis moves forward, that it does so in such a way that the results do not interfere with the SCBT’s operations. Keeping in mind the contribution and importance of the SCBT to the economy and culture of Santa Cruz, we request the analysis incorporates the value of the SCBT as it contemplates alternatives for the corridor.

The SCBT looks to the construction of the highspeed rail line in the Central Valley and the importance of truly utilizing the future of that system will depend on rail remaining on the corridor.

Please do not hesitate to contact me, should you have any comments or questions.

Best regards,

Melani Clark  
CEO, Roaring Camp Railroads
Commissioners,

Keep all high capacity and mass transit on Highway 1 corridor. Widen Highway 1 to 3 lanes each direction and include aux lanes as well. Make highway 1 a toll road that can identify autos by their license plate and charge by county of registration. Additionally, implement a mono rail or some other type of mass transit on highway 1.

The rail corridor needs to be used as a bike and pedestrian path. Do not implement any type of high capacity or mass transit on the rail corridor.

Improve the Metro bus system service that I know is operating at a capacity that is sub-standard. Improve it so it reaches more neighborhoods, reduce fees and subsequently increases ridership.

Protect our neighborhoods. NO HIGH CAPACITY or MASS TRANSIT / TRAINS on the rail corridor.

Joe Martinez
Aptos

Hi Ginger,

I was looking at the project schedule, and I wasn’t seeing any contact points with the city of SC – in particular with the SC Transp & Pub Works Commission.

Is there any plan to either present to or gather input from the commission?

: Ron Goodman
: 831 272 4627
: whatisron@gmail.com
To fully illustrate what I want to demonstrate I think I would need geographic contour maps showing the elevated spots as well as the flood-prone sections. But using the maps you sent me I will try to describe my thoughts.

Referring to the numbers on your potential stations map, the on-the-ground rails trouble begins after leaving station (2) at Bay and California, where the track descends behind the Waste Water Treatment plant and Neary Lagoon. To put in an elevated system like CyberTran you could start it at (2) and/or have a station at Bay and West Cliff Drive towards the back of the trailer park above the tracks.

The "downtown" station at (3) by the wharf which is in our tsunami and sea-level rise area, could be placed above the Sanctuary Exploration Center on the land now occupied by the Howard Johnston hotel. There are already steps going down from there that passengers could use to get to the wharf area. A ground rail train going through that area today stops all traffic at the roundabout. An elevated vehicle could sail right over that intersection, run along the boardwalk, the trestle, and over the Eucalyptus grove without needing to remove the trees.

The next potential station stop (4) at Seabright could again be built on higher ground at Arana Gulch behind the harbor, then continue elevated over the Twin Lakes and Corcoran Lake area, also flood-prone . . . and so on to Capitola. I know the railroad is the shortest route between Santa Cruz and Capitola and I think it would prove popular. It could be the initial project, building it segment at a time as we are currently doing for the bike trail.

Eventually, in co-operation with the Monterey Bay Community Power, I think a Cybertran system could become a micro-grid and extend along the coastal rail line to Monterey,

The future is in our hands.

Dana Bagshaw

In short, please add CyberTran to your List of Alternatives.

Thanks, Dana Bagshaw

I thought this description might help in adding CyberTran to your list. It is lifted from the attached letter of recommendation Dexter Vizinau sent us:
CyberTran’s Ultra-Light Rail Transit (ULRT) system using Autonomous Rail Vehicles (ARV’s) is a technology that is more than an idea. Two full scale prototypes have been built and tested. The system has been taken to 60 mph and has been proven to be capable of climbing a ten percent grade. ULRT technology was originally developed by our federal government at the US Department of Energy’s Idaho National Laboratory. The Federal Highway Administration has conducted an investigation into the technology and deemed it near deployment. Many tests and studies have been completed including a BART study . . . [that] determined ULRT costs much less to build and to operate and maintain than traditional fixed guideway transit systems. The ULRT system can also be powered by solar and includes an electric distribution system and power grid inter-tie.