

On 5/7/2020 7:21 AM, Gina Cole wrote:  
Dear Commissioners,

To connect the residents and students from the South side of Highway 1 to the North side at Mar Vista Drive, has been on the to-do list for longer than many of us can remember. Wouldn't it be amazing to bridge the gap created by the ever widening Highway 1 with a safe and direct route to access both Mar Vista Elementary and Cabrillo College? (And let's not forget, The Farm Bakery!)

The Mar Vista Bike-Pedestrian Bridge Project has also been delayed, postponed, and pushed further down the to-do list for longer than most can remember.

While, in reading the Staff Report, it seems to be an advantage for the Regional Transportation Commission to take the project over from the County of Santa Cruz and to combine this seemingly small to-do with the bigger project of Auxiliary Lanes and Bus On Shoulder along this section of Highway 1. There seems to be both a time and money saving advantage in the "one fell swoop" thinking here.

However, given that the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes and Bus On Shoulders from State Park to Bay/Porter Project also seems to be very contentious in the County, and could end up delayed for any number of financial, environmental, political or pandemic issues, coupling the Mar Vista Bike Pedestrian Bridge to the Highway Project may instead, just continue the pattern of moving this safe, and much desired neighborhood/school connector a few more lines/years down the to-do list, taking more time and needing more money, and denying another generation a safe, direct route from home to school.

Bike Santa Cruz County urges you to consider how these projects are linked and to look at how the bike-pedestrian bridge project could be "to-done" in the event that the larger Auxiliary Lanes and Bus On Shoulder project experiences delays. If that means, un-linking them and voting no on the Amendment, please do so.

Respectfully,

Gina Cole

**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](http://bikesantacruzcounty.org)

Patricia McVeigh [pmcveigh@baymoon.com](mailto:pmcveigh@baymoon.com) 5/5/2020

Thank you for continued discussion of this situation. Where are all those Lift Line Vans, and the others designated to help? Those small vans could be a wonderful resource for those of us needing transportation, - and in the future when a rail line is available, they will serve as connectors to the rail line from many neighborhoods. Currently the large busses move through town with only a few people riding - this is unacceptable, especially as they are subsidized. Integrating needs in our community is vital for sustainability. Peak times with students moving to schools are a prime need, taking many single driver cars off the roads, think of the many possibilities. As we emerge from our current situation, and look at ways we are different, please look at the bigger picture and make Santa Cruz an example of best use.

thank you  
Patricia McVeigh  
Santa Cruz

[bikerick@att.net](mailto:bikerick@att.net) 5/6/2020

Dear Commissioners:

Please ensure that the Mar Vista bike-ped bridge proceeds as quickly as possible, even if that means independently of the Highway One expansion project. This bridge will allow those residents in the vicinity on one side of the freeway, especially children, to safely and conveniently go to school (e.g., Mar Vista Elementary, Cabrillo College) or activities on the opposite side of freeway. This project has been on the books for at least two decades. In retrospect it should have been constructed along with the original freeway construction in the late 1940's that split the neighborhoods.

Members of the Bicycle Committee have periodically requested that this bike-ped bridge move forward. In response we were told that it was dependent on highway planning and environmental review which was taking a long time. At long last, several years ago there was a break-through – the RTC allocated separate funding for the bridge! The second break-through was the completion of the master EIR for Highway One, which had been another factor holding up moving forward with the bridge. And, just recently, there was a third break-through when the County assumed control of the project. Finally, we could see the light of day for the bike-ped bridge getting built!

It is thus very disappointing to read in your packet that the bridge would now be reincorporate into the highway project – and surprising, because the Bike Committee was not apprised of this. The reason stated in the staff report is that this would actually allow the bridge to be built sooner than if it remained a County-led project. However, history has shown that highway project timelines often slip by years due to funding, environmental, logistical, political and other issues. Compared to the highway components, the bridge is less expensive, controversial, complex, and impactful on the environment – it should be ready to go much sooner.

If you do agree to the staff recommendation to recombine the bridge and highway project, please direct staff to periodically report back on the progress towards meeting the timeline stated in the staff report. Also, please direct the consultant to report back in a few months as to whether the bridge project alone would require a full EIR or whether a Negative Declaration (ND) would suffice. If the latter, then please commit to preparing an ND for the bridge and not including it in the Highway EIR. If the former, then please commit to preparing an EIR that clearly distinguishes any adverse impacts from the bridge project and resultant necessary mitigation measures. Perhaps certain chapters can cover the

bridge and others cover the highway, so, if necessary to accelerate bridge construction, an independent EIR for the bridge could be split off from the larger EIR.

Finally, please commit to once again decoupling the bridge from the larger project if the timeline starts to slip due to non-bridge reasons or if and when it becomes apparent that the larger highway project will be delayed.

.  
Thank you.  
Rick Hyman  
Member, RTC Bicycle Committee

Brian Peoples [brian@trailnow.org](mailto:brian@trailnow.org) 5/5/2020

RTC,

We do not agree with RTC staff's recommendation to award contract agreement with Industrial Railways Company for the repair of the Ballast Deck Timber Trestle at MP 4.87. We believe less risk to Santa Cruz taxpayers, less risk to RTC Staff safety and lower overall cost to Santa Cruz taxpayers is to award the contract to Stacy and Witbeck.

The idea of having RTC staff sit at the site to "monitor" contractor hours, work scope and equipment activities to control cost is not practical. RTC staff has limited experience in this type of construction based on the fact that their estimated cost was half the actual bid cost and no past experience with train bridge repairs.

Control of workload and cost by RTC staff for a Time & Material contract is not possible. Contractor is required to perform tasks needed to complete work and the contractor is most qualified to make field-adjustments to the work. RTC staff would have no ability to make work scope changes by contractor who is more qualified to make decisions on project work.

Attached are two photos of the area near Harkins Slough that shows the railroad tracks are completely covered with mud and trees on the tracks. The idea of having RTC staff sit at the site and watch the contractor is not only a waste of RTC staff time, but also increases risk of injury to RTC staff.

Finally, the cost of RTC Staff sitting at the site monitoring construction is not being included in the overall cost so it is misleading that RTC recommendation is the most cost-effective. We would ask "what work normally performed by RTC staff will stop while sitting at the construction site"?

We recommend RTC approve the lump sum contract to Stacy and Witbeck, which limits the risk to the RTC for cost overages.

Best regards,

Brian Peoples  
Executive Director  
TrailNow





Rick Longinotti [longinotti@baymoon.com](mailto:longinotti@baymoon.com) 5/5/2020

Dear Commissioners,

I'm concerned that the proposed applications for the SB1 Solutions to Congested Corridors (SCC) and Local Partnership Programs do not comply with the guidelines for those programs. Both of those grant programs are competitive. In the last round of SCC grant funding, less than half of applicants received funding. With the decline of gas tax revenues, the next round may be even more competitive.

The portion of the RTC's proposed grant application that doesn't comply with the guidelines is the request for funding for auxiliary lanes from Soquel Ave. to State Park Dr. The state is looking to fund projects that are cost-effective—that actually reduce traffic congestion. According to the EIR on Highway 1 improvements, the TSM Alternative, which includes the auxiliary lanes and ramp metering, was found to result in "very slight relief in traffic congestion compared to the No Build Alternative." Hence the auxiliary lanes project would result in even less relief in traffic congestion.

The EIR published a traffic analysis on only one of the auxiliary lane segments: Soquel Ave to 41st Ave. It found that "In the Southbound corridor in the PM peak hour...the Auxiliary Lane Alternative would slightly worsen traffic operations."

There are other guidelines that the auxiliary lanes do not meet. The Guidelines read: "Highway lane capacity-increasing projects funded by this program shall be limited to high-occupancy vehicle lanes, managed lanes, and other non-general purpose lanes designed to improve safety for all modes of travel."

According to the EIR, the proposed auxiliary lanes will not improve safety on the highway. "The total accident rates overall and by segment in 2035 under the Tier I Corridor TSM Alternative would be the same as the accident rates for the No Build Alternative."

Non-compliance with the guidelines does not bode well for the success of this grant application. I urge the Commission to re-think the strategy of building auxiliary lanes. Rather, please consider the construction of bus-only lanes on the shoulder of Highway 1. The RTC staff are currently favoring a bus-in-auxiliary lane approach (except at the underpasses, when the bus would travel in a bus-only lane merging into the next auxiliary lane). This approach is likely to result in buses getting stuck in auxiliary lane traffic, rather than having the advantage of a dedicated lane.

We applaud the RTC staff for applying for funding for protected bike lanes on Soquel Dr. This makes it all the more important not to undermine the success of the grant application by including the auxiliary lane project.

Thank you for considering,

Rick Longinotti, Co-Chair, Campaign for Sustainable Transportation