

Transit Corridors Alternatives Analysis  
Milestone 2 Email Input from Partner Agencies and RTC Advisory Committee  
Members

**From:** [bikerick@att.net](mailto:bikerick@att.net) <[bikerick@att.net](mailto:bikerick@att.net)>

**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 11:31 AM

**To:** Thomas Travers <[ttravers@scrtc.org](mailto:ttravers@scrtc.org)>

**Cc:** Ginger Dykaar <[gdykaar@scrtc.org](mailto:gdykaar@scrtc.org)>; 'Amelia Conlen' <[conlen.ameliawren@gmail.com](mailto:conlen.ameliawren@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** RE: BAC Zoom meeting info

Hi: Here are the questions I wish to ask with regard to Item 14. Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis:

Does level boarding for Alternatives 1 & 2 mean that there will be room inside the vehicles to store bicycles?

If not, does level boarding extend to the racks, trailers or other bicycle conveyances that would hopefully be on the Alternative 1 & 2 vehicles?

What are the physical differences, if any, among the four chosen vehicle alternatives as to how they carry bicycles -- specifically in regard to having: ample room for bikes; some room for recumbent, cargo and other non-common size bikes; an easy means to secure the bike on board; ability to be internally reconfigured to increase room for bikes if demand warrants; security features for bikes on board; bikes viewable to owners who are on board?

Which, if any, of the other vehicles considered in the non-selected alternatives would allow bikes to be brought and stored onboard in a safer, easier, and/or more efficient manner with respect to the above points than the four chosen vehicle alternatives?

What are, if any, the physical or operational differences among the four chosen vehicle alternatives that would restrict bicycle-friendly policies, such as no bumping bikes on board for other users; no extra charge to bring bikes on board; no extra ticket, permit or license to bring bikes on board and no time restrictions for bikes to be brought on board, from being considered and, hopefully implemented?

For which, if any of the other vehicles considered in the non-selected alternatives are there inherent designs or operations that be more conducive to adopting the above bicycle-friendly policies?

What are, if any, the inherent physical differences among station design for the four chosen vehicle alternatives that would affect those with bicycles accessing the stations, waiting at the stations, or boarding from the stations -- such as comfortable accommodations while waiting; secure and ample bike storage for those who prefer not to bring their bikes on board; convenient, safe and signed bikeways leading to and from stations and boarding areas; room for support items for bikes at waiting areas or on board, such as air, drinking water?

Would station design for which, if any, of the other vehicles considered in the non-selected alternatives be inherently more friendly for bicycles and their riders with respect to the above points?

What are the physical differences, if any, among the necessary footprints (including track or paved surface, sidings, station location, signals and signing, safety buffers, and fencing) for the four chosen vehicle alternatives as to how they influence the location of the rail trail?

What are the physical differences, if any, among the necessary footprints (including track or paved surface, sidings, station location, signals and signing, safety buffers, and fencing) for the four chosen vehicle alternatives as to how they influence how bicyclists can access the rail trail, including crossing the footprints of the vehicles?

Which, if any, of the non-selected alternatives' footprints pose fewer constraints on rail trail location and access?

As you can see, these questions follow from the previous Bicycle Committee discussion on what criteria to use. I know there are a lot of factors that enter into the decision as to which mode to choose and much passion. Hopefully, the Committee can focus on the differences, where there are any, among the alternatives that specifically relate to bikes. I figured it would be helpful to send these ahead of time, rather than type them into chat; sorry for not finishing sooner. "See" you tonight.

Rick Hyman

[bikerick@att.net](mailto:bikerick@att.net) 4/14/2020

Wow, thanks for the fast turnaround. And good to know that the buses can probably carry bikes inside, Rick

Theresa Rogerson [Theresa.Rogerson@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Theresa.Rogerson@santacruzcounty.us) 5/11/2020

Hi Ginger –

My apologies that my audio wasn't working for the stakeholder meeting last week. Here are my thoughts:

- 1) I found that the smaller capacity options, such as shuttles and gondolas, to be more appealing now in light of this pandemic. I would think studying and surveying on what people are willing to do in the new normal might be a wise idea (like what the airline companies are doing now).
- 2) Might be a good idea to think of how the options on the table could be repurposed during a disaster or emergency, such as the use of buses to provide internet access to rural areas, to deliver food or to shuttle people to shelters.
- 3) I'm sure this has been published previously but am wondering how many commute trips take place within our county vs. from here to locations outside the county. Seems like most are to go

over the hill from here in which case I wonder if there ever could be a connection with what is built here to locations farther out, like a gondola over 17 😊

- 4) Lastly, is the expectation that most people would use this corridor for commuting or for recreational purposes, and local vs. tourist users mostly? Not sure if we have estimated numbers for this.

I wasn't able to load the open house links well so hope my comments can be incorporated.

Theresa

Murray Fontes [murray.fontes@cityofwatsonville.org](mailto:murray.fontes@cityofwatsonville.org) 5/11/2020

Ginger,

Watsonville has the following comments on the Alternatives Screening Results and Short List of Alternatives presented with Milestone 2 of the Transit Corridors Alternatives Analysis.

1. Watsonville's priorities for the TCAA include the following:
  - Compatible with freight
  - Create additional commute options for Watsonville residents
  - Affordable fares
  - Maximize number of boarding locations within Watsonville
  - Integrate with overall transportation system
  - Support Transit Oriented Development
  - Reliable travel times
  - Support greenhouse gas emission reduction goals
2. Watsonville supports the four recommended alternatives.
3. The City has the following concerns for the proposed alternatives:
  - a. Arterial and Right-of-Way Bus Rapid Transit
    - Compatible with freight?
  - b. Autonomous Road "Train"
    - Compatible with freight?
    - Maximize boarding locations?
  - c. Light Rail/Electric Multiple Unit
    - Maximize boarding locations?
  - d. Commuter Rail/Electric Multiple Unit
    - Maximize boarding locations?

Murray Fontes

**From: Rick Hyman, District 5 Member**  
**To: Bicycle Advisory Committee**  
**Re: BAC Meeting 4/13/20 Item 14 Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis**

Questions from Rick Hyman (RH) & responses from Ginger Dykaar (GD), RTC staff, 4/13/20

RH: Here are the questions I wish to ask with regard to Item 14. Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis:

Does level boarding for Alternatives 1 & 2 mean that there will be room inside the vehicles to store bicycles?

GD: I am not sure what you are referring to when you say "Alternative 1&2" (initial or short list 1&2??) but the Active Transportation metric evaluated indoor space for bicycles and the access measure evaluated the ability for level boarding for mobility devices and potentially bicycles if there was space in the vehicle.

RH: If not, does level boarding extend to the racks, trailers or other bicycle conveyances that would hopefully be on the Alternative 1 & 2 vehicles?

GD: See above

RH: What are the physical differences, if any, among the four chosen vehicle alternatives as to how they carry bicycles -- specifically in regard to having: ample room for bikes; some room for recumbent, cargo and other non-common size bikes; an easy means to secure the bike on board; ability to be internally reconfigured to increase room for bikes if demand warrants; security features for bikes on board; bikes viewable to owners who are on board?

GD: Did not evaluate at this level of detail in screening the alternatives

RH: Which, if any, of the other vehicles considered in the non-selected alternatives would allow bikes to be brought and stored onboard in a safer, easier, and/or more efficient manner with respect to the above points than the four chosen vehicle alternatives?

GD: See Active Transportation metric results for how the alternatives were evaluated for bicycle based on capacity of vehicles and whether elevated

RH: What are, if any, the physical or operational differences among the four chosen vehicle alternatives that would restrict bicycle-friendly policies, such as no bumping bikes on board for other users; no extra charge to bring bikes on board; no extra ticket, permit or license to bring bikes on board and no time restrictions for bikes to be brought on board, from being considered and, hopefully implemented?

GD: Did not evaluate at this level of detail in screening the alternatives

RH: For which, if any of the other vehicles considered in the non-selected alternatives are there inherent designs or operations that be more conducive to adopting the above bicycle-friendly policies?

GD: Did not evaluate at this level of detail in screening the alternatives

RH: What are, if any, the inherent physical differences among station design for the four chosen vehicle alternatives that would affect those with bicycles accessing the stations, waiting at the stations, or boarding from the stations -- such as comfortable accommodations while waiting; secure and ample bike storage for those who prefer not to bring their bikes on board;

convenient, safe and signed bikeways leading to and from stations and boarding areas; room for support items for bikes at waiting areas or on board, such as air, drinking water?

GD: Did not evaluate at this level of detail in screening the alternatives.

RH: Would station design for which, if any, of the other vehicles considered in the non-selected alternatives be inherently more friendly for bicycles and their riders with respect to the above points?

GD: Did not evaluate at this level of detail in screening the alternatives

RH: What are the physical differences, if any, among the necessary footprints (including track or paved surface, sidings, station location, signals and signing, safety buffers, and fencing) for the four chosen vehicle alternatives as to how they influence the location of the rail trail?

GD: Did not evaluate at this level of detail in screening the alternatives.

RH: What are the physical differences, if any, among the necessary footprints (including track or paved surface, sidings, station location, signals and signing, safety buffers, and fencing) for the four chosen vehicle alternatives as to how they influence how bicyclists can access the rail trail, including crossing the footprints of the vehicles?

GD: Did not evaluate at this level of detail in screening the alternatives

RH: Which, if any, of the non-selected alternatives' footprints pose fewer constraints on rail trail location and access?

GD: The Right of Way metric provides some qualitative information on the amount of right of way that will be needed for the various alternatives with consideration for how both a transit and trail system can be accommodated.

RH: As you can see, these questions follow from the previous Bicycle Committee discussion on what criteria to use. I know there are a lot of factors that enter into the decision as to which mode to choose and much passion. Hopefully, the Committee can focus on the differences, where there are any, among the alternatives that specifically relate to bikes. I figured it would be helpful to send these ahead of time, rather than type them into chat; sorry for not finishing sooner. "See" you tonight.

GD: The performance measure analysis in Phase 2 will consider more of these effects when comparing the short list of alternatives.

From: Sally Arnold, District 3 Alternate Member  
To: Bicycle Advisory Committee  
Re: BAC Meeting 4/13/20 Item 14 Alternatives Analysis short list

---

I have spent some time looking carefully at the document and I have a lot of questions, but as far as *this* committee is concerned, I want to suggest that we provide some specific feed back to the RTC staff and commissioners on their short list of transit options.

From a cyclist's point of view, I think we'd be well served if The RTC would prioritize those vehicles choices that do these three things:

- 1. Provides the easiest access and most bike storage capacity per vehicle**
- 2. Can be implemented the quickest so we get an accessible trail and quality transit soon.**
- 3. Preserves and protects the continuity of the entire 32 mile corridor FOREVER so that we do not risk losing the corridor to easement problems**

If any of the currently proposed 4 options will put public ownership of corridor at risk or significantly delay the building of the trail, perhaps they should not even be on the short list for further study.

I'm certainly open to providing even more suggestions to the RTC, and I'm sure that some of our committee members will offer some. But these three items seem like a basic beginning we might all be able to agree on to start the conversation.