



MILESTONE 3 LIVE CHAT #2 RECAP

Wednesday, November 18, 2020 | 6 – 7:30 p.m.

11 TOTAL CHATTERS

[Please note that any additions after the chat was closed were provided in brackets and italics.]

#1 Keith Otto - keith_otto@yahoo.com

- Are ridership numbers in the TCAA report 'people', or 'boardings' (as in one person or commuter boards twice per day; so boardings = 2x people)?

- Ridership numbers are forecast for year 2040, is that correct? And these numbers assume train service starts and is up and running by what year?

- Where is La Selva Beach station located exactly?

- The seasonal La Selva Beach station will be operational during how much of the year?

- How much eminent domain will to be done south of Santa Cruz?

- Where can one read all the questions and answers from this chat session (Wed Nov 18) and the previous chat session (Thu Nov 12)?

Keith Otto

Project Team Member
5

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

Keith Otto

Previous message got chopped off ... was trying to add ... Thank you!

Ginger Dykaar has joined this conversation.



Ginger Dykaar

Hi Keith,

Welcome! The ridership numbers are boardings. Each transit ride is one boarding.

Yes, ridership numbers are forecasted for 2040.

The exact location for La Selva Beach Station has not been identified but Manresa Beach area would be the ideal destination.

The TCAA evaluated La Selva as a seasonal weekend service. The decisions about the service and exact station locations will be decided in future steps of project development.

As the projects are being developed along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, more detailed survey information is being collected. There are currently no plans for eminent domain south of Santa Cruz.

The chat discussions will be posted on the RTC website.

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA, do you have any more questions?

Keith Otto

Ok, Thank you. And the 2040 ridership numbers are based on train service started and up and running by what year?

Kim Pallari has joined this conversation.

Kim Pallari

Generally for a study like this we do not estimate ridership for service start up.



Kim - Right. But you have numbers for 2040. So those are based on the service being up and running some time before 2040. What year is

Keith Otto

that? Is it 2039? or 2030? or 2025? or?

Unfortunately we do not have a specific start up date or construction date at this time but rather are planning at this time for approximately 13 years from now. This estimate is based on the project planning

Kim Pallari

moving forward with funding in place.

13 years from now. $2020+13 = 2033$. Which is maybe start of

Keith Otto

construction? Do I have this right?

Kim Pallari

That is correct.

Ok. And then no date at this time as to when construction is complete,

Keith Otto

and service is up and running?

Kim Pallari

You are correct, not at this time.

Yet there are ridership estimates for 2040, with an unknown service

Keith Otto

start date? Do I have this correct?

The 2040 horizon is based on RTC's modeling. Planning for this type of project is typically based on a horizon year rather than a specific projected year which is unknown. A construction year will be identified

Kim Pallari

in future phases.

Not looking to beat this to death, but what am I missing? There are ridership numbers for 2040. These are not the first year or initial start

Keith Otto

up numbers. I get all of that. But the modeling must assume that the service is up and running sometime before 2040 and I am trying to



understand when that might be. Obviously items at that point are estimates. When is the estimated start of service?

Kim Pallari

I apologize, I mis-spoke. While we didn't do start up analysis for this early study phase, we did estimate an approximate year of service start to be 13 years from now which would be around 2033 timeframe.

Keith Otto

Ok. So just so I am clear - 2033 is start of service (not start of construction - start of construction would need to be before 2033 for construction to be complete by 2033). And then 7 years later, 2040, ridership numbers are estimated as noted in the report. Do I have all of this correct? Thanks!

Kim Pallari

Yes you are correct.

Keith Otto

Ok. Thank you. Thanks for putting up with me / all the questions!

Kim Pallari

Absolutely. We appreciate your participation and engagement in this important Study.

Keith Otto

Sure thing! Peace. Over and out.

#2 Mark Mesiti-Miller - markmesitimiller@gmail.com

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Re: Tbl 5.2



Project Team Member
5

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

Kim Pallari has joined this conversation.

Kim Pallari

Hi Mark. Do you have a question regarding Table 5.2?

Mark Mesiti-Miller

O&M costs/rider and O&M costs/passenger mile are quite different than the figures found in the National Transit Database. Can you explain why they are so different. CRT is \$0.50 / pass mile and LRT is about \$0.80 / pass mile in the NTD but in this study quite a bit higher

Further the NTD shows BRT at about \$1.10 and the TCAA shows it about \$1.20 - much closer to the NTD...

In Tbl 5.4 the TCAA indicates that BRT is likely to increase TOD where it runs in the corridor but no effort is made to quantify this difference. Do you think the increase is directly related to the length of corridor used? Since BRT only runs in the about 30% of the corridor length, is it reasonable to assume BRT will only generate about 30% as much TOD?

Kim Pallari

Thank you for your comment. The NTD provides estimates for systems in place that are nationally based defaults for O&M. What was done for this study was to base O&M specifically on each alignment.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

On page 5-32, there is a statement that "Bus Rapid Transit proposes to convert 6.7 miles of the ROW from a railway to a paved guideway." yet in tbl 5.1 there is a BRT 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B with lengths of 7.7mi and 3.22mi listed. Was the 2A and 2B options eliminated?



In Tbl 5.7 the TCAA indicates that level boarding for BRT is likely limited to stops where BRT runs in the corridor but no effort is made to quantify this difference. Since BRT only runs in the about 30% of the corridor length, is it reasonable to assume that level boarding will only be available at about 30% of the BRT stops?

I have typed several questions for which I have not yet received a response. Is anyone there? Can you only handle 1 question at a time?

Shannon Munz has joined this conversation.

Shannon Munz

Several of the BRT options shown in Table 5.1 were eliminated during Value Engineering. The 6.7 mile length is the BRT system alignment that rose to the top as a result of value engineering.

So yes, after value engineering we did eliminate 2A and 2B

I am working on drafting responses to your other questions.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

thanks

Shannon Munz

Level boarding could be available at some stops outside of the ROW for BRT, but due to road ROW constraints level boarding platforms cannot be assumed at all stops. Precise design for all BRT stops was outside of the scope of this study.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Tbl 5.9 seems to indicate that BRT will have about twice as many collisions per year as LRT ($2.00 / 0.91 = 2.2$) and about forty times as many collisions per year as CRT ($2.00 / 0.05 = 40$). Is that correct?

Kim Pallari

Thank you Mark. Hold tight please.



Mark Mesiti-Miller

Your response: "Level boarding could be available at some stops outside of the ROW for BRT..." can you please estimate the % of stops likely to have level boarding outside the ROW? Was the cost of creating level boarding stops outside the ROW included in the CapEx cost estimates for BRT?

Tbl 5.9 indicates BRT will reduce the overall annual cost of collisions by \$62,700 but LRT will reduce the annual cost of collisions by \$52,100. If this figure is somehow related to VMT reduction figures and the estimated annual collision figures, it seems LRT would be saving more money than the BRT option. Can you explain why BRT appears to be saving more money than LRT?

Kim Pallari

We will have to get back to you on your first question regarding % of stops that will have level boarding outside the ROW. For your second question, station and stop locations were built into the cost estimate.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Tbl 5.15 Can you please explain where each end of the End to End travel time estimate is located for BRT, CRT, LRT and ART? Can you please other time estimates from other station to station trips? For example: Aptos to the Boardwalk? Capitola to the Boardwalk? If not, how can other station to station times be estimated?

Kim Pallari

Thank you for your detailed question. We are working to respond to many chats this evening and would like a chance to go back to the data and provide you with a more detailed response. Would you mind if we responded via email using your gmail account?

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Please take your time and respond when you can to all my questions. If you don't mind, I'll keep asking questions and you can respond to them



when you can. Please note, my second question regarding TOD potential still needs an answer.

thanks

Ginger Dykaar has joined this conversation.

Ginger Dykaar

Hi Mark, this is Ginger. Do you have a question on TOD?

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Tbl 5.16 provides estimates of auto travel times. Please provide the locations of the beginning and end points for the auto travel time estimates?

Hi Ginger. here is my TOD ? In Tbl 5.4 the TCAA indicates that BRT is likely to increase TOD where it runs in the corridor but no effort is made to quantify this difference. Do you think the increase is directly related to the length of corridor used? Since BRT only runs in the about 30% of the corridor length, is it reasonable to assume BRT will only generate about 30% as much TOD?

Ginger Dykaar

The auto travel time on Highway 1 is for the distance from Larkin Valley Road to Morrissey Blvd. [*NOTE- to be exact the distance is from 0.4 Miles south of Larkin Valley Rd - 0.3 Miles North of Morrissey Blvd*]

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Tbl 5.17 - the estimated gate down times seem inconsistent with measurements I have taken of gate down times at other passenger rail systems and inconsistent with gate down times one can view on YouTube of various rail transit systems - provided estimates are much longer. Can you explain how these estimates were calculated?



Ginger Dykaar

I do think the length of the corridor is a factor in the possibility of TOD but it also depends on the land use and available areas along the SCBRL and the size of the TOD. Without more detailed analysis, I would not want to say 30% is representative.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

I understand your TOD response " Without more detailed analysis, I would not want to say 30% is representative." Can you provide a range of estimated TOD likelihood for BRT vs either Rail option?

Ginger Dykaar

This is a conservative time determined by rail experts at HDR for the gate down time.

I do not think we have a way to assess the TOD likelihood in BRT versus Rail but I will look into it and if available will provide in a FAQ that is posted on our website and include in the final draft report. I will notify you if there is a way to assess this quantitatively.

The end to end travel time for the four alternatives is from Pajaro Station to Natural Bridges Drive.

We do not have other travel times between different stations besides these end points.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Given "The end to end travel time for the four alternatives is from Pajaro Station to Natural Bridges Drive." why then are the auto travel times provided in tbl 5.16 "The auto travel time on Highway 1 is for the distance from Larkin Valley Road to Morrissey Blvd." for a substantially shorter distance? To make a fair comparison, It seems the end to end travel times for autos should be based on the same end points. Please



provide auto travel times for the same end points as the public transit alternatives. Thanks...

Ginger Dykaar

As for level boarding potential for BRT off the rail ROW, the details of the number of stops that do not have the space for level boarding was not evaluated quantitatively but as mentioned in the performance measure analysis could be more difficult to implement.

The project team considered comparing the travel time for the same end points as the transit alternative but given the intent of the question from the public to determine how the transit alternative would reduce travel times on Hwy 1, the decision was made to show the auto travel times just on the highway.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

When comparing BRT to the CRT/LRT options, would it be fair to average the figures given for the CRT/LRT options when comparing them to the BRT option?

Given that BRT is generally defined as "a fixed-route bus mode that has at least 50 percent of its route on exclusive guideways" and the proposed BRT will only have about 30% of its route on an exclusive guideway (the rail corridor), can you still honestly call the proposed system BRT?

Ginger Dykaar

The collision data is based on a shift from auto to transit.

LRT has 1.18 collisions less per year than a no build.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Tbl 5.21 indicates that implementing LRT will result in an annual reduction of 4.06 metric tons of GHG emissions. Is that a reduction for all modes of travel in the entire county? That figure seems very low.



Are you sure that is not a reduction of 4.06 metric tons of GHG emissions per day?

Ginger Dykaar

The reason that LRT does not have a substantial reduction in costs that parallels number of collisions is that nationally there are more fatal injuries from LRT relative to BRT.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Tbl 5.18 - is somewhat confusing to me. In the BRT column, the figure of 132 minutes is provided. Does this mean that the estimated 90 minute trip could actually end up taking 132 minutes? Similarly, for the CRT column the figure provided is 56.25 minutes. Does this mean that the estimated 45 minute trip could actually end up taking 56.25 minutes? Of do these figures mean something different?

Ginger Dykaar

Thanks for pointing out the GHG numbers. Let me check tomorrow and see if this needs to be revised.

The travel time reliability numbers say that 95% of the time the trip for BRT will be 132 minutes or less.

Similarly for CRT, 95% of the time, the travel time for CRT is 56 minutes or less.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Tbl 5.19 - the CRT/LRT capacities are substantially higher than the BRT option. Is it possible that these options could prove so popular that there will be far more ridership than predicted by this study? If so, any idea how much more?

Given, "the travel time reliability numbers say that 95% of the time the trip for BRT will be 132 minutes or less." how often will the BRT trip be the 90 minutes predicted?



In the ridership data that is provided, there are three values provided that represent 1)the base ridership based on existing land use, 2)ridership based on work that jurisdictions are doing to develop areas around the proposed station locations and 3) a 10% increase above this second amount based on ridership increase due to TOD that would develop based on the transit service being in place.

Ginger Dykaar

Thanks for all your help. I look forward to getting a transcript of my Q&A session and the answers to other questions at your earliest convenience.

Mark Mesiti-Miller

I will figure out your answer to the travel time reliability for the 90 minutes and put in an FAQ and let you know.

Ginger Dykaar

Thanks for participating in the chat. We are closing the chat.

#3 Visitor 487471

Visitor 487471

I live in live oak and would like to chat about the rail corridor

Project Team Member
5

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

Shannon Munz has joined this conversation.

Shannon Munz

Thank you for joining our live chat. I am happy to answer your questions.

Visitor 487471

is there a planned timeline for developing the bike or walking path on the rail corridor in live oak?



I see they have done a lot on the westside, wondering when they will start here in live oak

Shannon Munz

The rail trail segment in Live Oak is in the environmental phase and we are actively applying for grants for construction.

#4 Barry Scott - barry@coastalrail.org

Barry Scott

I hope turnout is good, especially for south county and Spanish language visitors!

**Project Team Member
5**

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

Kim Pallari has joined this conversation.

Kim Pallari

Hi Barry. Thank you. We hope to have lots of good conversations tonight as well. Thank you for joining.

Barry Scott

Hi Kim, will the RTC publish some or all of the conversations from these chats?

Kim Pallari

Yes we plan to post all the questions and comments on the project webpage following the chat sessions and closure of the online public open house.

Barry Scott

That's great news! I'm a big fan and grateful for the amount of public engagement built in to the process. Also, very excited about the Locally



Preferred Alternatives. Using our rail line seems like the most easily implementable transit alternative we could hope for.

Kim Pallari

Thank you for your comments and participation tonight.

My favorite findings, rail transit:

- Provides the Shortest Length of Time to Implement. The schedule for implementing passenger rail will require less time than the other transit corridor alternatives.
- Assures Continuous Corridor for Transit and Trail. The rail transit alternative assures continuous use of the SCBRL ROW for its intended purpose, which creates more certainty on preserving the corridor for all uses.
- Provides Faster Travel Times and Greater Travel Time Reliability. Passenger rail utilizing a dedicated guideway for the entire distance between Santa Cruz and Pajaro provides the fastest travel times and greatest level of travel time reliability.
- Reduces Auto Vehicle Miles Traveled and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. As transit ridership increases, auto vehicle miles traveled will decrease.
- Serves a High Percentage of Disadvantaged Populations in Santa Cruz County. The passenger rail system includes 91% of its rail station stops within census tracts identified as transportation disadvantaged populations in the county.
- Provides Regional Rail Network Compatibility. Passenger rail will provide the best regional network integration potential and

Barry Scott



compatibility with the California State Rail Plan and neighboring Monterey County regional rail project plans.

- Two-way travel is assured using three strategically located passing sidings and modern transit dispatch systems. Expect service every 20 to 30 minutes!

Kim Pallari Thank you Barry!

Barry Scott Thank you to everyone at the RTC!

#5 Johanna Lighthill - jjmmlight@comcast.net

Johanna Lighthill

Hello, Are quiet zones included in capital costs of rail options? If so, what is the estimate and under which line item are they listed?

**Project Team Member
5**

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

Ginger Dykaar has joined this conversation.

Ginger Dykaar

Hi Johanna, The quiet zone costs are included in the capital costs. Let me find out what line item it is listed under.

Johanna Lighthill

Thanks!

Ginger Dykaar

Quiet zones are under the line item "Crossing signals" in the detailed cost appendix.



\$22.6 million for 43 crossings

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA. Do you have any more questions for the chat?

Johanna Lighthill

Thank you. Just confirming that there are no planned safety mitigations for private crossings?

Kim Pallari has joined this conversation.

Kim Pallari

In future project development phases such as environmental clearance, potential affects and mitigation measures including for safety will be identified.

Johanna Lighthill

Thank you. Next question: Regarding reliability, why was LRT and CRT determined to be most reliable? If a rail vehicle breaks down, wouldn't it delay all vehicles on the line, effecting travel in both directions?

Shannon Munz has joined this conversation.

Shannon Munz

Rail vehicles were determined to have better travel time reliability because of the exclusive dedicated guideway. The most pressing issue with reliability is typically congestion, not vehicle breakdowns.

Johanna Lighthill

Thank you. I appreciate your feedback. Can you tell me, did the TCAA consider findings of the RTC's 1998 Major Transportation Investment Study (MTIS) which recommended a busway on the corridor?

Shannon Munz

Yes, MTIS was one of the many studies referred to and considered as part of this study.



But data, trends, and goals such as GHG emission have changed significantly since 1998. The TCAA primarily considered the most up-to-date information in the analysis.

Johanna Lighthill

Thanks, Shannon. When I attended the workshops, I asked consultants how different types of transit would impact the trail. Consultants said that this would be addressed further in the study. Were impacts to trail accessibility considered? My understanding is that rail requires stricter safety and separation measures (ie fences) than bus. Any info on this?

Shannon Munz

The potential impacts on the trail are addressed on pages 5-35 to 5-36 of the document. Rail separation requirements are generally more specific, but rail also requires less ROW width than the proposed BRT system. Analysis results show that overall, the trail would not be affected by any of the transit options in the rail ROW. More clarification on this item will be added to the report.

Johanna Lighthill

Thanks. I'm especially concerned about public access to the trail. From what I've read about FRA requirements, fencing will be required and will strictly limit crossing. Wondering if bus requirements are as severe? I'll look forward to reading specifics.

Lastly, several options were eliminated from the initial list of transit options because they did not meet the requirements of "high capacity" transit. Can you define "high capacity"? Number of passengers or frequency?

Shannon Munz

Slow speeds were also a factor in options being eliminated. Shuttles also scored low for: TOD, Freight impacts, corridor preservation, promoting active transportation, universal access, travel time,



ridership, and emissions reduction. So, in other words they weren't just eliminated because of their lower capacity.

Our chat session time has ended but if you have any additional comments or questions, email transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org.

Johanna Lighthill

Thanks. The SCCRTC approved the UCS which specified “high capacity transit.” I just wondered what exactly that meant. Thank you for your time addressing my questions. Of course, I have many more! Take care!

#6 Shachar - shachart@rinspin.com

Shachar Hi,

Project Team Member
5

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

Kim Pallari has joined this conversation.

Kim Pallari

Hi Shachar, do you have a question or comment?

Shachar

Hi Kim, is the proposal to use the trestle bridge that crosses in capitola village over the river. If so, what is the thinking to reduce the vibration (and noise) from the trains crossing over. Our house is underneath the trestle on riverview ave. When the holiday train comes thru during Christmas it literally vibrates our whole house.

Kim Pallari

During this early phase and study, we did not go through that level of analysis. If the trestle is retrofitted, it would likely reduce the vibration



considerable. However that is not something that will be determined during this phase.

Shachar

Thanks. Is the analysis right now to narrow down what type of transit vehicle would be used (light rail, bus, etc)? Once this phase is done, will the proposal need to go to a county vote at some pt for approval on a bond measure?

Shannon Munz has joined this conversation.

Shannon Munz

Yes, the purpose of the TCAA is evaluate transit alternatives to define a locally-preferred alternative that offers the greatest benefit to Santa Cruz County in terms of equity, environment, and economy. We are now in the final phase of the TCAA. The draft results and locally-preferred alternative will go to the RTC commission in February for approval.

Shachar

So when/where should I write in to express my concern about the noise and vibration for trains every 30 mins

Shannon Munz

You can submit comments for the board to consider before they make a decision to transitcorridora@scrtc.org.

#7 Kim James - kimjames@aol.com

Kim James

It looks like the 4 options have been narrowed down to CRT and LRT. Is that correct (the locally preferred alternatives)?



Project Team Member
5

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

Kim Pallari has joined this conversation.

Kim James

I'm going to step away for a moment - I'll be right back.

Kim Pallari

Based on the analysis, the CRT and LRT are the Proposed Locally Preferred Alternative.

Kim James

Thank you.

Would the CRT option have quieter wheels than existing railroad car wheels? A few years ago when the Polar Express ran our house shook every time the train passed.

Ginger Dykaar has joined this conversation.

Ginger Dykaar

Hi Kim, welcome to the TCAA chat.

Kim James

Hi, should I re-type my question or can you see it?

Ginger Dykaar

There are continual improvements in rail vehicle technology. I believe the Polar Express was a locomotive that produces more vibration. The vehicles that would likely be used for this corridor would not be a locomotive pulling cars but each vehicle having its own power.

Kim James

Thank you. If the headways are 30 minutes, does that mean a train would pass our house every 15 minutes (allowing for both directions)?

Ginger Dykaar

A green/electric fueled vehicle would also be less noisy similar to autos.



Kim James Is the green / electric the LRT option or CRT?

Ginger Dykaar Correct, 30 minute headways in each direction would mean on average a train every 15 minutes.

Kim James It's not the noisy as much as the shaking & vibrations.

A train every 15 minutes all day long is very rough. Our house is next to the tracks.

Ginger Dykaar Both the CRT and LRT options would utilize green/electric propulsion.

Kim James Roughly what is the implementation time for this project? Did I read correctly 11-13 years for CRT and LRT?

Ginger Dykaar Yes, the length of time for implementation for passenger rail is 11-13 years if funding is available when needed.

Kim James When would the project begin? What is the next step? Is it in the report? I only got to page 282

Ginger Dykaar Look in Chapter 5 under the length of implementation performance measure to see the next steps that would be needed for each of the 4 alternatives.

Kim James Is BRT still an option? If so, am I correct in seeing the railroad tracks would be paved from Capitola to Natural Bridges? Would the buses run on the paved existing train tracks? And timing for BRT option is 15-17 years?



Ginger Dykaar The project team is proposing passenger rail for the locally preferred alternative but this could change to BRT or ART based on input from public, other stakeholders and the transportation commission.

Kim James So essentially it's down to CRT and LRT, with BRT and ART being long shots?

Ginger Dykaar IF BRT is implemented, tracks would be removed and pavement would be needed for the BRT. The TCAA evaluated BRT between Capitola and Natural Bridges. As we go through environmental review, the end to end points could change.

Kim James Where does the public give input? The survey?

Ginger Dykaar This is the proposed alternative from the project team. The commission could decide differently especially if input from stakeholders was more supportive of BRT.

Kim James Unimportant, but there are a couple of typos I noticed in the 350 page document. Would you like me to tell you where they are? I didn't look closely, just saw a few while reading.

Ginger Dykaar Yes, you can provide input via the survey and also by sending an email to transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org.

Kim James Okay. Thank you.

Ginger Dykaar Help with typos is always appreciated!

Kim James Last question - when is the commission meeting?



Shannon Munz has joined this conversation.

Hi Shannon. Thanks for your call yesterday. Sorry I missed you.

Shannon Munz

We will present the draft TCAA results to the commission at the Jan. 3 meeting. We will seek approval of the TCAA results from the commission at the Feb. 14 meeting. *[Correction – the draft TCAA will be presented initially to the RTC at the January 14th meeting as the holidays shift the January meeting to January 14th. Approval will be sought at the Feb 4 meeting.]*

No problem. I hope you are getting all of your questions answered.

Kim James

I am. You guys are great. Thank you.

Shannon Munz

Great, and thank you for participating.

Kim James

I think I've covered all of my questions. Have many folks logged in tonight?

Shannon Munz

We have had quite a few but I do not have the exact number.

Our chat session time has ended but if you have any additional comments or questions, email transitcorridoraa@scrtc.org.

#8 Guy Preston

Guy Preston

I'm curious if we can only chat one-to-one or if there are group chats?



Project Team Member
5

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

Kim Pallari has joined this conversation.

Kim Pallari

This is one-on-one chatting with our project team. However, the comments and questions will be posted to the website following the closure of the online open house.

Guy Preston

Thank you. Good job on the website. Good luck tonight and happy holidays!

Kim Pallari

Thank you Guy. Much appreciated and happy holidays to you and your family as well!

#9 juliet goldstein - shiningjoys@gmail.com

juliet goldstein

Whilst i recognize the traffic problems on hwy 1, I have sided with those who are very concerned about a transit train system. The noise, where are people going to park their cars to get onto the train, how many people will use the train when they need to go to various locations on a trip which they can do with a car.

Project Team Member
5

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

#10 Monique - mkremeroffice@gmail.com



1. How will Santa Cruz fund the shortfall between the cost to run any proposed transit and the ridership income?

Monique

**Project Team Member
5**

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

Kim Pallari has joined this conversation.

Kim Pallari

RTC and partner agencies are exploring all funding options for this transit system from a variety of federal, state and local sources.

Monique

Does that mean that it is not yet known? I know that as regards train at least there is a significant shortfall built into the cost projections and has been since the feasibility study all those years ago, no? If that's the case, why is there not a more clear sense of where that money will come from?

Kim Pallari

We are still early in the feasibility phase. Once there is a project identified and approved, then funding sources can be identified. We have identified several grant funding sources but cannot apply until we have a project identified.

Monique

Oh, I see. My interest/concern comes from what is happening with the trains currently operating in the bay area (BART and SMART) both of which are operating at severe losses and, in the case of SMART at least, there was a pretty big deficit before Covid even hit. How would SC handle something like that? I guess I am wondering if the pretty severe financial challenges that these other transit entities are experiencing being analyzed and considered as the RTC does it work?

does its work



Also, Would any shortfall take money from the current Metro or is that financing protected or would whichever of these options that was decided on replace some or all of the current metro system?

Kim Pallari

Yes RTC understands what is happening with other owner operators in terms of use of funds for O&M and Capitol both locally and nationally. This will continue to be a part of analysis as this project moves forward. The revenue assumptions do not include funding that is currently going to Metro service.

Monique

That's good to hear. As regards the BRT, would the rubber wheel buses use both a rapid transit lane on Hwy1 and the rail corridor? If yes, would they then leave whichever corridor they were on to get closer to a final destination or would there be stations where they would drop folks and other rubber wheel options (other buses, ride share, bikes, feet) take over?

Kim Pallari

On Hwy 1, there will not be a dedicated transit lane but there could be a "bus on shoulder" option for peak commute periods to allow improved travel times for the BRT.

The BRT option would use Hwy 1 from Watsonville and would exit to the right-of-way to access stations. We have not yet done a first/last mile analysis for connecting services. That detail for each station will be a part of the next phase of work.

Monique

So no buses on rail corridor (sorry, I have not had time to read the entire proposal)?

Kim Pallari

Yes the BRT would utilize both Hwy 1 and the rail corridor. BRT would access the rail corridor for part of the trip (about 7 miles). I am going to



look up the map to give you more specifics of where the BRT would travel on the rail corridor. Please hold tight.

Monique Thank you

Kim Pallari The BRT would use the rail corridor from Park/Coronado to approximately Murray Street at Seabright Ave. *[And BRT would also use the rail corridor from Depot Park to Natural Bridges Drive.]*

If you have a final question I would be happy to respond. Our live chat session is about to close.

Monique Interesting. I personally feel that if the rail corridor is going to be used for mass transit, rubber wheels are the way to go since the rail corridor is not near many places anyone needs to commute. Thanks for your input. My final question is what is the next step?

Kim Pallari Thank you for your comment. The next step is for the team to review all the comments/input collected through this process and to present the information to RTC Board at the January board meeting and then go back in February for RTC Board approval.

Thank you for joining this evening. Feel free to send any additional comments via email at transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org. Good night.

Monique I see. Thank you for your time!



So, just learning about all of this a few minutes ago. Not sure what your directions are telling me to do, but since our time is limited, can you tell me what the two train options are and there fueling sources? And, are you considering an all-electric option that is not fuel cell and if not, why not?,

Beverly

**Project Team Member
5**

Thank you for your interest in the TCAA Project, a team member will be with you shortly.

Kim Pallari has joined this conversation.

Kim Pallari

Hello Beverly. Thank you for joining us. After the performed based analysis, the proposed Locally Preferred Alternatives are CRT and LRT.

We are considering electric propulsion and fuel cell will be a part of the evaluation. We are not looking at diesel systems.

Beverly

7224-934138# ph my. . this send to able be even will I sure not . and side one to goes screen The. response your read to unable am I everything is in reverse order including my ph #

I am going to give up on this. If you want to call me, great. I am president of the Electric Auto Assn Central Coast CA.

Kim Pallari

Beverly we apologize for any confusion or technical challenges you are experiencing. We are happy to talk over email. If you would like to email the project team at transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org with your comments and questions we can respond in that format.