Dear Regional Transportation Commission:

The Santa Cruz, Big Trees & Pacific Railroad (SCBT), a subsidiary of Roaring Camp, is the only local railroad company that has operated in Santa Cruz County for over 57 years, making us a landmark. Our employees are locals, we work with local vendors, and our business brings thousands of visitors to the area who utilize other businesses, such as hotels, restaurants, retail stores and gas stations during their stay. The Santa Cruz community enjoys many of the events we host throughout the year, such as Mother’s Day Brunch, Easter Egg Hunts, Holiday Lights Train, the Channukah Train, as well as large community fundraisers like Redwood Mountain Fair. Our community outreach even includes location support for disaster relief providers, such as CalFire and the National Guard, during the recent CZU Lightening Complex Fire. We are proud to say we are truly a community business.

The Felton Branch Line connects Roaring Camp to the Beach Boardwalk via the wye and Beach Street portion of the Santa Cruz Branch Line. Thousands of people travel the route that connects the two parks each season, alleviating hundreds of cars off the highways and surface streets of Santa Cruz. Our trackage rights extend down to the Boardwalk and it is important for the Regional Transportation Commission (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. We believe a shared use of the line is achievable through special signal equipment.

Several alternatives provide that freight will not be available north of Park Ave. in Capitola. This would be a negative impact for our railroad, prohibiting future replacement of equipment, such as new locomotives that cannot be shipped via truck due to dimensions and clearance challenges on Santa Cruz County surface roads. It is imperative to our railroad that the track from Watsonville to Santa Cruz remains intact so that we can bring equipment by rail, without this possibility our future will be severely impacted.

Several alternatives suggest adding a separate set of tracks between the east leg of the wye and the Boardwalk, as a means to separate transportation modes. This suggestion poses a serious challenge to the RTC, community and especially the stakeholders in the immediate area. The Boardwalk should be
advised that this option is under consideration as it is anticipated it would not be favored by the Boardwalk. However, we believe that a shared single track can be achieved through special temporal separation signals that control vehicle movement on the track. We again want to stress our trackage rights on this section of the railroad and our ability to fully utilize those rights.

The Alternative Analysis also suggests limiting our train movements to the east leg of the wye and to make depot park the terminus of our train route, instead of the Boardwalk. Both of these options would severely impact our railroad financially, logistically and are not acceptable to our business plan.

Finally, future planning should not rule out freight anywhere along the Branch Line. There is the possibility of agriculture and landfill shipments from North County, technology and industry in West and Central Santa Cruz County, and one must always consider industries that will emerge in the future. A single train can haul hundreds of truckloads of goods at one time. It is the most efficient way to move goods, reducing the burden on highway infrastructure and road systems.

We appreciate the RTC taking the time to consider the impact of the Alternative Analysis on our railroad and look forward to working with the RTC as it moves towards a decision.

Best regards,

Melani Clark
CEO, Roaring Camp Railroads
November 27, 2020

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Approve Electric Passenger Rail as the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

Without reservation, we agree with the TCAA/RNIS recommendation that Electric Passenger Rail be selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative. We urge you to approve the recommendation and move forward with developing a strategic business plan and exploring governance options for future transit service along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

Chapter 6 of the TCAA/RNIS summarizes the many reasons Passenger Rail is clearly the best of the 18 alternatives considered for providing high-capacity public transit alongside the Coastal Rail Trail, and we will not repeat them here. We are grateful the evaluation of alternatives was guided by our community’s commitment to the triple bottom line framework of equity, environment and economy. Knowing the recommendation is based on the triple bottom line gives us a high degree of confidence that passenger rail is the very best investment and will provide maximum benefits for the people, the planet and our shared prosperity.

There are several benefits to selecting passenger rail not specifically included in Chapter 6. Because these benefits are important, we list them here:

- CRT/LRT will protect 100% of the existing ROW allowing completion of the Rail Trail ASAP.
- CRT/LRT will generate 29% more permanent jobs and 22% more construction jobs than BRT.
- On average, CRT/LRT will be about four times safer than BRT.

We want to acknowledge the excellent work of the RTC, METRO and Caltrans staff who jointly collaborated with the expert consulting team in preparing the TCAA/RNIS report. Please see the addendum to this letter for our specific comments offered only with the intent to make this excellent report even better.

Thank you,

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

CC: Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, Board of Directors
FORT Board

P.O. Box 1652, Capitola, CA 95010-1652 www.railandtrail.org 831-419-4622
Addendum to the letter dated 11/27/20
“Approve Electric Passenger Rail as the Locally Preferred Alternative”

1. Several items to be addressed and or previously addressed were not included in the draft TCAA/RNIS report. Some, but not all of these items, include the following:
   1. Analysis of METRO’s future funding stream
   2. Governance options for capital and operating phases of the project
   3. Connector services for First Mile / Last Mile options
   4. Next steps for implementation of high-capacity public transit in the rail corridor

2. Table 5.2 includes a line for “O&M Costs/Year” for the alternatives. When comparing the listed O&M costs to the range of costs provided in the body of the report (page 5-15), we noticed the $19.5M figure listed for BRT was the low value in the stated range of $19.5m-$21m but the $25M figure listed for CRT/LRT was the high value in the stated range of $23m-$25m. Please use the same relative values within the range for all the alternatives or explain the reason for what could appear to be bias in the figures chosen.

3. Regarding O&M costs provided for CRT/LRT in Table 5.2 and on page 5-15, it appears the quoted range is $10m to $12m higher than the $13.2M estimate for O&M cost provided in the 2019 Unified Corridor Investment Study (page B-12). Please explain the substantial increase, especially in light of the general trend of substantial decreases in O&M costs for electric vehicles. Please also provide a detailed breakdown of items included in the O&M cost figures.

4. Table 5.2 includes a line for “O&M Cost/Passenger Mile” for the alternatives. The figures listed for CRT & LRT are three to four times higher than the figures provided in the National Transit Database (NTD) maintained by the Federal Transit Administration, but the listed figure for BRT is roughly the same as found in the NTD. Please provide a detailed breakdown of the items included and the calculation for each of the CRT/LRT O&M figures.

5. Table 5.2 appears to provide cost figures over 30 years yet in the body of the report there is this statement: “Total revenues assumed 25 years of revenues (2020-2045) reported in 2020 dollars,” (the last bullet on page 5-24). Table 5.3 appears to use a 25 year time horizon as well. Please explain and resolve these apparent discrepancies.

6. Under the LRT column in Table 5.12, the typical fare ranges from $1.75 - $3.25, yet the average fare used for estimating funding revenues is shown as $4.50. Please explain and resolve this apparent discrepancy.

7. Thanks for discussing the range of fares for these systems. Given that many, if not most, public transit users will probably purchase monthly “all-access” type passes providing access to the entire public transit system, it would be helpful if the report included cost estimates for monthly “all-access” passes. Please provide cost estimates for “all-access” passes for a BRT + regular bus, CRT + regular bus, and, LRT + regular bus.

8. Table 5.17 lists “Estimated signal gate down time” for CRT/LRT at 90/75 seconds respectively. Please provide the data and methodology for these estimates as our collective experience with the actual signal gate down time of other CRT/LRT systems indicates signal gate down times will be much shorter, perhaps half the estimates provided. Providing a comparison with the ‘downtime’ of a typical red light would be informative and helpful in understanding the magnitude of the estimated signal gate down times.
9. While Table 5.17 provides estimates of signal gate down times, BRT is proposed to have double the frequency of CRT/LRT during peak travel times. Therefore, signal gates will be down twice as often for BRT service as for CRT/LRT service. Accordingly, the estimated impact of each alternative on the affected road network's Level of Service, if any, should be included in the table. Furthermore, the total gate down time per hour for each alternative should be listed allowing an “apples to apples” comparison between alternatives.

10. Under the discussion of Regional Connectivity beginning on page 5-52, it was good to see the illustration from the State Rail Plan. It would be helpful and educational if a graphic from TAMC's “Monterey Bay Area Network Integration Study – Future Service Vision” dated October 2020, was included to illustrate the regional rail network described, especially “around the bay” service between Santa Cruz and Monterey. Assuming you agree, here is an illustration for your consideration:

![Monterey Bay Area Integrated Network Diagram]

Above illustration from page 2 of TAMC’s “Monterey Bay Area Network Integration Study – Future Service Vision” dated October 2020

11. It is our understanding the auto travel times listed in Table 5.16 are for an automobile trip on Highway 1 between Larkin Valley Rd. and Morrissey Blvd. We understand Table 5.16 is intended to illustrate the impact of implementing transit on the SCBRL, which is described in the body of the report to be “no impact”. Given the adjacent location of Table 5.16 to Table 5.15, the casual reader is likely to be misled in thinking the times listed in the two tables can be directly compared. Of course, doing so would lead that same casual reader to mistakenly think that peak travel time in a car between Pajaro Station and Natural Bridges Drive would be roughly the same as travel by CRT/LRT. Please provide a far more detailed explanation of Table 5.16 or update Table 5.16 with estimates of auto travel time using the same trip starting/ending points as the transit alternatives. An apples to apples comparison would be more useful and more accurate.
November 24, 2020

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

RE: CFST Response to Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis

Dear Commissioners,

The Campaign for Sensible Transportation advocates for transportation systems that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and provide equitable mobility to the residents of Santa Cruz County.

By consensus of the CFST Working group, this is our response to the RTC’s Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis:

We support the preferred alternative for the railroad corridor identified by staff as part of the TCAA study - an electric rail system - as long as the service allows for a contiguous trail alongside the service in the right of way. We acknowledge the financial and other hurdles that need to be addressed prior to its implementation, and advise the Commission to continue to study additional technologies that may become relevant to future transit uses of the corridor.

We also support dedicated bus lanes on Highway One that do not involve additional auxiliary lanes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bruce Van Allen
Co-Chair, CFST
Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that we at Regeneración - Pájaro Valley Climate Action strongly support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

We are now in a climate emergency. Since the transportation sector accounts for over half of Santa Cruz County emissions, it’s imperative to make significant changes in our transportation systems as quickly as possible. We especially need alternatives to cars carrying one person.

Advisory Board

Mayra Bernabe
Organizer, COPA (Communities Organized for Relational Power in Action)

Adam Bolanos Scow
Senior Strategist, Public Water Now

Francisco Estrada
Fund Development Officer, Pájaro Valley Community Health Trust; 2019 Mayor, Watsonville

Anne Hayes
Director of Development, Western Region, Climate Central

Kirsten Liske
Vice President of Community Programs, Ecology Action

Nelly Vaquera-Boggs
President, Pájaro Valley Federation of Teachers

Electric Passenger Rail would connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

Rail is superior to the bus option for many reasons. We are concerned about the bus option because: 1) it would take longer to develop 2) there could be major problems with right of way since existing easements were for purpose of rail and 3) with a limit of 3 bikes per bus that makes it a risky bet on whether any individual could count on riding to station and getting on with their bike.

In contrast, electric train will be faster, accommodate many more bikes, more accessible, and will be implemented sooner.

We envision staff at PV High who live in North County utilizing the train to get to Ohlone Parkway and then walk, bike, carpool or shuttle to school; young people employed by the Boardwalk taking the train to and from work, and UCSC, hotel, restaurant workers taking the train to downtown and connecting to their final destination.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Sincerely,

Nancy

Nancy Faulstich - Executive Director, Regeneración
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org

Re: TCAA. Stakeholder Input

The Sierra Club supports the preferred alternative for the railroad corridor identified by staff as part of the TCAA study - an electric rail system, as long as the rail system allows for a contiguous trail within the rail corridor. The Santa Cruz Group of the Sierra Club is comprised of some 4000 members throughout Santa Cruz County.

The Sierra Club has long advocated for rail transit systems because rail transit promotes Transit Oriented Development (TOD), an effective strategy for reducing urban sprawl and preserving open space. In the long run, because rail is centered on a single line and around stations, it supports infill along the corridor and a lifestyle in which residents are able to walk for a majority of their needs and use the train for longer trips. Trips taken via electric rail systems have low greenhouse gas emissions per rider and encourage civic interactions. They allow residents long range mobility without the need for significant investments of personal capital. Rail transit on the corridor will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and provide equitable mobility to the residents of Santa Cruz County.

We also understand that electric rail on the corridor is only one component of a broader integrated county transit system. We urge the RTC to create an integrated transit network with rail and bus connectors, to be (ideally) run by the Metro and to build dedicated bus
only lanes on Highway One and study additional technologies that may become relevant to our future transit system, both on the corridor and within the county.

Thank you for your consideration,

[Signature]

Micah Posner, Executive Committee Chair

Sierra Club, Santa Cruz Group
November 25, 2020

Chairperson McPherson
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commissioners
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Chairperson McPherson,

Ecology Action’s strategic plan calls for decarbonizing our building and transportation systems while supporting zero emission vehicles, multimodal, and active transportation. The RTC staff and TCAA consultant’s recommended Transit Corridor Alternative Analysis’ (TCAA) preferred alternative aligns with these goals because the proposed electric rail transit solution is a viable way to reduce carbon emissions. Currently over 50% of greenhouse gas emissions are generated by passenger and freight transportation in Santa Cruz County.

A Coastal Rail Corridor that includes both a biking/walking path and electric passenger rail service can meet the mobility needs of a wide variety of residents and visitors as we look for alternatives to gasoline fueled car trips. Rail and trail can complement each other as people can bike along the Coastal Rail Trail to a train station, board the train with their bike, and then bike to their final destination. With the growing popularity of ebikes—that go further, faster with less effort than regular bikes—the bike and train connection can be available to more residents.

Electric rail service also could provide much needed reliable and sustainable transportation options for those living in south county who work in north county. Watsonville area residents face horrific commuter traffic going to and from work. A fully developed Coastal Rail Corridor will connect our communities.

Thank you for moving forward with increased sustainable transportation options as we need to move decisively in providing climate crisis solutions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chief Executive Officer
Ecology Action
Comments from members of the public

From: Bud Colligan <bud@colligans.com>  Date: June 3, 2020 at 5:17:57 PM PDT

Dear Commissioners,

It's an ironic commentary that the rest of the world is changing car roadways to bike paths and e-bikes are surging worldwide (see article below from today's NYT), while our RTC debates a $1M study to decide between trains we can't afford and will never run and larger buses that won't fit on the corridor. At least look at micro shuttles shared with bikes and peds on the corridor as an actually doable alternative.

Santa Cruz County's transportation plan is so out of step with fiscal and transportation reality it's absurd. But continue with your meeting and ignore reality while the majority of RTC Commissioners speak platitudes to their base! Sometimes leadership requires a pivot, and you have an excellent opportunity to make one. Frustration of the people is boiling over in many areas, and you can add our RTC to the list of bodies that is unresponsive to feedback and ripe for change.

Regards,

Bud Colligan
Live Oak resident

E-bikes are finally having the moment they deserve, our tech columnist says.

The benefits of owning a battery-powered two-wheeler far outweigh the downsides, especially in a pandemic. The bikes offer a compelling alternative for commuters who are being discouraged from taking public transportation. They also provide much-needed fresh air.

But their popularity has surged from the years when they were dismissed as vehicles for lazy pedalers and seniors. They're now as difficult to buy as toilet paper was a few weeks ago. Here's what you need to know if you're considering buying one.

From: Brian Peoples <brian@trailnow.org>  Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 8:29 AM  To: Cynthia Dzendzel <cyndzen@earthlink.net>

Cynthia,
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Agree with you that Roaring Camp should continue to have rights to operate from Felton to Boardwalk.

This was our second point in the posting that if the decision is made for passenger rail along the Santa Cruz Branchline, Roaring Camp will be shutdown. So the question we are asking is "why isn't the shutdown of Roaring Camp included in the Alternative Analysis?".

How would Roaring Camp operate if there was 60 passenger trains a day passing in front of the Boardwalk. It will shut them down and that needs to be part of the analysis. A million dollar study should include the impact on Roaring Camp for decision criteria on a final mass transit solution.

This is a great example of how RTC is not doing a real good analysis and it will be the third time RTC study has failed. We need honesty from our government representatives and Roaring Camp and our community is not getting it.

Best regards,

Brian Peoples
Executive Director
TrailNow.org

From: Cynthia Dzendzel <cyndzen@earthlink.net> Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 8:15 AM

Thanks for your quick response. I don’t know why Roaring Camp would need the tracks from Watsonville to Santa Cruz, since they only run to the Boardwalk. They do use the tracks from Felton to Santa Cruz, as does San Lorenzo Lumber. As I mentioned, it was an agreement made before the existence of Roaring Camp Railroads that use of the tracks in Santa Cruz would never be impeded, as a condition for paving the streets in Santa Cruz. We should not put in jeopardy our history and culture, which Roaring Camp is instrumental in conveying to thousands of visitors every year. Roaring Camp does not just benefit its owners and employees, it is a treasured part of this community and we should find a way to support the valuable part they play in making Santa Cruz County a tourist destination appreciated world wide.

Regards,

Cynthia

On Jun 5, 2020, at 8:04 AM, Brian Peoples <brian@trailnow.org> wrote:

Hi Cynthia,

Thank you for reaching out to us. We agree, Roaring Camp is a great company.
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Having said that, a private company imposing restrictions on transportation resources that benefit the community is wrong. Roaring Camp should not be telling our community that we need to fund their operations and keep the railroad tracks from Watsonville to Santa Cruz to ensure they will always have that connection. Private companies should not be allowed to use taxpayer-owned and managed property for their exclusive benefit.

Best regards,

Brian

From: Cynthia Dzendzel <cyndzen@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 7:27 AM
To: Brian Peoples <brian@trailnow.org>
Cc: Bruce.McPherson@santacruzcounty.us
Subject: Re: Roaring Camp "Elephant in the Room"

The city was allowed to pave around the tracks under the condition that the railroad would never be removed or trains stopped from operating. Roaring Camp is not a Boardwalk amusement park ride. It has wide support in the community and is a valuable family-run business. Please do not attempt to build public opinion against continued operation of the Roaring Camp Railroad.

Cynthia Dzendzel

From: Roland Saher <rolandsaher@gmail.com> Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 9:07 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I want to urge you to reconsider your scoring of PRT as a future option for transit in SC County. I highly recommend that you take to heart the points Brett Garrett made in his letter to you. Did the RTC base their evaluation on outdated information? Does the RTC feel threatened in their business model by the alternative PRT poses? That would not be sufficient grounds for any decision that is supposed to serve the people!

Respectfully, Roland Saher
ROARING CAMP “THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM”

The “Newsflash” in the cartoon is illustrating that the private company Roaring Camp is being given special benefits as part of the Mass Transit Alternative Analysis.

Included in the long-term analysis is the requirement to maintain the railroad tracks between Santa Cruz to Watsonville to support Roaring Camp operations (Diesel Trains). The commitment to keep the tracks forever for a private company, that provides no transportation services, is a major misstep within the analysis. The purchase of the Santa Cruz Coastal Corridor is to improve TRANSPORTATION across the county, not adding more amusement park rides that add more air pollution. To put a private company interest over the good of the public is poor public policy.

Another error within the Alternative Analysis is the failure to address the fact that Roar Camp would be required to close their Santa Cruz Boardwalk ride due to the 60 passenger trains per day operating along the Santa Cruz Branchline. The impact on the local business is not included in the analysis nor is the anticipated legal challenges Roaring Camp will take against Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC).
WASTING TAX DOLLARS ON OLD RAILROAD

Supervisor John Leopold (1st District / Soquel, Live Oak, Summit, Santa Cruz Capitola) believes “Everything is fine”.

We disagree. With Santa Cruz Coastal Trail closed for decades and millions a year being spent for the train to nowhere, everything is not fine!!!

$6,440,460 tax dollars were spent by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) in 2019/20 – all for the Santa Cruz Branchline (railroad):
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- Railroad Studies (RTC staff salaries/benefits): $379,993
- Railroad Studies (consultants): $640,007
- Railroad Management (RTC staff salaries): $236,500
- Railroad Repairs and Maintenance: $4,997,564
- Railroad Legal Fees: $111,296
- Railroad Professional services (i.e. consultant): $74,750
- Other railroad operations (insurance): $20,250

Why does the RTC continue to waste time and money on maintaining the old railroad? We say stop holding hostage the Santa Cruz Coastal Trail NOW!!!

---

From: christy martin <cmartin@cm-squared.com> Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 6:28 PM

Thank you for the update. Half of the short list options in the alternative analysis were rail based. However, we have now had two rail operators that could not sustain a freight business and the SMART train that was used as a model in the RTC feasibility study was unable to pass their recent tax measure that was required to maintain their operations and cover the budget overruns for the remaining construction.

Those are concerning indicators of the financial viability of rail, even before the new economic reality and potentially lasting changes on commuting and mass transportation. How is the alternatives analysis going to assess the economic feasibility of each option in light of current events?

Thank you
—Christy Martin
PLEASE get out of the say and rip up the tracks - making way for a beautiful bike and walking path from Watsonville to Santa Cruz. It's the only sane thing to do and would get so much use!

La Selva Beach Improvement Association
314 Estrella
La Selva Beach, CA 95076

July 17, 2020

Mr. Guy Preston
Commissioners
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Decision regarding Rail Corridor Options

Dear Mr. Preston and Commissioners:

At our July membership meeting held via Zoom Video because of the pandemic, the membership voted unanimously to ask the Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission to delay any decision making on the rail corridor options until after the Coronavirus Pandemic is resolved - presumably next year. Our membership has previously expressed concerns about the rail-trail option proposed by the Commission and those concerns remain. However, we believe the public should be involved in the process before the Commission makes any commitment to the options it is now considering. While we know the RTC staff has tried to reach out via some limited surveys (which I note are not scientific efforts to poll the community at large about the options it is considering), the pandemic has made in-person communications with the RTC virtually impossible and education and outreach very limited. The La Selva Beach membership believes it would be a terrible mistake for the RTC to commit to an option without public participation and buy-in. Whatever option the RTC ultimately chooses is likely to require the public approval of a sales tax. If the RTC proceeds with a decision without consideration of the wishes of the public, then it is unlikely to get the funding required to support its decision. Therefore, we recommend that you postpone any decision-making on the rail corridor options until at least the summer of 2021 - if not later. Thank you for your consideration of the wishes of La Selva Beach community, which will be directly impacted by the options under consideration.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to express my unwavering support for the long-term focus on rail transit along our rail corridor and the MBSST.

Rail transit will serve the broadest possible number of users, with the greatest efficiency and potential to integrate with expanding rail service in our state and nation. As automobile and air traffic systems reach their limits or continue to exceed infrastructure capacity at peak times, rail can provide a safe and efficient means to serve our communities and local economies.

Thank you in advance for your support of this long-term vision for our community.

Kind Regards,

Eric Richter

From: Paul Nolan <pkn337@gmail.com>  Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 6:48 PM

Please choose passenger rail transit. Trains are proven to be reliable, efficient, and safe. This is the future Santa Cruz needs. A bus system on the corridor would be a massive short-sighted mistake. Going with busses would open a whole new can of worms that we don't need. We have the rail infrastructure and we should utilize it for its intended purpose. I know the only reason that this decision needs to be made clear is because groups such as TrailNow have misled the public to benefit their personal desires. These desires do not line up with what the county needs and should be ignored. The RTC is smart and knows exactly how these groups spread biased information.

I would certainly use a passenger rail system as much as possible since I do not drive.

Thanks,

Paul, Aptos resident.
Hey all,

Please build passenger rail along the existing rail corridor. I hate driving and don't want to keep clogging highway 1.

-- Kyle

From: Eliece Horton <elieceh@yahoo.com> Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 12:33 PM

Dear RTC Commissioner,

Please support passenger rail transit with dedicated bike cars, so I can take my bike on the train. Thank you!

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

From: malabar7 <malabar7@comcast.net> Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2020 3:10 PM

Hello,

My name is James Long. I am a Capitola resident.

I have some thoughts about the Coastal Rail Trail project and why we so desperately need a train for it to continue.

Santa Cruz, a city, county, where people talk about equality for everyone, diversity.

With that being said there are quite a few folks that are taking a very narrow and discriminating view with regards to our Rail with Trail opportunity. It is just that. An opportunity of various degrees.

The Trail Now folks ( a minority group ) are only interested in a bicycle riding path... period. They’ll make the argument that the tracks are unsightly, that they’re taking up space, we need to save the Capitola Trestle, etc. That removing the tracks for a trail only path is the best solution.

It’s not. Trail Now doesn’t speak for all people within the county. We can have both.

Very few Trail Now folks have a hobby where they like riding their bicycles long distances or even at all.

The notion they put out that all these people ( up to 10, 000 riders everyday ) will suddenly start riding bicycles for commuting or start walking along the pathway is not true either. Doctors will say this too
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but you would be hard pressed to get someone to stop looking at their cellphones for any length of time to go ride a bike or go for a walk for that matter. In the rain too? Hot out? Cold at night? 365 days a year? SC County is also a tourist destination.

The people that want to ride bikes and or walk are doing so now regardless of what a path looks like. I am one of those walkers.

I am sixty two years old. It’s not uncommon for me to walk 8 miles on a Saturday or Sunday, and 3-5 miles on some week days. I consider myself lucky that I can get out and walk. Some folks cannot. Think of folks that are bound by a wheelchair, or blind, or mentally challenged.

I think the Trail Now group has what I call the “Field of Dreams” mentality.

If you build it (Trail Only) they will come. I’m sure after 6-10 months the novelty of the Trail Only path will wear off at which point people will think “we” made a big mistake and of course would never admit to..

A March 24, 2016 Santa Cruz Sentinel (1) article talks about Santa Cruz County’s elderly population ranking among the fastest growing in the US.

As these folks start to retire they are going to be thinking more about their finances, about the high cost of gas for their car, etc. They aren’t going to jump on their bicycle and ride to Aptos Village for lunch or to just get out and get fresh air. Most of them would be too afraid to ride a bike.

They are going to want to get out no doubt but what would be a better way than to hop on a train that can take them beyond the city limits?

I’m sure some of these folks will be living near the transit stations.

Connecting people is what the Rail With Trail is going to do. The Human Connection.

Natural Disasters

As a commuter over the “Hill” I often think about the “what if” scenario if there’s a major natural disaster like the next big earthquake or major fire along the county borders where our roadways will be shutdown because of a disaster. Freeway and Highway overcrossings collapse. Reminds me of some of the scenes from the Bay Area where bridges collapsed after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake.

SF BART ridership went up 124,000 riders days after the earthquake. (2)

An example if the Hwy 1 overcrossing at Bay/Porter streets collapsed due to an earthquake how would emergency vehicles be able to respond through the area?

How would goods and services be delivered if the roadways are closed due to inaccessibility? The public in their vehicles would be blocking every small street trying to get around. Think of other roadways
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where there is an overcrossing (Hwy 1 near Mission St. Pedestrian Overhead Walkway) Engineers would have to inspect these overcrossings before the public could drive under them. Would take days I’m sure.

Hwy 17.

That was a mess earlier in 2017 with all the rains that created landslides and made it so portions of Hwy 17 weren’t drivable. Same with Hwy 35, Hwy 9, Old Santa Cruz/ San Jose Rd. Before you know it we’d be boxed in.

Hwy 1 southbound was an option for me driving up to Hayward one day. But what if Hwy 1 in both directions got shut down and no vehicles allowed along the highways. How are we going to get emergency equipment into the areas? How are we going to get food trucked to the markets, etc? That’s where the railroad corridor would come to the rescue. Boxcars, flatcars bringing in equipment. Amtrak moved people on an emergency basis in Santa Barbara as I recall.

I would think local business developers would jump at the idea that their developments could be right next to a railway station.

Aptos Village. New townhouses got built right next to the old Bay View Hotel just north of the existing tracks. New businesses have been springing up.

New Leaf Market is a great new resource. A mile west up Soquel Dr. is the Rio Del Mar shopping center and that’s getting a major make over now.

The SF BART Richmond Station is one example of residences adjacent to transit centers. Condos have been built right next to the station practically on the same real estate chunk. Same way in San Leandro.

I happen to work for SF BART in Hayward as a Transit Vehicle Mechanic. I drive 57 miles one way. Work Swingshift. I actually enjoy driving Hwy 17.

I have friends that travel on Bart (they work for BART too) and being able to ditch the car and ride BART then walk to where they want to go is great. They can also walk to the station from their houses. Some friends ride their bike from South Hayward Bart Station into work a couple miles away.

SMART up in the North Bay. How great that is in operation.

Lots of small condos being built near the stations so people can commute to work, going shopping in Corte Madera, take the train to San Rafael, bus over to the Ferry Building then take the Ferry to a ballgame at AT&T Park. Or, ride up to Sonoma County and go wine tasting, or ride to the station on Airport Blvd. and take a plane out of Sonoma County Airport. No need to pay for airport parking fees.

Here again the rail system connecting people and eliminating excessive cars on the roadway.

Crime Activity
I have some thoughts about what would happen if the tracks were to be removed and the pathway become a trail only path. There would be more graffiti and criminal activity going on without the train presence especially in areas of town where there’s less population. Both sections of a bike path would become more homeless camps. Currently signage along the Santa Cruz Branch Line of “No Trespassing” keeps a lot of folks off the tracks (except for David Date) and out of the area except for the homeless and graffiti taggers. I know this because I walk along side of the tracks or out in the bike lane (keeping my fingers crossed I don’t get hit by a cyclist) along Park Avenue in Capitola where I live.

The county isn’t or hasn’t done much to pick up trash along the railroad tracks. Various volunteer groups in the county have as I have helped them. When you have trashy areas it gives criminals the idea that not many people come around and they don’t worry about committing crimes.

Home owners behind the corridor fences would sleep better at night knowing people aren’t going to be lurking.

Areas that became bike paths in Los Angeles (3) for example have had several incidents over the years of people being mugged for their bikes and other crimes committed. San Lorenzo River Walk Trail. Homeless over by the Ross store. Sound familiar?

Santa Rosa too along the Joe Rodota Trail leading towards Sebastopol which happened to be the old electric train ROW. They’ve since run those folks out.

As I stated in the beginning only a few people will be able to take advantage of a bike trail / pedestrian walkway but all of us in the county and beyond can benefit from having a railroad transit system operating with a trail. Would be great to one day connect with the folks in Monterey area.

There’s lots of money for rail transit projects in the State of California right now.

The way I see it and have seen on other pathways the cyclists eventually displace the pedestrians. No amount of painted lines will keep cyclists in line.

Now the pathway will be used by cyclists only. Pedestrians will be on the train. At least people have an option.

What I would personally like to see is electric trolleys much like what the Union Traction Trolley ran in Santa Cruz to Capitola from 1904-1927.

Harnessing solar power in panels at remote locations around the county could power the trolleys with batteries. Less noise, cleaner.

That type of technology is here. We could get Tesla Automotive company to get onboard with it. Think of Santa Cruz County being at the forefront of that type of technology?

There’s a video on YouTube titled, “sol train santa cruz”. Talks about solar powered cars and also talks and illustrates the use of solar powered trains. (5)
I do not think we need to have multiple trains running all day long.

That notion is a lie created by Trail Now as they have no facts based how a Trail Only scenario could work. More fear mongering.

They have come up with an opposition argument against rail transit and the end result is that the trail only scenario is the way to go. They must think the public is really stupid.

Train frequency travel is based on supply and demand. The trains could bring people to and from the area, students have an option of not only going to UCSC, but to Cabrillo College in Aptos, or the CSU Monterey Bay. Students can study on the train, sleep, or just enjoy the scenery. Not to mention other folks.

Like the trail only folks that ride their bikes to Monterey from Santa Cruz then realize the don’t have the energy to pedal back in a head wind.

Some SC City and County employees live in Watsonville and could ride the train to and from work and not have to be caught up in the gridlock.

Another truth that Greenway and Trail Now don’t talk about is that there is no money for a Trail Only scenario.

No EIR has ever been generated as there is no money for that.

Almost two years ago now when Greenway Capitola conned the voters into voting “Yes” on Measure L they did so by creating a fear campaign that said the Capitola Trestle was so old that a train might crash down into the village, and they only wanted human powered transportation to roll on the corridor and that would resolve the transportation problems in the area. Not even close.

But then after the passing of Measure L Greenway and Trail Now talked about operating buses along the corridor. Wait a second… a bus has an engine, or a motor. It’s not human powered! A bus isn’t self guided like that of a light rail vehicle.

Imagine how much more money would have to be spent for constructing a path for operating a bus? All the trees removed and replaced or cut back?

Imagine removing all the sections of rail? About 264 rails per mile (40’ per rail stick) (both sides.) x 32 miles. Where is all that going to be stored?

Think of how many ties per mile. About 5,280 x 32. They are about one foot spaced apart.

Those old ties were soaked in Creosote and Arsenic. A hazardous material. Where would those go? Can’t burn them or grind them up. The soil underneath the ties would have to be removed. Steel retaining walls on either side of the buses would have to be constructed because a bus is not self guided. You need to have a bus driver concentrating on the drive the whole time. No looking at their cell phones.
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Can’t have a bus roll off the Capitola Trestle down below into the village and, or drive into the cyclists.

So far segments of the CRT are being worked on and completed and after the washout in La Selva gets repaired a better opportunity for trains to roll through the area again.

I personally would like to see the Santa Cruz Big Trees & Pacific Railway operate on the SCBL They have the rolling stock and the personnel to operate trains.

How great would it be to ride the Beach Train from Felton or Santa Cruz to Monterey and back? The possibilities are endless having rail transportation.

Not to mention the jobs created for locals.

Please consider a train as the only option on the corridor. BRT doesn’t make sense.

Sincerely,

James Long
Capitola

Rail with Trail References

(2) Bart Ridership increased 124,000 after 1989 earthquake http://www.spur.org/publications/urbanist-article/2010-07-06/transportation-and-rebuilding
(3) The Case Against Bike Paths http://la.streetsblog.org/2010/01/05/the-case-against-bike-paths/
(4) sol train santa cruz (You Tube) https://youtu.be/B3VgDexf_As

From: Erin Rose <erin1rose@yahoo.com> Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 11:27 AM

Hello,

I'm excited to see construction in Santa Cruz but we really need the trail here in Aptos, too. Please expedite work on segments 11 and 12 as the highway is a physical barrier that the trail will help overcome. For the Transportation Corridor Alternatives study, please select Light Rail and not select bus transit on the corridor because that change in direction would surely mean many more years of delay in the Aptos segments of the project. Don't be distracted and don't delay, Aptos residents really look forward to the Coastal Rail Trail and Rail Transit.
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Thank you very much,

Erin Rose

From: Greg Cole <greg.cole@comcast.net> Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 6:45 AM
Hi,

Wanted to advocate for the southern sections on the trail project. I recently purchased a bike and have enjoyed riding it locally but am eager to go a little farther. Having a trail will make it even better.

I'm excited to see construction in Santa Cruz but we really need the trail here in Aptos, too.

Please expedite work on segments 11 and 12 as the highway is a physical barrier that the trail will help overcome.

For the Transportation Corridor Alternatives study, please select Light Rail and not select bus transit on the corridor because that change in direction would surely mean many more years of delay in the Aptos segments of the project.

Don't be distracted and don't delay, Aptos residents really look forward to the Coastal Rail Trail and Rail Transit!

Thanks,

Greg

From: Eliece Horton <elieceh@yahoo.com> Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2020 7:34 AM
Support rail transit and please build our Aptos Trail Segments 11 and 12!

I'm excited to see construction in Santa Cruz, but we really need the trail here in Aptos, too. Please expedite work on segments 11 and 12 as the highway is a physical barrier that the trail will help overcome.

For the Transportation Corridor Alternatives study, please select Commuter Rail and not select bus transit on the corridor because that change in direction would surely mean many more years of delay in the Aptos segments of the project.
Don't be distracted and don't delay, Aptos residents really look forward to the Coastal Rail Trail and Rail Transit!
I am dreaming of taking my bike on the train. You can make my dreams come true!

R E C Y C L E: Ride your Bike again Today!
Eliece Horton
From: howardfcoheninc@aol.com <howardfcoheninc@aol.com>

Is there a RTC document that list the remaining TCAA alternatives being considered by the RTC?

Regards,

Howard Cohen

From: ms7330@everyactioncustom.com <ms7330@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 1:41 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Please Choose Rail for the TCAA Short List of Alternatives

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support the rail transit options on the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of any traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to improved public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and escape traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit is compatible with continuing construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so, over time, rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Marc Schneider

From: elijahmermin@everyactioncustom.com <elijahmermin@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 11:32 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit
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Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Elijah Mermin-10rail

From: gmcpheeters@everyactioncustom.com <gmcpheeters@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 11:33 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. I own a home one block from the rail line on the West Side.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.
Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Greg McPheeters
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Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Dave Stoltz

From: anna.landaw@everyactioncustom.com <anna.landaw@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 11:41 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

We must have an alternative to cars in Santa Cruz, and rail is the best option. The only way to have a viable public transportation option that will actually serve the community is one that won’t be impacted by traffic as busses are.

It is vital for our community, our planet and our economy that we create a safe and reliable way to get around the county without needing to own a car.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Anna Landaw

From: njbruckner@everyactioncustom.com <njbruckner@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 11:41 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I strongly support rail transit for the rail corridor in Santa Cruz County.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.
Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Natascha Bruckner

From: crocetti@everyactioncustom.com <crocetti@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 11:42 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is necessary for our county to continue to thrive. Both North and South County are dependent on each other. The quality of life for those who must commute to work is greatly diminished by the amount of time we spend in our cars. Help us get out of our cars! There are days when I can get to Watsonville form Santa Cruz faster on my bike that I can in my car. We need the rail, all those idling cars on the highway is creating more air pollution for everyone in addition to causing unnecessary amounts of stress.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Crocetti

From: summercrone21@everyactioncustom.com <summercrone21@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 11:46 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Having experienced both forms of transportation over the years, I can confirm that rail is a better option for a senior like myself lucky enough to survive into my seventies.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Patricia Beardsley
same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you,

Rosemary Kendall

From: joanr0623@everyactioncustom.com <joanr0623@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 11:59 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail
service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
joan rost

From: dsmuckeroates@everyactioncustom.com <dsmuckeroates@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 12:00 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Dustin Smucker

From: sc_sharks Cove@everyactioncustom.com <sc_sharks Cove@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 12:18 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@scrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Lawrence Denis Freitas

From: goldenlove@everyactioncustom.com <goldenlove@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 12:30 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@scrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

Thank you for working so hard to make the rail/trail option a reality. My family supports this project 100%. All three of us ride bikes to work and my business has workers in Watsonville that could save time, reduce pollution and highway expansion costs, and protect our planet from run away climate change by riding a train to and from Santa Cruz. Projects like this make sense for a more sustainable future, public health, and, ultimately, our survival.

Golden Love
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

Rail transit for the rail corridor is a brilliant idea.

It will help to relieve congestion from South County to North County on Highway 1. I hear horror stories all the time about hour long commutes.

Teens working at the Boardwalk would have a safe and easy trip to work. They can easily support people on bikes who would prefer not to risk the trip through town to get to the beach or the west side. It can also accommodate people who are disabled.

Rail transit helps reduce the impact on our environment caused by cars and busses.

It will be a nice addition in and of itself, but even better when taken in the package deal with the trail.

The rails exist. Let's use them.

Susan O'Connor Fraser

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,

TAM Fraser
From: karen@everyactioncustom.com <karen@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 12:38 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit and Urge Moving Forward

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. I’ve lived in Santa Cruz for 25 years and this is the most exciting development due to its potential, proven potential, to ease traffic congestion, help people of all abilities, help the environment and improve quality of life for all.

Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners. Please move forward to make it happen.

Sincerely, Karen Kefauver

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Karen Kefauver

From: dandion1@everyactioncustom.com <dandion1@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 12:41 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create
environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Amy Bolton

From: elanasifry@everyactioncustom.com <elanasifry@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 12:45 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.
From: crwilson1225@everyactioncustom.com <crwilson1225@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 12:50 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I do not support rail transit!

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I do not support rail transit for the corridor.

Rail transit is:

1. Wasteful - there are not enough passengers or freight in our county to support rail transit.
2. Expensive - without identified funds or operators to run it.
3. Lacks infrastructure - such as passenger stations, parking and a passing loop.
4. Too narrow - many sections not wide enough for a rail and a trail.

Rail transit is not right for our county.

Please railbank and build an active transportation trail.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Craig Wilson

From: osorio.lisa@everyactioncustom.com <osorio.lisa@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 1:02 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.
Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Lisa Osorlo

From: rsolick@everyactioncustom.com <rsolick@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 1:06 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I DON"T Support rail/trail

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I want the trail only with rail banking option.

The rails have to be ripped up in any case, and it will be decades before a train can run. In the meantime, make the trail usable for all of us in the county. We've waited far too long. The connections for rail are ridiculously expensive - road connections, gates at each crossroad, stops for people to embark and disembark - those will take decades. Very few people are predicted to actually use the train, because of the cost and the time. It will hardly get anyone off the highways, according to studies commissioned by the county. A trail, though, could be such a great solution for all means of alternative transportation - gently graded, runs all along the county, would be the least expensive and the fastest to do. I've been in many places that have these trails - New Paltz, NY; Yellow Springs, Ohio; Amherst, MA - and they're extensively used and appreciated. Please get out of the way and let us have a trail now.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Randa Solick
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Peggy Kenny

---

From: gerilieby@everyactioncustom.com <gerilieby@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 1:19 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. We need it. It works. And it best serves all, not just the privileged.
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Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Geri Lieby

From: maryzmckenna13@everyactioncustom.com <maryzmckenna13@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 1:42 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit and the Rail Trail

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. I think it would be a serious mistake to not include rail transit in the transportation master plan for Santa Cruz County. The traffic in Santa Cruz County will only get worse, and the people of South County deserve the same access to public transportation as the people of North County. Eliminating the railway would make the trail accessible to bicyclists and walkers, and change the rail into a largely recreational pathway. I strongly agree with and support the statements made below.

Passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

We need to do everything we can to fight climate change and protect the environment. Passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Finally we need to consider financing and maintaining the railway easement. Passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners. If we lose the easement, it would extremely difficult, if not impossible, to regain it.

Thanks for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous.
Transit Corridors Alternatives Analysis
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Sincerely, Mary McKenna, Aptos

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Mary McKenna

From: Jo Stephenson  Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 1:44 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people, and the community as a whole since passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, providing the most reliable service. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail would enable us to travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

In comparison to a Bus option, passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain and in the long term a better investment of tax dollars.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Jo Stephenson

From: Jean Tarr  Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 1:58 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access
and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Jean Tarr

From: Justin Meek  Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 2:08 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

The region needs another transportation option between North and South County. Passenger rail would provide a needed connection between Santa Cruz and Watsonville and should have the added benefit of reducing congestion along Highway 1.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Justin Meek

From: Jennifer Buell  Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 2:17 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.
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Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Buell

From: Val Cole Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 2:38 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I'm excited about the future of commuter rail here in Santa Cruz County. I'm excited because:

* Its the greenest way to move us around
* Its much more affordable than widening Highway 1, which will only generate more greenhouse gasses
* It will provide predictable commute times around the county
* It will help the many in South County who travel north for work to have another option to siting-in their cars.
* It scales -- we can add cars to the trains and trains to the tracks to improve ridership
* Rail will propagate a number of other "last mile" solutions and act at the backbone of a green commuting infrastructure in our county. Those include -- bike rentals, van pools to large employers, driver services (like Uber), etc.
* It will tie our county into the statewide rail program, providing green and pleasant ways to travel our wonderful state.

Val Cole
Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Val Cole

From: Thomas Govea  Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 2:44 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. I may not be a resident of this area, but I come to bay area for work, working on bay area transit projects (BART, VTA and MUNI), and Santa Cruz is my favorite get away from these concrete jungle.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices. Rail transit would also assist when weather causing damage to the mountain passage as experienced when highway 17 had lane closures from collapse roadways due to excessive rain.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Thomas Govea

From: Donna Hall  Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 2:44 PM
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Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor and do not support removing the rails.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,

Donna Hall

From: Larry Detloff  Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 2:48 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. It’s a good emergency backup transport system in case of a serious problem with earthquake or fire.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create
environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Larry Detloff

From: Michael Borg Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 3:50 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Michael Borg
From: Christian Fine  
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 5:02 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

It would seem utterly foolish to rip out such a valuable transportation resource.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Christian Fine

From: David Scott  
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 5:08 PM
Subject: I want a safe bike path before I die.

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I have a hard time believing there is going to be a commuter train. I think trying to build a trail that leaves room for a train rather than replacing a train, is going to take much longer and be much more expensive.

Please imagine simply removing the tracks and paving a trail. What could be easier?

However, if you have your hearts set on maybe having a train some day, then let’s go! Show us that you can get something done, while we live!
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Thanks!

From a bike commuter stuck on unsafe streets, that doesn’t care too much about a train, and dreams of a beautiful trail. And a guy that if ever given a chance to vote on it would vote trail now, even without the possibility of a someday train.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
David Scott

From: Levi Glatt Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 5:26 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Levi Glatt
From: Eric Laumann Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 6:04 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,

Eric Laumann

From: Dr. Petra Mottishaw Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 6:09 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

Petra the veterinarian, marine biologist and conservationist here,

Thanks for all the opportunities to give my opinion again as we move forward with this contentious issue.

I support rail transit for the rail corridor, as I believe we have the evidence that it’s the best option.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access
and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Let's go forward with healthy, evidence based movement on this and accomplish the best!

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Dr. Petra Mottishaw

From: Alan Anderson Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 6:17 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail
service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Alan Anderson

From: Marisol Sanchez Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 6:24 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Marisol Sanchez

From: John Carothers Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 6:31 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,
I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Such a dedicated corridor would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Since passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, we will lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. It’s taken way too long already. Let’s get this done!

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
John Carothers

From: Sofie Salama Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 8:10 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. It is a service that I would use!

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.
From: Violeta Barroso  Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 8:30 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Violeta Barroso


From: Nataalya Urosevic Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 9:03 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I am writing this to show my full support for the rail system.

I believe that it is one of the only ways to prevent what has happened in countless other communities, which is worsening traffic due to public transport NIMBYism. We need this rail
system, and public transport, to prevent countless hours wasted in traffic, and reduce the stress on our roads, and of our people.

We cannot stop people from moving into these areas, but we can make it so that way when our population rises, we are prepared to serve everyone.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Nataalya Urosevic

From: Lois Robin  Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 10:07 PM

Dear Commissioners:

I favor a train on the corridor. But I see one major problem. That is, unless provision is made for good connection to other local transportation, people will not ride the train. Those who have bicycles and ride them may use the train because their bicycle can get them around. My daughter lives in Petaluma and NEVER uses the very accessible Marin train because when she gets to a train stop, there will be no way for her to access her intended destination; a shop, a school, a library, house, office, etc. Therefore, she uses her car.

Buses that could move off the corridor into streets that access other destinations could be valuable, but as you have expressed, removing the rails is an additional expense we don’t need.

I imagine there are trains available now that are quiet. I live next to the train corridor, and while I never minded the noise of large freight trains that passed behind my yard, my neighbors did. But the sound level is an issue that needs clarification so that these folks will not be oppositional.

Most of the people I know that oppose the train do so because they ride bicycles and do not want to have a fence next to them or be confined to a narrow area. I am too old to ride a bike so this is not important to me, but “Greenway” ramps up the case against rail for bike riders. They need convincing that a train corridor will benefit them as well as provide transit for people too old or infirm to bike.

The “failure” of the Marin train is often the subject of negative opinions for a train. An accurate evaluation of the Marin train should be offered in terms of its performance and costs as either positive or negative. Instead of hearsay, we need an accurate evaluation. As I understand it, the circumstances and purposes of this train system are similar to our own.

I will not be around when this train is established. But I do understand that we have only three north/south corridors for moving traffic. And the rail corridor is one of them. It must be used for transit,
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and I imagine there will be many innovations making rail travel practical and enjoyable on it as I have experienced in coastal communities elsewhere, such as the Cote d’Azur in France.

Lois Robin

From: Delise Weir Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 7:53 AM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Delise Weir

From: Glenn Gragg Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 8:03 AM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access
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and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Glenn Gragg

From: Kyle Rak Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 9:13 AM
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

As an Aptos resident, I support the project to build commuter rail along the coastal corridor. This will make it possible for those who don’t drive, to have access to the neighboring towns, and could cut down on vehicle traffic.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Kyle Rak

From: Kaloyan Kaloyanov Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 11:47 AM
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access
and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Kaloyan Kaloyanov

From: Dean Silvers
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 12:25 PM

Subject

Keep those RR tracks and then add a train!

Your Message

As a Santa Cruz resident since 1970, I have been longing for alternative transportation for too long. As a bicyclist and fan of public transit, I am very excited to see the progress happening with the Rail + Trail project. It's so essential that BOTH of these forms of transportation have their routes that are away from the congested streets and freeway. Please do NOT let the tracks be removed and instead keep working on the Rail + Trail, followed by getting an electric train or trolley of some sort, which will be cheaper and also compatible with the State Rail Plan. Do NOT let a few nearby landowners stop this project. I make that last statement as someone who lives on Myrtle St., parallel to Chestnut St and the rail line there. I bought my home here in 1986 specifically to be near the rail & depot.

Thank you, Dean Silvers
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From: Don Lauritson Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 3:56 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail-type transit for the rail corridor as a first choice.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners. Bus transit does not do this.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Don Lauritson

From: Dave Riggs Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 4:31 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Building a light rail system between Santa Cruz and Watsonville is without a doubt the best long term investment that could be made for the residents of this county. At this point in time, the opportunity is at hand and that may not be the case for long. A light rail system linking the the south county to Santa Cruz would link significantly alleviate traffic congestions and reduce the carbon footprint for thousands of commuters daily.

If we do not take the opportunity to build a light rail connection now, future generations will wonder how we could have been so irresponsible and short sighted. The cost of build the system
goes up everyday that we delay. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners. It hard to envision a public works project that would provide such a vast and immediate benefit - reduce traffic congestion, reduce emission and provide economic stimulus at the same time.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Dave Riggs

From: Karen Groppi Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 10:54 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

After riding the SMART train from Marin to Santa Rosa, I'm convinced that this kind of system would be best for our community. Rail travel can be all-electric smooth, quiet and efficient. Therefore I'm writing to thank you for all you have done so far to provide for this transit corridor and register my support for choosing the rail transit options.

Another advantage (in addition to those listed below) which I noticed about the SMART system is that restrooms were provided on the trains limiting the construction of facilities at stations. Restrooms on buses seem unlikely.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.
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Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Karen Groppi

From: JEANETTE GUIRE  
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 11:13 AM

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. I am evacuated from the slv fires. This is the only email I could find on the website. Please redirect to correct department.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Jeanette Ponzo Guire  
Felton Resident for 40 years

From: Kenneth Garges  
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 3:50 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I Do NOT support rail transit for the rail corridor.
Rail transit works well for some areas. In places where the tracks are located near popular destinations or locations that handle lots of freight. But the Santa Cruz tracks are neither. A passenger rail service on these tracks does not take people anywhere they want to go. There are a handful of places that could use the tracks for freight but most have shut down.

As Elon Musk says “the future of transportation is 3 dimensional.” Flying cars, point to point on demand vehicles, tunnels, route optimization asking existing roads. Rails are one dimensional never going where you want or when you want.

Let's stop spending taxpayer money reviving 1800s technology.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Garges

From: Sarah Drobshoff Sent: Saturday, August 22, 2020 5:58 AM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
-----Original Message-----
From: Eric Johnson Sent: Saturday, August 22, 2020 7:21 AM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Eric Johnson

From: Lily Ohlson Sent: Saturday, August 22, 2020 8:25 AM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.
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Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Lily Ohlson

From: Olivia Siemer  
Sent: Saturday, August 22, 2020 1:26 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people and the planet. A passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Also, passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.
Sincerely,
Olivia Siemer

From: Lind Nicol Sent: Saturday, August 22, 2020 11:01 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Lind Nicol

From: Ron Rasmussen Sent: Sunday, August 23, 2020 3:51 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. I am an avid road bike cyclist and while I and others can enjoy the adjacent path it is absolutely paramount that we develop and maintain rail transit for all. In addition as shown already with the new paths already put in adjacent to the rail, Rail with a Trail is the fastest and most economical path to creating a trail.
Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Sincerely,
Ron

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Ron Rasmussen

From: eric richter Sent: Sunday, August 23, 2020 4:59 PM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support the option of rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.
Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,

eric richter

From: John Caletti Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 9:11 AM

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,

John Caletti

From: Eva Holt-Rusmore Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 12:46 PM
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

THANK YOU for supporting a transportation system that will lead us into the future sustainably and equitably.

Sincerely,
Eva Holt

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Eva Holt-Rusmore

From: logan@everyactioncustom.com <logan@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 4:10 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit 100%

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

Rail is far superior to bus or any automotive transit in this situation. Especially since the rail is already in place.

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.
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Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Logan Daniel
logan@austeja.com

From: salguod@everyactioncustom.com <salguod@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 4:18 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I support a personal rapid transit system, but since the odds of that happening are basically zero, I support rail transit on the rail corridor

It's closer to being able to be implemented and it is a more efficient mode of transport. Both of this mean it will be cheaper to operate and faster to get running and useful

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Douglas Jones

Jack Carroll <educatorjc@gmail.com>
I don’t want to pay for a train. There are no freight customers. We already have one tourist train. The voters for Measure D specifically excluded paying for a train. The State Rail Plan has no money behind it. The SMART train has enormous losses and needs to be rescued. Caltrain is underfunded. Amtrak is underfunded. Who’s gonna pay for this?

--

Jack Carroll
Soquel, California
cell 408-234-7583

From: david van brink <david.van.brink@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 4:29 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: [tcaa] support RAIL on corridor

Dear Commissioners & Deciders,

Having seen the preliminary outputs of the Alternatives Analysis, it appears clear that, by the numbers, the rail options still provide the greatest bang for the buck in the scheme of things. They attract higher ridership and stronger transit development, and leverage existing infrastructure the best.

And provide the best multimodal accessibility, for persons of all mobility levels and bicycles too.

We've looked at the data and choices in ever-increasing detail, let’s let the results guide us to the best solution, which is to put Rail Vehicles on the Rail Corridor.

As the spine of an integrated network, Rail on the Corridor will be a spectacular success.

Warmly -- David Van Brink, Citizen of Santa Cruz

From: terry_mcgrew@everyactioncustom.com <terry_mcgrew@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 5:54 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,
I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Terry McGrew

From: Kristin Bradham <kristin.bradham@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 7:07 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Support for rail

Hello RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I am writing to you to tell you how excited I am by the idea that we will have rail in Santa Cruz. Getting from one end of the area to the other is a nightmare with a car, and we have this beautiful rail route that could reduce trips by car, if only we would use it.

I have lived for many years without a car, but this was only possible because I have lived in places where there is good public transportation. This rail route would be the start of a beautiful system.

I also have personal experience from the Sacramento area. My parents lived in Folsom, when they proposed a light rail stop next to their house many people
protested it saying it would cause housing prices to fall. Two years later, the closeness to the rail meant my family could sell their house for about 30% MORE than before the rail. It was a bonus for the family who bought their house.

Thanks for making the rail possible!

Kristin Bradham

From: Anne Smith <smith.anne.l@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2020 7:26 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Advocating for Rail Transit

Dear RTC commissioners and staff,

I recently moved back to Santa Cruz after living in Berlin, Germany for 11 years and I’d like to voice my support for rail transit in the rail corridor.

Leaving the amazing rail transit system that connects all of Germany is one of the things I will miss most: even the smallest of villages have a rail station with regular service. Rail transit is used by nearly everyone in the country.

Rail transit is so much easier and more reliable than busses, as well as being more environmentally sound. It is also much more feasible to do multimodal commuting such as with rail + bicycle, rather than with busses since trains can accommodate many more bicycles than busses. As an avid cyclist, this is important to me. I will not consider taking my bike on a bus.

Santa Cruz has the opportunity now to create modern rail transit system in the rail corridor and I for one would be utterly delighted and will absolutely use it if it were put in place.

Thank you,
Anne Smith

From: elainerohlfes@everyactioncustom.com <elainerohlfes@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 1:00 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.
Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Elaine Rohlfes

From: blueiris@everyactioncustom.com <blueiris@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 8:51 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.
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Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Dianne Dryer

From: dorrianca@everyactioncustom.com <dorrianca@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2020 9:39 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is better for people: passenger rail would operate in a dedicated corridor free of traffic congestion, so it would provide the most reliable service, as well as offering South County riders the same access to quality public transportation as North County riders. Rail provides the easiest access and maximum amount of bike storage per vehicle, as well as the easiest access for wheelchairs, and accommodates more people with personal mobility devices.

Rail transit is better for the planet: passenger rail can be implemented sooner than bus transit in the corridor, meaning we can travel car-free, lower our emissions, fight global warming, and bypass traffic congestion sooner. Rail transit would let us continue construction of the Coastal Rail Trail without delay. Tearing up the existing tracks to replace them with a road for buses would create environmental trauma such as demolition waste, grading, miles of new pavement, and digging for storm drainage systems.

Rail transit is better for prosperity: passenger rail is less expensive to operate and maintain so over time rail transit will be the best investment of tax dollars. Funding to implement passenger rail service on our corridor is identified in the State Rail Plan. Preserving the tracks protects the easement and so protects against legal challenges by adjacent landowners.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Danielle Dorrian
The following is being circulated throughout Santa Cruz County. A longer variation is already in this week's Pajaronian.

“Rail-Trail” Will Not Be Safe

After becoming aware of serious limitations of “Rail-Trail” a few years ago, I was 99% sure that it would be a mistake. After recently walking the corridor, I am now 100% sure.

While the ideals of converting a 100+ year old single-track originally intended for only slow-moving freight into “all things for all people” are noble, the limited width sacrifices too much. As an engineer with decades of experience in designing and developing a variety of reliable computer systems, I know what is realistic and what is bunk.

Rather than forcing us taxpayers to pay for further government waste, why not at least build a viable level “Trail-Only” now, that could evolve to a “Bus-Trail”? This would also be able to easily tap into the pending Bus-On-Shoulder planned for Highway 1. This would provide infinitely safe full loops rather than risking the inherent head-on collisions of single-track linear train systems.

A Very Concerned Citizen,

Bob Fifield
I have just heard a clear presentation of the difference between the trail only and the rail/trail. There is no question that in light of the seriousness of global warming, we must proceed with the Rail/Trail option. Please make clear to everyone that the trail only is attractive to those who want something right now without looking at the obvious catastrophic consequences of not getting people out of their cars!

Dee Roe

From: Katherine Wyle <katherinewyle@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 20, 2020 9:44 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: No rail

Please take the rail part out of it. The train will be useless because people will take a car for far distances so they can get to their exact end destination, and will use a bike on the trails. A train would be a real nuisance for Santa Cruz. Good job getting a trail though.

From: ANDREA RATTO <andrearatto@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 27, 2020 8:01 AM
To: Lara.Bertaina@dot.ca.gov; Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>; Joseph Ward <wuterboy@live.com>
Subject: Highway one and rail trail

I have lived in Santa Cruz County for 45 years, and have commuted both south and north on Highway one. It’s clear we have needed an auxiliary lane for years and that’s what we voted on with Measure D. We did not approve a tourist train that will not serve the needs of south county residents for commute purposes at all. It’s an ill conceived grab by the tourist industry to have the county finance their tourist train. As a south county resident it makes no sense for me to get in my car, drive to downtown Watsonville train station (parking??) wait for the train, spend 30 or so minutes to a train station in Santa Cruz, wait for a bus for an unknown length of time (Metro as we know is choking and has cut routes back), ride the bus somewhere close to my workplace then walk the rest of the way. Now we’re looking at at least 60-90 minutes or more. How is this serving our commute needs? I am all in favor of reducing greenhouse emissions and drive a Hybrid but time is valuable as well. Many families with children have to drive and pick up their kids daily. The train does not address this. Finally the cost of this project is doomed already. Are taxpayers going to want to subsidize this tourist train? For whose benefit? Trains work in densely populated urban areas where they can accommodate many passengers. Look at the Sonoma Rail system which is close to going belly up financially. Do the math and please don’t waste our tax dollars repairing the tracks and bridges for a train that will not benefit the majority of the population here. Shall we put it to a popular vote again? And this time with transparency as to the facts of this issue
Andrea Ratto

From: strim@everyactioncustom.com <strim@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 11:11 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I Support Rail Transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Rail transit is the best long term solution for traffic in Santa Cruz County. It will provide a solution to the horrible commuter hour traffic between Santa Cruz and Watsonville. It is also the best solution for climate change, getting people out of their cars and restructuring land use and jobs around mass transit. The Bay Area invested in BART 50 years ago. It is time for Santa Cruz County to build a modern light rail system.

Keep working on and making progress on rail. Please do not choose a bus alternative or merely a walking/bike trail, neither of which build toward a long term viable alternative transportation vision.

Thank you for leading the way in transforming our transportation system and making our community more equitable, more sustainable and more prosperous for everyone.

Sincerely,
Wendy Strimling
113 Limestone Ln  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-2060 strim@baymoon.com

From: Kyle Kelley <rgbkrk@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2020 2:29 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I support rail transit

I endorse the Coast Connect Vision!

Please keep it going!

-- Kyle

From: frank rimicci <frankeej1958@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2020 7:19 PM
To: Grace Blakeslee <gblakeslee@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Rail trail
Hi, I just wanted to emphasize the need for the segment of trail in Aptos to Santa Cruz and was wondering if You could pass on the message? We need a trail to get off the roadways, its too scary. And Santa Cruz already has the West cliff and rail trail and UCSC trails while We only have streets.

Thanks, Frank

From: Dave Bartoletti <get2bart@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 2, 2020 2:17 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Trail Only - PLEASE

I want to add my voice for the Trail only option. We do NOT need a train to Davenport and I do not want to pay for such a plan.

We could have a world-class tourist attraction with a wonderful trail only along the old rail line.

Please stop taking us down this nonsensical, costly path to a rail+trail solution.

Dave Bartoletti
Joel Wheeler
525 Townsend Dr, Aptos, CA 95003

From: Robert Montague <bobm831@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, November 6, 2020 4:21 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Train vs Trail

This platform is not very amenable to input. It is not clear to me, or indeed, to many in our community that rail, or any form of mass transit on the rail corridor would be feasible. I think that too much time has passed in discussion that is not open to consider the options that do not include mass transit. Please do consider this as an option that our community needs, in order to have a chance of moving forward in a way that today’s community can support.

Thank you,
Bob Montague
831-332-8025

Sent from my iPhone

From: Gary Sultana <g_sultana@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 6, 2020 10:38 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Pedestrian/Cycle Trail
1. Mass transit on existing roads. Improve bus system. Create mass transit right of way on highway one. Improve highway one corridor.

2. Dedicate old rail right of way to low impact pedestrian and cycle/light electric usage.
   A. Cost effective  
   B. Quiet  
   C. People friendly  
   D. GET REAL! We do not have, nor want the population to make a rail service in our area cost effective. Japan, the country of efficient rail service, removed rail service in rural areas where ridership was not sufficient to justify the cost of operation.

Hi Ginger,

I tried to locate how to give my public input after reading and thinking about the SCCRTC's Transit Corridor study. I couldn’t figure-out where and how to give my thought, so I'm giving it to you to hopefully send along to the proper area for the commissioners to access.

I ride my bicycle daily from south county into north county (13 miles each way) to work. The scariest leg of my bike ride is Aptos. The lack of bicycle lanes on the Aptos Creek bridge, the abundance of motorized vehicles, the blocked bike lane caused by delivery trucks, assorted work trucks (AT&T, Public Works, Davey Tree, cable companies, etc), the lack of bicycle lanes beneath the train trestles both west and east of the village, and the lack of a bicycle lane on the blind-curve east of the village, all combine to make the stretch of roadway from State Park Drive to Rio del Mar Blvd a safety challenge.

And what's the alternative to riding on Soquel Drive through Aptos? Only one: riding down to the Rio Flats and riding back up. Have YOU rode your bike up Rio del Mar Blvd from the Rio Flats (going eastbound)? Or, have you rode your bike up Spreckles Drive (going westbound)? Extremely steep, and not pleasant. So, my point is that there really isn’t any alternative to riding along Soquel Drive with all of its safety problems.

What is needed is a flat pedestrian/bike bridge across the Aptos/Valencia creeks. That’s reasonable. There’s several pedestrian/bike bridges across the San Lorenzo River. And there’s a pedestrian/bike bridge across Soquel Creek. And there's the pedestrian/bike bridge across Arana Gulch. All of these bridges enable safe crossings without motor vehicle threats to safety.

I would like to have the commissioners consider a pedestrian/bike bridge connecting the rail corridor from Rio del Mar to Seacliff Beach directly, without crossing Highway 1 and without forcing pedestrians and bicycles in Aptos Village.
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My proposed pedestrian/bike bridge would run on the ocean side of Highway 1, directly from where the railroad trestle crosses Highway 1 in the Seacliff area (near the church grounds) to where the railroad trestle crosses Highway 1 in the Rio del Mar area (near the tennis/swim club).

Thank you for this letter to commissioner's Transit Corridor Public Input.

Respectfully,

Peter Stanger, La Selva Beach, Ca

From: ANDREA RATTO <andrearatto@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, November 9, 2020 7:35 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: "Rail Trail"

Your analysis fails to mention a number of important points. 1. The current rail corridor is too narrow throughout the majority of Santa Cruz County with the exception of north of the city and parts of Watsonville to allow two tracks and a trail for bicycles and pedestrians.

2. Multiple examples, including the Smart Train in Sonoma County have demonstrated that this type of rail service for a limited population base are not even close to cost effective and will continue to put a burden on local taxpayers indefinitely. 3. Even if constructed this train will not practically help south county residents with families to provide transportation needs including dropping off children at different schools then getting to work and transferring to a bus to get to work in a timely fashion.

4. We have over 10,000 commuters driving over highway 17 for employment. This train will do nothing to alleviate this commute congestion. 5. Having a true pedestrian and bicycle trail will bring many tourists to Santa Cruz to enjoy our community and beaches. Having utilized the beautiful bike and pedestrian right of way in Monterey recently made it clear to me that the beautiful beaches and unique community that we have here are reasons that people come to Santa Cruz County. This trail is not an option if the tourist train is constructed. 6. Train to Davenport? Really, how many commuters travel to Davenport??

7. Our population is projected to increase unfortunately whether we like it or not. This train will not conveniently serve the commuting needs of the majority of the population so it will not be used. The projected rider analysis that you provided is grossly overinflated.

8. Time to put it to a vote again. We did not vote for a tourist train. We voted for a repair of our local roads, widening highway one and looking at alternatives to the existing rail. Let's rail bank this project until if or when it seems practical to revisit a train to nowhere, like the Christmas train that failed.

From: Don Hoernschemeyer <dh1618meyer@cruzio.com>
Sent: Monday, November 9, 2020 8:53 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: analysis
Seems like we've been here before, like 5 - 7 years ago, when I attended a county-wide meeting to hear options for improving transportation in our community. Those offered plans failed to get support.

What is new now? I would like to hear.

Thank you

Don Hoernschemeyer, PhD

From: Bruno Kaiser <brunokai@pacbell.net>
Sent: Monday, November 9, 2020 8:29 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Rail line

My opinion regarding the project for a rail line to Santa Cruz is that it is not as useful, and not be used as widely as an alternative. That is, to expand the road between these cites to 3 lanes. Most people would prefer to drive to avoid having to take the substantial time at both ends from the train to get to their destinations. The congestion of Hwy 1 in the afternoon especially, costs drivers about 30 extra minutes for the trip.

Regards,
Bruno Kaiser
87 Paseo
Watsonville
😊

From: Gary Sultana <g_sultana@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 7:07 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Existing ROW Usage

I support bike and pedestrian usage only for the existing rail ROW. Electric bus service should be developed to serve all of Santa Cruz County.
HAS A “SUMMIT ROAD BY-PASS” EVER BEEN SERIOUSLY STUDIED? MUCH OF THE HIGHWAY 17 TRAFFIC REQUIRED TO GO THRU SANTA CRUZ TO GET TO CITIES SOUTHEAST COULD BE REDIRECTED ON A HIGHWAY TRAVERSING SUMMIT ROAD TO HIGHWAY 152 AND CONNECTING WITH HIGHWAY 1 INTERSECTING WATSONVILLE. BECAUSE OF THE MOUNTAINOUS TERRAIN IT MIGHT BE MORE ADVANTAGEOUS TO INTERSECT WITH HIGHWAY 120 SOUTH OF WATSONVILLE RATHER THAN DEPART AT HIGHWAY 152. THANKS FOR YOUR RESPONSE. FRANK REMDE

I choose NONE of the 4 offered alternatives. The cost of implementing any of your listed alternatives is prohibitive. There is no identified funding for implementing any of your alternatives. All alternatives would require local tax increases.

Mass transportation should be kept on the Highway 1 corridor. There should be NO mass transit on the rail corridor. Bus Rapid Transit / Bus on Shoulder on the Highway 1 corridor can provide meaningful mass transit improvements to all of Santa Cruz County. Bus Rapid Transit / Bus on Shoulder on Highway 1 can be implemented quickly and cost effectively. In fact, offering FREE bus rapid transit to Santa Cruz County residents on the Highway 1 corridor would provide a great incentive for residents to use this transportation option. It would lessen the cars and alleviate congestion on Highway 1, introduce mass transit to many Santa Cruz County residents that have never used mass transit, and ease our carbon footprint. Offering bus rapid transit on Highway 1 would introduce a quick, efficient solution to Santa Cruz County’s transportation woes.
For the rail corridor, a trail-only solution for bikes and pedestrians should be implemented.

It’s time to really listen to your constituents instead of trying to justify decisions that were made years ago. It’s time to develop and execute a timely, affordable mass transportation plan for Santa Cruz County.

Respectfully,
Ellen Martinez
20+ Year Full-Time Resident of Santa Cruz County
ellen@ellenmartinez.com

From: Tom <lorne993@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 4:51 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Train Study

Hello,

I can’t understand why you are beating this dead horse over and over again. Your studies are very flawed. How or where do address these questions and concerns?

- Capital and operating cost for train and trail is $1.8 Billion (Train $1.3B, Trail $500M) - excludes Trail maintenance/management
- Destroys over 20 historic trestles
- Closes Roaring Camp Boardwalk operations
- Shutdown surface-streets at railroad crossings creating gridlock every 15 minutes
There is a wonderful opportunity to build a world class trail for a fraction of the cost of a train, that would be heavily used and be available within a matter of months not years and years like a train would require. Besides trains are a 19th-20th century technology, electric bikes, scooters, tricycles, besides your conventional bikes, skateboards and plain walkers are the future, and not disruptive to the communities the coastal corridor runs through. Please take into consideration the view point of “Trail Now” and stop the endless studies about a train that is certain to be a failure. I am part of a family that has, or has had first or second homes in Santa Cruz County for three generations. We love the Santa Cruz, Capitola, Aptos, Le Selva Beach communities and we don’t want to see them rattled by a noisy train barreling through every 15 minutes!

Thank you for your consideration,

Tom Livingston

313 Searidge Road

Aptos, CA
Once again, the RTC has released another study that provides nothing new. It's like a "Dear Santa" letter at taxpayer's expense that is fueled by unrealistic expectations that a rail system will fix the transportation woes of Santa Cruz County.

I have lived here for nearly 10 years now and first thought it would be so exciting to have a train running through my neighborhood and as I learned more about what was actually happening, I can't believe anyone believes this is a sensible solution.

The single track rail line is simply too narrow. with 3 sidings between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, only 8 vehicles can run at a time (5 in one direction). Since smaller vehicles are being considered, there is very low capacity that will be capable with this arrangement.

We need to concentrate on Bus on Shoulder on Highway 1 and Bus Rapid Transit along Soquel and Mission. This is a solution that can be started now, can scale and adjust to peoples needs while providing a clear view to commuters that there is a faster way between Santa Cruz and Watsonville. For those in-between, a safe wide trail is the ultimate solution.

I have sat through many RTC meetings since getting active in the discussion and I find it disheartening that the commission fails to listen to actual citizens that have concerns, yet cozy up to those that either back rail or contribute through non-profits to pretend there is full community support. There isn't. And this is why you will have one of the leading members of the rail movement losing his position with more to follow if you do not follow the will of the people you are supposed to represent rather than continuing down this path without an approved plan or funding.
Please stop with the studies and simply come up with your plan and bring it to a REAL democratic vote with the funding requirements. These open houses and surveys that can be filled out multiple times are skewed at best.

Respectfully,

Jack Brown
Aptos, CA

From: jessevansfiddler@everyactioncustom.com <jessevansfiddler@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 9:18 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Rail is the only option that will provide reliable and high-quality service between Watsonville and Mid-County. Please keep transit in the rail corridor and off of the congested roads by choosing rail.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

Choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jessica Evans
921 Seaside St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4227 jessevansfiddler@gmail.com

From: Dean Cutter <deanc@cruzio.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 8:28 AM
To: transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org.
Subject: Transit corridor survey

Over 10,000 residents petitioned for the bike only option on the RXR. John Leopold’s re-election was sunk by his unwavering adherence to the RXR over the bike trail option. This survey does not allow for public input for the bike only option. Considering you are supposed to represent the
public, it is unconscionable that you are omitting a very significant segment of the public from this process.

I used to lead my middle school students on group rides from Live Oak to Wilder Ranch on a regular basis, until the roads became too dangerous. Some kids were only 10 years old on 1 speed clunkers, and made the round trip just fine. The RXR is a flat, car-free, practical route. A child, or even an out of shape adult, on a cheap bike going 10 miles an hour, could make it from Capitola to Downtown Santa Cruz easily in 25 minutes.

I’ve been teaching middle school here for 30 years. Sadly, I’ve observed a dramatic drop in the number of students using bikes to get to school or to get around town. They say it’s too scary. Strangely, kids have been totally ommitted from the conversation regarding transport options in this county.

With the advent of ebikes it is totally reasonable to commute from Watsonville to Santa Cruz. For the price of a train we could subsidize bikes and ebikes for riders.

To be honest, I don’t think the RTC is equipped to consider the bike only vision. I’ve testified at hearings, written letters, and filled out these surveys. The feeling I get is that I am communicating with the ether, with nobody on the other end. You do not seem to represent the thousands of my like-minded citizens of this county. Hopefully, the removal of John Leopold has gotten your attention and there will be a shift in vision.

Sincerely,

Dean Cutter, Santa Cruz

From: ericmwc@everyactioncustom.com <ericmwc@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 4:27 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.
The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Eric Laumann
26 Mar Monte Ave  La Selva Beach, CA 95076-1635 ericmwc@msn.com

From: elanasifry@everyactioncustom.com <elanasifry@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 4:31 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Elana Sifry
elanasifry@gmail.com

From: heddicr@everyactioncustom.com <heddicr@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 4:41 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.
I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

I think this option best meets the needs of the entire community and supports transportation for older and disabled community members. In addition, I think it would be an excellent choice for tourists.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Heddi Craft
299 San Jose Ave  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-6247 heddicr@gmail.com

From: ericdickjohnson@everyactioncustom.com <ericdickjohnson@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 5:11 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thanks,
Eric Johnson

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Eric Johnson
Santa Cruz,
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

LD Freitas
Aptos, Ca.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lawrence Freitas
522 Harriet Ave Aptos, CA 95003-3706

From: eressler@everyactioncustom.com <eressler@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 5:24 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.
Transit Corridors Alternatives Analysis
Milestone 3 - Email Received between 6/03/20-11/27/20

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Eric Ressler
eressler@gmail.com

From: robarko@everyactioncustom.com <robarko@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 5:28 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Robert Arko
2 Thayer Rd  Bonny Doon, CA 95060-9767
robarko@gmail.com

From: dlane@everyactioncustom.com <dlane@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 5:42 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.
I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Don Lane
132 Van Ness Ave  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4208 dlane@cruzio.com

-----Original Message-----
From: cory181818@everyactioncustom.com <cory181818@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 5:57 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Cory Matsui
cory181818@fastmail.com

From: KARLTREK@everyactioncustom.com <KARLTREK@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 5:58 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Karl Thomas
304 Lazywoods Rd Felton, CA 95018-9302
KARLTREK@GMAIL.COM

From: jaakko831@everyactioncustom.com <jaakko831@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 6:30 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

I completely support this effort.

Thank you.
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Katharine Munger
319 Gharkey St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-6019 mungerk@carleton.edu

From: TMA Kellogg <tmakellogg@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 6:46 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: RTC Survey Completed

Today I completed the RTC survey. I strongly support building the trail without the train/rail.

Why?

- Capital and operating cost for train and trail is $1.8 Billion (Train $1.3B, Trail $500M) - excludes Trail maintenance/management
- Shutdown surface-streets at railroad crossings creating gridlock every 15 minutes
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- Trail built sooner than trail with train would increase safety for bicycle riders dramatically
- No identified funding
- Requires local tax increase
- Delays use of transportation corridor for decades
- Significantly increases cost of trail
- Requires eminent domain of private property
- Major noise nuisance from 6 am to 9 pm
- Speeding trains (45 MPH) create major safety hazard

Tom Kellogg
Aptos, CA

From: francis.nimmo@everyactioncustom.com <francis.nimmo@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 8:01 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Francis Nimmo
913 Seaside St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4227 francis.nimmo@gmail.com
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

30-40 years from now, one of the signature pieces of Santa Cruz County will be the use of rail along the beautiful coastal route. Let’s not squander this resource with short sighted pragmatic considerations. Let’s have a bigger vision and trust in a future we can’t yet imagine.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas Butz
111 Montclair Dr  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-1301 tbutz111@aol.com
Transit Corridors Alternatives Analysis
Milestone 3 - Email Received between 6/03/20-11/27/20

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Steven Most
241 32nd Ave  Santa Cruz, CA 95062-5457
stevenericmost@gmail.com

From: rmbl2010@everyactioncustom.com <rmbl2010@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 5:08 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone. As soon as I get confirmation that rail service will be implemented, we will sell our home and try to move as close to the tracks as possible. We want to beat the rush. I look forward to being able to getting on a train and travel anywhere in the USA.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Steven Schieffer
444 Whispering Pines Dr # 136 Wahoo, NE 68066 rmbl2010@aol.com

From: melchoraguila7@everyactioncustom.com <melchoraguila7@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 10:30 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.
I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Abigail Melchor Aguila
1084 San Miguel Canyon Rd Apt H Royal Oaks, CA 95076-9135 melchoraguila7@gmail.com

-----Original Message-----
From: pldgwriteme@everyactioncustom.com <pldgwriteme@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 10:33 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

This type of service is greatly needed. There are many local residents that work, shop in north county and the electric rail train service would have a positive impact on Hwy 1 traffic and our environment.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Patricia Guevara
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Karen Juarez
475 Cloudview Dr Watsonville, CA 95076-3642 kjuarez1111@sbcglobal.net

From: cs.book.kelley@everyactioncustom.com <cs.book.kelley@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 10:50 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.
Myself and my family of 5 look forward to the many benefits this project would provide for our family.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Kelley
200 W Cliff Dr  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-6100  cs.book.kelley@gmail.com

From: gerilieby@everyactioncustom.com <gerilieby@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 10:54 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I so look forward to this happening. As I age, my needs for public transportation increase. I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

geri Lieby
310 Everson Dr  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-7131 gerilieby@me.com

From: rebec307@everyactioncustom.com <rebec307@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 11:40 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.
I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

This is the moment to move forward with the Electric Passenger Rail. Commuters need it, South Country residents need it and the planet needs it.

Please make progress happen!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Schiffrin
144 Holm Rd Spc 89A Watsonville, CA 95076-2445 rebec307@yahoo.com

From: MEEKSHONEY@everyactioncustom.com <MEEKSHONEY@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 12:51 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

I grew up in San Jose where the public voters and people in power had the chance to build BART to San Jose for $1,000,000 and the proposal was defeated. I learned that people aren't very good at thinking far ahead to make the best choices since we're often limited by the present day options. $1,000,000 seemed like too much at the time. Now the powers have agreed to bring BART to San Jose for a cost in the billions. Short term thinking isn't very helpful when long term solutions are needed—it certainly wasn't in this case. I see the rail corridor as a similar situation. A short term solution to by-pass the rail part of this corridor will make it more expensive down the line to do the right thing and join the south and north county communities with a potentially beautiful rail system.
The right building of this could mean we value the travel to the destination as much as the arrival. Isn't that a refreshing way to look at moving people.

I think rail/trail was bad wording to promote this worthy project because too many people became stuck on a diesel spewing locomotive befouling our streets and air, but rail has so much more potential than that outdated image. What could go on that rail is limitless in terms of options, but the rail needs to be there to make this happen. How it becomes a beautiful ride to and from is an option. We have a chance to create something unique and incredibly important and useful to our county, and it would be a shame to lose that chance just as San Jose lost their chance 50 years ago. Thinking far ahead isn't easy, but that's the responsibility of those, like you, who are in power.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Alayne Meeks, Soquel

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alayne Meeks
2621 N Rodeo Gulch Rd Soquel CA95073 Soquel, CA 95073-9421 MEEKSHONEY@GMAIL.COM

From: Bud Colligan <bud@colligans.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020
To: gpreston@sccrtc.org, gdykaar@sccrtc.org...
Subject: Open House Live Chat

Dear Guy,

I just tried to participate in the Open House Live Chat. It is not effective as a means of getting information or responses that would inform a community member about open issues in the Alternatives Analysis.

So...for the record, my questions are the following:

1. Why is there no mention of Capitola's Measure L on pages A-7 and A-8 when it is now written into city code and is opposed to the current RTC plan of record?

2. On what basis were "likely" funding sources in Appendix I determined? They seem to be fanciful expressions of desire. To label them "likely" is highly misleading.
3. Why is there no discussion of timing, terms and conditions, competitive nature of grants, etc. for capital or operating expenses on a project as big as $1.2 billion? So many things would have to come together miraculously to fund capital or operations in this manner and the risks of that happening, even to get 59% of capital and 47% of operations, are prodigious.

4. Why is Roaring Camp, a private business, considered in this public report?

5. Of the ridership of 5,150 in 2040, how much of that comes from Watsonville? Since social equity is such a large part of the consideration for this project, should we continue to rely on the PRFS's number of 300 roundtrips per day as the number? [You weren't here, but the initial recommendation of the PRFS before feedback from Watsonville was that the train run from SC to Aptos only because the ridership from Watsonville was so small.]

6. Why is there no mention in the report of the recent election, won by Manu Koenig 57% to 43% over John Leopold, the largest train proponent, when the train was the central issue in the campaign? I would think that TWO elections would constitute public input when thousands of people are voting, vs. the extremely small amount of public input, mostly from the train lobby, received by your project consulting team for the Alternatives Analysis. By contrast, over 33,000 county residents voted in the 1st District election--over 86% turnout! There are ways of getting representative input from random surveys of county residents. Why are accurate polling/survey techniques not being used to get public input vs. the unrepresentative methods being used by the RTC and its consultants?

7. Why is the report unable to find representative train systems in counties the size of Santa Cruz County? Examples given are from large cities that have much larger populations and density than Santa Cruz County and are not representative of the tax base and transportation issues we face here.

Guy, it's important to ask the important questions before we go any further on this $1.2 billion project. The disposition of the corridor is going to a vote, and the sooner we stop wasting money on studies and attempt to ascertain the real wishes of our county residents, the sooner we will be able to bring the community together around a solution supported by the majority.

Thank you for your answers to the questions I have submitted.

Regards,

Bud
From: Bud Colligan <bud@colligans.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 7:52 PM

To: Guy Preston <gpreston@sccrtc.org>

Cc: Zach Friend <Zach.Friend@santacruzcounty.us>; Patrick Mulhearn <Patrick.Mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us>; Bruce McPherson <Bruce.McPherson@santacruzcounty.us>; Gine Johnson <gine.johnson@sanatcruzcounty.us>; Ryan Coonerty <ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>; Manu Koenig <rskoenig@gmail.com>; Randy Johnson <Rlj1200@gmail.com>; Jacques Bertrand <jacques.bertrand@sbcglobal.net>; Sam Storey <samforcapitola@yahoo.com>

Subject: Fwd: Action Alert: RTC Poised to select Electric Passenger Rail

Dear Guy,

This email from Coast Connect is why your "public input process" has no credibility. It is also documented in the Alternatives Analysis itself where it details "public input," which is dominated by the same retired people with nothing better to do than go to your meetings to provide input on why a train is the best alternative for the corridor. Working people and normal citizens do not have time or are not informed sufficiently to provide their input. So instead, this process masquerades as input.

If you want real input, look at the election for the 1st District Supervisor, where the use of the corridor was a primary issue. The "train" candidate, John Leopold, lost in a landslide, 57% to 43%. That's REAL INPUT. To the extent you continue to use lobbying efforts as the "public input," you will continue to divide the community and not solicit the will of the people. We will continue to waste taxpayer money for many more years until you are forced to vote for a tax to support the train, at which point the voters will resoundingly reject your plan, as they have now done twice in the Measure L election in 2018 and again this past week. Continue at the RTC's peril with this ill-conceived plan.

Regards,

Bud

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Jessica Evans, Friends of the Rail & Trail <info@railandtrail.org>
Date: Wed, Nov 11, 2020 at 4:10 PM
Subject: Action Alert: RTC Poised to select Electric Passenger Rail
Dear Peter,

We have big news to share, and two important action for you to take. The draft Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis (TCAA) study has been released, and Electric Passenger Rail has come out on top as the Proposed Locally-Preferred Alternative.

The Draft TCAA Study has shown that rail transit will provide the fastest, most reliable, most equitable, and most climate-friendly public transit to serve our county and that rail transit is the only option guaranteed to preserve the easement so that trail construction can continue.

What's Next: Your Voice is Needed Now

The study will be revised based on the public comments and then the Regional Transportation Commission will either affirm the electric rail choice or reject it in favor of bus service. Your voice is needed now to show that the public supports the study outcome in favor of rail transit.

The RTC has created an online Open House to share the draft study results with the public and created a survey to solicit public input and comment. The RTC will also accept comments by email. Either way, the public comment period closes on Friday, November 27th.

If you’d like to see the TCAA draft study Open House, click here. To see the full draft study, click here. If you have questions about the draft study, you can join an online chat session with an RTC TCAA team member on Thursday Nov. 12, 2020 from 12-1:30 p.m. or Wednesday Nov. 18, 2020 from 6-7:30 p.m. by going to the online Open House during one of those times and clicking the chat icon in the bottom right corner of the Open House web page.

Please Take Action Now!

Please take a moment right now to take two actions: fill out the survey and send an email supporting rail transit. You will find our quick reference guide to the survey below, and a convenient email form here.
Survey Guide: Here’s How We Filled Out the Survey

Survey Question 1 - Please rank the top five performance analysis results that you think should be considered most carefully... We chose these for our top five. Please rank them in order of your own preference:

- Continuity of Transportation Corridor
- Promotes Active Transportation
- Travel Time
- Travel Time Reliability
- Emissions Reduction

Survey Question 2 - We left this optional “Other” comment space blank.

Survey Question 3: Please rank the top five elements most important to you as a passenger... We chose these for our top five. Please rank them in order of your own preference:

- Security and safety
- Fast travel times
- On board bike capacity
- Level Boarding
- Independent accessibility for all ages and abilities

Survey Question 4 - We left this optional “Other” comment space blank.

Survey Question 5 - Please rank the top five elements most important to you as a community member… We chose two for our top five elements and then chose Other and added three more that we thought needed to be included:

- Allow implementation of continuous rail trail (MBSST)
- Quiet zones to eliminate horns at crossings
- Other

Survey Question 6 – Other comment: We felt these were important additional elements.

- Provide the fastest transit travel time during rush hour.
- Provide fastest implementation. Improve transportation sooner, not later!
- Produces the maximum number of jobs.

Alert: we noticed that if we clicked the same importance rank for two items, the first item we clicked became un-selected. Do you still have 5 items selected for each category in the above questions?
Survey Question 7 - Please share your opinion regarding the locally preferred alternative... We chose the top option, Commuter Rail Transit (CRT) or Light Rail Transit (LRT):

- I agree with passenger rail (CRT/LRT) as the locally preferred alternative

Survey Question 8 - Please explain the reason for your opinion... Tell the RTC why you prefer passenger rail.

Survey Question 9 - What is your preferred frequency of service? We chose:

- Every 30 minutes

Survey Questions 10, 11, 12 For the last three questions we recommend whichever choices best suit your needs or the needs of your loved ones.

Thank you for taking the survey! If you haven't yet, please also click here to send a quick and easy email comment in support of rail.

Thank you for your continued actions in support of Rail and Trail. You are making a huge difference. Together we can transform transportation and improve the quality of life for everyone who lives, works, and plays in Santa Cruz County.

Your friends at Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail

We exist because of your financial support. You can donate easily online by using this link.
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: TCAA

To Whom It May Concern,

Please continue as quickly as possible building the 32 mile bicycle/pedestrian trail through our entire county. And, immediately implementing passenger rail to connect us to the rest of the state south of Watsonville.

Fortunately I am retired, and I live by the rail corridor and I am able to advocate for families and individuals who are busy working, without computer access and putting food on the table that don’t have time to attend these important online meetings.

Stepping back and looking at this objectively; every public street, avenue, road, highway, freeway, overpass, underpass, sidewalk, traffic light, crosswalk light, bridge, rail corridor throughout the entire USA is paid by taxpayers from various federal, state and county taxes, grants, bonds, and measures.

Fortunately Santa Cruz County residents overwhelmingly approved Measure D that includes the maintenance and upgrade of our entire rail corridor to serve everyone in our county; young, old, disabled, those without vehicles commuting from Watsonville, Aptos, Capitola, Santa Cruz and Davenport, whether by foot, bike or light energy efficient clean, quiet passenger rail.

Please remember our residents living in Watsonville and south Santa Cruz County who usually are not voicing their unanimous support for rail and trail because working, or without internet access and/or language barrier.

Maximum options serving the maximum number of people.

Sincerely,
Tina Andreatta
Aptos, CA

From: jpotterton@everyactioncustom.com <jpotterton@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 1:16 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.
I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

I am a senior who has family and friends in Watsonville and I want a fast alternative to highway 1 for visits in the afternoon.

Thanks,
Jim Potterton

Thank you.

Sincerely,
James Potterton
330 Sims Rd Santa Cruz, CA 95060-1328
jpotterton@sbcglobal.net

From: Mike Ransom <mikeransom24@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 2:17 PM
To: Zach.Friend@santacruzcounty.us; Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: Trail vs. Train

On Wed, Nov 11, 2020 at 2:10 PM Mike Ransom <mikeransom24@gmail.com> wrote:

To Whom it may concern,

I wrote a letter three years ago voicing my opinion for a trail only. With the current status of the county and state government debt I thought I would write one more time in favor of a trail only.

First and foremost, being fiscally responsible and government do not go hand in hand but there is no other choice with conditions were they are today. A train is something this county can’t afford to invest in. Even after years of dumping money to build the railway there will be costs to actually run the system that will just cost us taxpayers. Most systems, like Sonoma/SF rely on subsidies to keep costs down. All this does is cost us taxpayers while still in these areas showing poor ridership. The trail is a cheaper and
quicker way to open up transportation alternatives for our area. Other smaller electric alternatives could be utilized on the trail.

I’m 59 and live in the Aptos region. Riding a bike in many of our streets is simply not safe. If I had the opportunity to use the trail I would choose a bike over a car most of the time. I think safety is a concern for many and the trail addresses the safety issue especially in Aptos. Also with the Village, a train coming through every 45 minutes would cause gridlock in an area that already has traffic concerns.

The time is now to stop this narrative on trains and focus are time on building a trail. At this point, a trail is going to take years to complete. Let’s start now.

Thank you for your time,

Mike Ransom
831-332-7124

-----Original Message-----
From: mari42597@everyactioncustom.com <mari42597@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 1:53 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

This rail is important for everything mentioned above as well as the fact that it will reduce greenhouse gas emissions as well as congestions on the 1!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Maria Corona
3045 Capitola Rd Apt 46 Santa Cruz, CA 95062-3546 mari42597@gmail.com
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Brian Corser
114 Ladera Dr Santa Cruz, CA 95060-5254 bcorser@calcentral.com

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

Passenger rail is the only pro-working family and pro-environment solution. I will use the train! I can’t wait.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kerstin Breidenthal
kerstinahlgren@gmail.com
From: bwright@everyactioncustom.com <bwright@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 3:00 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction. There is no other way to address equity, quality of life, and climate change. Period.

I grew up riding CalTrain between San Francisco and San Jose on a frequent basis, which saved my parents gas money and the exhaustion of driving in traffic too. In fact it allowed my mom to live car free, a model of living that led me to live without a car until I ... moved to Santa Cruz, where it was not possible!

Taking trains is relaxing and an opportunity to meet your neighbors, get some work done, and ideally to save money too. With proper planning, it can facilitate more access for beach goers to enjoy Watsonville's rockin' downtown and cyclists' access to paths throughout the County. This is a must! And besides, didn’t we already vote on this?

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Brooke Wright
418 Lincoln St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4335  bwright@environmentalin.com

From: jessie.n.beck@everyactioncustom.com <jessie.n.beck@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 3:33 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.
I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

As a commuter from Soquel to the West Side of Santa Cruz, I am continually frustrated by the traffic on Hwy. 1 and the lack of regular and quick climate-friendly transportation options. The Metro is helpful but can take an hour or more to get from Soquel to the West Side. A rail transit option would be hugely beneficial for me, and for others who cannot afford to live in the city of Santa Cruz but work there. It is a climate problem and an equity problem, especially for those who commute from South County.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone. I strongly support rail transit for the rail corridor.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jessie Beck
2621 N Rodeo Gulch Rd  Soquel, CA 95073-9421 jessie.n.beck@gmail.com

From: Nitroxbaby@everyactioncustom.com <Nitroxbaby@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2020 7:28 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.
Hi, I have been following this debate for years now about how to use the rail corridor. I am aware that there was funding from the state to use for specific purposes and that has created some limitations. However, continued funding from local tax dollars for a project with questionable budget projections means, to me, we need to be flexible and fiscally cautious especially considering the current economic impacts from covid and the coming economic impacts from climate disruption which will be ongoing and intensifying for centuries most likely. I have long hoped for a trail friendly project emphasizing people powered low budget transportation which could get cars off the road and build community. Therefore I urge you to adopt the most minimalist project possible so you don’t lock us into unpayable costs for operation and maintenance down the road. And please find a way to make it walk, bike, skate, scooter, and alternative micro transport friendly and centric.

Thanks,

Terry Tiedeman
Trevethan Ave
Santa Cruz local family since 1906

Hello,
I have been urged to write my opinion of the RTC’s decision to continue studying a rail and trail option for the coastal corridor. Don’t you folks think you have done enough harm to our community by continuing to pursue the too expensive, pipe dream of rail shared with a trail? The People don’t
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want rail!! Manu’s decisive victory shows that. The People want a Trail NOW! If there had been a bike trail where the rail tracks are now over the harbor, my late husband, Benjamin Doniach, would be alive today. He was killed in a head-on collision riding his bike on the Murray St. bridge on July 10, 2018. Santa Cruz desperately needs to get bikes off the street and onto protected cycling paths NOW, not in 10 years. It is just too simple: tear up the tracks, pave a path, paint some lines, and let the coastal corridor become a WORLD CLASS attraction for CYCLISTS. The failure of the RTC to back a trail only plan will have big repercussions. There is now a concerted effort to get the folks on the RTC who support a train replaced by fairly elected new blood, people who will put the will of the People ahead of the fantasy of the RTC train crowd.

Tutti Hacking
Long-time cyclist and Santa Cruz resident/property owner

From: ak_thompson@everyactioncustom.com <ak_thompson@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2020 9:23 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Alana Thompson
ak_thompson@hotmail.com

From: corradoborg@everyactioncustom.com <corradoborg@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2020 10:54 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,
I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Electric Passenger Rail is the fastest, most ecologically sound, and best solution, and my family and I will use it very regularly.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Michael Borg
41 Grandview St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-3000 correдобorg@yahoo.com

From: slustgarden@everyactioncustom.com <slustgarden@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 12:52 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Steve Lustgarden
28 Hanover Ct  Santa Cruz, CA 95062-2651 slustgarden@gmail.com

From: agoldenk@everyactioncustom.com <agoldenk@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 3:22 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Why does every country in the world do rail well except ours?

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Andrew Goldenkranz
120 Montero Ct  Aptos, CA 95003-3462
agoldenk@gmail.com

From: claudiarbrown@everyactioncustom.com <claudiarbrown@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 4:00 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

I believe this plan be if it’s ALL users (walkers, bikers, passengers etc)

Thank you,
Claudia Brown  

Thank you.  

Sincerely,  
Claudia Brown  
600 Pelton Ave  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-6531 claudiarbrown@gmail.com  

From: jamiet@everyactioncustom.com <jamiet@everyactioncustom.com>  
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 4:26 PM  
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative  

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,  

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.  

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.  

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.  

Thank you.  

Sincerely,  
jamie townsend  
22921 E Cliff Dr # 95062 Santa Cruz, CA 95062-5450 jamiet@rattlebrain.com  

From: karltrek@everyactioncustom.com <karltrek@everyactioncustom.com>  
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 8:00 PM  
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative  

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,  

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.  

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.
The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Karl Thomas
304 Lazywoods Rd  Felton, CA 95018-9302
karltrek@gmail.com

From: ayasbek@everyactioncustom.com <ayasbek@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 8:42 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

I also believe that the rail corridor is a massive public benefit and attempts to steal this right of way from the public is nothing short of disgusting. The efforts or wealthy jerks and libertarian morons to derail this concept is unacceptable. Enough already. Build the trail, keep the rail and lets move on.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Alex Yasbek
400 34th Ave  Santa Cruz, CA 95062-5103
ayasbek@gmail.com

From: dsilvers@everyactioncustom.com <dsilvers@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 9:07 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dean Silvers
316 Myrtle St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4942  dsilvers@cruzio.com

From: Kaki Rusmore <krusmore@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 10:36 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: transit on rail corridor

I am so glad to see that passenger rail service is the locally preferred option. It is the most ecologically sound and the most accessible. I look forward to seeing additional sections of the trail built and enjoyed while we develop the details for passenger service. Please do not be dissuaded by a loud but unrepresentative group trying to undermine this effort.

Thank you,

Kaki Rusmore
Aptos

From: Duke Houston <dukehouston01@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 7:17 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

William Houston

From: Michele Huesties <michelehuesties@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 7:29 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Michele Huesties

From: carol easton <carol.easton1@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 8:09 AM  
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Carol Easton

From: Donna Murphy <ms.donna.marie.murphy@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 8:29 AM  
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Support for Electric Passenger Rail use of Corridor

Dear RTC:

Electric Passenger Rail is the best, most sustainable, and most equitable use of the Rail Corridor, and should be implemented as soon as possible.

After years of thoughtful analysis, the determination that Electric Passenger Rail is the preferred local option is re-assuring — as it affirms that rail is the best environmentally; it is the best for convenience, reliability, comfort, accessibility; and it is the spine of a much broader, more efficient public transit network. There are so many superior benefits to bus transit that it seems superfluous to detail them, yet they include:

1. Faster, more reliable travel time (giving commuters hours each week of time for family, recreation, or civic involvement) — the best for quality of life for those who must commute to work, school, or to access services.
2. It is easy to access regardless of physical impairment, age, income, or group size.
3. It reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled, reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
4. When paired with shuttles or other short-range transit, rail service will help workers or customers access major businesses and services more easily, with less hassle, and lessen demand for parking infrastructure.
5. It can be implemented relatively quickly if there is public will and leadership.
6. Moreover, this option uses the entire corridor and better serves the population centers; and connects with the regional and state rail network — making the infrastructure investment the wisest use of resources. The partial use of the corridor (just 7 miles) in the bus alternate makes no sense and is an egregious, wasteful expenditure.

Please take this final step and approve Electric Passenger Rail for our county once and for all. This decision is the best for our county residents today as it enables prompt continuation of the bike/pedestrian trail; and for the near future when residents can have a sustainable, efficient, and enjoyable transit option to travel between Santa Cruz to Watsonville and to the statewide rail network.

Donna Murphy
Santa Cruz

From: David Field <fieldmusic@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 8:56 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I'm writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

David Field

From: greg@everyactioncustom.com <greg@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 8:28 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Gary Landgrebe

---

I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

We need alternative transportation modes to favorable impact our environment and reduce traffic congestion on our highways.

Sincerely,

William C. Bishoff
Capitola, CA 95010

---

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Greg McPheeters
741 Seaside St Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4716 greg@movedbybikes.com
Every rapid people moving rail system I have traveled on is more elevated or under ground. I think our rail system would lead to congestion in the city and cause more problems than it solves.

From: Ros Munro <ramunro55@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 9:43 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Ros Munro
Live Oak

Hi -

I’m writing to show my support of Electric Passenger Rail between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. Having lived in Boston I know how helpful commuter rail can be. What a wonderful addition to our community.

- Rebecca

From: marycaravalho@everyactioncustom.com <marycaravalho@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 10:17 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.
The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

We have to begin building and using mass transit to help our environment survive.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mary Caravalho
129 Los Altos Ct Santa Cruz, CA 95060-3333 marycaravalho@gmail.com

From: hectormelgoza831@everyactioncustom.com
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 11:09 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Hector Melgoza
105 Ginos Ct Freedom, CA 95019-2626 hectormelgoza831@gmail.com

From: Rosie King <rosieanneking@cruzio.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 11:22 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Support for Draft TCAA Study
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Rosie King  
20th Ave.  
Live Oak  
Santa Cruz 95062

From: Geraldine Lieby <gerilieby@me.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 11:34 AM  
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Geraldine Lieby

From: Sharon Hull <plants@cruzio.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 11:59 AM  
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: support for rail transit

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Sharon Hull  
Santa Cruz

From: barry@everyactioncustom.com <barry@everyactioncustom.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 12:13 PM  
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,
I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

We need Electric Passenger Rail to operate between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at Watsonville Junction in Pajaro.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Rail transit can be implemented sooner than any other form of transit on the corridor, please begin now!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Barry Scott
260 Rio Del Mar Blvd, Aptos, CA 95003-4656 barry@coastalrail.org

From: 4400610@everyactioncustom.com <4400610@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 12:51 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Brian Lopez
4400610@PVUSD.net

From: ms7330@everyactioncustom.com <ms7330@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 12:36 PM
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Dear RTC Members,

I fully support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

We need accessible, environmentally sound transportation solution especially for those workers in the county who need reliable transportation without increasing bus and auto use.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Marc Schneider
222 Marnell Ave  Santa Cruz, CA 95062-1223  ms7330@yahoo.com

From: Karen Close <spaciouscraniosacral@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 1:10 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,
Karen Close

From: Dennis Cavaille <dcavaille@cruzers.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 1:41 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

I'm writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,
Dennis Cavaille

From: Guy Zahller <gop.r.war.criminals@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 2:52 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I'm writing to let you know that I support electric rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

--

Peace, Love and Vegetable Rights!

Guy Zahller

From: David Fairchild <fairch@cruzers.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 3:07 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support bus rapid transit (BRT) for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the prior US DOT funded Watsonville- Santa Cruz corridor study and choose BRT as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,
David Fairchild

--

David Fairchild
831/763-3709; 831/254-3547

From: sdrobshoff@everyactioncustom.com <sdrobshoff@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 3:16 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Sarah Drobshoff
100 Claremont Ter  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-1740  sdrobshoff@gmail.com

From: Jennie Dusheck <dusheck@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 3:38 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I strongly support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please don’t hesitate to follow the TCAA recommendation and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

In particular I think the best options are BEV powered trains with frequent service, 7 days a week, to serve recreation as well as commuters. I would object to the wheeled bus like service. We should use the tracks we bought.

Sincerely,

Jennie Dusheck
Health & Climate, Writing & Editing
Ph:  831•427•1391
dusheck@gmail.com

From: george marino <gamarino@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 3:45 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

As a Santa Cruz County resident I am requesting that you follow recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative. I would like to see a multi use transit rail corridor, with a bike path if feasible.

George Marino

-----

From: Elisabeth Potts <ejpotts47@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 4:07 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

- I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative. -

From: erichter@everyactioncustom.com <erichter@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 4:16 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I strongly support the development of Electric Passenger Rail along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, in order to connect Santa Cruz County communities, and our community to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

eric richter
4622 Fairway Dr  Soquel, CA 95073-3037
erichter@giro.com
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Robin Eleanor Gaura

---

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

I read the full report and am very impressed by the thorough research and well-organized outreach. I’ve been following this discussion for decades and am hopeful we can now start moving on this wonderful transportation plan.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Beck
894 Eddy Ln  Santa Cruz, CA 95062-2856
jeannebeck22@gmail.com
From: jennifer harris-anderson <buzznjen@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 5:37 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Rail Corridor

The latest analysis is not complete without a trail only option. A train or other mass transit is not a good fit for our county. It would serve an elite few and be heavily subsidized with regressive taxes. One only has to look to the SMART Train to see that only rich people ride it. Plus the SMART Train is having low ridership issues and financial troubles. A train is the opposite of social justice. Bringing low income people to Santa Cruz to tend our elderly, pour our concrete, fix our cars, clean our motel rooms and work in our restaurants, then ship them back to south county is wrong. We should be building real affordable housing in Santa Cruz in walkable neighborhoods near job centers. This would take cars off the road more than any train. Moving the county government center to Watsonville would also go a long ways in achieving social justice and relieving congestion. A wide-multi use, continuous trail. (Not the rail trail option) would be the best use of the corridor.

Best Regards,

Frank Anderson

From: mtustin@everyactioncustom.com <mtustin@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 8:34 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

The trail is a perfect idea, but it would be fool-hardy to eliminate rail possibility. that was done all around the Bay Area back in the 1950s while freeways were being built. then we spent a fortune repurchasing land to build BART. Let's not make this mistake again. A rail line is rare and worth keeping. Mari Tustin

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mari Tustin
603 National St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-6040 mtustin@pacbell.net

From: cindy_rubin@everyactioncustom.com <cindy_rubin@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 10:44 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I am writing because I would like to see electric passenger rail service connect Santa Cruz to Watsonville. We need an alternative to automobiles and our bus service. People who cannot afford cars or cannot drive should have alternatives. I believe when we invest in rail transportation infrastructure, our county will be able to attract better paying jobs and help people in our community commute to work, at the same time providing a means for people to more efficiently move within the county, thereby making this a more attractive community to live and work.

Cindy Rubin

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Cindy Rubin
2450 Trout Gulch Rd Aptos, CA 95003-3036 cindy_rubin@comcast.net

From: zjsampson@everyactioncustom.com <zjsampson@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 8:46 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Zachary Sampson
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Eva Holt
112 20th Ave # 3 Santa Cruz, CA 95062-4961 eholtrusmore@gmail.com
I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

As a father and someone that considers how my everyday actions impact the environment and traffic congestion, I wholeheartedly support the rail the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Dain Zaffke
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
dain.zaffke@gmail.com

From: kaitlynschlicht@everyactioncustom.com <kaitlynschlicht@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 10:51 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kaitlyn Schlicht
308 River St Unit C12 Santa Cruz, CA 95060-2753 kaitlynschlicht@gmail.com
Transit Corridors Alternatives Analysis
Milestone 3 - Email Received between 6/03/20-11/27/20

From: Philip Boutelle <philboutelle@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 3:27 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Support the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I strongly support the findings of the recent TCAA study, indicating that rail transit for the rail corridor is the best option moving forward. Please support the TCAA study recommendation and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

With over 90,000 people commuting from one place in the county to another, we need an alternative to the highway for moving people back and forth across the county. And with the state rail plan providing a massive amount of funding, plus the new federal administration promising funding for shovel-ready funding for carbon-free mass transit in communities with populations over 100k, we are well positioned to receive additional funding to see this project through, leveraging our existing Measure D funds as required for a local match.

Lastly, please remember that it is vital that the complete rail corridor is maintained for public use, and using rail is to date the only proven transit approach that will legally maintain this right of way.

Thank you for your continued diligence in these matters.

-Phil Boutelle
Santa Cruz

From: Elisabeth Potts <ejpotts47@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 4:07 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

- I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative. -

From: jeffreymos@everyactioncustom.com <jeffreymos@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 12:34 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.
I am proud to support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction. I am excited to have rail service as an option for my travel and to take cars off the road. I live along side the right of way and say "Yes in my Back Yard!"

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone. I look forward to more car-less travel for myself and fewer cars on the road.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Moss
1110 E Cliff Dr Apt 3 Santa Cruz, CA 95062-3769 jeffreymos@aol.com

From: Paul Braga <paulb25@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 1:36 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Open Comments

Hello

As a life long resident of Santa Cruz County, I am very frustrated by the RTC’s continued efforts to have a train. I just tried to take your survey on the website, but I find it to be very biased towards favoring a train.

I do favor trains in larger metropolitan areas, but in Santa Cruz county the notion of a passenger train is a boondoggle. You are wasting money on studies, and future money to maintain such a project. Please consider this view point.

Lastly, I have a very large network of friends and family in Santa Cruz County, and I have found nobody who supports the train. I believe you are pursuing this effort on false pretense.

I support using the rail corridor for trail only.

Sincerely,
Paul Braga
Aptos, CA
831-239-8862

From: bryan.largay@everyactioncustom.com <bryan.largay@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 1:47 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bryan Largay
160 Farmer St  Felton, CA 95018-9416
bryan.largay@gmail.com

From: Karen Haralson <ktese@cruzio.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 3:48 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Karen Haralson

From: jessevansfiddler@everyactioncustom.com <jessevansfiddler@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 3:51 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.
I also have a criticism to offer: I was disappointed that in the survey, 'risk to the corridor' was not flagged as creating risk for trail construction. It seems obvious that anything that creates problems with the title, right of way, easement, etc., is bound to create problems for trail construction as well. When I asked Ginger about this, she agreed it could be an issue and recommended I highlight that fact in an email. So please consider this my critical comment on the Draft Study:

Risk to the easement should be considered a risk to trail construction. Therefore it also follows that people who choose trail construction as their top priority should also be considered to be supporting rail transit over other transit options, since rail is the only option that protects the legal integrity of the corridor.

The data seems clear across the board: rail will provide the fastest, most reliable, most equitable, and most climate-friendly public transit to serve our county. I urge you to move forward confidently in selecting passenger rail transit for our rail corridor.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jessica Evans
921 Seaside St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4227  jessevansfiddler@gmail.com

From: Brendan Quirk <brendanbquirk@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 4:33 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Open House Comments

Hello,

I live in downtown Santa Cruz and I would love to see the Electric Light Rail (LRT) system put into place. I think it is sleek and just feels less intrusive than the large commuter trains. I think we should also invest in a bus rapid transit system in addition to the LRT to alleviate pressure on both systems - BRT would primarily be serving the direct highway 1 corridor while the LRT would be closer to the coast moving through the coastal neighborhoods. We need to move away from single passenger vehicles and having more public transportation options is always better!

Thanks!

From: carter@everyactioncustom.com <carter@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 6:26 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,
I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Carter Potts
114 Lucia Ln  Scotts Valley, CA 95066-4557 carter@rattlebrain.com

From: shachar <shachar@rinspin.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 6:47 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Concern about vibration and noise at the Capitola trestle bridge

Hi,

I’m writing in to share my concerns (as well as my neighbors) on riverview ave in capitolia regarding the proposal on having CRT/LRT trains running above riverview ave daily every 30 mins. My concern is based on our experiences over the years with the holiday trains that run across the tracks during the christmas season. Everytime one of these trains crosses our entire house vibrates as the train goes from one end to the other. Additionally, the noise is very loud even with the windows closed. Even with major retrofitting that I imagine would be required to sustain daily use of the trestle, I’m very concerned that the vibration and noise issue will not be substantially addressed. Please keep in mind the hundreds of homes that will be affected by noise and vibration along the rail line as you consider options here.

Thank you,
Shachar Tassa
334 riverview ave
Capitola

From: de.alloin@everyactioncustom.com <de.alloin@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 7:23 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,
I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

As a life-long resident of Santa Cruz County, I've seen first hand how transportation has changed over the last 25 years. It's about time that Santa Cruz County explore new and innovative solutions to transportation issues, this is why I am writing with my support toward using ELECTRIC PASSENGER RAIL to connect everyone along the rail corridor.

Among the many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail, perhaps the most important to this county's future is transport that is reliable, connecting our diversity of populous, and a transportation solution that goes beyond "green washing".

For these reasons, and many more, electric passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, sustainable, and prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deana Alloin
PO Box 1833  Santa Cruz, CA 95061-1833
de.alloin@gmail.com

What the heck TCAA and Sierra Club?

I just go this email and survey Nov 17th. I opened it today (the 18th) and found out I had already missed the two opportunities to join the informational chats on the 12th and the 18th and the survey is full of questions that are "above my pay grade" as our former president once said. I couldn't begin to answer these questions without some depth of understanding of the complex issues suggested. I would suggest an accompanying analysis and explanation of the questions if you hope to get any clear feed back from average citizens.

BTW: I'd love to see a commuter/recreational train run from Watsonville to Santa Cruz and visa versa. But it's not very clear how to say that simply with the survey.

Thanks for you consideration
Roscoe
831-247-8231
As I predicted before the TCAA study was started, it will come out for a train. No surprise here, as all your “studies” are predetermined because of the criteria you choose to organize the studies around. The community is really getting tired of endless costly studies.

Since the purchase of the corridor, you have not changed course or offered any compromise on the use of the corridor. You continue to disregard new data and believe that you can predict the future. Our county is not large enough to warrant a train and the train corridor does not go where people want to go. Our county has a lot of needs and very little funding to solve these needs. At some point, you will need to compromise to get anything done and let the voters get involved in what happens in the corridor. That time is soon approaching.

Please stop doing “studies” and actually pay attention to what our community can afford and wants.

Sincerely

Robert Stephens
Aptos

From: triciansc@everyactioncustom.com
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 8:47 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Yay! Finally!
I am so excited to be able to envision Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction. 😊

I will look forward to taking my bike on the train or streetcar or whatever it will be. 🚴‍♂️ Please keep up the good work. But some folks need to know why it is taking so long.

I agree with the many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail.

Choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Trician Comings
316 S Branciforte Ave  Santa Cruz, CA 95062-3323 triciansc@mindspring.com

From: Gabriel Wolff <lunaseawolf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 9:46 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I'm writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Gabriel Wolff

From: Herb Jellinek <home@newscenter.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 9:11 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: The future includes rail

Hi,

Just a note to say that our family strongly supports a Santa Cruz County transit plan that includes rail.

Keep up the good work, especially planning for rail passenger service.

Herb Jellinek and Susana Wessling

From: Ron Nance <ron.nance@fusionbrand.agency>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 11:35 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: RTC Please follow the data & plan

Please follow the plan for a future that includes passenger rail transit!!! We support all the bike and walking ideas, but we need the passenger rail to cut down on the car pollution and allow not just the older population but everyone in the county a clean and efficient way to move through the county safely. The passenger train Will help all the people in the county.

Best regards,

Ron Nance

From: christianvanminnen@gmail.com <christianvanminnen@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 11:20 AM
Dear Commissioners,

I support Santa Cruz County Greenway’s plan for the rail corridor and their healthy, forward-thinking vision for our overall county transportation outlook.

Please help to ensure Greenway’s alternative plan is given fair consideration in the Unified Corridor Study. Our county needs realistic, affordable alternatives to gridlock not a fantasy train with invisible riders.

Thank you,

Christian Rex van Minnen
Westside Santa Cruz

From: groovacious@everyactioncustom.com <groovacious@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 1:22 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diane Cowen
506 San Juan Ave Santa Cruz, CA 95062-1248 groovacious@yahoo.com

From: thomas karl larson <seascapelarson@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 1:23 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: rail trail
We strongly object to spending anymore money on rail service. If you feel that the public is behind this then put it to a vote for all citizens of Santa Cruz County. I suspect more people would rather use the trail for walking and biking only. If we want social equity then add a third lane to Highway one all the way to Watsonville. Santa Cruz has widened the highway through their portion so it is only fair that Watsonville citizens have equal access to three lanes.

Tom and Melanie Larson

From: James Danaher <danaher@cruzio.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 4:46 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC,

I support rail on the corridor. I am concerned about noise, and so I prefer electric. I have seen a video of a very sleek, self-propelled electric streetcar. All options should be considered for the rail line. We don’t have to invent anything new. Europe is full of options we can study and consider.

Thank you,
Jim Danaher

Sent: Saturday, September 5, 2020 12:33 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>

Name
Bill LeBon
Email
BillLeBon3691@gmail.com <mailto:BillLeBon3691@gmail.com>
Subject
Rail Transit Now!
Your Message
Dear RTC,
I am writing to STRONGLY encourage your to pursue RAIL transit on the SC RAIL line NOT bus service. If you want to get people out of their cars you have to provide an incentive. Sorry, busses are not an incentive. No one I know likes to ride a bus. Trains on the other hand are COOL and FUN! Check out the SMART train in Sonoma and Marin County: VERY COOL AND FUN! And people LOVE riding them. They even go ride them just for fun. Nobody rides a bus for fun.
Thank you!
Bill LeBon

Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2020 8:21 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
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Name: Rebecca Zeilon
Email: rzeilon@gmail.com
Subject: Rail and Trail
Your Message:
I support rail in Santa Cruz County

Sent: Monday, November 9, 2020 12:48 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>

Name: Bonnie Gutierrez
Email: bocuda@cruzio.com
Subject: TCAA
Your Message:
I vote for the Light Rail option because it offers a stop in La Selva Beach. Manresa Beach State Park is a jewel and the La Selva stop would provide access to it. Also, campers at the KOA, Manresa, Sunset Beach and South Beach along San Andreas Road could catch the Light Rail at the La Selva Beach stop and visit other attractions to the North end of the county without using their cars.
I request operation hours be from 6am-10 or 11 pm. 9pm seems early. This would allow more county access time and easier connections with other transportation links at the Pajaro station and to return back home without driving.
RTC must serve the needs of all county residences with a rail/trail option!
County residences voted for a rail/trail. It should NOT be an elitist bike/walking trail only. Besides cutting down on car travel and pollution, I want all adults, elders, youth, bike riders, disabled, disenfranchised, and tourist to have the ability to visit all of Santa Cruz County and enjoy the richness and diversity we offer. The Light Rail will allow that.
Keep moving forward!
Thanks!

Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 8:34 AM
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/.

Name: Dean Cutter
Email:
deanc@cruzio.com

Subject
RTC survey

Your Message
This survey does not allow for public input for the bike only option. Considering you are supposed to represent the public, it is unconscionable that you are omitting a very significant segment of the public from this process.

Over 10,000 residents petitioned for the bike only option on the RXR. John Leopold’s re-election was sunk by his unwavering adherence to the RXR over the bike trail option.

I used to lead my middle school students on group rides from Live Oak to Wilder Ranch on a regular basis, until the roads became too dangerous. Some kids were only 10 years old on 1 speed clunkers, and made the round trip just fine. The RXR is a flat, car-free, practical route. A child, or even an out of shape adult, on a cheap bike going 10 miles an hour, could make it from Capitola to Downtown Santa Cruz easily in 25 minutes.

I’ve been teaching middle school here for 30 years. Sadly, I’ve observed a dramatic drop in the number of students using bikes to get to school or to get around town. They say it’s too scary. Strangely, kids have been totally omitted from the conversation regarding transport options in this county.

With the advent of ebikes it is totally reasonable to commute from Watsonville to Santa Cruz. FOR THE PRICE OF A TRAIN WE COULD SUBSIDIZE BIKES/EBIKES for riders and build the trail, with hundreds of millions of dollars left over for other needs.

To be honest, I don’t think the RTC is equipped to consider the bike only vision. I’ve testified at hearings, written letters, and filled out these surveys. The feeling I get is that I am communicating with the ether, with nobody on the other end. You do not seem to represent the thousands of like-minded citizens of this county. Hopefully, the removal of John Leopold has gotten your attention and there will be a shift in vision.

Sincerely,
Dean Cutter, Santa Cruz

Sent: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 5:21 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>

Name
Martha Graham-Waldon

Email
marthagw@comcast.net

Subject
Rail Bikes

Your Message
Santa Cruz County should purchase and utilize Rail Bikes while waiting for the electric train to be completed. This would bring in tourists and dollars to our county. See below:

https://www.railexplorers.net/

Sent: Friday, November 13, 2020 1:01 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>

Name
Gary Heath
Email
garylheath@gmail.com <mailto:garylheath@gmail.com>
Subject
Rail Corridor
Your Message
I am a lifelong resident of Santa Cruz and I believe that it is time to stop wasting tax payer money on endless studies regarding the corridor. Few people want rail and we all know that it will be a money pit. Multiple studies show that it is not a practical alternative, yet you keep funding study after study. Typical public bureaucracy just spend other people’s money and accomplish NOTHING. Our busses are under utilized, so what makes anyone think a train is going to work? Put a world class trail for bikes and pedestrians and it will be used by way more people than a train will ever serve, even if you could ever get it built. Manu's election was driven by his position on the rail corridor and the people spoke loudly. Let the people decide what should be done as the RTC has proven incapable of listening to the will of the people.

Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 11:39 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>

Name
William Delaney
Email
william.delaney@gmail.com <mailto:william.delaney@gmail.com>
Subject
biased survey
Your Message
Be advised that the survey re the corridor study has been seriously compromised as it was hacked by the universe of train advocates and a link published in Trains magazine. I hope you are able to identify such responses especially given that multiple responses were allowed. I also noted that the survey lacked the usual demographic profile of the respondent severely limiting its usefulness as a research tool!

From: Justin Walsh <justinmwalsh@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 5:20 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: I support rail

Hello,
I just wanted to let you know that I support having the rail as part of the transit corridor project. A trail is not sufficient for our transportation needs.

--
Regards,
Justin

From: annekennedy2005@everyactioncustom.com
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 8:30 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Anne Kennedy
502 Pine St Capitola, CA 95010-2204
annekennedy2005@gmail.com

From: Anne Easley <aeasley@baymoon.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 8:57 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: A rail connection between Watsonville and Santa Cruz

I fully support a rail transit line between Santa Cruz and Watsonville and hope that the voices of a few NIMBY’s don’t stop this important connection.
The rails must never be removed when the need is so great for a transportation system on this important corridor. Please make this rail line a reality for the thousands that need it, helping to alleviate the burden of traffic and pollution in our area.

Follow the data and plan for a future that includes rail transit in Santa Cruz County.

Thank you,

Anne Smith Easley

From: aeasley@everyactioncustom.com <aeasley@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 9:14 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I absolutely support an electric passenger rail transportation system on the Watsonville to Santa Cruz corridor that will connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction, alleviate traffic on highway 1 and reduce carbon emissions.

Some of the many benefits to passenger rail alongside the trail are a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone. The need is there. Please hear our voices.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Anne Easley
604 Graham Hill Rd Santa Cruz, CA 95060-1409 aeasley@baymoon.com

From: Ann Bodine <abodine999@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 9:18 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: RAIL TRANSIT

Please continue to work to insure than Santa Cruz County develops low emission, low energy rail transportation. Highway gridlock robs people of a significant portion of their lives, including family time. And we desperately need to do everything possible to reduce global warming. Rail transportation will do both

--Ann Bodine
831-600-7362 (landline, no text)
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Emily Scott
Santa Cruz,
mlescott26@gmail.com

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

I’m a teacher at Watsonville High, and I think a lot of our students would benefit from having an easier way to commute to Santa Cruz for a variety of job, cultural, and educational opportunities available in Santa Cruz.
Transit Corridors Alternatives Analysis
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Thank you.
Sincerely,
Amy Muraki
101 Serrell Ave  Santa Cruz, CA 95065-1128 muraki@cruzio.com

From: Steve Leonard <ngc1432@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2020 10:46 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Support for rail transit on the rail corridor

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,

Steve Leonard
119 Wilkes Circle
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

From: pbradley2004@everyactioncustom.com <pbradley2004@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2020 7:54 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Let’s move forward and complete the project without further delays.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Paula Bradley Bradley
PO Box 1146  Capitola, CA 95010-1146
pbradley2004@sbcglobal.net
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
peggy flynn
330 Trescony St # A Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4753 peggyflynn26@gmail.com

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using high capacity commuter rail with dedicated bike cars to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state high speed rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail with dedicated bike cars alongside the multi use trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Eliece Horton
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

The rail option is best for us since it makes the most environmental sense, provides a higher level of economic benefit and provides the most equitable transportation for our varied communities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jill and Dan Dion
1525 Laurent St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-2038  
dandion1@mac.com

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

THE CLIMATE CRISIS DEMANDS THAT WE PLAN NOW FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS!

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Dear Ms. Dykaar,

My personal experience being an insurance broker for three decades and insuring properties throughout the entire Santa Cruz county is important due to asking questions with many real estate agents, real estate brokers plus architects and contractors regarding properties next to or close to the rail corridor.

Every professional clearly stated buyers purchasing their homes, commercial real estate and rental properties next to or close to the rail corridor were happy with these purchases. There are buyers specifically looking for properties next to the corridor for future anticipation of bike/pedestrian trail and electric passenger rail service.

The ease of an additional opportunity of commuting by foot, bike and/or passenger train versus single use cars that clog our streets, and difficulty finding any parking in areas of apartments, condos, townhouses and commercial properties is a breath of fresh air...figuratively and realistically.

Sincerely,

Tina Andreatta
Aptos, CA 95003

I am 90 years old and grew up riding trains in Europe and on the East Coast. Even when I first moved to Santa Cruz, I could take the train to San Francisco for a day of shopping. A rail line between the north coast and Watsonville would be a wonderful asset for anyone who doesn’t drive. And they would support the environment by reducing the emissions from cars and buses. Those who support a trail would still have that trail. To me the rail/trail option is a no-brainer.

Joan Gilbert Martin

From: Danielle Garland <dgarland09@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2020 6:12 PM
I live in Aptos. I would love to have a long walk/bike trail around Santa Cruz county. It could eventually link to the Monterey trail. A single train track is never going to be useful for traveling around the county. Please focus on the bike/walking trail. Any extra funds could go to widen Hwy One. Thanks
Danielle Garland

From: evasbrunner@everyactioncustom.com <evasbrunner@everyactioncustom.com>  
Sent: Saturday, November 21, 2020 8:36 AM  
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

I FULLY SUPPORT RAIL TRANSIT FOR THE RAIL CORRIDOR!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Eva Brunner
105 Routier St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-2236 evasbrunner@gmail.com

From: caburne@everyactioncustom.com <caburne@everyactioncustom.com>  
Sent: Saturday, November 21, 2020 9:48 AM  
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,
I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

The world’s environment, our beautiful local environment, cannot sustain a future based on the car - the over crowded highways that pollute the air and waste precious time. Travel by train allows the possibility for one to relax (no road rage), read, meditate, engage with neighbors, finish that last bit of work, even nap. The public needs to be educated as to the joys and benefits of travel by train, which is something I have long enjoyed in other parts of the world. I believe that if we build it, along with the necessary and convenient infrastructure, people will use it.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
S. LaVerne Coleman
Santa Cruz, CA 95065
caburne@gmail.com

From: jddion@everyactioncustom.com <jddion@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 21, 2020 10:33 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,
I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.
Thank You!

Sincerely,
Jill Dion

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jill Dion
1525 Laurent St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-2038 jddion@me.com

From: emmaho@everyactioncustom.com <emmaho@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 21, 2020 3:35 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I so look forward to riding the train to Watsonvill and back instead of driving.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Joel Isaacson
143 Mason St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4712
emmaho@mac.com

From: chrisweir@everyactioncustom.com <chrisweir@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 22, 2020 4:11 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I believe it is critical that Santa Cruz County reduce it's green-house-gas emissions, and an Electric Passenger Rail between Santa Cruz and Watsonville will make a huge impact. A clean, modern, electric rail would provide desperately needed relief for our clogged roads and highways, especially
at commute hours. Workers and students would have a time-reliable commute option, and
disabled and older citizens would have a transit option that is easier to navigate than buses.

We already have the rail, and it occupies a critical and optimized path already through our county -
so let's put it to it's highest use!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Christine Weir
316 California St  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4216 chrisweir@baymoon.com

From: mark wegrich <wegrich@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 22, 2020 7:13 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: s.c.transit

Your attention please,
I wish to object to the r.o.w. being used as a rail system. It won’t serve most people and won’t
connect to downtown santa cruz or the university. Also there has been no discussion of the cost of
this project. As a taxpayer I am tired of my taxes going up every year for reduced services. I do
know that the Denver Metro rail system sold 100 million tickets in 2017 and it still is seeking
government subsidies. The RTC is not acting in good faith promoting a project that will have to be
subsidized forever. Instead they should develop a bike / hike trail that will serve thousands of local
residents at a comparatively low cost. For your information santa cruz is a bike town without a
decent connecting bike trail. The r.o.w. should be rail banked and a low cost trail built. This would
be a huge boost for our tourism industry providing rental bikes of all types and a safe walking path
for the public.
Its high time for the RTC to give up wasting money on train studies and build a bike trail. Continued
wasting of taxpayer dollars is asking for legal action against the County.

Sincerely,
Mark Wegrich

From: grompa@everyactioncustom.com <grompa@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 22, 2020 9:10 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the
recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.
I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you,

Robert Elledge
Watsonville, Ca

Thank you.

Sincerely,
ELLEDGE ROBERT
78 Blake Ave  Watsonville, CA 95076-0533 grompa@sbcglobal.net

From: judyyoungwdfa@everyactioncustom.com <judyyoungwdfa@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 8:16 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
judith young
From: kkalojanov@everyactioncustom.com
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 9:54 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kaloyan Kaloyanov
6105 Abbey Rd Aptos, CA 95003-3147
kkalojanov@yahoo.com

From: lasummers123@everyactioncustom.com
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 11:05 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.
From: jimx@pacbell.net <jimx@pacbell.net>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2020 7:27 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Comments

Great program and good reports.

Santa Cruz electric rail link thru Watsonville to Monterrey would be a great tourist asset. The track is still there.

Also, the availability of the track to haul emergency supplies in a disaster should be considered.

Jim Blain
Scotts Valley

From: mjsriodel@everyactioncustom.com <mjsriodel@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 12:09 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.
The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

I would also like to add that I have been a travel agent for many years and have travelled to many destinations. I would love to see our rail trail hook into Watsonville Pajaro Junction and the California bullet train. Having travelled throughout Europe, what a joy to use their rail. Having international clients, they are stunned at our lack of good rail. Let us join the 21st century and make life easier for us all. We don’t all need to be on the highways. We need to have good, safe, alternative travel options. What a beautiful train ride to go from Davenport to Watsonville. Why not show off our beautiful coast....safely, with less impact on the environment.

Thank you for all your efforts!
Stay well and safe,
Maryjane Slade

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Maryjane Slade
110 Elva Dr  Aptos, CA 95003-5118
mjsriodel@yahoo.com

From: jfbergs@everyactioncustom.com <jfbergs@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 12:09 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
From: curtcoleman@everyactioncustom.com <curtcoleman@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 12:26 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous, and ecologically sound community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Curt Coleman
114 Plum St Santa Cruz, CA 95062-3412
curtcoleman@gmail.com

From: dorrianca@everyactioncustom.com <dorrianca@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 1:07 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.
The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

For years I have witnessed the massive traffic snarl heading from Watsonville to SC in the morning and the reverse in the evening. Fortunately for me - I had the reverse commute but I always felt so bad for all of those drivers.

We need to plan for the future. Highway 1 thru Santa Cruz will never be able to handle all the cars everyday. We need an alternative transportation system for cleaner air and ease of movement thru the county.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Danielle Dorrian
dorrianca@aol.com

From: rgbkrk@everyactioncustom.com <rgbkrk@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 2:54 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

We must invest heavily in passenger rail while we stop subsidizing roads and parking. We can create an interconnected network that self funds itself by leasing land, housing, and commercial around the rail corridor while providing mixed mobility options. We need rail for our future and in alignment with the past.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kyle Kelley
200 W Cliff Dr Santa Cruz, CA 95060-6100 rgbkrk@gmail.com

From: info@everyactioncustom.com <info@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 8:32 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,
I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Gary Dolowich
info@jademountain.net

From: ctxmf74@everyactioncustom.com <ctxmf74@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 9:44 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

There would be many benefits from a comprehensive rail/bus/walk and bike transportation system serving our Santa Cruz county and beyond. A future ready plan is a necessity for our quality of life over the next decades. Abandoning the rail component would be short sighted and could only cost us more in the long run as we would eventually have to face the facts that we will need better transportation options as our population increases. Whatever it costs now will seem cheap 50 years out.

Due to housing costs many of our essential workers live in Watsonville and work in Santa Cruz so they need a reliable, timely way to get to work. A light rail line is the perfect answer proving superior energy efficiency, all weather reliability, comfort and safety. It is foolish to expect them to ride a bicycle for an hour or more then work all day then ride home in whatever weather the day may bring. They deserve better than that.

As a retired person living in mid county I’d greatly enjoy being able to walk to a light rail station and zip downtown or to Capitola or on to Watsonville and even be able to connect to Amtrak to venture in state or beyond. Again a rail line makes more sense than trying to do all this in a car or bus.
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I’ve seen the utility of light rail in Sacramento and San Jose and think we deserve the same for our growing area. Eventually I’d like to see the whole region and state connected with an efficient rail network as many European and Asian countries have done or are in the process of doing. I’ve lived in Santa Cruz for 70 years and would hate to see it turned into an isolated exclusive island for high income visitors to ride their bikes along a trail when we all could be using our rail line as a productive part of our daily lives and our economy. Regards Dave Branum, Live Oak

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Dave Branum
Santa Cruz,
ctxmf74@yahoo.com

From: billlebon3691@everyactioncustom.com <billlebon3691@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2020 10:24 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

And trains are FUN! People love to ride them! Busses suck! Nobody likes riding busses.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
William LeBon
PO Box 7138 Santa Cruz, CA 95061-7138
billlebon3691@gmail.com

From: Doug Huskey <doug.huskey@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2020 10:40 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: RTC Train Bias Concerns

Dear RTC commissioners and staff,

I am writing to express my concern about the RTC support for train on the transit corridor for the following reasons:

1. There has not been a budget plan to support this. Cost for Light Rail (Electric Rail) run from $15 million to $100 million per mile (google). For a 20 mile segment this is between $300 million and $2 billion dollars. The recent Alternatives Analysis puts the cost at $1.3 billion. There is no plan to apply for grants for this, and there has been no plan on how to raise the local portion which will require a public vote on a bond measure and/or sales tax increase. Proceeding with this plan without a budget, funding strategy or public vote seems to be negligent and reckless. How do you feel about this? Do you support the necessary taxes to make this plan happen? If so, can you say so publicly? Do you think you have the support for this from your constituency?

2. The plan for train needs connectivity at both ends to be practical. Given the distance of the Watsonville end from residential areas, it is unclear how the ridership will get there. Ridership estimates have been low ranging from 300 to 700 trips per day. There will be a very low fair box recovery rate, so this ridership must be subsidized to keep fares below $20 for a trip from Watsonville to Santa Cruz. Even at that price will this be affordable to the vast majority of commuters from Watsonville to Santa Cruz? Again the question is are we getting the best results for our investment? And where will the 25-30 million / year operating costs come from? Can you share your plan to address this concern?

3. The rail line has multiple places where climate change and rising sea levels will impact it. What is the plan to mitigate those issues?

4. The rail line requires the removal of many trees, fencing and construction of retaining and safety walls. 35% of the accompanying trail must be diverted to public streets with rail. This would not be true with buses or other rubber tired public transit.

5. If we agree with bus rapid transit solutions, we could open the trail portion now, with a gravel temporary trail that would be replaced as the public transit options are funded and construction begins. Wouldn’t you be proud to support a feasible plan that delivers results in the next few years instead of decades?

I urge the RTC to shed any bias and work together for a feasible strategy that can create a world class recreational trail such as Monterey has. Their rail trail has created business and recreational opportunities and is a major tourist and visitor attraction for Monterey county. Can’t we do the same?

Regards,
Dear RTC Commision and Staff,

I am writing to communicate my interest and questions about the progress of the currently proposed Rail-Trail element of the regional transportation plan. I live in the Rio Del Mar Bluff area of Aptos. Our home is adjacent to the existing rail right of way.

My questions are about existing level of research and findings pertaining to the impacts of any proposed mechanical (bus or rail) use of the rail right of way, related to noise pollution and seismic impacts as a result of vehicular use of the right of way.

We have owned our home since 2003 and we did experience the impacts of the rail use that was intermittent at that time. There was obviously noise caused by passing freight use, and more importantly, seismic vibration due to the weight and motion of the train. Recent SC County sewer upgrade work on the street facing our home brought this concern forward, as the use of the larger excavating equipment resulted in the shaking of the ground and our home at a level that was obvious.

I am concerned that there is a depth of research in both of these areas of concern prior to proposals being committed to so that residents living in proximity to the propose rail corridor do not experience deleterious impacts.

We support the importance of regional and comprehensive transportation planning and execution. We have lived much of our life abroad in various countries where there was such a system and it is one of the most salient and positive features of living in a community where a car is not a necessity. It is in fact one of the most disappointing features of returning to our home of origin that we now need one car for each adult to function.

I would like RTC staff to respond to my inquiry by proving access to documents that detail the research and any recommendations, outcomes, decisions that are in process or have been made that are related to noise pollution and seismic impacts.

Thank you in advance.
From: tompurdy@everyactioncustom.com <tompurdy@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2020 1:59 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction. I am also interested in the section that will go north to Davenport. A stop at Wilder Ranch State Park would benefit the many people who go there the hike and ride. And Davenport is a nice place to have an afternoon or evening meal.

Living the the San Lorenzo Valley, I recognize what a unique resource the rail corridor from Watsonville to Davenport is. I wish citizens had had the foresight to purchase the corridor from Santa Cruz to Boulder Creek, as it would make it easier to develop a walking / biking trail in the valley. In addition, having a rail line would add an important public transportation option for the valley. So I think it is critical to preserve the corridor from Watsonville to Davenport not only for biking and hiking, but equally important, for light rail service. I only hope that we can build on this project to some day expand the concept into the San Lorenzo Valley.

My usage would most likely involve taking my bike on the Metro bus to Santa Cruz and then either riding the rail, or my bike to Wilder Ranch. And also traveling further on occasion to Davenport.

I also like the option of traveling south to Parajo station and being able to take a train to San Jose, where I might travel up the Peninsula to SF or up the East Bay. And being able to go south to Paso Robles and the LA area would also be nice as these links get developed.

Thanks for doing the work to keep this concept alive and moving forward!
Tom Purdy
tompurdy@scshop.com

Thank you.
From: Bob F <bobfif@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 11:59 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: A Safe Bus-Trail for all can evolve from "Trail-Only"

My name is Bob Fifield. I reside in Aptos. I'm a retired engineer. I'm not a salesman and not into politics (but I'll speak up when matters get out-of-hand). I have decades of experience in applying common sense. I am pro-rail where it makes sense and even have a patent for an All-Express Passenger Train System that is being freely circulated worldwide. Please Google, "Public Transportation: If You Build It (properly), They Will Come" and follow the links. (Please understand that I am only one person and developed this years ago. It does need to be updated to incorporate Bus-On-Shoulder.)

While most of us agree upon the ideals, the reality of trying to squeeze in a limited single-track “Rail-Trail” within the 30-mile corridor, will sacrifice well-being and even safety. With decades of experience in reality, I would not be in favor of anyone riding a train on the “Rail-Trail” that I know is not safe (in the attempts to become a viable commuter train) even if it were free.

A strategic "Bus-Trail" can do what the ideals of "Rail-Trail" were fantasized to do and do it safer for less. Since it incorporates “Trail-Only”, during unfortunate times (like a major virus outbreak), it will always be useful by easily reverting to that. (Realize that a railroad track becomes only an obstacle in such scaled-down times.) "Bus-Trail" can also scale-up to safely handle passengers every minute 24/7. It occupies one paved lane on the corridor and makes use of one lane on Highway 1 for a safe return loop, rather than attempting to play "critical-timing games" on the very limited single track. "Rail-Trail" which WILL risk people's lives. We don't need another "unsinkable" Titanic (hyped to improve business profits) or hear from "experts" that "we've-done-so-much-thorough-testing-that-nothing-can-go-wrong" next Challenger disaster!

The proposed RTC “Rail-Trail” is unfortunately restricted to a single track limited to a simple linear configuration, so due to just that risky limited aspect it will never be as favorable to this area as BART. Another train on a single-track limited to a linear configuration within Santa Cruz County may end up being only a continuation of the Roaring Camp Novelty Train catering to bringing tourists to Capitola Village and the Santa Cruz Boardwalk. (Remember how disappointed many were in Watsonville when the "Polar-Express" only went from the Boardwalk to Capitola and back?)
"Bus-Trail" is not limited to only where tracks are present. It is limitless and can have Right-of-Way or a whatever-makes-sense-at-the-time compromise. Electric rubber-wheeled buses (presently available to METRO) driven only by professional drivers within a coordinated METRO system, will minimize any clog on an exclusive single lane within the corridor which can also accommodate patrols to help ensure its safety and that of the adjacent Trail.

Why take so many risks with nothing to gain? (And what about the negative impact on the Trail for those trying to enjoy a safe, peaceful environment?) We need to understand:

<1> Outside money should not influence more than common sense

<2> We CANNOT circumvent the laws of physics

Why don’t we initially implement a safe Trail-Only now, and build upon that to lead to an appropriate Bus-Trail that can be agreed upon by all and will improve transportation?

From: Michael Loik <mloik@ucsc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2020 6:23 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Rail Transit Support

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative. I hope you will consider using solar PVs for the source of electricity to run the trains.

Sincerely,

Michael E. Loik
Felton, CA

From: Robert Engler <bobnyuri4424@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2020 7:12 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: TCAA Study

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support light rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose light rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Sincerely,
Robert C. Engler

From: lindarosewood@everyactioncustom.com <lindarosewood@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 26, 2020 12:51 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

An Electric Passenger Rail through Santa Cruz country will be the pride of California. So many other beautiful areas of California are marred by highway 1 through the coastal towns. We will have convenient, quiet transit along our old railway line. Electric passenger rail is the best choice. Thanks for all the work to figure this out.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda Rosewood
707 Riverside Ave  Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4637 lindarosewood@gmail.com

From: samsgram@everyactioncustom.com <samsgram@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 26, 2020 6:07 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I’ve been a Live Oak resident for 49 years and worked at the National Marine Fisheries Service way out on the west side until I retired. Passenger rail would have connected me directly with my job at NMFS saving me the commute and the environment. I believe the rail trail has extraordinary benefits for the Santa Cruz community that we won’t really understand until it is completed.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.
Dear Regional Transportation Commissioners and Staff:

Here's my letter that was published in the Santa Cruz Sentinel Wednesday, November 25, 2020:

*It's been eight years since the Regional Transportation Commission bought the coast rail line for public use, 20 years since it had the money to do so, and four years since Measure D was approved by a 2/3 countywide vote.*

*Meaningful shifts in how we get around obviously take time and money. They also require leadership and grit. I appreciate the determination of the RTC to push forward with the big picture always in mind. Adding streetcar-like transit to the existing coast trail line, together with a trail, will provide us with more, and more beneficial, options as we move into an uncertain future.*

*Tomorrow will never be like today. We can act today though to make tomorrow less onerous for ourselves, future generations, and for this unique bit of land by the sea we’re so fortunate to inhabit.*

- *Linda Wilshusen, Live Oak  
  RTC Executive Director 1985-2005*

My hope is that with this decision, our community can move beyond the divisive narrative that this is a competition between bus service (or cars or bikes) and other forms of public transportation. We need everything, and this will only be more true into the future.

Please find a way to agree with the data offered by your staff, your advisory committees, and your consultants, and move forward now with the recommended electric passenger rail/rail transit project decision.

Thank you very much for your consideration.
From: jeb@everyactioncustom.com <jeb@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 26, 2020 8:35 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Please pursue electric trains on the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Pajaro Junction. Rail transit is the most efficient means of mass transit, from the perspective of combatting global warming and moving people fast without having to deal with rush hour traffic and ever expanding freeways.

Do not rip out the rails and lose the easements! Then we lose both rail and trail.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeb Bishop
319 Brook Ave  Santa Cruz, CA 95062-3708 jeb@baymoon.com

From: lexi@everyactioncustom.com <lexi@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 26, 2020 9:06 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I participated in gathering signatures for the initiative which provided the bond funds that were used to purchase the SCBL, and I have long supported having some form of passenger rail on this line.

The potential for an equitable, efficient, and environmentally sustainable transportation alternative to connect both north and south county, and on to the wider rail network, has always been great. The likelihood of federal and state funding is only enhanced by both the President-Elect’s emphasis on climate change as one of his administration’s highest priorities, and by our Governor’s decision to phase out the sale of ICE cars in the not too distant future.
On the other hand, any non-passenger rail proposal would require the repayment of the bond funds, and simultaneously jeopardize the continuous ROW. At the very least there would be significant delay in implementation.

The benefits of passenger rail on our county’s corridor are undeniable.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Lexi White
Santa Cruz,
lexi@cruzio.com

From: johnbriss2@everyactioncustom.com <johnbriss2@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 10:49 AM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

The past 40 years have seen thousands of Santa Cruz residents and many guests of the region putting their support behind the Rail and Trail system and I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

It is time to move with all due speed to bring to the Central Coast a truly multi-modal transportation system that will be a model for the rest of California and the nation!

Sincerely,

John and Patty Brissenden
Live Oak and Hope Valley

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Brissenden
Dear RTC Staff and Commissioners:

I would like to commend you on a job well done with the TCAA report. It shows a top-notch thoroughness and attention to detail, particularly in the area of demand analysis and use of state-of-the-art methods and information sources such as Streetlight Data’s anonymous cell phone data.

I understand that this is a complex and expensive project to undertake, but I believe that there are two important tailwinds to consider and take advantage of.

The first is the update of the State Rail Plan, updated on five year intervals and last updated in 2017. The 2022 update will start moving from planning to actualization and has the possibility of initial allocation priorities for state funding. It is important that Santa Cruz County be ready for this in order to both minimize delay and reduce costs, because otherwise there is a five-year wait. Rail projects in other communities have received up to 80% in outside funding.

The second issue is integration with Metro. Since we are a small (but densely populated, at least along the rail line) County, our budget is limited. A well-thought through integration with Metro has the potential to greatly increase ridership while reducing the average cost per rider. I imagine stepping off a rail vehicle and finding one or two circulator buses waiting at many rail stops, creating a rapid and frequent access to seamless transportation for over half of the population of the County. The goal should be to grow the user base to include many users who have extensive choices for transportation, not just “users of necessity.” A tight integration with and management by Metro could accomplish this. I realize that studying this integration was beyond the scope of the TCAA because it is not limited to the rail corridor.

Again, thanks for a study well-done. Now let’s build it!

Respectfully,

Bruce Sawhill, PhD

Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear Commissioners and Staff,
The TCAA/RNIS has conclusively demonstrated Electric Passenger Rail is the best high-capacity public transit system to implement alongside the Coast Rail Trail in the rail corridor when compared to all other reasonable alternatives, particularly the BRT and ART bus-type alternatives examined in the most recent phase of this study. Please approve Electric Passenger Rail as the Locally Preferred Alternative and move this project forward.

After years of thoughtful analysis, the determination that Electric Passenger Rail is the preferred local option is reassuring as it affirms passenger rail service is not only best from an equity and environmental perspective, passenger rail is best for speed, reliability, comfort, accessibility, and will serve well as the robust spine of a much broader, more efficient public transit network serving not just our county but the entire Monterey Bay Area and the state.

The TCAA/RNIS details many of the reasons Passenger Rail is superior to the alternative. There are so many superior benefits to bus transit that it seems superfluous to detail them, yet they include:

1. Faster, more reliable travel time (giving commuters hours each week of time for family, recreation, or civic involvement) — the best for quality of life for those who must commute to work, school, or to access services.
2. With level-boarding access at every stop, provides easy access regardless of physical impairment, age, income, or group size.
3. Rail is far better at reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled, the gold standard metric for determining environmental impacts and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
4. When paired with buses, shuttles and other short-range FMLM options, rail service will help workers and customers access major businesses and services more easily, with less hassle, and lessen demand for parking infrastructure.
5. It can be implemented relatively quickly compared to any other alternative.
6. This option uses the entire corridor and better serves the population centers; and connects with the regional and state rail network — making the infrastructure investment the wisest use of resources. The partial use of the corridor (just 7 miles) in the bus alternate makes no sense and is an egregious, wasteful expenditure.

Please take this final step and approve Electric Passenger Rail for our county once and for all. This is the best choice for our county today as it enables
prompt completion of the Rail Trail and will soon provide residents a sustainable, efficient, and enjoyable public transit option for travel between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, points between and points beyond via the coming state rail network.

Thank you,
Mark Mesiti-Miller
City of Santa Cruz resident for 37 years

From: Tom Rath <trath1@att.net>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 12:36 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: RAIL & TRAIL OPTION

I have been a member of the national Rails To Trails Conservancy since 2005. I receive their magazine and have seen the accomplishments made in other areas. I prefer the rail and trail option for our county. Together they would provide the most broad range benefits to our local residents as well as our tourists. The Metro shuttles could sync up with the station schedules and provide transit to our educational and business locations for those riders who would not be walking or biking to their final destinations.

I have read that TIG/m based in Southern California has offered to demo one of their hydrogen powered light rails for free rides. I believe the period was for two weeks. I checked their web site and their units look very promising. This would give local residents, pundits, stakeholders and naysayers an opportunity to experience what we could actually have available as alternative transportation. Unfortunately, many remember the old, noisy, polluting Union Pacific rock train that ran from the Aromas quarry to the cement plant in Davenport. Some would like the public to believe that if we adopt the rail option we will be returning to something similar only in passenger format. TIG/m has smaller commuter and light rail models that would best meet our needs locally.

From: saladinssale@everyactioncustom.com <saladinssale@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 1:17 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

I urge you to bring the only unused cross-county transit corridor back into use for multi-modal transit - don't just keep widening Hwy 1 or simply settle for a narrow-benefit and exclusive
"linear bike park" along the rail corridor. Keep looking forward and continue planning for long-term benefits. New trail construction is already bringing benefits and every section built proves that we can do this.

Santa Cruz County is going to continue to grow in population - we can’t ignore that reality so we must plan for it. Rail is the technology that will allow simply adding more connected units to match demand without adding the cost of additional operators. Rail has the capacity to allow many, many passenger to take their bikes with them, not just 3 or 4 on a bus. This will be a big part of the first mile / last mile solution.

I want to be able to reliably take my bike with me to Watsonville, Capitola, Monterey, Salinas and the SF Bay Area and ride when I get to my destination. I want to comfortably sit with personal space while I access the internet and work remotely. Rail will let me do both smoothly, at street level and without the limitations of buses.

Big projects take determination, time and patience. Keep listening to public transit experts who have the credentials and experience behind the positions the recommend. YOU ARE ON THE RIGHT TRACK! Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA Study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Saladin Sale
413 Western Dr Apt 10 Santa Cruz, CA 95060-3077 saladinssale@gmail.com

---

From: Brett Garrett <brett@dolphyn.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 2:37 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Milestone 3 and future technology

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

Given the projected timeline of 11-13 years to implement rail service, I strongly recommend that any decision regarding Milestone 3 must leave the door open for technologies (including Personal Rapid Transit) that may not yet exist or have not been comprehensively studied.

Milestone 3 failed to analyze any system that can truly meet the transit needs of Santa Cruz County. I have serious concerns regarding the “preferred” rail alternatives:

- Headways of 30-60 minutes seem inadequate; the system needs more frequent service to get people out of their personal automobiles

- Social distancing concerns have not been properly addressed
• The system doesn't appear to provide convenient access to Cabrillo College or downtown Santa Cruz

• The system is not well-adapted to floods including sea level rise

• The system uses excessive amount of energy per passenger-mile (too many empty seats in motion, in a heavier-than-necessary vehicle, with many stops and starts)

These concerns could be resolved with Personal Rapid Transit, a technology that is becoming more viable with each passing year. Examples include The Boring Company’s Las Vegas system expected to open soon, a Glydways system coming to Oakley, and serious study underway in San Jose.


Given the timing of this study, it is tragically ironic that the draft report contains no mention of the challenges of using or operating a transit system during a pandemic. I brought this omission to RTC’s attention in my March 18 email “Public Transit and the Coronavirus.” It was important then, and it’s even more important now.

As a reminder, I provided extensive documentation during Milestone 2 of why I disagreed with the consultant's conclusions regarding Personal Rapid Transit. That documentation is available here: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1EFEIkU65hAAHMdHs2ikHxyTwrNpXLskqFxkwhMSIXEQ/edit

Sincerely,

Brett Garrett
190 Walnut Ave Unit 301
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

From: Anna Huskey <annahuskey3@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 2:54 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis

Hi,

I am concerned that rail transportation on the corridor will be too expensive. A lot of compromises are being done to support rail without the local funding approved. The few times (in Capitola and the District 1 supervisor race, the public has voted against rail and for a contiguous implementation of a recreational trail. Let’s put it to a vote.

Monterey has implemented a great recreational trail, why can’t we just do that too? At the very least, how about creating a gravel or compressed granite trail now why we go through the many years/steps/process required to get a public transit option approved, funded, designed and implemented.
Sincerely,
Anna Huskey

From: Nadene Thorne <nadenetd@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 3:42 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Cc: Ryan Coonerty <ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>
Subject: No train!

It makes no sense to conclude that the choice with the highest cost and the least ridership - and no funding - is the best. Only a kindergartener would conclude that the choice with the most bullet points should be selected without weighting the value of each. And once again! No cost-benefit analysis - how, in good conscience, can intelligent people merely reshuffle all the data previously collected from so many earlier studies and still keep coming up with the unreasonable answer?

That contributions from the Land Trust and FORT and their offshoot Coast Connect have supplied a cheering squad does not make light rail or commuter rail on the corridor a reasonable prospect for our county. You’ve had transportation planners visit the county whose advice you ignored, and you’ve seen the SMART train debacle play out - and somehow the RTC and staff thinks they can make a train work in our much smaller county.

Of course, as it stands now, we’ll be doing surveys until all of you are long retired so perhaps really the goal is just to kick the train can down the road another few surveys but never really take any substantive steps to pull together plans that incorporate the transportation needs of the county as a whole, given our geography, population, and economics. That seems to me how we're going -- certainly actions speak louder than words.

Nadene Thorne
140 Averitt St.
Santa Cruz 95060

From: Ira Davis <arcticseeker@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 3:56 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: CRT and/or LRT won't work

To the RTC:

Bus Rapid Transit might work - and it’s cheaper, faster, and doesn't require the creation of over a billion dollars of infrastructure - it can be scaled as needed. Right now I probably wouldn't ride any form of mass transit - but then as the costs keep going up and the timeline keeps moving back, I may not be alive when/if the RTC ever gets transit going on the rail corridor.

The one idea that was discarded a few studies ago, that could be done fast and cheap, is to take out the tracks and put in an inexpensive trail the length of the county. The Westside trail near me doesn't go anywhere and is reportedly over 6 million dollars because of keeping
the tracks. And it's taken over a year and it's still not done. In this time of city and county budget cuts, that amount of money is crazy!

What will it take for the RTC take a step back and re-evaluate reality?

Thank you,
Ira Davis
140B Averitt Street
Santa Cruz, California
95060

---

From: krsandel <krsandel@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 4:30 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Milestone 3 TCAA Results

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I'm writing to urge you to move forward on selecting CRT/LRT as a primary mode of public commuter transit in Santa Cruz County. After a lengthy public feedback process, it's clear from the TCAA that rail options offer the fastest service, accessibility, convenience, and ridership potential. These two rail choices also enjoy high public interest and support.

Santa Cruz County is under-served in public transportation, leading to frequent and long standing problems with traffic congestion, particularly on the North/South corridor for commuters. A user-friendly rail system would take thousands of cars off the road every day, reduce GHG emissions, and retain the county's ROW on the rail line. I believe it would be an increasingly popular option for commuters after riders had a chance to use the system and appreciate its benefits.

It would also allow for reduced need to build parking, including making unbundled parking in new developments more feasible, thus lowering the unit cost for renters or buyers along the transit corridor.

Expanded public transit offers the county significant benefits, and we badly need to improve our transit options. Please choose CRT/LRT for the future of Santa Cruz County.

Thanks for considering my views,

Kristen Sandel

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S®6 active, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

---

From: James Anderson Merritt <mail@jamesmerritt.name>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 4:34 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Comments on Milestone 3, Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis

To the RTC Commissioners and Staff:

I want to go on record as being very disappointed with the TCAA process so far. I am convinced that traditional passenger rail is not feasible for our region (for reasons that many others have explained, multiple times in the past), but also that the remaining alternatives are not limited basically to auto, bus (whether regular or BRT), or “active transit.” As well, I reject that we are forced to choose between a “trail only” or “rail/trail” use of the corridor. There are other approaches we could take, especially in view of an often-stated justification for purchasing the corridor in the first place: to use it for transit that will alleviate or eliminate congestion in our major arteries, and improve county mobility in general.

In a forward-looking document, I expect to see adequate consideration given to alternatives to those endorsed by the transit and political establishments, and while I appreciated that you recently spent staff effort and report pages on some of them -- in particular, Personal Rapid Transit: PRT -- I do not believe that the examination was appropriately thorough, much less fair or properly objective. Several PRT systems have been in passenger service for many years, one for several decades. From those real-world examples, sincere research and due diligence could have yielded data on anticipated costs and timeframes for construction, costs of operation, route planning, ridership estimates, safety, energy efficiency and emissions reduction, and customer satisfaction, just to name a few important decision criteria. When I looked into those issues as a citizen who sees that traditional transit methods haven’t been working for years, and who knows that we need to do something soon, which will actually be effective in solving our many interlocking problems, I was pleasantly surprised to see just how well PRT might serve our needs. But that option was eliminated even before Milestone 3; its absence going forward impeaches the credibility of the TCAA process in my eyes.

The goal is difficult: find a way to use the rail corridor for practical transit. A rail approach will not achieve the goal, because of its cost-ineffectiveness. Providing for BRT lanes on the shoulders of our highways and arterial boulevards won’t achieve that goal, although BRT will operate more cost-effectively than trains, because people prefer cars to buses and, in the era of COVID, have a good reason to do so. Widening highway lanes for automobiles hasn’t proven to be of cost-effective help in alleviating traffic woes. As well, neither the BRT nor highway-widening approaches require or utilize the corridor! And, although a “trail-only” approach may open the corridor for “active transit,” that will hardly make a dent in the larger, countywide traffic problems on our arterials. We need to think differently, but, with PRT, we do not need to gamble on unproven technology or approaches. Yet time after time, those responsible for planning our transportation situation give this option short shrift. The recalcitrance is wearisome to those of us who have been in the County for any substantial length of time. We can do better.

Thank you for receiving and considering my comments. As a country resident since 1990, I challenge you all to do more forward, broader-based thinking, and to put more rigor behind it, than I have seen to date in the RTC’s inquiries concerning PRT or other alternatives to transit-as-usual.

-James Anderson Merritt
533 Broadway #1
From: fainamps@everyactioncustom.com <fainamps@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 4:35 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Choose Rail for the Locally Preferred Alternative

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

This project is so important for our community, thank you for your commitment to providing clean and equitable transit options. I’m so excited to be able to take an electric rail to all my most frequent destinations and even be able to get down to Watsonville more! Rail will mean significantly more trips without a car, and a better more healthy lifestyle for myself and my family.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Faina Segal
1190 7th Ave Spc 30 Santa Cruz, CA 95062-2738 fainamps@gmail.com

From: Jacob Wysocki <jacobw@ms2.net>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 4:53 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Comments on Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis

As a Live Oak resident, UC Santa Cruz graduate, and local business owner, I would like to express my support for the Light Rail Transit option described in the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis. I consider the following factors to be important in my decision:

1. Shortest commute time during peak hours. Either of the commuter or light rail options have end-to-end commute times of approximately half of the bus rapid transit option.
2. Greater carrying capacity for bicycles compared to bus rapid transit.
3. Connectivity to regional transit. The possibility of taking a train from Santa Cruz to either Monterrey or connecting to Southern California is extremely attractive, as described in the California State Rail Plan.
4. Use of existing infrastructure. The rail and right-of-way already exist. While some investment and time are required to bring the commuter rail to fruition, there will likely never be a better or lower cost opportunity to bring rail service to Santa Cruz.
While either of the rail options have a larger short term cost than the bus rapid transit option, the long term maintenance costs are very similar. Finally, in a time when many nations and communities around the world are investing in their communities by expanding public transportation infrastructure, it would be a step backwards for our community to pursue any option that removes the rail tracks, whether for a shared bus route or for a trail-only option.

Jacob Wysocki, PhD
Owner, Mixed-Signal Systems, Inc

From: nelsontrio@cruzio.com <nelsontrio@cruzio.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 4:56 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Comment on TCAA Milestone 3

Friendly greetings RTC staff and commissioners,

Thank you for carrying out the TCAA study.

I am a resident of the City of Santa Cruz since 1980 and am a retired Environmental Planner and Land Use Planner.

My wife and I support the TCAA's proposed “Locally Preferred Alternative” of Electric Passenger Rail, implemented in a rail + trail design, running the full length of the corridor including Watsonville and Pajaro.

Considering the opposition to rail public transit coming in part from some corridor neighbors who have concerns about possible impacts on them where they live, I suggest the RTC place a high priority on bringing some demonstration electric train vehicles to the corridor and providing the general public an opportunity to get on board and experience what a ride on this corridor could be like. Too many people have little idea of the slumbering potential of this transportation corridor, and too many have fears generated by a vocal group of determined opponents.

The little “Daisy” trolley car was going to be a nice start, but it got shut down? Actual demonstration electric-powered train cars would create some excitement, just like completion of sections of the MBSST trail will.

To address the climate crisis that can be expected to intensify in its impacts going forward, society will need to shift expenditure priorities away from transportation infrastructure spending for energy-intensive private automobiles, and also away from a vast national military budget that effectively defunds other means to make our society livable and secure into the future. Public transportation is a great thing to invest in.

best,
Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to let you know that I support rail transit for the rail corridor. Please follow the recommendation of the TCAA study and choose rail transit as the locally preferred alternative.

I support using Electric Passenger Rail to connect everyone along the rail corridor between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, and connect our county to the regional and state rail network at the Watsonville Pajaro Junction.

The many benefits of providing passenger rail alongside the trail make it clear that choosing passenger rail is the best way to transform our county into a more equitable, more sustainable, more prosperous community for everyone.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mary Miller
sanetown@gmail.com
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Arielle Miller
ilikeorganic@gmail.com

From: Keith Otto <keith_otto@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 9:23 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: SCC RTC TCAA Milestone 3 Survey

SCC RTC TCAA Milestone 3 Survey

Good to see that this survey contains the selections 'None of the above' and/or 'Other' for at least some of the questions - something that was lacking in past surveys.

Unfortunate to see that the survey did not ask people for their names / contact information, or at least contain the question:

- **How many times have you filled out this survey already?**

as it appears that one person can fill out the survey multiple times. Because of this, I am not sure how any meaning can be attached to the results of this survey.

Regards,
Keith

From: James Slabaugh <jimsla@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 9:48 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: survey

I completed the online survey monkey, but it will not send. I have pressed the SEND button four times, but it doesn’t transmit. Please count me as favoring some form of mass transit along with the trail. Personally I believe a passenger train or trolley would be better than bus for less air and sound pollution. Having a passenger alternative would be the most forward thinking, anticipating what would be the greatest good for more people and more areas of the county for the longest time into the future. I believe rail banking will mean that public mass transit will never happen on the rail corridor. Once the tracks are buried or torn up, the likelihood is they will never become useful or used again.

RTC Staff

From: cathypaul14@comcast.net <cathypaul14@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 11:28 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: comments on the TRANSIT CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS AND RAIL NETWORK INTEGRATION STUDY
To whom it may concern:

I think many public members would agree that the theoretical ideal of rapid rail transport is great. However, the realities of funding and ridership need to be evaluated in great detail to have a system succeed in meeting the numerous objectives outlined in the Study. I have recently moved from San Rafael, CA to Aptos and have observed the SMART system from original funding to current low-ridership operations; thus, I have opinions based on what actually happened, relative to how the system was originally sold to the public. I lived in San Rafael for 27 years and commuted to Sonoma County for all of that time; my office was always less than 1000 ft from the rail line, but ended up being 5 miles from the nearest station when SMART began operations (even though the SMART office was across the street!). I have a few comments on each of the Triple-bottom-line analysis topic areas, as follows.

**Economy:**
- The current estimate of the capital cost is about $500 M. There is not estimate that shows how these costs will grow as the actual construction occurs. I see no analysis of other systems and how their cost estimate grew from planning to build. I would expect this to be at least a factor of 2; thus to over $1B! I don’t see how SC county can afford that.
- The cost per rider show in Table 5.2 seems too low by about a factor of 2, even assuming the capital cost does not increase and the ridership is 5,000 per weekday (which I don’t believe, given the experience of SMART). 5,000 per day times 210 weekdays per year = 1.05M riders per year. $24M O&M costs divided by 1.05M riders = about $23 per rider, about twice what is show in Table 5.2. the train will lose significant money on the weekends, so I have ignored them.
- The capacity numbers shown in Table 5.11 are not the correct measure; you should be using demonstrated ridership, based on similar systems built new in areas with similar population density.
- The ridership numbers are significantly higher than what SMART has currently, and the driving force for commuting in Sonoma and Marin (SF jobs) is significantly higher than the job density in Santa Cruz County! Even if the ridership can grow to 5,000 per day over the first 5 years, it will take 10 or more years to make up for the losses from those first 5 years.
- In addition, the ridership estimates totally ignore the changes in work-at-home that will continue well past the end of COVID, so ridership will be even lower.
- Although stated otherwise, the population densities along the ROW are much lower than the population density in the LA area or the San Jose area, for example, where new train transit is being built. A comparison to the train on the SF peninsula is not a fair comparison, since that commuter train was operating in the late 1950s.

**Equity:**
- It seems a joke to show Seacliff and Rio Del Mar as poverty on your maps.
- I am not sure about your travel-demand modelling, but it seems to me that many of the Watsonville to Santa Cruz area vehicle trips are done using pickup trucks or other cars where the driver needs his/her vehicle during the day; I don’t think these trips can be done via rail or bus. The job density just does not see high enough to warrant these ridership numbers.
Environment:
- I don’t see anything in the Study regarding the elevation of the ROW in the southern portion, relative to sea level. It seems to be a very expensive proposition to raise the ROW higher as sea-level rise become a problem. This is similar to the problems with CA37 across the north bay. Please take this into account in your costs.
- The Study comments on transit-oriented development imply that anything done in this area is only a positive. However, TOD that occurs near busy roadways or US1 expose those residents to increased pollution from vehicles. The Study should consider the negatives, not just the positives of TOD. Now if we are thinking about 2050, maybe all those vehicles are electric and this will not be a problem, but that is not true at the start of the ROW use in these models.

Other:
- Your calculations on wait time at rail/road crossings may meet standard practice methods, but does not hold water in real life. The SMART train track and station in San Rafael has caused very significant traffic delays that can reach 10-15 minutes to get across the tracks at rush hour! The analysis in Table 5.17 is not anywhere near realistic for many of the crossings in Watsonville and the Capitola-to-SC sections; please take this into account.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Paul Roberts
Aptos, CA

From: J Lighthill <jjmmlight@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 11:37 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: TCAA and MTIS

Dear RTC staff and Commissioners,

Previous studies relevant to the TCAA are listed in draft Appendix A. One is the 1998 “Around the Bay Study,” which concluded that ridership on recreational rail would be sensitive to fares. Another study that year was the RTC’s 1998 Major Transportation Investment Study. Aside from a brief mention on page 1-6, the findings and recommendations of this study were omitted from the current study. Like the TCAA, the purpose of the MTIS was to analyze options for the rail corridor, and it concluded that a Busway on the corridor was the recommended/preferred option. In addition to busway, inter-city recreational rail was recommended. Soon after, the RTC began study to implement the “Village Cruzer,” a tourist trolley proposed to run between Capitola and Aptos. The rail plan failed. The EIR was never finalized. The EIR draft discussed many environmental effects and necessary mitigation measures (one of which included replacing corridor neighbors’ windows to address potential noise issues).

It seems absurd that today passenger rail along the entire line is recommended when a short recreational line was deemed infeasible.
From the 1998 MTIS, pages E-4 and E-5:

“The consultant’s recommendation for the Watsonville-Santa Cruz-UCSC corridor is to construct and operate a combined busway and bikeway facility along the Santa Cruz Branch Line right-of-way from Natural Bridges in Santa Cruz east to State Park Drive in Aptos. This is a long-term strategy and the cash flow analysis of this strategy assumes that the Busway would not be operational until the year 2006.”

“In the near-term, it is recommended that the region allocate $15.6 million for track upgrades and lease payments to Union Pacific to test market an Intercity (weekend) Recreational Rail service. The region should also move forward with the environmental review and design of the busway concept. In order to accomplish this recommendation, the region must also identify new sources of revenue.”

“As discussed in the text, this recommendation is made for several reasons including:

- The interregional rail component is a means of testing this potential long-term strategy with limited public moneys
- The busway/bikeway provides an additional means of east-west capacity as an alternative means of travel to Highway 1 and the parallel arterial streets that are projected to be over capacity by the year 2015.
- The busway/bikeway provides a flexible transit-based means of travel that strengthens the regions commitment to alternate modes. And
- The busway provides an improved means of access to the beaches, the new SCMTD maintenance facility, as well as the major activity centers in the corridor.”

Imagine if we had implemented what was recommended over 20 years ago. Yet, this option still supported with the data in today’s TCAA: A BUSWAY and a TRAIL. See 1998 and 2020 bus maps below.

Earliest language described rail corridor acquisition “for transportation purposes.” The 2001 SCCRTC RTP states “Retain the option of future in-county passenger rail service for when it is financially feasible, acceptable to the community, and only after the completion of an environmental impact report concludes that all the significant impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.”

Any rail plan you may propose will only be financially feasible IF it is acceptable to the community, and thus confirmed by the approval of a new tax measure. Before moving ahead with any more study, please put this to a vote. We can’t wait another twenty years.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Johanna Lighthill
Dear SCCRTC,

Thank you for considering my comments and questions.

What is the purpose of the study? Is it to provide transit opportunities to the communities along the corridor, or to provide commuter service? “Purpose of the study” (TCAApage 0-3): “The TCAA/RNIS was prepared to identify a locally preferred transit alternative to serve the most populous and congested sections of Santa Cruz County....” Yet, preferred rail provides 5-6 stops to Santa Cruz, while only 2 to Live Oak and 3 to Watsonville, despite
Watsonville and Live Oak each being considered disadvantaged and each having higher populations. (Persons/sq. mile: Santa cruz= 5100, Live Oak 5100-7100, Watsonville 8000). This is not equitable.

The TCAA, funded by Measure D, includes a Rail Network Integration Study (RNIS), which was partly funded by CalTrans division of Rail and Mass Transit. It is not surprising that a rail study recommends rail. Connecting to State Rail seems to be a higher priority than serving the community.

“Proposed locally preferred alternative” lists rail characteristics and benefits, but many of these are not advantages over BRT. The Bus has many of the same benefits with many advantages over rail:

- highest frequency (every 10-15 minutes! Rail is 30-60)
- longest duration of service (5am till midnight. Rail quits at 9pm)
- most stops (23 vs only 11-13 with rail)
- most # of stations within 1/2 mile of disadvantaged communities(BRT=22,LRT=13)
- lowest capital costs
- lowest operating costs
- highest % of funding from existing sources
- lower fares
- highest ridership countywide
- highest weekday ridership
- highest weekend ridership
- least impact at grade crossings (fewer grade crossings, shorter wait to cross traffic)
- more flexibility to adapt to future technologies
- similar flexible design for seats/bikes/mobility devices
- level boarding along ROW
- provides service to popular destinations off ROW
- quieter (no train horns or crossing bells; no quiet zone safety mitigations)
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-least impact on environmentally sensitive areas

-least impact on coastal erosion

-greatest reduction of energy/fuel consumption

-uses existing Metro stations

-maintains freight in Watsonville

-allows Roaring Camp to maintain Boardwalk operation

-supports Transit Oriented Development (TOD) on the corridor

-Compatible with State Rail Plan, like Rail Plan

-allows Transit and Trail to coexist (rail shifts trail to adjacent public way).

Counters to the advantages listed for rail:

-faster: Rail transit time on the corridor is 55, but the TCAA does not mention that the UCIS determined that Bus on Shoulder will provide a 40 minute commute between Santa Cruz and Watsonville.

-More reliable: Rail is deemed more reliable due to the fact that BRT may face delays with street traffic. The TCAA mentions the 1st and last mile connections, but does not provide details about how the reliance of bus connections may affect reliability. Also, disruptions on a rail line could create critical delays of all travelers (both directions) on the line. Buses can go around hazards, rail cannot. Serves longer distance trips: this is a trade off. BRT includes more stops and provides more service to more people. LRT travels 12 miles through dense communities with only one stop (Cabrillo/State Park to Ohlone). Flexible design for seats, bikes, etc.: buses offer this too.

91% of stations within disadvantaged communities: Compare total number of stations, BRT=17, LRT=12).

-Level boarding: BRT provides level boarding on the ROW.

Greatest integration with State Rail: Bus can travel to rail station, too.

Too many specifics are not addressed in the study, and require further analysis (to be addressed in environmental and design phases): system integration (1st/last mile connections), frequency, stations, funding, FRA compliance (if freight runs, most likely at night), grade crossings, quiet zones, retaining walls for cliff erosion, how transit affects trail accessibility and more. Why more study?

Are the rules for separating rail from trail different from separating bus from trail?
What are the quiet zone costs breakdown? Why aren’t private crossings included?

Climate Change resiliency: “...erosion impacts likely to require retaining walls or other protection to adapt to climate change.” P5-62. What are “other” costs, and is $7 million retaining wall costs specific to the eroding bluffs?

How many rail vehicles are included in $63 million estimate? Will proposed daily transit routes consist of single cars or 3-car trainsets?

How many buses are included in the $19,968,000?

LRT headway: table 5.1 lists LRT 1 and 2 headway peak/off peak 30/60, but figure 6.6 lists 30 min all day. Can you clarify? Also, can you explain weekend “30 minute Frequency all day with every 60 minute express?

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Johanna Lighthill

From: Ed Porter <eporter95@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 11:59 PM
To: Transit Corridor <transitcorridoraa@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Consider Automated Transportation Networks (ATN) as a compelling form of rail transportation

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

The RTC has, for several years now has spent major sums studying potential transportation alternatives in our Coastal Rail Corridor.

The train shown above is from page 6-3 (151), Figure 6.2 in this draft of the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis.
Comparison to smarter, smaller vehicles makes sense here. ATN (Automated Transpiration Network, is called this by our neighbor, San Jose). It's called PODcars in the EU, PRT (Personal Rapid Transit), is the common name in the USA. Mountain View has used yet another acronym, AGT which is, presumably Automated Guideway Transportation. I've used the term ATN below to include options from among all of these choices worldwide.
Both of these photos are taken directly from City of Mountain View's Automated Guideway Transit Feasibility Study. [https://mountainviewagtfeasibility.files.wordpress.com/2018/03/mvagtreport_final_feb-2018_combined.pdf](https://mountainviewagtfeasibility.files.wordpress.com/2018/03/mvagtreport_final_feb-2018_combined.pdf)
The Mountain View effort is analogous to our own RTC's **TRANSIT CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS** a draft of which is here under review.

My view is that the ATN form of rail transit offers compelling features that place it as a top choice for today's informed observers on the subject. Our future rail transport should be 100% safe, 100% Green, and the kind of low cost only possible through this modern technology.

The train shown above is quite an expensive option. Here, I ask RTC consideration of a wiser point of view for these times. I refer to the point of view emerging from E. F. Schumacher's book "Small is Beautiful" where he advocates for a consciousness to champion small, appropriate technologies and policies that are believed to empower people more, in contrast with ideas such as "bigger is better".


Here are some key **ATN** features:

1. Cars are automated and provide exceptional on-demand service
2. Cars go from origin to destination NON-STOP.
3. Guideways are grade separated with the guideway elevated in all congested locations.
4. Guideways can also be on the ground such as along sections of freeway fencing where there are no cross-streets.
5. The ATN modality has been in operation in at least five major installations around the world. All of these five **COMBINED** have a near-PERFECT safety record with **ZERO** fatalities or even serious injuries since the year 1974 **VERY SAFE!** (Think of a MOST-welcome implementation of **Vision Zero**! )
6. The ATN modality is electric and can also have a canopy of solar panels over the guideway. Thus it does not consume fossil fuels either directly or indirectly. **VERY GREEN!** Please note that electric vehicles that employ electricity generated at remote power plants using fossil fuels could NOT be considered green in this comparison.

7. Cost of small ATN cars and guideway is probably between one tenth and one fifth the cost per mile of light rail and about half or LESS the cost of an equivalent bus line.

8. Small individual cars of an ATN system can act in a "Dual Mode" leaving the guideway to provide the equivalent of automobile transportation to and from final destinations resolving the "last mile" problem.

9. ATN systems can compete very favorably with automobile time efficiency and handily beat it during congested rush hours. The "last mile" issue is effectively eliminated and equity is provided for all.

10. ATN vehicles are quiet as demonstrated by the quiet passage of virtually ANY electric cars.

Exquisite **Safety**, genuine **GREEN** solar propulsion, Surprising **lower costs** than any other rail system, AND travel from origin to destination NON-STOP!

It's important to assure that this smaller and more desirable form of rail transport be **included** in this study and not **excluded**.

The consultant suggests larger electric vehicles such as in the illustration below. **TRAINS.** The 5 or 6 car train is comparable to the Metra System in Chicago as well as similar commuter trains used in other major US cities.
The concept of Vision Zero is transportation designed such that zero fatal "accidents" or serious injuries occur with its use. This has been proposed in all Santa Cruz County cities and to the County Board of Supervisors. Adoption has faced resistance because some transportation professionals feel that the goal is not possible to achieve.

But, at the same time, ATN systems around the world enjoy literally a **perfect** safety record where none of the systems in daily public use have had ANY fatalities or even any serious injuries. For this reason alone, ATN rail transit should be included in consideration of the Light Rail Transit possibilities.

The size of the train shown in the draft report matches much larger urban areas around the country than Santa Cruz and Santa Cruz County. This capacity may not be needed in this County and precious SCRTC studies have indicated that it cannot be supported by ridership needs here.

It's important to make sure that, while considering the electric commuter concept, the RTC comes to understand that smaller ATN electric rail vehicles may be smarter and, **SHOULD** definitely be an option!.
One way to think about this is to consider how ATN would impact our transportation demand here and, particularly, the peak traffic load on highway 1. On its busiest days, highway one averages about 100,000 trips per day. Sometimes more.

Most of the weekday rush-hour traffic is within about an 11 hour window from 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM.
(from CALTRANS data and charts)
Let's say that 90% of that traffic is during those hours. So 90,000 trips divided by 11 hours is about 8,181 trips per hour. It's probably a bit less.....

This will compare the 8,181 trips with the number of trips that could be easily handled by a single ATN guideway in one hour.

For this example, a car with an average of 2 passengers per vehicle is used. An already well demonstrated headway of 15 seconds between vehicles is used. That would provide for capacity of 8 passengers every minute and 480 passengers per hour. Of course a 4 passenger car could double that. And a reduction of the headway to 7.5 seconds could double it again. Such improvements after, say, the first year of operation are perfectly reasonable to forecast and plan for, And, judging from the years communities take to adopt new transit options, it would fit perfectly with that adoption rate. Compare with the historical BART adoption rates for this conclusion.

So now, on this projection, we are at 1920 passenger trips per hour, probably after a year of initial operations. Now we introduce a four seat car so that some trips can have 3 or 4 riders. Always "on demand" the system would dispatch the right car for the service request. (just like Uber?)

The 1920 passenger trips per hour has presumably removed about one quarter of the trips from the 8,181 max traffic load on highway one. Most knowledgeable observers would say that if you removed one quarter of that traffic, the traffic jam would be gone. And those riding in the ATN vehicles would be traveling from their origin to their destination NON-STOP! and probably at 45 mph or more. A HIGHLY competitive average speed.

In a second year of operation, headway time could be halved again and the passenger load of the ATN would be again doubled!
Many further enhancements are likely and before another year or two, the ATN could carry MOST of the passenger load currently carried by Highway 1.

Both systems would balance in ridership in a sort of "natural equalization". Both would feature light, well **below-capacity** traffic. And this is ONLY the beginning! Most ATN designers expect to move incrementally to one HALF second headways. Looking ahead say, 5 years and beyond, and, given that throughput and a variety of car sizes, it's not unreasonable to plan for 7200 passenger throughput of trips per hour. To be conservative, that's actually only about HALF of the capacity that could be expected!

So please consider this and the other positive features of ATN when the urge is to buy the expensive train system pictured above that will cost 10 to 20 times as much as an ATN system.

**SMALL IS BEAUTIFUL!** **And so is ATN!**

Best Regards,  
Ed Porter  
831 427-0836  
EPorter95@gmail.com
Dear SCCRTC Staff and Commissioners,

Our family lives in Seacliff. We have been looking forward to the creation of the formal Coastal Rail Trail since before its purchase by your agency since it already is a trail for locals wishing to travel safely on foot between Aptos Village and Seacliff. Construction of the recent Aptos Village Project and COVID-19 has only increased its popularity.

I was initially excited about the trail and a train. I love trains and ride them whenever I can, and our county desperately NEEDS a reliable transit system.

Participation in numerous SCCRTC stakeholder meetings for the various studies about creating rail transit along with the trail has been very educational. As much as I want to ride the train locally, the criteria required to support this type of travel just does not match our county. I commuted to Santa Cruz from Watsonville for work, so I understand drivers’ frustrations. Train travel along the corridor is very appealing until you do the math and neighborhood representatives have explained this repeatedly, in detail, at multiple stakeholder and public meetings over the years. Lots of expensive studies and surveys were produced, but the outcome was always the same because the goal was rail. Rail is often perceived as better than the bus. It feels modern, cleaner, futuristic, and elegant. Busses are often viewed as crowded, noisy, smelly (Gack! not diesel...) slow and as older technology. And, if it travels the same roads as cars then it can’t be faster than the train, right?

The TCAA promotes rail as the preferred choice but describes its funding, ridership, integration, and equity in often vague, or hopeful terms that denote a disconnect from the shape, population, topography, and demographics of our county. For example, what will “equity” truly means for south county residents? Their commute will not improve significantly if a train runs in the corridor. Half of the Hwy 1 commuters are driving into the county from other areas, or they are leaving the county for work. They will not be riding a train. There are no studies indicating the number of south county commuters requiring their vehicles for work within our county nor what the rest of the south county commuters are willing to sacrifice to leave their cars at home. The logistics of using public transportation are not simple unless you happen to live within a couple blocks of your origin and destination and there aren’t many of these near the proposed rail stops because adding stations would only increase commuter travel times. Another travel mode is then required to reach destinations, such as downtown Santa Cruz, UCSC or Dominican Hospital, well beyond walking distance from the station. This is not a faster trip. The TCAA states, "A key component of a successful high-capacity transit system is an integrated network of "first mile/last mile" connections that allow transit system users to complete their journey from the transit station closest to their destination, to their destination
Transit Corridors Alternatives Analysis
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itself." Why then, would you take a bus to a train to another bus to reach work when the bus
does both?

The BRT option of the TCAA uses existing infrastructure along with relevant portions of the
corridor to achieve the same goals as rail. If METRO were properly funded and expanded, it
would be a more reliable, flexible, cleaner, affordable, and attractive way for residents to
travel. The auxiliary lanes planned for the highway, along with running busses on the shoulder
will help all commuters. If the bus on shoulder system is also integrated with local routes AND
our county bus system is prioritized back into usefulness, more people will ride it for both
commuter and non-commuter trips. This will remove even more cars from the road, reducing
travel times for everyone. And, most importantly, it reduces greenhouse gasses.

Common sense suggests fixing and enhancing our existing infrastructure before adding to it;
using precious transportation funds to create a county-wide, integrated BRT system, restore
local roads, expand our bike paths, and improve pedestrian safety is the fiscally responsible and
right thing to do for all Santa Cruz County residents.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Downing
Seacliff