



**Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)**

DRAFT MINUTES

Thursday, May 20, 2021, 1:30 p.m.
Teleconference

Due to precautions associated with COVID-19 (coronavirus), the meeting was held by teleconference, consistent with Governor Newsom's Executive Orders which allow legislative bodies to hold Brown Act meetings via teleconference.

ITAC Members Present

Matt Machado	County of Santa Cruz Public Works
Anais Schenk	County of Santa Cruz Planning
Kailash Mozumder (Chair)	Capitola Public Works
Mark Dettle	Santa Cruz Public Works
Claire Gallogly	Santa Cruz Planning
Athena Cheung	Scotts Valley Public Works
Murray Fontes	Watsonville Public Works
Justin Meek	Watsonville Community Development
Paul Hierling	Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)
Gus Alfaro	Caltrans District 5
John Urgo	Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
Wondimu Mengistu	Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
Teresa Buika (Vice Chair)	University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC)
Piet Canin	Ecology Action

RTC Staff Present

Rachel Moriconi, Guy Preston, Sarah Christensen Fernanda Dias Pini, Luis Mendez, Tommy Travers, Ginger Dykaar, Grace Blakeslee, Tommy Travers, Shannon Munz

Others Present

Chris Schneider, City of Santa Cruz
Nathan Nguyen, City of Santa Cruz/
Rob Tidmore, County of Santa Cruz
Malinda Gallaher, Caltrans District 5
Members of Public Present – see list at end of minutes

- 1. Call to Order:** Chair Kailash Mozumder called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.
- 2. Introductions:** Roll call introductions of committee members were made. All attendees participated by teleconference.
- 3. Oral Communications:** Rachel recognized Claire Gallogly for her service as ITAC Chair for the past two years, noting that she provided thoughtful, engaged, and effective leadership during her tenure.
- 4. Additions, deletions, or changes to consent and regular agendas:** Handouts were provided for Items 8 and 10.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Approved Minutes of the March 18, 2021 ITAC meeting

The Committee approved a motion (Buika/Fontes) approving the consent agenda (13-0), with Machado, Mozumder, Dettle, Gallogly, Cheung, Fontes, Meek, Schenk, Urgo, Mengistu, Alfaro, Buika and Hierling voting yes by roll call vote. Canin abstained.

REGULAR AGENDA

6. Status of transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents

Representatives from ITAC member agencies provided updates on Measure D and RTC-funded projects, other major projects and planning efforts.

Capitola – Kailash Mozumder reported the completion of the Capitola Avenue streetscape sidewalk project near Capitola Village and that plans and specifications for the 41st Avenue adaptive signal program funded by grant from the Monterey Unified Air Pollution Control District are being finalized, that this project is expected to go out to bid in the Summer/Fall 2021, and that it dovetails well with the County's adaptive signal program.

Santa Cruz Public Works – Chris Schneiter reported on: the completion of the Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX) and Measure D-funded Pacific Avenue sidewalk infill project by the wharf; Highway 1/9 project construction has started with utility relocation, which will be followed by more construction activity; and two city-wide paving projects will start in June that include paving on Delaware Ave, Market St, Fairmont, and cap seals on several residential streets.

Santa Cruz Planning – Claire Gallogly reported that the City is working with the other local jurisdictions and UCSC to roll out a bike share program and secure a new vendor for the area.

Watsonville Public Works – Murray Fontes reported that the city has awarded a contract for Active Transportation Program (ATP)-funded Lincoln St project, with construction this summer. Segment 18 of the Rail Trail is almost done. The city has issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a design consultant for city's portion of the Harkins Slough Road bike/ped project. At its meeting this month, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) considered a request for adding complete streets elements on Highways 129 and 152.

Scotts Valley Public Works – Athena Cheung reported that infill sidewalk construction on Blue Bonnet is finishing.

County of Santa Cruz Public Works – Matt Machado reported that the new signal at Soquel Drive/Aptos Creek Road is done, with timing set to connect five signals together. Additional work in Aptos Village continues. Rob Tidmore reported that

Rail Trail Segment 10-11 project implementation is underway, with site investigation work expected to be completed within a few weeks and design starting later this summer.

County of Santa Cruz Planning – Anais Schenk reported the County is finishing the County’s Active Transportation Plan with Ecology Action. Pop-up protected bike lanes and enhanced pedestrian facility demonstrations will be installed on Green Valley Road 5/28-6/23, and on Portola Drive June 25-July 21. Kick-off festivities are planned on the first day of each demo.

UCSC – Teresa Buika reported that UCSC is expecting 85% student occupancy on campus for Fall 2021, that students must be vaccinated to access campus, and that large classes will likely still be held virtually. She noted that COVID-response could change before the start of the fall semester.

METRO – John Urgo reported that METRO will change to its summer service schedule on June 10, 2021, including a return to pre-COVID-19 levels of service, and extra night and weekend service. METRO will continue reduced service for the Highway 17 Express route and is expecting full level of service to accommodate return of UCSC students in the fall. Mr. Urgo also reported that bus stop signs are being redesigned based on current standards, METRO has initiated a new [Cruz On-Demand](#) service. METRO is also working on a joint Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC) application with the City of Santa Cruz for Pacific Station. In response to a question from Teresa Buika, Mr. Urgo noted that COVID-related capacity on buses has been increasing and is expected to increase to full capacity by the fall. He noted that capacity on the Highway 17 Express is still restricted to 8 passengers based on Santa Clara County requirements.

AMBAG – Paul Hierling reported that work is continuing on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), with the project lists and revenue estimates finalized, environmental review initiated and modeling work underway.

RTC – Rachel Moriconi reported that the RTC has worked with partners to launch the [Go Santa Cruz County](#) transportation demand management program, which provides resources and incentives for using alternatives to driving alone. The RTC board adopted the 2021 Unmet Needs List for transit and paratransit at its meeting this month. Sarah Christensen reported that the Highway 1 41st Ave-Soquel Drive auxiliary lanes/bus-on-shoulder project is ready-to-list (advertise) for construction. The Highway 1 Bay/Porter-State Park Drive project is environmentally cleared, with final design underway.

Ecology Action - Piet Canin reported that May is Bike Month. He appreciated everyone that helps fund the event and noted over 1000 participants so far. He noted work with the County on its active transportation plan and pop-up installments.

Caltrans District 5 – Gus Alfaro reported that Caltrans will be hosting a focus group meeting on the Central Coast Highway 101 Business Plan on May 27th, and

encouraged stakeholders to provide input on priorities along the corridor. He noted that for National Bike Month, the California Highway Patrol (CHP) is hosting several bike safety rodeos. He encouraged everyone to check out and share Caltrans videos on [how transportation is funded](#) statewide and the road charge pilot program, which is evaluating a range of alternatives to gas taxes, including per mile fees, paying at gas pumps, and electric vehicle charges. He also announced new FHWA guidelines for alternative uses of highway right-of-way, including alternative energy, broadband, and vegetation management. He also highlighted the Governor's California Come Back/economic recovery plan which would provide economic relief for families and additional funding for infrastructure, addressing the housing crisis, broadband, and modernizing and reducing greenhouse gases from the transportation network. Rachel Moriconi also reported that the Measure D-funded Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing project will be going out to bid for construction, with bids due to Caltrans in July.

Coronavirus/returning to work and board meeting protocols – Agencies provided updates, noting participation has increased with online meetings; Caltrans is allowing more teleworking long term, especially given benefits of reducing commutes and travel for meetings. Some agencies noted blended staffing in-person and remote and alternate in-office schedules to minimize the number of people in shared offices, more flexible schedules, continuation of virtual/on-line meetings and following state guidelines.

Public comments received

Brian Peoples requested information about community outreach for the bridge seismic retrofit project at the Harbor/Murray Street and asked that the traffic signal on Trout Gulch and Soquel operate as it did before it was synchronized. He expressed support for work being done on segments 10-11, and 12, but said design work should be delayed until a final decision is made on the use of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line corridor.

Jessica Evans requested that agencies make it possible for members of the public to be seen at virtual meetings.

7. Distribution of Federal Highway COVID Relief Funds

[NOTE-SUBSEQUENT TO THE ITAC MEETING, CALTRANS INFORMED REGIONS THAT COVID RELIEF FUNDS CANNOT BE SUBALLOCATED BY FORMULA. Due to this new information, staff will be returning to the ITAC with revised recommendations on process for programming the funds at its next meeting.]

Rachel Moriconi, RTC, provided an overview of the federal Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2021 (CRRSAA), enacted by Congress in December 2020. Of the highway funds, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has decided to program 60% to state programs (SHOPP and ITIP) and 40% to projects selected by the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies. \$2.5 million in CRRSAA 'highway' funds are available for programming by the RTC to projects in Santa Cruz County, with roughly 50% available through the State Transportation Improvement Program (Mid-Cycle STIP) and the rest through a new Surface Transportation Block Grant Program-like program, or

CRRSAA-STBG. She also discussed project eligibility and options for programming these funds and that Caltrans and the CTC may make the region's apportionment available as state-funds. The RTC is required to submit project lists to the CTC for concurrence and allocation. She recommended the ITAC identify priority projects for programming CRRSAA highway funding and recommend that the RTC: program the region's shares of CRRSAA-STBG funds (approximately \$1.27 million) to cities and the County of Santa Cruz by population formula; program 5% of the region's formula share of Mid-Cycle State Transportation Improvement Program COVID Relief funds (Mid-Cycle STIP) to Planning, Programming and Monitoring; and indicate its intent to program the balance of Mid-Cycle STIP COVID Relief funds (approximately \$1.2 million) in combination with any new 2022 STIP formula shares and other RTC-discretionary funds through adoption of the 2022 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) this Fall.

Matt Machado stated that the County may have projects with Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX) funding which could be exchanged for CRRSAA funds, focusing CRRSAA on fewer projects. He suggested programming 100% of the CRRSAA funds by population formula to the cities and County to backfill gas tax revenue losses to road maintenance programs.

Claire Gallogly expressed support for keeping a portion of the funds competitive to provide funding opportunities for regional projects implemented by local jurisdictions and projects implemented by local non-governmental agencies (NGOs) and others, especially for projects which may not be eligible, competitive or considered priority for statewide or federal grants.

In response to a question from Murray Fontes, Rachel stated the ITAC would discuss programming options for the balance of the region's formula share of Mid-Cycle STIP and other RTC-discretionary funds at a future ITAC meeting, once information is available on any new 2022 STIP formula shares. Funds would be programmed by the RTC through adoption of the 2022 RTIP this Fall.

Mark Dettle stated that a 100% formula distribution of the CRRSAA-STBG funds should be considered, but expressed support to wait to decide on the process for Mid-Cycle STIP funds.

Piet Canin stated that Ecology Action would like to compete for some funds to be able to meet the increased demand for bicycle programs brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Public Comments: Carey Pico suggested apportioning funds by a formula that considers lane miles or vehicle miles, rather than a population-based formula.

Ben Vernazza stated that consideration should be given to those most impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and economic crisis and suggested that the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) provide input on the distribution of funds.

Member Machado moved to recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) program 100% of the region's share of the CRRSAA-STBG and Mid-Cycle STIP funds to the cities and County by population formula, with 5% of the region's formula share of Mid-Cycle STIP for Planning, Programming and Monitoring. The motion failed due to a lack of a second.

In response to questions from Claire Gallogly, Rachel Moriconi said that the CTC would program Mid-Cycle STIP funds in FY22/23, though it would consider advance allocation requests and that 100% population formula distribution of the CRRSAA-STBG and STIP funds would mean that Ecology Action, Bike Santa Cruz County, METRO, UCSC, RTC and other local transportation partners would not be able to access the funds.

Members Dettle/Fontes moved to:

1. Recommend that the RTC:

- a. Program the region's shares of Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act-Surface Transportation Block Grant funds (CRRSAA-STBG) (approximately \$1.27 million) to cities and the County of Santa Cruz by population formula for projects that meet state and federal criteria, with staff helping facilitate the exchange of population shares of funds between agencies if one or more agencies are willing to trade the CRRSAA-STBG for other previously programmed RTC-discretionary funds (change the "color" of funds); and**
- b. Program 5% of the region's formula share of Mid-Cycle State Transportation Improvement Program COVID Relief funds (Mid-Cycle STIP) to Planning, Programming and Monitoring, including RTC administration of COVID relief funds, per California Transportation Commission guidelines; and**

2. That the ITAC reconvene after 2022 STIP estimates are released to discuss and decide on how to program the balance of Mid-Cycle STIP COVID Relief funds in combination with any new 2022 STIP formula shares and other RTC-discretionary funds.

In response to a question from Claire Gallogly, Mr. Dettle confirmed his intent of the motion is that discussion of how the remaining balance would be apportioned would be done after the STIP estimates.

Teresa Buika stated that it is important to leave some of the funds competitive for other valuable regional projects, and supports the original staff recommendation, but is also open to accept the motion and discuss the matter at a later time.

The committee approved the Dettle/Fontes motion (13-0) with Machado, Schenk, Dettle, Gallogly, Mozumder, Cheung, Fontes, Meek, Buika, Urgo, Mengistu, Canin, and Hierling voting yes. Alfaro abstained.

8. Highway 1 – State Park to Freedom Auxiliary Lanes and Bus on Shoulder Project & Coastal Rail Trail Segment 12 Addition of Interim Trail Alternative

Sarah Christensen, RTC presented an overview of the Highway 1 – State Park to Freedom Auxiliary Lanes, Bus on Shoulder, and Coastal Rail Trail Segment 12 project and discussed the addition of an interim trail alternative to the project's on-going preliminary engineering and environmental analysis. Ms. Christensen asked ITAC members to review and provide input on the proposed approach to add the interim trail alternative to the preliminary engineering and environmental analysis of the project.

Guy Preston, RTC, added that there is a need to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to be consistent with the intent of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and that it is prudent to address concerns in the earlier stages of a project to avoid future delays. Mr. Preston also noted the RTC long-range view plan is to provide a corridor that serves multiple purposes, including rail transit. He stated that an interim trail analysis provides an opportunity to analyze the corridor more effectively, consider permits, moving the existing fixed railway to make vertical, horizontal, and curvature adjustments for future rail and the trail.

Kailash Mozumder asked if other alternatives previously omitted from the trail master plan have also been reconsidered. Sarah stated that through preliminary engineering, efforts have been made to find an alignment that makes the most sense through this corridor. The current build alternative, with a rail and trail, has the trail on the inland side of the tracks.

Matt Machado expressed support for the staff recommendation, as well as support for rail, and stated it is responsible to consider viable alternatives for the trail.

Mark Dettle asked for clarification on the additional cost of including the interim trail alternative, if the intent is to only add an alternative to have a complete environmental analysis or if this change in scope would also need additional design work. Sarah stated additional environmental analysis and engineering work would be needed to provide a side-by-side comparison of the alternatives. Guy added that it is not unusual consider two build alternatives.

Murray Fontes asked for clarification on Progressive Rail's request to abandon services on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Guy stated that while Progressive Rail gave a 90-day notice of intent to abandon the line and terminate the contract with the RTC, they have since notified the RTC that it does not intend to abandon the line at this moment, and instead has contracted with Roaring Camp to provide freight service in Watsonville.

Mr. Fontes asked about the environmental requirements for removing the rail and the ties and material underneath and if the proposed study would be scoped to perform such analysis. Guy stated that the intent behind adding an interim trail to the environmental analysis is to look into those technical questions.

Mr. Fontes inquired if this additional analysis would look into trail component requirements, such as fencing. Guy reported elements such as fencing requires a focused discussion with partner agencies and the Environmental Health Services to ensure public safety, adherence to the Coastal Act, capacity to meet public demand.

Member Paul Hierling left the meeting at 2:55 pm.

Public Comments:

Carey Pico stated that any assertions that once railbanked tracks cannot be reactivated are incorrect and there are well documented instances of reactivated tracks that had been previously railbanked or abandoned.

Jessica Evans noted that the scope of the proposed interim trail alternative is inconsistent with the Measure D Expenditure Plan and requirements of Proposition 116.

Brian Peoples supported the staff recommendation, stating that the corridor will be heavily utilized and should be made available to the public as soon as possible.

Ryan Sarnataro supported the staff recommendation, recommended that resale of the rail should be incorporated to the project scope due to current high prices of steel. Also stated that 12-16 feet is not the optimal width for a trail.

Lawrence Kaplan supported the staff recommendation and recommended analyzing a trail design that does not call for pavement at all sections to reduce project costs.

Ann Kaplan supported the staff recommendation, stating that it will provide the public with important information.

Mark Mesiti-Miller questioned whether railbanking is a possibility on the rail corridor, noting that it may be incorrect as Roaring Camp, a federally recognized freight operator, has a need for this line. He recommended that the RTC obtain approval to railbank from the Surface Transportation Board prior to conducting the proposed interim trail alternative analysis, adding that this alternative is unfundable and unreasonable.

Barry Scott stated opposition to any study of an interim trail on the corridor because it disrespects the public process in place since the rail corridor was purchased. He noted that RTC studies on the corridor have shown that rail with trail is the best use for this facility and that studying this alternative goes against various state and regional transportation plans.

Sally Arnold requested the ITAC to recommend that the RTC take no action on this item. Stated that an interim trail project is not listed on the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) nor the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP), that it would be more expensive than building the trail as laid out on the Monterey Sanctuary Scenic Trail Masterplan, and that a study of an interim trail should include analysis of track restoration and trail realignment costs.

David Van Brink stated that he does not believe that rail tracks would be replaced once they are railbanked, and that this proposal is morphing into rail prevention on the line.

Jack Brown supported the staff recommendation and noted that studying an interim trail is consistent with CEQA requirements.

Ben Vernazza stated that Segment 12 is costly due to the need to replace bridges to be able to accommodate both rail and trail. He supported railbanking to expedite use of the facility and to improve pedestrian safety in mid-county.

Jeanette Guire, Roaring Camp, stated that removal of rail goes against years of progress made by the RTC. Rail provides important transportation alternatives for the community. Railbanking is short-sighted and would only leave the trail or the highway as transportation alternatives for county residents. Ms. Guire added that a study of an interim trail alternative should include the costs remove the rail, build the trail, remove the trail, rebuild the rail and rebuild the trail in a different location – as that would be the only way for a true comparison between the trail only and rail with trail alternatives. She stated that Roaring Camp does not support the staff recommendation.

Machado moved that the ITAC recommend the RTC look at alternatives, including the interim trail as described on the staff report. Mark Dettle opposed the motion and Machado withdrew his motion.

Mr. Dettle noted that the City of Santa Cruz supports rail with trail, expressed support for including an interim trail analysis to make the environmental analysis more complete, avoid project delays, and promote actions to ensure the continual and expedient delivery of the Coastal Rail Trail.

Dettle/Machado moved for the ITAC to support the staff recommendation to prepare a complete Environmental Impact Report for Segment 12 of the Coastal Rail Trail in order to avoid future delays in the implementation of the rail with trail Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail project.

Piet Canin noted that the staff recommendation is for a study and that it does not exclude a rail alternative; Ecology Action supports rail/transit and trail use of the corridor. He stated that it is important to keep delivering segments of the Coastal Rail Trail and to keep working towards multi-use of the corridor with both trail and rail/transit.

Nathan Nguyen supports ensuring that this project has a complete environmental analysis to reduce delivery risks and project delays.

Teresa Buika requested clarification on what would be included in the complete Environmental Impact Report. Mark noted that it would include the interim alternative.

The committee approved the Dettle/Machado motion (8-0) with Machado, Schenk, Dettle, Gallogly, Mozumder, Fontes, Urgo, and Mengistu voting yes. Cheung, Canin, and Buika abstained. Meek and Hierling were not present.

*Claire Gallogly left the meeting and designated Nathan Nguyen as her alternate.
Chair Mozumder moved Item 10 ahead of Item 8.*

10. Capitola Trestle Update & Interim Trail Alternative

Sarah Christensen, RTC, presented on the proposed approach for additional engineering analysis of the Capitola Trestle for a potential interim trail alternative on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. She requested that the ITAC review and provide input on the proposed approach and potential interim trail alternative being added to Coastal Rail Trail Projects under development.

Kailash Mozumder stated that the Capitola Public Works Department supports the staff recommendation.

Murray Fontes asked what would happen to the \$50,000 set aside for the study on the Capitola Trestle if the RTC does not approve the staff recommendation. Sarah stated that the funds could potentially be de-programmed and that staff would look to the Commission for additional direction.

Mr. Fontes asked whether the staff recommendation differs from the intent behind the original feasibility study allocation and whether those funds would still be available for such study if the staff recommendation is not approved. Sarah stated that the staff recommendation would be to perform a structural feasibility analysis to determine if the trestle could be retrofitted to accommodate a multiuse trail instead of both rail and trail, as was originally intended. Sarah responded that if the staff recommendation is not approved, that a feasibility study could still happen in the future. If the bridge needs repair or replacement, it would likely have to happen as part of a major capital project and not as a stand-alone project due to limited funding options. Sarah noted that as the Commission is not moving forward with an environmental analysis of rail transit, sound information is needed to assist with implementation of other potential interim uses on the line.

Rob Tidmore state the analysis would be helpful for the County-led implementation of segments 10 and 11 of the Coastal Rail Trail and could lead to significant savings and efficiencies.

Mark Dettle asked whether the staff recommendation would be impacted by the Capitola Measure L. Kailash responded that Capitola Public Works staff investigated the matter and found no conflict.

Public Comments:

Brian Peoples expressed support for the staff recommendation and expressed safety concerns about the current condition of the Capitola Trestle.

Barry Scott stated that bridge replacement should happen but that the replacement should be able to accommodate rail and trail use and that the cost to replace a bridge that can accommodate either trail-only or rail and trail would be similar.

Mark Mesiti-Miller stated that the RTC should not proceed with the study of an interim trail until railbanking issues are resolved, and suggested that the ITAC modify the staff recommendation to include studying feasibility of an interim use of an ultra-light rail on the trestle.

Ben Vernazza noted that the corridor between Capitola and Santa Cruz had been studied to be used as a bus corridor in 1996, and that he supports the staff recommendation and stated that the new improvements on Highway 1 will alleviate congestion.

David Van Brink stated that the Commission originally allocated the \$50,000 to study transit and trail on the trestle and not trail only.

Sally Arnold stated studying an interim trail alternative on the trestle is not consistent with RTC plans and hopes the ITAC recommends the Commission take no action on this matter. She noted that any analysis done should also include rail and trail and account for costs of restoring the trestle to accommodate both.

Ryan Sarnataro supported the interim trail and stated it would be an asset to Capitola.

Machado/Fontes moved that the ITAC recommend the RTC pursue additional engineering analysis on the Capitola Trestle for a potential interim trail on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

Nathan Nguyen asked if it is the standard practice for the other agencies leading the implementation of different segments of the Coastal Rail Trail to also obtain input from the other ITAC agencies along the various stages of project development and delivery. He also noted that a policy direction has been given by the RTC and Santa Cruz City Council, and he is supportive of full environmental review of segment 12. Rachel Moriconi responded that the ITAC serves as a technical advisor to the RTC. Since the RTC is the lead agency for the segment 12 project and the Capitola Trestle study, staff is seeking advisory input from the committee. Agencies implementing other Coastal Rail Trail segments are not advised by the ITAC.

Murray Fontes requested clarification if the staff recommendation is to study the feasibility of modifying the Capitola Trestle to support a multiuse trail. Sarah Christensen confirmed his statement.

Mark Dettle noted that conducting a safety and structural analysis for interim use of the trestle makes sense and suggested also performing a load analysis.

Guy Preston stated that RTC consultants have looked at whether the bridge could accommodate a lighter vehicle and that study of rail transit on the corridor,

analysis found that the Capitola Trestle must be replaced if it is to be used for more than 10 years for rail, regardless of weight. The short utility span of an interim transit use makes it so that a study on it would not be cost effective. Additionally, the wrought iron and timber structure cannot support cantilevering a trail, which would be needed to accommodate transit and trail without trestle replacement. He also noted that the staff recommendation to analyze passenger rail on the corridor, which would include rail only on the trestle, was not approved by the RTC board.

Nathan Nguyen requested clarification on whether the interim trail alternative includes an analysis of building an interim bridge, also if a replacement trestle would be able to accommodate rail. Guy stated that environmental review and design of TCAA-RNIS preferred alternative would have looked at replacing the bridge completely. The current staff recommendation is to determine what needs to be done to accommodate a multiuse trail on the structure and whether the bridge can be preserved and utilized in the near-future.

Piet Canin requested clarification on whether the analysis would study the potential of using the Capitola Trestle for a bicycle and pedestrian path and also provide a project cost estimate. Guy stated it would only be a feasibility and not a full engineering analysis. If the study shows that a trail is feasible on the existing structure, then additional analyses, including cost and design, performed.

Teresa Buika noted that Mark Mesiti-Miller posted a clarifying comment noting that he requested that the study be for the interim use of the Capitola Trestle for a lightweight rail vehicle such as the TIG/m, which is 10% of the weight of a freight locomotive. Guy stated that the Commission has not directed staff to move forward with rail transit on the corridor and that it is known that the Capitola Trestle would have to be replaced to accommodate rail transit, as such it is unclear what kind of feasibility study would be performed to that end.

The committee approved the Machado/Fontes motion (10-0) with Machado, Schenk, Mozumder, Dettle, Nguyen, Cheung, Fontes, Urgo, Mengistu, and Canin voting yes. Buika abstained. Meek and Hierling were not present.

9. State and Federal Legislative and Funding Updates

Chair Mozumder moved Item 9 to after Item 10.

Rachel Moriconi, RTC, provided a verbal update on state and federal funding sources, including: release of the state budget proposal (May Revise), which includes supplemental funding proposals to the Active Transportation Program (ATP) and other transportation programs; federal infrastructure bill and the reauthorization of the Fixing American's Surface Transportation Act (FAST); federal earmarks; federal Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainable and Equity (RAISE) grant applications due mid-July; and CTC workshops for the next round of competitive Senate Bill 1 grants will start in late-August.

Piet Canin asked if RTC is able to advocate for the proposed \$500 million augmentation for the ATP. Rachel stated that through the Central Coast Coalition, of which RTC is a member, a letter of support was submitted on the State Budget asking to increase funds for ATP by \$2 billion, as well as requesting augmentation to the State Transportation Improvement Program, Highway Safety Improvement Program, the bridge program, and other transportation programs.

11. Next meeting. The next meeting of the ITAC is scheduled for 1:30 p.m. on June 17, 2021 via videoconference (Zoom). ITAC meetings will be canceled if there are no action items to be brought before the committee.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Fernanda Dias Pini, RTC Transportation Planning Tech

Attendees:

408****292

Carey Pico

Brian Peoples

Jessica Evans

Ann Kaplan

Barry Scott

Ben Vernazza

cookconstr@cruzio.com

David Van Brink

Sally Arnold

Jack Brown

Jacques Bertrand

Jeanette Guire

Joni. S.

Karellr

Lawrence Kaplan

Mark Johannessen

Mark Mesiti-Miller

Melissa Hartman

Michael Pisano

Nadene Thorne

Tim Brattan