

From: [Pete Haworth](#)
To: [Regional Transportation Commission](#); [REDACTED]; [Sandy Brown](#); jacques.bertrand@sbcglobal.net; eduardo.montesino@cityofwatsonville.org; [Randy Johnson](#); ladykpetersen@gmail.com; [Greg Caput](#); [Ryan Coonerty](#); zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; [Manu Koenig](#); [Bruce McPherson](#); [Mike Rotkin](#); tim.gubbins@dot.ca.gov
Subject: Advisory Ballot Measure
Date: Friday, January 28, 2022 1:46:06 PM

I am writing regarding the advisory ballot measure proposed by Brown, Montesino, and Rotkin to be discussed at the February 3rd 2022 RTC meeting. The gist of it is essentially the same as a letter from Mr Rotkin to the Sentinel several weeks ago and it's as riddled with fallacious arguments now as it was then.

Exposing the county to a cost of up to \$1million dollars for this is financially irresponsible. In addition, suggesting that it could be paid for out of Measure D funds is ridiculous. County voters who approved Measure D certainly had no intention of the funds being used for politically motivated projects such as an advisory ballot measure. Even if it were possible to use Measure D funds, that's \$1million that would not be available to the projects Measure D was intended to support.

The Greenway ballot initiative includes the following statement in section 2.2:

"The Greenway would allow for commuting, active transportation, and recreation while preserving the option for future rail use through railbanking, a federal program that allows an existing rail corridor to be used as a trail and leaves certain infrastructure, including bridges and trestles, for potential future rail use."

Section 3.2 includes:

"Prioritize interim use of existing trestles and railbed for the Greenway, while preserving future rail options through railbanking."

Should the Greenway initiative pass and if at some time in the future the county voters decide that they support passenger rail, it's abundantly clear that would be possible. That's the whole point of railbanking but apparently that is lost on Brown, Montesino, and Rotkin.

The letter to the RTC from the proposers includes *"Given the width of the rail corridor, the only way to build a trail meeting these specifications would be to remove the railroad tracks."* This in direct contradiction of Section 3.7.3 of the Greenway ballot initiative which states *"While development of the full multi-lane Greenway is encouraged where feasible, support reduced Greenway widths where necessary to accommodate physical barriers, minimize environmental impacts, or avoid the need for new infrastructure, like major retaining walls, in order to reduce costs and expedite implementation."* Apparently Brown, Montesino, and Rotkin didn't take the time to read the Greenway initiative or, more likely, chose to simply ignore the parts that don't support their claims.

Finally, I find the statement "The initiative would not apply to the Commission or substantially impact or necessarily guide any of our decisions." to be astounding. If the Greenway initiative passes, it will be a clear signal that county voters do not support a passenger rail service at this time and for the RTC to ignore that would be

unacceptable. No doubt Brown, Montesion, and Rotkin would hypocritically rush to state that "the people have spoken" should their advisory ballot measure result in a "yes" vote majority.

In conclusion, please do not recommend that this ill-conceived, hugely expensive, misleading advisory ballot be allowed to proceed.

--

Peter Haworth
Soquel.

From: [Joe Martinez](#)
To: alnorthc@cabrillo.edu; sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; ibertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; eduardo.montesino@cityofwatsonville.org; greg.caput@santacruzcounty.us; "Ryan Coonerty."; "Bruce McPherson."; "Zach Friend."; ladykpetersen@gmail.com; "Manu Koenig."; "Mike Rotkin."; [Regional Transportation Commission](#); [Robert Quinn](#)
Subject: Feb 3rd RTC Meeting Input for Item"s #22 & #23
Date: Sunday, January 30, 2022 10:39:30 AM

Commissioners,

The information to be presented on Item #22 has been presented before and discussed, at length. This information, provided by the RTC, clearly supports rail banking. Please, do your job, move forward with railbanking.

If there is a vote on February 3 to rail bank, please support and vote YES for rail banking.

Item #23 is quite simple: Vote NO! Mr. Rotkin's proposed ballot just another attempt to confuse Santa Cruz County voters—and that is what this proposed ballot measure will do.

Please move forward NOW. Rail bank the corridor. Preserve future rail options. Build a wide, continuous, multi use trail NOW.

Sincerely,

Jose Martinez

From: [Doug Huskey](#)
To: [Regional Transportation Commission](#)
Cc: [Mike Rotkin](#); [Sandy Brown](#); [Jacques Bertrand](#); eduardo.montesino@cityofwatsonville.org; [Alta Northcutt](#); [Greg Caput](#); [Bruce McPherson](#); zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; [Randy Johnson](#); [Tim Gubbins](#); manu.koenig@santacruzcounty.us; [Kristen Petersen](#)
Subject: Feb 3rd meeting: Item 23: DO Not put a 2nd ballot measure on the June ballot -- too confusing
Date: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 12:04:32 PM

We urge the RTC to **not approve** item 23 to put an advisory measure on the June ballot. Such a measure is confusing when there already is an approved ballot measure on the subject. This advisory measure is designed to specifically confuse the public with two competing measures about the same subject.

One of the primary issues with the current preferred alternative is a lack of identified funding. Any additional ballot measure should be to raise funds, i.e. a 1/2 to 1 cent sales tax measure to fund the implementation of light rail on the SCBRL. If the RTC is not ready to try to raise the required matching funds for a train, then stop studying and talking and build a two lane divided trail with separate pedestrian facilities along the entire length of the SCBRL from Lee Road to the San Lorenzo river. We need to be using this corridor now and it will make a tremendous asset for active transportation and tourist usage in our county, similar to what Monterrey county has enjoyed for many years with their rail-trail.

Doug and Anna Huskey
[REDACTED] Santa Cruz, CA 95060

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Regional Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: February 3 meeting
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 8:28:01 PM

Dear Commissioners,

I urge you to **support** the proposal to rail bank the coastal rail corridor (Item#22). It makes sense to move forward with the rail banking process.

The Greenway ballot initiative was circulated by over 170 unpaid citizen volunteers for six months who successfully gathered over 13,300 County Clerk validated signatures of county voters. A manipulative maneuver to place alternative "advisory" measure (Item#23) should be **rejected**.

The RTC staff report in today's agenda packet is clear:

"transportation agencies such as the RTC do not tend to place advisory measures on the ballot and due to the way that state law is written, it is not absolutely clear that the RTC can place an advisory measure on the ballot."

The Greenway ballot initiative is clear: it prioritizes a interim use bike and pedestrian trail on the county's rail corridor rather that a potential new commuter rail system. Trust the voters decide.

Respectfully,
Peter Stanger, [REDACTED] Watsonville, CA 95076

From: [Heather Paul](#)
To: [Regional Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: Greenway petition
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 1:01:58 PM

To whom it may concern,

Please do not add another ballot measure in addition to the one Greenway has submitted. Please do not muddle the issues.

Thank you,

Heather Braga
Aptos, CA

From: [Debby Molina](#)
To: [Regional Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: June 2022 ballot initiative
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 10:56:52 AM

Dear RTC Members-

Greenway has collected over 16,000 signatures from Santa Cruz county voters. All signatures were collected entirely by volunteers in all 5 districts. The Santa Cruz community clearly wants to vote on this issue and to move forward, without millions more spent on studies, surveys and reviews. We already have an initiative ready for the June 2022 ballot. There is absolutely no need for the RTC to create an advisory measure. It would be a distraction, a waste of time and money, and unnecessary.

I am absolutely opposed to this new delaying tactic. Let's move forward!

Thank you.

Deb Molina

District 1

[Sent from Yahoo for iPad](#)

From: [Krista Corwin](#)
To: [Luis Mendez](#)
Subject: Public comment on item #23
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 11:45:00 AM

Hi Luis,

Please see the below public comment on item 23. If you would like this comment posted as a handout please let me know.

Thank you,
Krista

From: Jean Brocklebank [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 30, 2022 12:14 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Cc: Sandy Brown <sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com>; jacques.bertrand@sbcglobal.net; eduardo.montesino@cityofwatsonville.org; rlj12@comcast.net; ladykpetersen@gmail.com; Greg Caput <greg.caput@santacruzcounty.us>; Ryan Coonerty <ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>; Zach Friend <zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us>; Manu Koenig <manu.koenig@santacruzcounty.us>; Bruce McPherson <bruce.mcpherson@santacruzcounty.us>; openup@cats.ucsc.edu; tim.gubbins@dot.ca.gov; alnorthc@cabrillo.edu
Subject: February 3 RTC meeting - agenda items #22 and #23

Dear RTC ~

I write in **support** of the RTC's proposal to rail bank the corridor (#22). I have read the RTC's FAQ and studied this enough to know that it makes sense to move forward with rail banking process.

I also write in **opposition** to the RTC creating an "advisory" measure for the June 2022 ballot. This would be a grave waste of funds, especially since there is already a ballot initiative, qualified by 4,000 more registered voters than the 12,000 that were necessary to get it on the ballot (over 16,000 registered voters) - from all 5 supervisorial districts!! All signatures were collected by volunteers. No one was paid to collect signatures!

The Greenway ballot initiative is clear: it essentially prioritizes, as an interim use, a bike and pedestrian trail on the county's rail corridor rather than a potential new commuter rail system.

Sincerely,
Jean Brocklebank
Live Oak
Elderly, low income, daily pedestrian

From: [Marilyn Calciano](#)
To: [Regional Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: RTC Meeting 2/3/22: Items 22 and 23
Date: Wednesday, February 2, 2022 8:20:20 AM

Dear RTC Commissioners,

Thank you so much for your service! I know how frustrated I am by all the misinformation and vitriol regarding rail issues in our county, so I can only try to understand how difficult this must be for each of you. Your dedication to understanding and acting on the facts is very much appreciated.

The work that Mr. Preston and the RTC staff have done is commendable on studying the rail banking issue (#22) in our county, and I would urge you to **support** rail banking as the best way to protect our corridor.

I also urge you to **reject** the “advisory” measure (#23) to add another measure to the ballot. The Greenway initiative is very clear and went through the democratic process with over 170 volunteers gathering certified signatures from over 13,000 citizens from all parts of the county. Please do not undermine this process by adding a confusing, costly, and cynical political ploy that did not go through this rigorous process to the ballot.

With gratitude,
Marilyn Calciano
Soquel
Community Volunteer

From: [Nadene Thorne](#)
To: eduardo.montesino@cityofwatsonville.org; [Sandy Brown](#); [Ryan Coonerty](#); [Andy Schiffrin](#); lowell.hurst@cityofwatsonville.org; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; alnorthc@cabrillo.edu; [Michael Rotkin](#)
Cc: [Regional Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: Time to Speak Up and Stop the Misinformation Campaigns
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 9:38:32 AM

Commissioners,

As a Greenway supporter and a close follower of Santa Cruz city and county issues for the last several years, I urge you to do your best to quell to onslaught of misinformation and outright lies that are being promulgated among those of your constituents who support a train on the rail corridor. You have all been apprised of the financial requirements for any near-term rail project, and I see none of you promoting a ballot initiative for a sales tax increase in order to move that project along. You are also well aware of the RTC staff and director's reports on railbanking, and have seen the jeopardy Sonoma and Marin Counties have found themselves in by not railbanking. Surely you would not allow Santa Cruz to suffer similar litigation by your unwillingness to act, or by your silence in the face of the latest near-hysterical falsehoods.

Greenway volunteers have been willing to 'put their money where their mouth is' by doing the hard work of collecting signatures for a ballot initiative that will most effectively elucidate the wishes of county voters, something the RTC has never done. Now is the time for you to step up to your responsibilities as the commissioners who speak and act in the best interests of the whole county, not just those loudest voices. In the upcoming commission meetings, I ask you to speak up for the truth of issues before you, specifically this week for those concerning plans for Roaring Camp and the rest of the rail corridor, and look to making decisions which will accomplish the most transportation options for the most people soonest and at a cost we can afford.

Thank you,
Nadene Thorne
[REDACTED]
Santa Cruz 95060