

**Summary of Comments Regarding the
Initial Study for Proposed
Recreational Rail Service**

Was in Will be in
Initial in EIR Phase II
Study Envt. Non-
 Assess- CEQA
 ment Issue Comments

I. Aesthetics	x	x			Based on the consultant's recommendation, the RTC is considering whether to include two visual simulations or arrange for a demonstration of the vehicle proposed for recreational rail service through the corridor
Stations (platform, shelter, lighting, etc.)	x				
Train Headlights	x				
Aesthetics of parked and moving vehicles				x	RTC to consider visual simulations for extra \$ OR secure a demonstration vehicle
View from residences				x	Owners purchased property adjacent to rail line active since 1875
Affect of service on scenic vistas	x				Will enhance access to scenic vistas
Visual impact of retaining walls, if necessary	x				Two retaining walls proposed near terminal platforms
Additional walls				x	Will be considered as part of future Rail/Trail project
II. Agricultural Resources					No comments
III. Air Quality	x	x			The scope of the EIR includes analysis of annual emissions of diesel particulates and other pollutants that may be emitted by the proposed project. The EIR will also compare project emissions with the thresholds of significance of the MBUAPCD to determine effects on regional air quality. Finally, the EIR will include a comparison of project emissions rates to the emission rates of other local diesel emission sources such as medium and heavy duty trucks.
Diesel fumes from rail vehicle including impacts to residents (not just the region) and alternative fuel options	x	x			

Was in Will be in
Initial in EIR Phase II
Study Envt. Non-
 Assess- CEQA
 ment Issue Comments

Pollutants from service conflict with Clean Air intent- Prop 116				x	Purpose of Prop. 116 is to enhance/establish passenger rail service
Diesel fuel exhaust in fog		x			
Impacts different at terminals		x			
Construction emissions		x			
Fan from diesel vehicle send fumes to wider area		x			
Odors from trains		x			
Request that auto pollutions be held to same standard as rail		x		x	RTC follow up - Include comparisons in EIR
Increased pollution from cars idling while waiting for train to cross; if LOS declines from D or better to E or F, need dispersion modeling		x		x	RTC follow up - check with MBUAPCD
Double standard: oppose diesel trains and support Hwy 1 widening				x	RTC sets policy per Regional Transp. Plan (RTP)
Direct & indirect source emissions (VOC and Nox) quantified/assessed		x			
Quantify PM10 from project and construction		x			
Assess exposure to sensitive receptors in adjacent land uses		x			
Mitigation measures necessary for significant impacts, incl effectiveness		x			
Reference new fed ozone standards and 2000 AQMP		x			
IV. Biological Resources	x				As explained at the last commission hearing effects to monarch butterfly and Santa Cruz long-toed salamanders are a winter and/or nighttime threat, neither of which criteria would be met by the proposed spring/summer/fall daytime rail service. Maintenance of vegetation within the ROW is an ongoing process undertaken by UPRR. This process would continue as part of the recreational rail service. The EIR will not include any further analysis of biological resources.

	<u>Was in Initial Study</u>	<u>Will be in EIR</u>	<u>Will be in Phase II Envt. Assess- ment</u>	<u>Non- CEQA Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Monarch Butterfly habitats	x				
Santa Cruz Long Toed Salamander	x				Fish & Game letter dated 11/26/03 says no impacts
Other habitats identified in MTIS	x				
Hidden Beach riparian area				x	Unclear reference
Impacts if vegetation needs to be cleared near crossings for visibility	x				
V. Cultural Resources	x				Mitigation included in the initial study requires that an archeological monitor be present during ground disturbing activities. No further analysis is required.
Archaeological/historical resources	x				
VI. Geology and Soils					The EIR will not include any further analysis of geology & soils. The initial study notes that the project would occur on an existing rail line and no alterations to the rail line are proposed.
	x				
Seismic hazards	x				
Liquefaction/Landslide potential	x				
Landslide	x				
Erosion/Loss of topsoil	x				
Effect of vibration on cliff erosion	x				
Melange, marine sedimentary, volcanic rock, sandstone, greenstone, sheared shale				x	Unclear reference
VII. Hazardous Materials					The EIR will include a summary of the results of the Phase II environmental site assessment.
Creosote (dust, leaching into soil and water)		x	x		Already exists, will be covered in more depth in the Phase II Environmental Assessment, check Romero bill (state) to ban by 2005, confirm whether railroads are exempt from federal standards, Phase II Evt Assessment to be done
Creosote thinned with Benzene or other toxic chemicals			x		
Metals from wheel friction			x		
Diesel fuel spill			x		

	<u>Was in Initial Study</u>	<u>Will be in EIR</u>	<u>Will be in Phase II Envt. Assess- ment</u>	<u>Non- CEQA Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Lead substances from brakes			x		
Ammonia and other chemical spills from derailments			x		
Who pays for toxic cleanup				x	To be negotiated as part of acquisition
Other incidents documented through EPA* in SCZ Co.			x		*and other environmental agencies
Hazardous materials transported via freight			x		Not an issue for this service
Polynuclear aromatic compounds			x		
Where are chemicals stored (fuel, cleaning solvents, etc.)			x		
Potential for trestle fires (releasing creosote into air)				x	RTC follow up
Do exemptions change if ownership changes (RR to RTC)				x	RTC follow up
Old (creosote - soaked) rail ties dumped				x	RTC follow up
VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality	x				The EIR will not include any further analysis of hydrology or water quality. The initial study notes that the project would utilize an existing rail corridor and that no substantial changes to the existing drainage patterns would occur.
Pollution runoff	x				
Runoff into Bay (creosote, diesel, metals)	x				
Rail takes less pavement than roads/parking, more ground absorption				x	RTC follow up - rail vs. auto impacts
IX. Land Use and Planning					No comments
XI. Noise	x	x			The EIR will include analysis of potential noise impacts, including train, train horns, and crossing device sounds. The EIR includes analysis of measurements taken at 3 different locations within the corridor and the estimated increase in sound attributed to the proposed project. The EIR will also include an analysis of potential vibration impacts of the proposed project.

	<u>Was in Initial Study</u>	<u>Will be in EIR</u>	<u>Will be in Phase II Envt. Assess- ment</u>	<u>Non- CEQA Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Provide visual comparisons to other sounds, weights, size, HP, etc.		x			
Train sounds (general operations, revving, start, stop, idle)		x			Provide impacts to residents (not the region), include noise induced hearing loss (NIHL) info
Horn sounds		x			Identify when train whistle would sound
Crossing device sounds		x			
Vibration		x			including sub-sonic frequencies
Hours of Freight traffic		x			
Sonic frequencies		x			
Freight compared with Budd rail cars		x			weight, horsepower
Idling times at terminus		x			
Announcement system at platforms				x	Announcement systems are visual, not audible (low light scrolling words/times)
Echo effect of nearby trees		x			
Fear of increased noise during sleeping hours				x	Proposed Rec Rail service hours are 10:00 am - 8:00 pm
Sensitivity to pets also needs to be considered (dogs - hi-frequency)				x	RTC follow up
Rubber wheeled alternative considered to reduce noise				x	No options currently available
XII. Population and Housing	x	x			The EIR will not include any further analysis of this issue area. The project would not increase population or the need for housing in the area, nor would it require a zoning change.
Impact on residents	x				
Growth inducing	x				
Environmental justice	x				
Requires zoning/land use changes	x				
XIII. Public Services					No comments
XIV. Recreation	x				The EIR will not include any further analysis of this issue area. The project would not adversely affect existing recreation areas; it would encourage more efficient use of existing parks by people already travelling to Santa Cruz.

	<u>Was in Initial Study</u>	<u>Will be in EIR</u>	<u>Will be in Phase II Envt. Assess- ment</u>	<u>Non- CEQA Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Hidden Beach Park				x	
New Brighton Beach				x	Project provides enhanced coastal access
Seacliff Beach				x	" " " "
XV. Transportation and Safety	x	x			The EIR will include a discussion of safety, including a review of accidents and derailments and projected future accidents based on national standards. The EIR will also include a discussion of crossing safety and recommendations, if required, to improve crossings pursuant to California PUC regulations.
Include delay (compare to standard traffic signal)		x			The EIR will include analysis of 6 intersections for existing level of service and effect of project on average delay.
Service will cause congestion		x			
Parking		x			The EIR will include a discussion of parking availability in the vicinity of each station.
Impact on congestion (local roads & Hwy 1)		x			
Bus connection infrastructure (needed?)		x			
Impacts on existing bus service - Routes 54, 55, 56				x	Project expected to draw different riders, Route 56 does not serve Capitola Village
Higher speed trains (clarify whether service would be Class I or II)		x			Condition of the tracks upgraded (new ties, ballast) to allow safer, faster operations (up to 25 MPH)
Potential impact to emergency vehicles		x			
Prepare according to CT's Guide for Prep of Traffic Impact Studies		x			
Include LOS impact to state highway system		x			consistent w/ the Highway Capacity Manual
Determine Trip Generation rates		x			based in ITE's Trip Generation Report
Include existing & cumulative trip volumes in the corridor		x			incl State Highway system
Include trip reduction measures		x			Project itself is a trip-reduction measure
Include encroachment permit for Hwy 1, if improvements needed				x	Staff to research, Encroachment permit may also be needed from railroad for Hwy 1 improvements
Increased traffic from people getting to the platforms		x			Impacts to 41st Avenue
New Brighton Road may need improvements		x			crossing steep on one side, potentially blind bend

<u>Was in Initial Study</u>	<u>Will be in EIR</u>	<u>Will be in Phase II Envt. Assess- ment</u>	<u>Non- CEQA Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-----------------

Will additional stoplights be needed around stations?		x			
New crossing mechanisms necessary?		x			
Consider people incl. non-drivers (kids, elderly & disabled) not just congestion (cars)				x	RTC sets policy per RTP
How will the risk of freight/rec rail train collisions be minimized				x	An operating plan will be developed through acquisition process
Eliminate Freight rail service				x	Not possible per Common Carrier laws
Tree trimming issues at Mar Vista				x	Unclear reference

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems	x	x			The EIR will not include any further analysis of utilities and services. No new utilities would be required, and the stations would not include restroom facilities or other facilities that would require water or wastewater disposal services.
Evaluate use of solar power at train stations and for other uses				x	Can be evaluated if service goes forward

OTHER ISSUES

Safety/Security		x			The EIR will include a discussion of safety as summarized under Transportation above.
Derailments - injury/property damage potential		x			
Condition of trestles				x	Assessed as part of acquisition Business plan
Crime/Vandalism				x	Historical activity and what happens with more corridor activity
Fire Hazards				x	Unclear reference
How will the corridor be patrolled				x	RTC follow up
Will electrical switches/boxes be needed?				x	RTC follow up
Security of cars parked while using service				x	No different than other parking situations
Train passes w/in 1/4 mile fro New Brighton Middle & Cap Elementary				x	Not within zone of potential impacts

Costs

	<u>Was in Initial Study</u>	<u>Will be in EIR</u>	<u>Will be in Phase II Envt. Assess- ment</u>	<u>Non- CEQA Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Funding/Spectrum of Costs - need for add'tl tax \$, upgrades to system, operation/maintenance				x	Project in initial stages, preliminary funding identified
Costs of storing trains during non-operating periods				x	The private operator will be responsible for developing an operating plan
Matched funds could be better used				x	Funds allocated per goals/policies in RTP
Financial stability of rec rail service				x	To be determined
Loss of property taxes from UP ownership				x	\$28,000/year
Property Values				x	Owners located next to active rail line
Compensation to property owners				x	Owners purchased property next to rail line active since 1875
Liability Insurance, who pays				x	RTC follow up via acquisitionBusiness Plan
Financial impact of new service on existing rec rail services				x	

Coastal Rail/Trail

Rail Trail analysis (Master Plan, EIR) should be concurrent				x	Separate projects in RTP
Bicycle/Pedestrian Path dangerous				x	Master Plan will consider safety issues
Not enough room for bikes on adj. streets if diverted from rail ROW				x	Master Plan will consider alignment issues
Service should serve Santa Cruz				x	RTC selected Cap-Aptos/Seascape segment at May 03 public hearing
Are decision makers acting without 'conflicts of interest'				x	Commissioners are legally required to excuse themselves from decisions where there would be a conflict of interest
Laws pertaining to bike/ped use in active rail corridor				x	Master Plan will consider applicable laws

Vehicle Type

Bring in a similar type train for the public to experience				x	Efforts are being made to bring in a Budd RDC used in summer months for Oregon recreational rail service
Consider a rubber (rather than steel) wheeled trolley bus in corridor				x	RTC follow up

<u>Was in Initial Study</u>	<u>Will be in EIR</u>	<u>Will be in Phase II Envt. Assess- ment</u>	<u>Non- CEQA Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	---	--------------------------------	-----------------

Consider Bio Diesel, rather than regular diesel, (100% vegetable oil)		x			
Consider non-diesel (solar power, battery, electrification)				x	Not feasible or available at this time
Consider Personal Rapid Transit (Taxi 2000) instead of a DMU				x	Not included in considerations until a successfully functioning example exists

Ridership

Calculation of visitor use/new trips & ridership per station				x	Recreational Rail Options report: 10,000 - 25,000 trips based on three trains/day; ridership expected to be highest at end stations, Capitola, Aptos & Seascape Villages
Beneficiaries: Residents vs. Visitors				x	RTC follow up
Buses v.s. trains				x	Trains us exclusive right of way, not subject to as many traffic signals and crossings, visitors more interested in trains than buses
Include proposed service & frequency description		x			

Misc.

Hours of freight traffic				x	Freight has priority right of way and will continue to operate per Common Carrier laws; acquisition agreement may address allowable hours of freight service.
Consider doubling the tracks in some sections				x	
Privacy				x	RTC follow up
No restrooms				x	RDC cars have restrooms
Jade Street Station				x	No longer being considered
Segmentation/Evaluate entire corridor				x	Unclear reference; environmental review conducted on acquisition of entire corridor
Rail ROW a redevelopment or enterprise zone area				x	RTC follow up
Impact of Foreign Trade Zone/NAFTA				x	RTC follow up
Infrastructure needed for Tourist Trolley		x			Describe in EIR
Possibility of eminent domain, deed restrictions, etc.				x	None identified at this time

	<u>Was in Initial Study</u>	<u>Will be in EIR</u>	<u>Will be in Phase II Envt. Assess- ment</u>	<u>Non- CEQA Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Utility location increased in corridor if in public ownership				x	RTC follow up
Delete extension to Seascapes				x	May not be included in initial phase of service, but included now to assess environmental impacts
Connect rail system with Greater Bay Area or Mont. County				x	Monterey County is pursuing an extension of Caltrain with a station in Pajaro/Watsonville Junction; Hwy 17 corridor not feasible at this time
Real estate law requirements regarding disclosures				x	Realtor's responsibility
How will trash and debris be minimized				x	Included in train operator contract
Total trip time		x			Approx. 20 minutes one way
Wheelchair access		x		x	Wheelchair access will be designed into the platforms as in the Preliminary Project Report
Define criteria used to determine whether impact significant		x			
Project consistent with SCCRTC's 2001 RTP				x	See Policies 1.5.3, 2.5.2 & 2.5.3 and Projects CAP-P18, SC-P74, RTC-3, RTC-P3 & RTC-21B
Construction impacts		x			
Additional storage facilities (buildings) needed?				x	None needed
Speeds of 15 - 25 MPH appropriate for residential areas				x	Rec rail would not run faster than 15-25 MPH
Coastal Commission review required for service/stations?				x	RTC follow up
Jurisdiction of the rail corridor				x	Under negotiation with UP
Joint trackage and interchange agreement w/ Roaring Camp/Big Trees may be needed				x	To be determined
Impact to people currently trespassing on the ROW				x	People on rail ROW are illegally trespassing
Project represents the will of the people				x	Included in RTP policies
Rec Rail first step towards more passenger train service				x	Depends on future RTP policy
Ridership not feasible unless high density land use supported				x	Project not dependent on high density land uses

	<u>Was in Initial Study</u>	<u>Will be in EIR</u>	<u>Will be in Phase II Envt. Assess- ment</u>	<u>Non- CEQA Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Consider a tunnel from Aptos or Soquel to Hwy 85				x	Not in RTP
Ridership estimates are low given scenic beauty				x	Ridership estimates may be conservative
How will trains be turned around at ends				x	Proposed rail cars (Budd RDC) are bi-directional
Use understandable comparisons for train types (i.e. 18 Wheeler truck to Honda car)		x			
Homeowners purchased property on a rail line active since before they were born and should take personal responsibility				x	
Use a 50-year planning horizon				x	RTP uses a 25-year planning horizon
Consider a less frequent, shorter alternative		x			Already an alternative
Include hedge/vegetation planting as mitigation		x			
Evaluate special event train service impacts		x			

Key:

IS - Initial Study

EIR - Environmental Impact Report

PPR - Preliminary Project Report

RRO - Recreational Rail Options