

Attachment 2
Summary of Comments Received on Draft RFP

Staff received a number of comments on the draft RFP. All comments are addressed below and are attached if they were submitted in writing. Revisions to the draft RFP resulting from these comments are already included in the draft RFP.

RTC's Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) - The E&D TAC representative to AMBAG's Sanctuary Scenic Trail Committee requested that the California Conservation Corps (CCC) be included as an agency with whom to coordinate planning and implementation activities. California Conservation Corps is not included due to the large number of other agencies named and the fact that the CCC tends to be involved with wilderness walking trails..

Caltrans – Requested that Task 3, item g, be removed and that the most appropriate implementing agency of each segment not be identified. Caltrans staff advised that the lead agency for trail construction should be the jurisdiction through which a trail segment traverses and highly discourages co-op agreements for construction of federally funded projects. Staff recommends not omitting Task 3, item g, at this time in the event that a segment overlaps jurisdictional boundaries and a lead agency may need to be identified.

Caltrans also requested that under the Proposal Contents – Section B: Demonstrated Knowledge (page 4), the bullet “engineering and design” be changed to “trail planning and design”. Caltrans additionally recommends deleting “surveying and right of way acquisition.” Staff recommends adding the words “trail planning” to the first bullet and not deleting references to other areas of expertise. Potentially, the more experience and knowledge a consultant has, the higher the quality of the work product to be received.

Santa Cruz Port District - Submitted a written comment ([Exhibit 1](#)) requesting that the agency be referred to as the Santa Cruz Port District (as opposed to Santa Cruz Yacht Harbor) and that reference to its coordination activities be changed to "Coordinate Trail with improvements through Santa Cruz Harbor." Staff recommends accepting this comment for inclusion.

City of Santa Cruz - No changes to the RFP were requested. City Public Works staff suggested (in [Exhibit 2](#)) inclusion of wording regarding providing the proposals on double-sided recycled paper and recycled plastic binding, should it be used. Staff recommends including wording regarding use of double-sided paper and recycled plastic materials.

RTC's Bike Committee – The Bicycle Committee representative to AMBAG's Sanctuary Scenic Trail Committee expressed concern regarding the limited budget for the extensive scope of the project. No changes were requested.

California Coastal Commission – Coastal Commission staff recommends creating 3 or 4 intermediate milestones as checkpoints which would be considered with key partnering agencies to allow for review opportunities before critical junctures are reached. Coastal Commission staff also recommends spelling out the relationship and decision making authority between RTC and advisory committees. Staff recommends addressing these issues as part of the contract scope of work with the selected consultant and also adding

to the presentations list that the consultant will make presentations to the RTC at key milestone junctures.

Coastal Commission staff suggested requesting that the consultant team demonstrate knowledge with basic alignment principles for the California Coastal Trail, the Coastal Act and the California Local Coastal Program public access policies. Staff recommends adding “knowledge of basic coastal access and planning issues” to the list of knowledge areas required.

Coastal Commission staff suggested that the RFP specify in Task 2 of the Scope of Work that segments be delineated which “reflect logical communities of interest and the separate local coastal program jurisdictions”. RTC staff recommends not including this level of detail in an RFP but rather addressing logical segment planning areas as the Master Plan develops.

Coastal Commission staff recommends referencing in Task 3, item j, the “Interpretive Plan already completed in partnership with the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary” as part of the interpretive opportunities analysis. Staff recommends including reference to interpretive plans already developed.

Minor editorial clarifications were also suggested and incorporated, as appropriate.

County Redevelopment Agency (RDA) – The County RDA submitted written comments (Exhibit 3) and expressed concern regarding collaboration between the Master Planning effort and local jurisdictions’ current and planned projects. RDA staff noted that the County RDA, as well as County Parks, was not referenced in the list of agencies with whom to coordinate and that a comprehensive list of relevant and affected departments was not listed. Staff recommends that this omission be corrected by including RDA Departments, local jurisdictions “and relevant departments and agencies”, as well as City and County Parks Departments to the list of agencies with whom to coordinate.

RDA staff recommends requiring the consultant to conduct an inventory of all ongoing efforts underway by local jurisdictions and feasibility assessments which would be dependent on local residents and jurisdictions for input. Staff recommends adding an inventory of all ongoing efforts to the consultant task list; however, staff views feasibility assessments of those efforts to be outside of an appropriate scope for this Master Plan.

Additionally, RDA staff questioned whether consultation regarding planned and current projects would occur at a staff level or at a political body level. Staff recommends monitoring coordination efforts and presentation needs throughout the development of the Master Plan and ensuring that all needed coordination is appropriately completed.

Santa Cruz County Interagency Task Force – The Interagency Task Force Chairperson submitted comments (Exhibit 4) requesting that specific mention be made of the work done to date by the group and that the work products developed by the Task Force be identified. See the response to the fourth comment by the California Coastal Commission above. Staff further recommends adding the wording “existing trail plans” to the list of plans included in Task 8: Long-Range Transportation Planning.

A request was also made for a clear focus on the closest access to the coast and ability to see the Monterey Bay from the Trail. Staff proposes to include the direction that the Trail Network will provide coastal access or coastal viewing opportunities where possible.

Another comment emphasized that the “main focus is not as a transportation plan” and that the Interagency Task Force has always emphasized the multi-use aspect of facilities it identified. Staff strongly recommends continuing the emphasis on multi-use facilities. However, staff does not recommend changing the language of the RFP for the Master Plan so as to de-emphasize transportation elements since providing transportation facilities is the primary mandate of the federal earmark funding secured by Congressman Farr and the funds programmed by the RTC.

The Interagency Task Force Chairperson requested that some of the funding available be used at the current time to purchase trail markers for jurisdictions planning or completing improvements along the Trail identified by the Interagency Task Force. The Trail identification work conducted by the Interagency Task Force was completed before federal transportation funding became available and at a time when the trail identified was limited to using existing facilities, some of which do not meet current multi-use transportation facility design requirements. Until a comprehensive Master Plan which addresses and analyzes all planning work done to date and potential new alignments is brought together into one document, assigning trail markers is premature. Staff recommends not addressing this comment in the RFP. However, staff does recommend assisting the Interagency Task Force in identifying grant opportunities appropriate for funding trail markers.

County of Santa Cruz Public Works – RTC staff received a phone inquiry from County of Public Works staff regarding how construction funds will be disbursed once the Master Plan and Environmental Review has been completed and the degree to which local jurisdictions will be beholden to construct new alignments identified. Staff indicated that the method by which funds will be disbursed for construction projects has not been identified, but will be determined by the RTC at a later date.

City of Capitola – City staff requested in a letter ([Exhibit 5](#)) that project funds be made available to jurisdictions to implement interpretive and wayfinding programs. As already noted in the RTC’s response to the Santa Cruz Interagency Task Force above, staff believes that it would be premature to designate wayfinding funds before the Master Planning process has been completed. The Master Plan will identify new facilities as well as already identified projects and allow the RTC and the public to prioritize all trail segments and signage features. In addition, the funds available for the project through the RTC from federal earmarks and other sources, are transportation funds which must be used for transportation facilities and limited wayfinding and trail marker signs, not interpretative elements.

City of Capitola staff state that an “11 mile core study area” was identified by the Interagency Task Force and approved by all involved jurisdictions be cited. See response to the first comment from the Santa Cruz County Interagency Task Force. Additionally, from a transportation standpoint, multiple alignments may be necessary to serve a wide variety of users.

City of Capitola staff recommends that the project be named the “Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Scenic Trail” as referenced in programming documents and Congressman Farr’s federal appropriation language. To this title, the RTC added “network” in order to include other similar projects such as the Coastal Trail and Rail Trail into one comprehensive plan. It also allows for including spurs that link to interpretive opportunities and other transportation facilities.

City of Capitola staff recommends citing specific documents in regards to the interpretive features to be considered as part of the Master Plan. See response to the fourth comment from the Coastal Commission. All relevant documents will be provided to the selected consultant.

City staff recommends noting the state mandate on the development and implementation of the California Coastal Trail and the Pacific Coast Bikeway. RTC staff recommends a stronger reference to development of the California Coastal Trail, but understands from Caltrans staff that there is no mandate on local jurisdictions to maintain the Pacific Coast Bikeway system.

City of Capitola staff requested that one or two representatives from the Interagency Task Force be made part of the consultant selection committee. RTC staff notes that Commissioner Ellen Pirie expressed interest in serving on the selection committee. Commissioner Pirie is a member of the Interagency Task Force and also serves as Chair of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Government’s two-county Sanctuary Scenic Trail Committee representing the County of Santa Cruz. Additionally, Commissioner Andy Schiffrin who also expressed interest in serving on the Committee represents the County of Santa Cruz. RTC staff has a list of interested individuals and stakeholder agencies that should ensure well-rounded and comprehensive proposal evaluations.

A comment was made stating that the committee (we assume this was meant to refer to the consultant) shall work with the Interagency Task Force in addition to the RTC, TAMC and AMBAG. The Interagency Task Force is one of the many groups that will be consulted throughout the development of this project.

Regarding universal access, Capitola staff recommends developing a constraints map and a “user’s guide” showing levels of difficulty for those with physical challenges (slope, surface material, etc). Where possible, RTC staff will recommend adding this level of analysis of potential segments as part of the constraints analysis, but development of a “user’s guide” is considered more appropriate following construction efforts as part of project implementation.

City staff supported the development of the trail north to the San Mateo County line, but noted that it should be accompanied by the development of “an associated Interpretive and Wayfinding Program.” As discussed above, the funds available for the project from federal earmarks and other sources, are transportation funds which must be used for transportation facilities and limited wayfinding signs, not interpretative programs. This is reflected in the direction of the RFP scope of work for the Davenport to Monterey County line as well as the Davenport to San Mateo County line.

Finally, City of Capitola staff noted that as part of CEQA, an Alternatives Analysis for the project is required and does not appear in the RFP. RTC addressed an Alternatives

Analysis in Task 5 Subsection A, Item b which states that the consultant is to provide a “a summary of the proposed trail network and alternatives.” Staff will ensure compliance under CEQA.