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INPUT FROM PARTNER AGENCIES

December 04, 2018 - January 09, 2019
Attached is the Caltrans comment letter for the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCIS).

John Olejnik, Senior Transportation Planner
Planning Management Liaison
California Dept of Transportation
50 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA  93401
(805) 542-4751
john.olejnik@dot.ca.gov
December 28, 2018

Mr. Guy Preston
Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Mr. Preston:

Caltrans District 5 and Headquarters Division of Rail and Mass Transportation appreciates SCCRTC’s efforts to address existing transportation challenges and future needs of Santa Cruz County through the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCIS). Following our joint review, we support and will continue to work with SCCRTC on the next steps that lead toward implementation of the preferred UCIS scenario. Since the preferred UCIS scenario promotes multimodal system investments, the study should position the Santa Cruz region for future funding opportunities from a variety of programs. Projects in the Highway 1 corridor identified in the UCIS could be competitive for the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) funds. The California Transportation Commission specifies the SCCP requirements for proposed projects to be evaluated in a corridor plan; the UCIS will likely meet the corridor plan requirements.

Caltrans continues to emphasize the vision of HOV lanes on Highway 1 and passenger rail service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, providing regional and statewide connectivity. Investments in both Highway 1 HOV lanes and branch line passenger rail service are not mutually exclusive and can support a shared vision of improved connections and travel time reliability in the Santa Cruz region. Caltrans stresses that it is vital for SCCRTC to preserve rail rights-of-way for rail service, particularly where there has been a public investment to purchase rail lines for this purpose as is the case with the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line and conditions established under Proposition 116 (1990). It is also vital to preserve this rail line because it aligns with the State Rail Plan vision for service and connectivity in the region.

The Rail Plan identifies the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line facility as a key corridor for providing passenger rail connectivity to this popular destination in the Central Coast, with connections to the San Francisco Bay Area and High-Speed Rail at Gilroy, as well as to the rest of the Central Coast region. This rail facility provides an alternative route into and out of the area if highways are closed due to weather, severe traffic-related incidents, or other emergencies. The Highway 1 HOV lanes also support this vision by providing integrated express bus services in the HOV lanes, offering timed connections to local, regional, and interregional destinations at the future rail mobility hubs.

The 2040 vision for full build-out of the Rail Plan’s integrated network of high-speed, intercity and commuter rail, and integrated express bus will yield significant ridership increases statewide and in
specific corridors. In Santa Cruz, total demand for inter-regional rail and connected transit trips will be about 2.1 million annually, compared with just over 550,000 in the 2040 no-build scenario. Regionally, the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) is advancing a rail extension project to Monterey County with $10M in Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) funding. This creates opportunities to expand Central Coast ridership gains sooner than the 2040 horizon. TAMC’s award includes an additional $500k for network integration planning in the region that will specifically address connectivity issues, including station area planning, schedule coordination, and ticketing integration throughout the Monterey Bay, South Bay Area, and Santa Cruz region. Taken together, there is substantial State support to deliver rail improvements in Santa Cruz.

There are also significant funding opportunities available from the State that can provide a pathway for advancing Santa Cruz County connections as part of the statewide network, now supported by SBI funding – building on the State’s investment in the corridor through Proposition 116 bonds. CalSTA’s recent announcement of new funding eligible to emerging corridors from the SB 1 State Rail Assistance (SRA) program is an opportunity for the region to advance plans and develop projects as part of a Central Coast regional rail network with connections to a statewide system. Caltrans recommends SCCRTC pursue an application for SRA funding to support network integration service planning in Santa Cruz and connections to the work initiated through TAMC’s TIRCP award.

This planning will identify the basic infrastructure components necessary for passenger rail operations on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line that address State Rail Plan service goals at a minimum, and any additional regional objectives for service. Environmental review activities for specific projects could be advanced through a subsequent SRA application, based on published guidelines, to clear projects for design and construction phases that could be funded through a future TIRCP grant, the STIP, and any regional funds that are available to deliver improvements.

Lastly, Caltrans supports regional efforts to develop the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for passenger rail use, including development of a parallel bicycle trail – both of which are consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Monterey Bay area and meeting regional greenhouse gas emissions targets. During the Rail Plan public comment period, many people expressed support for preserving the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line as a passenger rail facility as well as investing in a rail-trail corridor parallel to the tracks.

As stated previously, Caltrans supports and will continue to work with SCCRTC on the next steps that lead toward implementation of the preferred UCIS scenario. We look forward to the resulting final action on the preferred scenario on January 17, 2019. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (805) 549-3510 or kelly.mcclendon@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

KELLY MCCLENDON
Senior Transportation Planner
Branch Chief - District 5 Transportation Planning North
November 30, 2018

Supervisor John Leopold  
Chair, Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  

John,  

On November 16, 2018, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) Board of Directors approved the following recommendations to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) related to the Unified Corridor Investment Study:

1. Support Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Lite operational improvements in the Soquel Avenue/Soquel Drive/Freedom Boulevard corridor.
3. Commit to a public mass transit service and facility in the Rail Corridor, and:
   o Non-Mode Specific Alternatives Analysis: Begin implementation planning in the near term by conducting a comprehensive alternatives analysis to determine the most appropriate mode of public transit for the Rail Corridor; and  
   o Add a full analysis of specific operations and capital funding sources to the alternatives analysis; and  
   o Support mass transit use in the rail corridor in which mass transit would run adjacent to bike and pedestrian facilities, but not under the “rail banking” concept; and  
   o Support an RTC policy that would commit to funding METRO with TDA-LTF, TDA-STA and TDA-SGR at current percentage levels in perpetuity.

The METRO Board staff report for this item (#15) is attached.

The METRO Board requests that the RTC facilitate the development of a scope of work by the two agencies’ staffs for an alternatives analysis, which would iteratively develop and compare the most cost effective and efficient approaches to providing a high capacity mass transit service; taking into consideration operating and capital costs, land use development opportunities and impacts, and using realistic assumptions about the County’s public transit funding capacity.

Any major public transit facility and services proposed for the corridor would require significant local, state and/or federal funding. An alternatives analysis conforming to New Starts and Small Starts documentation requirements seems an essential
prerequisite to receiving federal funding for a major capital investment such as a rail or BRT project.

State of METRO

METRO is in the midst of developing a 10-Year Strategic Business Plan identifying priorities and funding capacity for the agency, a timeframe in which a mass transit solution could be implemented in the rail corridor.

METRO has only recently achieved a relatively stable budget with the injection of funding from Measure D and SB-1. Current funding levels are always under threat from changing economic conditions and funding allocation levels from external agencies.

Currently METRO is only able to maintain its bus service at a minimally effective level with available funding and it is acknowledged that in order to attract additional riders there is a need to increase the frequency and span of existing service prior to pursuing new services.

The METRO Board looks forward to working with the RTC to establish a realistically fundable solution in this corridor as part of effective countywide public transit network, and one that will not negatively impact METRO’s current funding levels, inclusive of any growth.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Bruce McPherson, Chair
Santa Cruz METRO Board

Enc: November 16, 2018 METRO Board Item #15
Mr. Guy Preston  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  

RE: Comments on the Unified Corridor Investment Study  

Dear Mr. Preston:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Unified Corridor Investment Study for the Santa Cruz to Watsonville corridors. My staff and I have reviewed the document and provide the following technical comments for your consideration.

Since announced in 2013, the University of California, under the leadership of President Janet Napolitano, has been working aggressively towards its goal of becoming the first university to reach carbon neutrality for its buildings and campus fleets by 2025, and to reach full carbon neutrality, including all air and commute emissions, by 2050. Every UC campus is working diligently to improve system efficiencies, implement new technologies, and educate future generations on the importance of sustaining our planet by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving equitable and affordable transportation options for all campus affiliates and visitors.

To provide guidance, the University’s Office of the President has adopted Sustainable Practices guidelines for each campus to achieve carbon neutrality. Specifically, “the University recognizes that single-occupant vehicle (SOV) commuting is a primary contributor to commute GHG emissions and localized transportation impacts” and each campus has committed to offering a full range of transportation options to encourage affiliates to travel to the campus via non-SOV modes. UCSC has long employed effective parking management policies, the provision of extensive transit services through Santa Cruz Metro and a Campus Transit program, as well as the implementation of numerous transportation demand management programs including an extensive vanpool program, carpool programs, a variety of bike programs, and carsharing. UCSC has been very successful in reducing vehicle trips made to campus, lowering VMT, and reducing overall parking demand and GHG levels associated with transportation to and from campus. Along with providing substantial student and staff housing on campus (which reduces overall trip-making to campus), these programs demonstrate UCSC’s commitment toward reducing transportation-related impacts in our community.

The University’s Sustainable Practices policies specifically identify the following goals:

**By 2025, each location shall strive to reduce its percentage of employees and students commuting by SOV by 10% relative to its 2015 SOV commute rates.** At UCSC, we are working to achieve a 33% overall SOV rate, compared to 36% in 2015.

**By 2050, each location shall strive to have no more 40% of its employees and no more than 30% of all employees and students commuting to the location by SOV.** Currently, UCSC has an employee SOV rate of 54% and an overall SOV rate of 36.8%.

Consistent with the State of California goal of increasing alternative fuel – specifically electric – vehicle usage, the University shall promote purchases and support investment in alternative fuel infrastructure at each location. **By 2025, each location shall strive to have at least 4.5% of commuter vehicles be ZEV.**
By 2050, each location shall strive to have at least 30% of commuter vehicles be ZEV. UCSC’s current share of ZEV vehicles is 1.8%.

In addition, the Sustainable Practices recommend that “each location is encouraged to partner with local agencies on opportunities to improve sustainable transportation access to and around university facilities in addition to developing its own transportation programs.”

Recognizing that the University cannot wait to act to reach 2050 Scope 3 (commuter) Carbon Neutrality Initiative goals, the UCSC Campus Sustainability Plan also offers specific interim transportation related goals and priorities to be sure the campus is making continued progress towards carbon neutrality:

Reduce commute travel mode impacts relative to a 2017 baseline by:

- reducing Scope 3 commuter greenhouse gas emissions 10 percent by 2022;
- reducing commute vehicle miles travelled (VMT) five percent by 2022;
- and reducing per capita parking demand 10 percent by 2022.

One strategy the CSP specifically calls out for UCSC is to “increase transit ridership to/from campus by 10 percent” through collaboration with “Santa Cruz Metro Transit District (SCMTD) to increase capacity and frequency of service on UC Santa Cruz routes, including incorporation of articulated buses and new routes to UC Santa Cruz satellite locations.” Overall, UCSC is working to get more people out of personal vehicles and into human-powered and other sustainable forms of transit or multi-occupant travel.

Another CSP Strategy is for UCSC to “explore creative funding options for sustainable transportation programs that reduce vehicle trips and address social justice implications of the current fee structure being heavily supported by student fees”

UCSC’s sustainable transportation programs implemented to date include:

- **Public Transit:** “Fare-free” boarding of all Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD) routes operating within Santa Cruz County. Under this longstanding program, UCSC affiliates made nearly 2.6 million boardings during 2017-18—more than 54% of all Metro in-county ridership—and paid more than $4.4 million in revenue to SCMTD.

- **Commuter Vanpools:** UCSC facilitates fourteen 12-passenger vanpools operating from locations in Santa Cruz, Monterey and Santa Clara counties, accommodating an average of 130 riders each work day.

- **Carsharing:** Since 2007 UCSC has contracted with Zipcar to provide short-term car rentals or “carsharing” to accommodate students, staff, and faculty who choose not to own or have private cars at UCSC. More than 9,000 UCSC affiliates and 1,600 community members have access to hourly rental of twenty-three cars located on-campus and another eight located around the City of Santa Cruz.

- **Bike Programs:** UCSC provides a free “Bike Shuttle” service transporting an average of 160 cyclists each weekday from the Santa Cruz westside to the main campus. In addition, numerous bike safety programs are provided to the campus community, including giveaways of bike helmets and lights.
• **Mode Split:** Studies conducted in Spring 2018 at the two campus entrances indicate that nearly 62% of all trips made to and from the UCSC main campus rely on a sustainable transportation mode, including 26.3% on SCMTD transit, 21.5% in multi-occupant cars, 11.8% in other TDM programs (i.e. Commuter Vanpools, campus-operated Day & Night Shuttles, and the Bike Shuttle), 1.7% bicycling, and 0.3% walking.

**General UCIS comments:**

Given the Carbon Neutrality and Sustainability goals of the University, our staff provide the following comments for your consideration of future investments along the unified corridor:

1. **UCSC supports the Preferred Scenario that includes “a range of transportation options” that include highway improvements, bus service enhancements, and passenger rail service along with significant bike and pedestrian improvements.** UCSC operates two satellite campuses located immediately adjoining (2300 Delaware site) or within ½ mile (Coastal Science Campus) of the rail corridor. SCMTD operates extensive direct bus transit service to the main campus along both Bay Street (via Routes 15, 16 and 19) and Western Drive (via Routes 20, 20D, and 22)—both of which offer convenient transfer opportunities to rail/bus transit near the Bay/California intersection and on Natural Bridges Drive.

   Given UCSC’s transit-reliant population for travel to these campus locations, transit along this new corridor could result in significant trip reduction, GHG and VMT reductions as well as time savings for our affiliates. The UCIS shows that transit ridership would increase significantly to 6% or 5.3% of all commuters with transit services along this corridor. As numerous commuting campus affiliates reside in mid-county and south county locations, this new rail transit service could help us achieve the CNI goals mentioned above. In addition, according to the UCIS, scenarios that develop rail and/or bus transit along the rail corridor are the only options that ultimately reduce overall vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gases (GHG), major goals for the UCSC Sustainability Plan.

2. **We concur with the recommendation of the City of Santa Cruz to include two additional projects—multimodal intersection improvements on Mission Street, and reconstruction of the Highway 1 Bridge over the San Lorenzo River—as represented in the original Scenario B.**

3. **UCSC also supports the development of the multi-use bicycle and pedestrian trail along the rail corridor** for safer, direct access to our satellite campuses along this route. UCSC has a relatively high bicycle commuter population, especially considering the steep hills to and on our campus. However, the City of Santa Cruz has some of the highest rates of bike crashes in our state, many of which involve college-age students. Developing a safer, continuous bike route along residential and commercial corridors, coupled with the advent of electric bikes, will provide campus affiliates and community members a great option for utilizing human-powered modes of travel, including access to transit options.

   By offering new and more efficient modes of transit, reaching a broader segment of the UCSC population living in the greater Santa Cruz area and beyond, this provides a more equitable transportation network for future generations. UCSC is proud to be named a Hispanic-Serving Campus, with 36% of “first-generation to college” students. However, much of our campus population includes lower-income families as evidenced by 35% receiving federal Pell Grants as reflected in the UCIS Figure 28, which shows much of the campus area as Poverty level due to the low incomes of our student population.

   In addition, many students do not or cannot afford to drive, or have become accustomed to and demand more options for travel depending on their needs. Furthermore, UCSC does not allow first- and second-
year residential students the opportunity to bring personal cars to campus and instead offer great transit, carsharing, ridesharing, bike programs and other options. Offering a variety of travel options helps support car-free living options and reduces the overall cost of household transportation needs.

UCSC staff have been impressed with the extensive and thorough review of all the alternatives presented for the Santa Cruz – Watsonville corridor along these three potential routes. Your staff should be commended for all of their efforts in this study and other efforts to make our local transportation network sustainable and equitable for all members of our community.

Sincerely,

Larry Pageler
Director, Transportation and Parking Services University of California Santa Cruz

Cc: Teresa Buika, Senior Transportation Planner, UCSC TAPS
Melissa Whatley, UCSC Government Relations
DATE: November 16, 2018
TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Barrow Emerson, Planning & Development Director
SUBJECT: UNIFIED CORRIDOR INVESTMENT STUDY UPDATE

I. RECOMMENDED ACTION

That the Board receive a presentation on the Unified Corridor Investment Study and recommend to the Regional Transportation Commission the following:

a) Support Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Lite operational improvements in the Soquel Avenue/Soquel Drive/Freedom Boulevard corridor

b) Support pursuit of a Bus-On-Shoulders (BOS) facility on State Route (SR) 1

c) Commit to a public transit service and facility in the Rail Corridor and begin implementation planning by conducting in the near term a comprehensive alternatives analysis to determine the most appropriate mode of public transit for the Rail Corridor and to support efforts to secure funding from federal and other sources, and adding a full analysis of operations funding sources as part of the alternative analysis.

d) Support mass transit use in the rail corridor in which mass transit would run adjacent to bike and pedestrian facilities, but not under the “rail banking” concept; and, an RTC policy that would commit to funding METRO with TDA-LTF, TDA-STA and TDA-SGR at current percentage levels in perpetuity.

II. SUMMARY

- The Regional Transportation Commission has conducted the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCIS), an analysis of potential multi-modal transportation investments in the State Route (SR) 1, Soquel Avenue/Soquel Drive/Freedom Boulevard, and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Rail Corridor) corridors.

- RTC staff will have presented a preferred “Scenario” to the RTC meeting on November 15, 2018 with selection of a preferred scenario targeted for the December 6, 2018 RTC meeting.

- METRO staff has participated in the development of public transit networks for the UCIS and continues to work with RTC staff to analyze data presented in the UCIS.

- Key issues of the METRO review of the UCIS include:
maximizing benefits in terms of efficient mobility, health and equity, the natural environment, and economic vitality.

Highway 1 and Soquel Ave/Drive are two of the most heavily traveled roadways in Santa Cruz County. Freedom Blvd provides an extension of Soquel Ave/Drive in the southern portion of Santa Cruz County. The Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line provides a new opportunity to provide transportation options between north and south county.

RTC staff will recommend a preferred scenario at the Nov. 15, 2018 RTC meeting. The final draft of the UCIS will consider the comments received at the November 15, 2018 Commission meeting and any other comments received by 5:00 PM on November 20, 2018. The final draft of the Unified Corridor Investment Study will be presented to the RTC at the December 6, 2018 RTC meeting to be held at 9:00 AM at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., 5th floor.

METRO staff will provide a detailed review and recommendations for next steps of the UCIS at METRO's November 16th Board meeting.

**Key Issues of METRO UCIS Review**

METRO staff review of the UCIS identifies the following key issues:

- Acknowledgement that the three corridors serve different and distinct markets and origin/destination pairs. Improvements in any one of the corridors does not provide needed services in the other corridors. Specifically, improvements in the Soquel/Freedom or SR 1 corridors to not address travel needs along the coastal community.

- Need for public transit priority and services in the Rail Corridor
  - A bicycle/pedestrian only facility in the corridor would not address demand for longer distance and higher capacity mobility. As bicycle/pedestrian facilities are possible in the Rail Corridor with either Rail or BRT operations, the desire for these facilities are addressed
  - The scenario-based analysis does not provide enough mode/corridor specific comparable detailed data and information is insufficient to determine the most appropriate public transit mode to pursue in the Rail Corridor
  - Whether Santa Cruz County has the financial capacity to fund METRO's existing network, anticipated and necessary future service expansion that is unrelated to the UCIS, along with these new services and facilities being considered by RTC. All of these services and facilities could draw from the same limited funding sources. A review of the UCIS suggests that some
The mode selection in this corridor should not be based on a choice between steel and rubber wheels but rather on the service profile (alignment, frequency, daily span of service) that most effectively meets the travel patterns and mobility needs in this area.

Any major public transit facility and services proposed for the corridor would require a significant state and/or federal funding contribution. METRO strongly recommends that a formal alternatives analysis be conducted directly comparing the ridership, operating and capital costs of the options. This type of analysis is required for projects pursuing federal funding such as the New Starts and Small Starts programs, which can fund both rail and BRT projects.

Therefore, as part of the commitment to implementation of a public transit service and facility in the Rail Corridor METRO recommends that in addition to a formal alternatives analysis being undertaken in the near term to identify the type of service and facility that would be most appropriate to meet the specific mobility needs in the corridor; that in order to support efforts to secure funding from federal and other sources, a full analysis of operations funding sources should also be conducted. Having this analysis will support efforts at securing federal funding support, including form the New Starts and/or Small Starts programs.

Issues Requiring Further Analysis

Without stating a preferred mode alternative, METRO staff notes a number of issues which need further investigation and clarity prior to determining the most cost-effective and appropriate service in the corridor including:

- The bus networks and service levels (frequency and span of daily service) provided to RTC for the UCIS were hypothetical for order of magnitude cost purposes and were not the subject of any rigorous detailed analysis of alternative networks as is necessary prior to making such a major investment decision.

- Ridership

Ridership comparisons suggest major differences between rail and BRT ridership based on travel times. There has not been the necessary “value engineering” of various segments of the Rail Corridor to determine with certainty the most cost-effective treatments which would determine alignment opportunities and thereby travel times.

Bus service planning is a balance/tradeoff between travel time and accessibility to the service. More detailed analysis of development patterns and non-motorized paths of access/egress to/from transit are necessary before finalizing placement of stations/stops and choice of service alignment directions.
### TDA Funds Apportioned by RTC

#### TDA/LTF Allocation to METRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA Category</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA Total</td>
<td>10,063,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Reserves</td>
<td>51,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Reserves</td>
<td>104,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Admin/Planning</td>
<td>1,144,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike &amp; Ped</td>
<td>190,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 185.5% METRO            | 7,074,858 |

#### TDA/STA Allocation to METRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STA Total</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STA Total</td>
<td>3,540,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC 99313</td>
<td>1,938,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO 99314</td>
<td>1,602,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| METRO                   | 3,540,904 |

#### TDA/STA-SGR Allocation to METRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STA Total</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STA Total</td>
<td>671,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC 99313</td>
<td>367,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO 99314</td>
<td>303,662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| METRO                   | 671,079 |

1 METRO believes that these funding sources could be vulnerable because RTC could change the % to METRO by amending its Rules and Regulations.

2 RTC's 99313 funds will be allocated, in part, to projects other than METRO beginning FY20 through FY22, at which time METRO's share will be reduced by 25%.

Additionally, a passenger rail service requires an extensive bus feeder network which is traditionally very costly to provide and are a significant use of vehicle and operator resources. The costs of these services need to be considered as part of the cost of the rail service in both capital costs and operating costs (specifically its contribution to cost per trip).
UCIS would require an increased commitment of METRO services and equipment, the funding source of which is as yet undetermined.

V. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The alternative of not pursuing transit improvements along these three corridors would limit the ability to provide viable attractive options to drive-alone vehicle use. Without competitive public transit options the region cannot address the issues of traffic congestion, air quality, and the economic impact of significant commute times and associated costs,

Not pursuing these improvements is not recommended.

VI. ATTACHMENTS

None.

Prepared by: Barrow Emerson, Planning & Development Director
INPUT FROM COMMUNITY GROUPS

December 04, 2018 - January 09, 2019
To: The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and staff

09 January 2019

Dear Commissioners and staff members,

In November of 2018, Brett Garrett and Santa Cruz PRT commissioned the attached study of PRT from PRT Consulting, Inc. in Franktown, Colorado. The study was prepared under the direction of PRT Consulting President Mr. Peter Muller.

Several names and acronyms are commonly used for this transportation mode. ATN is an abbreviation (Automated Transportation Networks, in the San Jose study). Others include AGT (Automated Guideway Transportation for the Mountain View study), PRT (Personal Rapid Transit), GRT (Group Rapid Transit), and Podcars in the EU. We use ATN for the remainder of this letter.

The purpose of this study is to document why the RTC Unified Corridor Study (UCS) should add ATN to the transportation modes to be considered as a part of the UCS. This is accomplished by addressing each of the performance measures used in the UCS in turn, with emphasis being placed on comparison with Scenario B.

We write for several reasons to tell you of the high degree of applicability of ATN for Santa Cruz County and the UCS.

• The first reason is the stellar safety record of ATN systems. Those in operation around the world are a startling 100% free of any fatalities or serious injury since 1975! (when the first system was launched) This is in comparison to about 40,000 fatalities on USA highways each year and, to a lesser but equally disturbing degree of recurring fatal accidents and serious injuries on conventional and light rail.
INTRODUCTION

“The objective of the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) is to identify multimodal transportation investments that provide the most effective use of Highway 1, Soquel Ave/Soquel Dr/Freedom Blvd, and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line to serve the community’s transportation needs.”¹ The UCS considered bus transit, rail transit, auto, bike/ped and rail freight modes. It also considered automated vehicles/connected vehicles even though those modes are still emerging. Despite this multi-modal approach, the study completely ignores a mode that has been operating in public service since 1975. This mode is called automated transit networks (ATN – an umbrella term for personal and group rapid transit - PRT & GRT). ATN suppliers such as Vectus, Ultra, Modutram and 2getthere have had ATN systems in continuous public service since 1999². ATN systems have completed over 200 million injury-free passenger miles.

The purpose of this paper is to document why the UCS should add ATN to the modes considered. This is accomplished by addressing each of the performance measures used in the UCS in turn, with emphasis being placed on comparison with Scenario B, understood to be the likely preferred scenario.

¹ SCCRTC’s Unified Corridor Investment Study, Step 2 Analysis Results, Draft, September 2018, by Kimley Horn
² Video clip of ATN systems in operation: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8IM5299tXcw
AUTOMATED TRANSIT NETWORKS

DEFINITION AND DESCRIPTION

Automated transit networks (ATN) is an umbrella term for two concepts that are now merging into one. These are personal rapid transit (PRT) and group rapid transit (GRT). PRT was conceived to use small (2 – 6 seated passengers) driverless vehicles carrying individuals or parties travelling together nonstop from origin to destination and not sharing rides with strangers. GRT uses large driverless vehicles (up to 20 or even 30 seated and/or standing passengers) which often wait before departing to encourage ride sharing and stop at intermediate stations if necessary. Modern PRT systems generally have 4 to 6 seats, encourage ride sharing and may make an intermediate stop or two. Other terms for these systems include Podcars (commonly used in Sweden) and Pod Taxis (commonly used in India). This study refers to these systems as PRT, GRT or ATN as appropriate.

ATN systems provide a very high level of service and passengers have no need to know routes, schedules or transfer points. All they need to know is the name of their destination station.

Table 1 on the following page provides a comparison of PRT with cars and conventional transit.

ATN systems proven in public service have capacities ranging from 2,000 to 10,000 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd) and maximum speeds ranging from 25 to 43 miles per hour. Higher capacities and speeds up to 20,000 pphpd and 60 mph are under development now that the American Society of Civil Engineers has agreed to adapt their Automated People Mover Standards to better apply to ATN systems. The maximum speed assumed in this study is 40 mph while the maximum capacity assumed is 5,000 pphpd.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>PRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Level</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trip Time</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost/Passenger</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Capital Cost/Passenger</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Potential and Cost Savings</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Demand 24/7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seated Travel</td>
<td>Yes, with limits</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Stop Travel</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short waiting time</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliant</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and Secure</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Friendly</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow &amp; Ice</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Walking</td>
<td>Not Often</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Friendly</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficient</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Appealing</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates inside buildings</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:  Poor ✗   Acceptable ✓   Good ✔️
The Ultra PRT System

The Ultra system is rubber-tired, battery-powered, and runs on an open guideway. The front wheels are steerable, and the vehicle keeps itself on the guideway without any physical lateral guidance (using lasers), simplifying switching, which is accomplished by steering. This system has been in operation at London’s Heathrow International Airport since April 2011. The commitment to using off-the-shelf technology, wherever possible, coupled with a rigorous testing and development program, has allowed the Ultra system to be the first modern PRT system to win a commercial contract. Heathrow Airport has expressed its satisfaction with the system by including significant expansion in its budget. However, it is understood that construction of a new runway may obliterate the existing system and alter the plans for expansion.

The Ultra vehicle was designed for four adults, plus luggage. However, Heathrow has opted to replace the bucket seats with bench seats, allowing the vehicle to carry a family of six. Commuter versions of this vehicle are anticipated to include two jump seats allowing six adults to be accommodated.

Open guideway PRT, such as that used by Ultra and 2getthere, tends to be more economical, but the rubber/guideway interface can be problematic during inclement weather conditions. Ultra has plans to address this issue, by using a glass fiber reinforced plastic grating as the riding surface. Preliminary testing by PRT Consulting in the winters of 2006 and 2007 has shown this solution to be very successful in mitigating the effects of Colorado snowfall.

Ultra PRT Ltd. is under new ownership that is aggressively marketing the system in Asia. They are reducing costs by implementing vehicle manufacture in India and other means. They are also developing a next-generation control system to allow higher speeds and shorter headways intended to increase capacity.
while reducing costs.

The 2getthere GRT System
2getthere, a Dutch company, has been operating an automated GRT-like shuttle bus system, in cooperation with Frog Navigation Systems in Rotterdam, Holland, since 1999. They are delivering their second GRT system using third-generation vehicles in Dubai in the United Arab Emirates. This system will have 25 vehicles and a capacity up to 5,000 pphpd. A third system is being delivered to Brussels Airport. The vehicles are capable of speeds up to 37 mph. Operation in mixed traffic is possible with top speeds up to about 30 mph.

The 2getthere PRT System
2getthere’s true PRT system was the first of its kind when it went into operation in Masdar City in the United Arab Emirates in November 2010.

2getthere’s PRT system is of the open guideway type, with somewhat similar attributes to those of the Ultra system.

The Vectus PRT System
Vectus is a subsidiary of POSCO, one of the world’s largest steel manufacturers. Despite being a British company owned and operated by Koreans, Vectus chose to establish a full-size test track, with an off-line station, in Sweden to prove operability in winter weather conditions and to meet the rigorous Swedish safety requirements. They have now accomplished both goals and moved on to implement a system in South Korea.

The Vectus system is of the captive-bogey type, where the undercarriage, or bogey, is not steerable, but has wheels which run along vertical side elements, thus, keeping the vehicle on the guideway. Switching is accomplished by movable wheels mounted on the vehicle. The test track vehicles were propelled (and braked) by linear induction motors mounted in the guideway. Mounting the motors in the guideway reduces the weight of the vehicles but increases the cost of the guideway. This is advantageous for high-capacity systems, but expensive for low-capacity systems.
Their first application in Suncheon Bay, South Korea, uses conventional rotary motors which obtain wayside (third rail) power. Propulsion batteries are not required, allowing the vehicles to be lighter in weight.

The Vectus Vehicle is designed to carry four or six seated adults, plus their luggage. In an urban transportation mode, the vehicle can also accommodate up to six standees.

**The Modutram ATN System**

While not yet in public service, the Modutram system has been included here because of the extensiveness of its test track and demonstration program. A public project is understood to be imminent.

Modutram, is being developed as a university effort with considerable funding from the Mexican government. This system is comprised of rubber-tired vehicles operating on a steel track. The vehicles have electric motors that are battery-powered.

The Modutram system has been designed specifically for the Mexican climate and is not initially intended to be capable of operating satisfactorily in snow and ice conditions. Development has progressed fairly smoothly from the initial design through a small test track to a larger test track with two stations and, more recently, a demonstration system that carries passengers in six-passenger vehicles.

Modutram appears well suited for urban operations. The system is designed for speeds up to 40 mph with minimum headways of 3 to 4 seconds. Vehicles can be physically coupled together to increase capacity.

**SOLUTIONS NOT YET PROVEN IN PUBLIC SERVICE**

Numerous ATN systems are in various stages of development ranging from being mere concepts to having engineering design completed and prototype systems in various stages of development. Some of the better-known names include JPods, Metrino, Futran (Milotek), PRT International, skyTran, Swift ATN and TransitX.

Some of the previously-mentioned systems have not emerged into the market because they have not yet funded a full-scale test track demonstrating complete functionality. All the example systems mentioned herein have achieved that demonstration milestone and have gone on to put systems into passenger serving operations. Others may emerge at any time.

Some of the emerging suppliers make aggressive claims regarding the costs and capabilities of their systems. These claims have often not been proven in practice and have therefore been ignored in this study. Should high speeds and capacities become viable at very low costs, this will further enhance the feasibility of the solutions discussed here.
More information on ATN concepts can be found here: www.prtconsulting.com and here: www.advancedtransit.org

CONCEPTUAL ATN LAYOUT

A conceptual layout (Figures 7 and 8) has been developed for purposes of comparison with the Scenario Brail project. Like the rail project, it extends along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way from the Westside of Santa Cruz to Pajaro Station near Watsonville. Unlike the rail project, portions of the alignment (mostly those through developed areas) are one-way with return one-way guideways located in the adjacent communities, mostly along the Soquel Avenue/Drive BRT routes.

These return guideways are elevated to facilitate retrofitting into existing road rights-of-way. Portions of the alignment within the rail right-of-way are also elevated to avoid at-grade crossings with other traffic (a key factor contributing to ATN safety and reliability).

Note that the routing and station locations shown are in no way intended to be final. The southern portion of the route could serve Freedom Blvd. (equivalent to BRT Lite in the UCS) or Highway 1. It could do so as a two-way line or it could be in the form of a one-way loop. In the latter case it would provide service/stations along two of the three routes (the rail corridor, Freedom Blvd. and Highway 1). It would also be possible to extend the system to UCSC and/or other destinations. If a goal is to improve circulation within Santa Cruz (for example), more guideway could be added, including additional north-south connectors with new stations between the loops shown.

ATN has almost infinite capability to be scaled up or down. It would be possible to start with a simple two-station demonstration shuttle system and to scale up from there in phases. As new routes and stations are added, the new stations will be accessible from the old with no transfers being necessary. The portion of the system from Santa Cruz to Aptos is likely to be very viable as a stand-alone system that could cover its own operating costs and most, if not all, of its capital costs through fare-box...
The ability of ATN to achieve a 39-mph average speed with a 40-mph maximum speed derives from the fact that all stations are offline, requiring no slowing of through vehicles. Note that slowing for horizontal alignment characteristics (tight curves – of which there are few) has been accounted for.

A single at-grade ATN track only requires about seven feet of right-of-way. The ATN may thus be able to co-exist with the existing rail line allowing for freight operations.
CONCEPTUAL ATN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS – 2035 FORECASTS

This section provides a conceptual analysis of the ATN alternative with particular reference to passenger rail and bus rapid transit as envisioned for Scenario B (understood to presently be preferred by some community groups).

SAFETY

Automated guideway transit is held to a far higher standard of safety (American Society of Civil Engineers Automated People Movers Standards) than any other mode of surface transportation. ATN operates on exclusive guideways separated from pedestrians and traffic. There are no crossings, only merges and diverges. The results speak for themselves – over 200 million injury-free passenger miles. Couple this with the fact that ATN’s higher level of service attracts more passengers than any other transit mode and it is clear that ATN will significantly increase safety over any other solution.

RELIABILITY AND EFFICIENCY

ATN systems for which data is publicly available (Heathrow Airport and Masdar City) are operating at availabilities more than 99.5%. This is five times more reliable than transit level of service A (97.5%).

Peak Period Mean Auto Travel Time

While an analysis of the impacts of ATN on auto travel time has not been undertaken, the significantly higher mode share with ATN (see below) will result in fewer autos on the road than with other transit modes and thus should have a greater positive impact on congestion and travel speeds.

Peak Period Mean Transit Travel Time

Referring to UCS Table 17, the ATN average travel time of 30 minutes between Downtown Watsonville and Downtown Santa Cruz is better than the average AM and PM peak period auto times of 52 and 60 minutes respectively. Referring to UCS Table 35, Scenario B, it is also better than the best bus time of 53.6 minutes and the passenger rail time of 41.0 minutes and considerably better than the worst bus time of 83.7 minutes.

Travel Time Reliability

ATN systems are designed to avoid traffic jams. Overcrowding results in people waiting a bit longer in stations which encourages ridesharing and thus boosts capacity at the time it is most needed. Trip times are always the same between any two stations with the small exception that some passengers may have a small detour or an intermediate stop or two if they have agreed to rideshare. Even these passengers will be able to count on very little daily variability in trip and waiting times.

Mode Share

The mode share for ATN has been based on the transit mode share for Scenario B adjusted to account for changes in waiting and travel times as well as revenue miles. The transit mode share for Scenario B includes 7,396 rail boardings per day (10/16/18 UCS FAQ) and an unstated number of bus boardings per day. Based on boardings reported by the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, Route...
The following discussion explains how bus daily ridership and ATN daily and peak period ridership were estimated for Scenario B from this information.

The analysis was based on work done by Liu\(^3\) and uses a Logit Model to estimate changes in mode share based on modal preferences and changes in trip times. Mode preference is the extra time a person would spend to use their preferred mode. For example, people have been shown to be willing to take a 25-minute longer trip by car rather than catch a bus. Public stated-preference surveys by PRT Consulting have shown ATN mode preference over bus to be higher than auto but, to be conservative, it has been assumed to be the average of auto (25 minutes) and rail (10 minutes). Transit wait times have been assumed to be the square root of peak headways per UCS Table 11. Since the number of bus stops varies, the first and last mile times for all systems have both been assumed to be five minutes. The BRT times have been averaged into one time. The average fare per trip was assumed to be the same for all modes ($5.50 per trip) and was therefore not a factor.

The Logit Model can predict the increase or decrease in ridership of a given mode based on the known ridership and any changes in service level (headways, first- and last-mile times and travel times). With the addition of modal preference values, it can be used to predict the ridership if one mode is replaced with another.

First, the Logit Model was used to estimate the BRT boardings in Scenario B. To do this, the model calculated the number of BRT boardings that would result if passenger rail, which produced 7,396 boardings, was paralleled with BRT service running a mile or so away through roughly similar neighborhoods. The characteristics of the rail and BRT service used in the model are shown in Table 3. The result was 1,479 BRT trips. This seemed low relative to the existing boardings and the BRT boardings were increased by 30% to 1,920 (the same as Route 71) to be conservative.

Next, the model was run in the same manner using the factors in Table 3 to predict the number of ATN boardings that would result if the rail system was replaced by an ATN system (22,800) and, secondly, if the BRT system was replaced with an ATN system (28,100). These results total 50,900 ATN boardings.

Table 3 shows the assumptions for each mode and the resulting ATN trips.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Headway</th>
<th>Wait Time</th>
<th>First + Last Mile</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Mode Preference</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Rail</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT (estimated average)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>50,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the accuracy of the Logit Model, it was used (in a previous project) to predict the bus ridership on the Red Route in Clemson, South Carolina, based on the actual automobile ridership and the

\(^3\)Liu, R et al (1997), “Assessment of Intermodal Transfer Penalties Using Stated Preference Data”, Transportation Research Record 1607 pp 74-80
differences in trip characteristics between the auto and bus trips. The model was run twice with slightly different factors each time. It predicted an average bus ridership of 3,459 which was 4% higher than the actual bus ridership of 3,239.

To compare the Logit Model to the model used in the UCS, it was used to predict the ridership on BRT in the rail corridor based on the rail ridership and the difference between the rail and BRT characteristics. The characteristics used are shown in Table 4 below. The first/last mile times used reflect the fact that the BRT has twice the number of stations as the passenger rail.

**TABLE 4. RIDERSHIP ASSUMPTIONS AND RESULTS (RAIL & BRT IN RAIL CORRIDOR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Headway</th>
<th>Wait Time</th>
<th>First + Last Mile</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Mode Preference</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B Rail</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C BRT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3,698 predicted BRT trips are 251 (6%) less than the 3,949 predicted by the UCS (10/16/18 FAQ).

The results in Table 3 above are consistent with those of other investigators around the world as illustrated in Figure 9, which is based on studies undertaken in the named cities using a variety of methodologies.

Part of the reason the ATN system does so well is that it covers both the rail and the Soquel BRT routes and would undoubtedly also pick up traffic from the local bus routes (a factor not accounted for above). This is largely because, unlike BRT, ATN combines high average speeds with numerous stations. Note that savings in local bus operating costs have not been accounted for here.

The 50,900 daily ATN boardings result in about 3,000 ATN pphpd in the peak hour (assuming 10% of trips are in the peak hour and a 60/40 directional split), which is less than the previously-selected maximum line capacity for this project of 5,000. The projected ATN boardings are not out of line with the 13,900 average daily boardings reported in 2010 for the Morgantown PRT system which only has five stations

To estimate countywide mode share, it was anticipated that bus ridership for UCSC and Highway 17 will exceed the current level of at least 11,000 daily trips, for a countywide total of at least 61,900 daily transit trips. Therefore, assuming a total of 947,700 daily trips for all modes (10/16/18 UCS FAQ) the countywide transit mode share with ATN is likely 6.53% or better, exceeding the anticipated result for Scenario B.

---

4 PRT Facilities Master Plan, West Virginia University, by Gannett Fleming, Lea+Elliott, Olszak, June 2010
5 Santa Cruz Metro, Comprehensive Operational Analysis, January 2016
Despite the comparisons and justifications, some will doubt the ability of high-quality transit with reliable express, on-demand service, numerous stations and short waiting times to attract riders. The ATN boardings have therefore been reduced 25% in the following analyses. This results in a daily ATN ridership of 38,800.

**ECONOMIC VITALITY**

**Public Investment**

The UCS revenue analysis appears to ignore fare-box revenues. This analysis assumes fare-box revenues at the average rate of $5.50 per boarding. In addition, to obtain a true comparison of the total cost of each system, the operating costs and fare-box revenues are estimated over a life of 30 years, assuming the 2035 ridership represents the average ridership. The daily boardings have been multiplied by 300 to determine annual boardings. The daily boardings are for weekday ridership and the 300 multiplier is used in place of 365 to account for lower ridership on weekends and holidays.

**TABLE 5. TOTAL COST COMPARISON (SCENARIO B)**

(All figures in thousands of year 2018 dollars, except subsidy per ride in 2018 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Capital Cost ($000)</th>
<th>O&amp;M Costs Over 30 Years ($000)</th>
<th>Fare-Box Revenue Over 30 Years ($000)</th>
<th>Total Net Cost Over 30 Years ($000)</th>
<th>Subsidy Per Ride ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soquel/Freedom BRT+ bus-on-shoulder (1,920 daily boardings)</td>
<td>$44,863</td>
<td>$534,000</td>
<td>-$95,040</td>
<td>$483,823</td>
<td>$28.00?^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail (7,396 daily boardings)</td>
<td>$339,800</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>-$366,100</td>
<td>$393,700</td>
<td>$5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B Total</td>
<td>$384,663</td>
<td>$954,000</td>
<td>-$446,142</td>
<td>$877,521</td>
<td>$10.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATN (38,800 daily boardings)</td>
<td>$1,403,500</td>
<td>$1,158,000</td>
<td>-$1,920,600</td>
<td>$640,900</td>
<td>$1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though table 5 shows that the ATN solution is considerably more expensive, it attracts far more passengers and thus has higher fare-box revenues. The ATN system more than covers its own operating costs through fare-box revenues (almost unheard of for US transit systems). In order to also cover the capital costs over 30 years (neglecting interest), the subsidy per ride for ATN is only $1.84. Even if the ATN ridership estimate is halved, the capital costs would be reduced (since fewer vehicles are needed). The operating cost would be approximately halved, and the required a subsidy would be $5.42 per ride, about half of Santa Cruz Metro’s current subsidy (for operating costs only) for intercity routes. On the other hand, as ATN ridership increases, the required subsidy decreases.

Note that it has proven impossible to ascertain the extent, if any, of BRT costs not included in the UCS Study. The study seems to imply that the costs shown are additional to existing service, which will continue, but does not provide the cost of the continuing service. Also, it is unclear whether the

---

^Ridership based on Table 3 assumptions. The UCS estimated BRT ridership is unknown.
projected fare-box revenue has been deducted from the annual O&M costs in the study or not (Table 4 assumes not).

An analysis of the potential amount of funding from known federal, state, and local revenue sources for ATN is not included here. Even though the ATN solution has the potential to fund itself (should the contingency allowances not be required), it is eligible for FTA funding in competition with other fixed-guideway modes as evidenced by the continuing federal grants being awarded to the Morgantown PRT System.

It is likely that an ATN system can be acquired under a design/build/finance/operate/maintain/transfer procurement model requiring little to no upfront funding. The supplier team would finance the project and receive payments over time in return for ensuring the system is available for public use meeting predetermined criteria. Technical and business failure risks would be protected by performance and payment bonds ensuring all debts will be paid and the system will be removed if it fails to work.

Visitor Tax Revenues and Other Economic Impacts
While no analysis is included here, the increased transit use, shorter trip times and reduced congestion should result in increased visitor tax revenues and positive economic impacts.

Costs Associated with Collisions
Motor vehicle collisions and associated costs should reduce approximately in proportion to the increase in transit mode share.

ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH

Automobile Vehicle Miles Traveled
If we assume the average transit trip length is 5.9 miles (UCS Page 119), we find that ATN increases the daily transit person trip miles by approximately 245,000. Assuming an average automobile occupancy of 1.29 (UCS Table16) and disregarding any induced automobile travel demand, this would reduce daily automobile vehicle miles traveled by approximately 190,000. This is about twice the anticipated VMT reduction for Scenario B.

Environmentally Sensitive Areas
While no analysis has been undertaken, ATN has a smaller footprint (seven feet wide for one-way track at grade) than any other transit mode. In addition, the lightweight vehicles produce almost no noise, vibrations, emissions or electro-magnetic interference. Accommodating a trail next to the ATN system will be relatively easy compared to train or bus, especially since the ATN guideway can be elevated the entire way or just in tight situations.

Greenhouse Gas and Criteria Pollutants
ATN vehicles themselves do not emit greenhouse gases, and in general ATN systems consume about one third of the energy per passenger mile of other transit systems. ATN guideways are well-suited to support solar panels (costs not considered here) which may be sufficient to meet the needs for motive
power. Even if the system lacks solar panels, it would likely be powered with carbon-free electricity from Monterey Bay Community Power. Battery-powered vehicles could facilitate energy storage. Reduction in automobile vehicle miles traveled and congestion should have significant positive impacts on emissions.

**EQUITABLE ACCESS**

**Transit Vehicle Miles Traveled**

Unlike most other transit modes, ATN vehicles do not have to travel to the end of the line or even the end of a scheduled route before turning around. Furthermore, they do not need to move to provide availability when there is no demand. This means there is less relatively empty vehicle movement. It also makes it more complicated to determine vehicle miles traveled without a detailed station-to-station trip demand matrix. Nonetheless, the ATN vehicle miles traveled have been estimated at 43.8 million miles per year. This is 6.5 times higher than the 6.65 million shown in UCS Figure 41.

**Household Transportation Cost**

Since “How much a household spends on transportation depends primarily on the number of automobiles in the household” (UCS Page 130), it is clear that the increased transit mode share with ATN will do more to reduce household transportation costs than any other alternative.

The community may wish to implement a tiered fare structure to encourage ride sharing and give passengers more control over their transit spending. For example:

- Tier one passengers pay per vehicle. They get a vehicle dedicated to them and their party (one to six). They wait less than a minute and travel nonstop to their destination.
- Tier two passengers pay per ride. They must be willing to wait up to (say) five minutes for others to arrive who are on the same route and can share the ride. They may have to make an intermediate stop or two.
- Tier three passengers pay a very low fare per ride and must be willing to wait longer (up to 20 or 30 minutes) for their ride.

This fairly unique ability to match the level of service to the fare paid promotes equitable access and mobility for all. An animation of an ATN station configured to accommodate this type of operation may be viewed here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dXyBJ_nyh4M&

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

ATN systems are commercially available from a number of suppliers. They have been in continuous public service since 1975 (1999 for commercially-available systems). This conceptual study has found a six-passenger ATN system to be superior to the UCS Scenario B combination of passenger rail and BRT. It is believed that consideration of a 24-passenger GRT system would probably also find superior results.

This analysis has not been undertaken to the same depth as the UCS analysis. However, the level of accuracy is adequate to demonstrate that ATN will be a far superior solution that is worthy of further
The operating characteristics have been proven in public service. The costs have been derived by experienced suppliers from projects that have been implemented. Even if the ridership estimate is halved, the ATN system will still cover its operating costs with fare-box revenues and it will only require a subsidy of $5.42 per ride to also cover its capital costs. This is far lower than any other alternative.

The thirteen key criteria in the UCS study have each been addressed. ATN has been found to be superior to Scenario B for each criterion. There appears to be no credible argument to exclude ATN from consideration.

APPENDIX A – PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND COST ESTIMATES

The ATN project description and cost estimates are provided below. This project has been evaluated at a conceptual level and a contingency of 50% has been used. Costs are based mostly on fixed bid prices in South Carolina in 2016 adjusted to reflect this project’s size and location.

“Annual Operations and Maintenance” includes costs for new ATN service, vehicle operations and maintenance as well as facility maintenance. Maintenance costs include replacement of worn parts up to and including vehicle replacement as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Table A-1: ATN System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>Natural Bridges Drive in Santa Cruz to Pajaro Station near Watsonville. The route from Aptos to Cabrillo Highway near Watsonville consists of two-way track along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way, mostly at-grade. The remainder of the route is mostly elevated and consists of one-way track along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way forming interconnected loops with one-way track along Mission Street, Lincoln Street, Soquel Avenue/Drive, 17th Avenue, Capitola Road, Clares Street and Wharf Road in Santa Cruz and along Salinas Road, Porter Drive, Main Street, Freedom Boulevard, South Green Valley Road and Ohlone Parkway in Watsonville. See Figures 7 and 8 for maps of the layout showing proposed station locations. It should be noted that the guideway routing and station locations shown are conceptual. They are intended for use in this conceptual analysis only. Determining preferred routing and locations requires extensive public input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>On-demand passenger service provided by driverless small (six-passenger) vehicles traveling along exclusive guideways and serving offline stations. Guideways and stations may be elevated or at-grade. This analysis is based on six-passenger battery-powered vehicles such as offered by Ultra or Modutram (and possibly 2getthere if they can accommodate six passengers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Connect 57 stations with 58.3 miles of one-way track. Provide 20 hours of service 365 days a year with an average wait time less than three minutes at any station and average speeds exceeding 35 mph.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Editor’s Note: A total cost table was originally included here. However it included cost figures for a maximum possible system. We think such a system would be built over many decades, not just a few years. So it’s unwise to include such large systems costs here.

The initial proof for any NEW ATN system in the USA will be a small demonstration. The jurisdiction will require extensive acceptance criteria. After satisfying all acceptance criteria, some initial phase will extend passenger service to a meaningful destination such as a transit center, a downtown area, a school campus, a sports arena, or other high trip-volume destination. This first expansion will probably be a mile or less. Certainly not dozens of miles. With excellent success and ridership, public demand will lead decision makers to add additional increments. It is probably not a good idea to anticipate a very large ATN system being built all at once. The temptation is too great for bloated costs, over runs, and other monetary mischief which has killed planned large ATN projects. In those examples, the result was invariably doing more of the same things already in use in that jurisdiction.

End of Editor’s Note

The Vectus “Sky Cube” ATN vehicle in Suncheon, South Korea
The Ultra PRT car at London’s Heathrow Airport

Santa Cruz PRT Video “What’s Moving Santa Cruz” on CD
Artist’s conception of ATN / PRT with solar panels next to Hagar Drive proceeding toward Downtown
• ATN is electric and can easily use power from solar panels to be a compelling answer to transportation GHG emissions. We have far too few implementations of our climate action plans so this one would be most welcome.

• Construction cost of a mile of ATN guideway is less than half the cost of a mile of new freeway lane. Perhaps even less.

• ATN trips carry their passengers from origin to destination NON-STOP. This matches the best performance of automobiles but also whisks passengers right past traffic jams and freeway bottlenecks. Because of these dependable and short trip times, Commuters may well prefer ATN over personal auto trips (happily reducing SOV automobile trips).

For these and MANY other reasons you will see in the study, **it is our request that ATN be included in any UCS alternatives analysis.** A wealth of additional information and data is available about ATN transportation and we are happy to assist the RTC and its staff in obtaining it.

Sincerely,

Ed Porter, President,
Santa Cruz PRT, Inc.
Greetings Commissioners,
Please find attached the more detailed analysis supporting the points made in the letter transmitted via the email below.

Best regards,
Mark

Mark Mesiti-Miller, P.E.
(831) 818-3660
Board Chair, Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail and Trail

Build the Trail – Keep the Rail
www.railandtrail.org

Imagine – 4 min video: https://youtu.be/qe3gRU-bpWY

Top 10 Reasons to Build the Rail Trail ASAP – 80 sec video: http://tiny.cc/TopTenReasons
Detailed Analysis of Passenger Rail Transit vs Bus Rapid Transit

Mark Mesiti-Miller, P.E.
Board Chair, Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail and Trail

Introduction

This detailed analysis is focused on answering the question of why the County of Santa Cruz should move forward to implement passenger rail transit rather than bus rapid transit along the existing rail corridor. A number of issues are explored and analyzed. Most of the data used in the analysis is taken directly from the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS). Other data sources are referenced when used.

Background Information

Passenger Rail Transit on the rail corridor is easy to understand and implement as it simply consists of upgrading the existing railroad tracks, adding boarding platforms and other appurtenances and running some type of new passenger rail vehicle along the tracks between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. There are many modern passenger rail vehicles to choose from and a final selection should be made after studying the specific needs of this county.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on the rail corridor is a bit more challenging to understand as the proposed BRT system only uses about 40% of the rail corridor (8.5 mi of 20.5 mi). The rest of the time, BRT will be running on local surface streets or along Highway 1. Even in the short 8.5 mile section of the rail corridor proposed for BRT use, more than 70% of this length (6.1 mi of 8.5 mi) requires running BRT on local surface streets near the rail corridor. Below is an illustration of the proposed BRT system taken from the UCS, Table 12.

Take a moment to study the “BRT on the rail corridor” proposal - it is important to understand what BRT on the rail corridor really means. Regarding vehicles, there are basically two types of buses from which to choose for BRT purposes: a standard bus or an articulated bus (sometimes referred to as a ‘bendy’).

As proposed, BRT on the corridor will consist of two-way traffic (2.4 miles) and one-way traffic (6.1 miles) with reverse direction on parallel local streets for a total of 8.5 miles. There are four places along this 8.5 mile stretch where two-way BRT traffic will occur over one-lane segments under signal control (buses will be held until lane is clear of bus traffic in opposing direction).

Two types of BRT service levels were identified in the UCS. BRT with 20 stops and BRT Express with 8 stops between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. Where data is provided for both service levels, only the data for BRT Express service is used to compare “apples to apples”.

The UCS is silent regarding what types of site appurtenances (boarding areas, shelters, intermodal transfer facilities, ticketing machines, bike parking, auto parking, etc) and other corridor improvements (signal controls at surface street intersections, traffic barriers between busway and trail, etc) would be included in
the implementation of BRT on the rail corridor. Yet, costs for these items appear to be included in the UCS estimated costs for rail transit. Thus, cost comparisons between BRT and rail transit are not accurate.

Analysis

BRT on the corridor only uses about 40% of rail corridor (8.5 mi of 20.5 mi) between SC and Watsonville. This fact alone raises important questions that must be addressed including:

- what happens to the other 12 miles of the rail corridor between Watsonville and Aptos
- how much of the remaining 12 miles exists as easements only and would be subject to expensive and lengthy litigation resulting from presumed abandonment of the rail line
- how much delay in building the rail trail would occur while easement issues are resolved and the rail trail master plan and environmental documents are redone
  - Assuming an average 3% annual rate of inflation and a delay of 10 years, means the cost of the Rail Trail currently estimated to cost $283M would go up $97M raising the total cost to $380M. This delay is an unnecessary waste of time and money.
  - If we add the cost of trail delay to the current estimated cost of BRT on the rail corridor, the estimated cost of BRT on the corridor rises to $362M, well beyond the $325M estimated cost of passenger rail transit.
- could we lose portions of the rail corridor all together ending the opportunity to have a continuous rail trail – what potential upside public benefit justifies taking such a risk?

As proposed BRT on the rail corridor fails to address the ‘Aptos Strangler’ identified as the obvious single biggest transportation bottleneck by internationally acclaimed transportation expert, Jarrett Walker, as BRT on the rail corridor starts/ends at State Park Drive. The ‘Aptos Strangler’ is a substantial source of social inequity and denies south county residents from enjoying the same access to education and employment opportunities as north county residents. The ‘Aptos Strangler’ denies south county residents the freedom north county residents have now and denies them the improved freedom north county residents would enjoy with a more robust transit system afforded by BRT on the rail corridor. Accordingly, BRT on the corridor appears to be discriminatory in that it fails to provide the same social equity and economic opportunity as rail transit would to all citizens.

The above figure illustrates how convoluted BRT on the corridor will be. Less than 30% of the rail corridor proposed for BRT allows unrestricted 2 way bus traffic. Accordingly, the proposal doesn’t meet the basic definition of a BRT system. If one simply studies the above illustration, it is clear that BRT on the rail corridor is what you would do if you had no other options. In that sense, BRT on the rail corridor appears to fail the common sense test because an efficient option exists, namely passenger rail transit.

What about CapEx: According to the UCS, BRT on the corridor is estimated to cost $265M. Dividing $265M by the 8.5 miles on the corridor = $31.2M/mile. Rail transit is estimated to cost $325M. Dividing $325M by the 20.5 miles on the corridor = $15.9M/mile. Obviously, rail transit provides a far more economical utilization of the rail corridor AND successfully addresses the ‘Aptos Strangler’ problem.

Question: How much more would it cost for BRT on the corridor to address the ‘Aptos Strangler’ problem? To address the ‘Aptos Strangler’, the next location available for buses using surface streets to access the rail corridor would require diverting buses from Highway 1 at San Andreas Road then proceeding down San Andreas to Seascape Blvd, then down Seascape Blvd and connecting to the rail corridor near the intersection of Seascape Blvd and Sumner Ave (near the entrance to Seascape Resort). This would add about 2.9 miles to the length of BRT on the corridor. BRT CapEx is about $28.6M/mi excluding the cost of bus vehicles ($22M incl contingency). Thus, the cost to extend BRT on the rail corridor to solve the ‘Aptos Strangler’ problem would be $83M ($28.6/mi x 2.9mi). Adding $83M to the original UCS estimate for BRT on the rail corridor of $265M results in a total estimated CapEx of $348M for BRT on the rail corridor. Add
to this figure the $97M cost of delaying the Rail Trail for ten years and the total CapEx for BRT on the corridor rises to $445M. Whether the grand total for BRT is $348M or $445M or some figure in between, the total cost to implement BRT on the rail corridor will be well beyond the $325M needed to implement passenger rail transit between Watsonville to Santa Cruz. For a transportation service that is inferior to passenger rail transit in so many ways and puts the rail corridor at risk, BRT simply does not make sense for the taxpayers of the County.

What about OpEx: The OpEx figures provided in the UCS stand in stark contrast to the figures found in the National Transit Database published by the Federal Transit Administration. According to Exhibit 6 of the NTD, the operating cost of bus rapid transit is $1.07 per passenger mile while the operating cost of commuter rail is $0.51 per passenger mile (52% less than BRT). The operating cost of light rail is $0.79 per passenger mile (26% less than BRT). Since we don’t know what type of rail transit service will be implemented, it is reasonable to say passenger rail transit will probably be 30-40% less per passenger mile than BRT when a true apples to apples comparison is provided. Since the UCS presents relative OpEx cost estimates so different than the NTD, I offer the following as possible explanations.

- Based on the figures provided in Appendix B-12, new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service with 15 min frequency on the rail corridor will only require an additional 29 hours of increased bus service on weekdays to support the new BRT operation. Yet according to figures in Appendix B-10, new passenger rail transit service on the rail corridor with 30 min frequency, will require 265.5 hours of increased weekday and weekend bus service to support new rail transit service (almost 10 times more). Assigning 10 times more cost to support rail transit than BRT is internally inconsistent. Either BRT on the corridor is receiving insufficient support or Rail Transit is receiving excessive support. Common sense suggests the level of supporting bus service necessary to serve both of these new faster and exclusively ‘main line’ type transit options should be essentially the same.

- Bus vehicles must be replaced more frequently than rail vehicles. Accordingly, total vehicle life cycle costs must be included in any comparative OpEx analysis. Per the Federal Transit Administration the expected useful service life of a bus is 14 years while the expected useful service life of a commuter rail self-propelled passenger car (such as considered in the UCS) is 39 years. According to the UCS, BRT buses are estimated to cost $22M (including contingency) but if they must be replaced 2.78 times as often (39yrs/14yrs), the real present day value of bus vehicles is $61M (22 x 2.78). The $39M additional cost ($61M - $22M) for more frequent bus vehicle replacements should either be added to CapEx or realized as an added OpEx cost. Given the 39 year life of the comparable rail vehicle, the math is easy and $1M should be added to the annual BRT OpEx figure.

- The UCS does not appear to include costs of maintaining the one-lane, two-way traffic signal systems, nor costs of maintaining signal systems at local street crossings of which there are many.

Summarizing, once true cost adjustments are made to the estimated OpEx for BRT, OpEx for passenger rail transit is likely to be substantially less than OpEx for BRT on the corridor.

What about Ridership: The UCS predicts daily ridership of 7,396 for rail transit and 3,949 for BRT. The 3,447 difference in ridership expressed as a percentage improvement, means passenger rail transit will carry almost 87% more passengers every day than BRT. The difference in predicted ridership is explained in the UCS as follows: “The main factors that reduced ridership is that BRT between Watsonville and Santa Cruz is not a dedicated facility for the entire length in both directions and that the travel time for BRT is longer
than for rail.” This monstrous difference in ridership alone justifies abandoning any further consideration of BRT on the rail corridor.

What about Transit Times: The UCS predicts transit travel times between Watsonville and Santa Cruz will be 41 minutes for rail transit whether travelling during AM or PM peaks. The UCS predicts the average transit travel time will be 58 minutes for a BRT service equivalent to rail service (i.e. BRT Express Service with 8 intermediate stops). A little math tells us BRT will be 17 minutes longer or result in a 41% increase in travel time. The difference becomes even more pronounced when one considers the UCS predicts AM travel time for BRT Express will be 63 minutes, 22 minutes longer or a 54% increase in travel time. Given the much poorer travel time performance for BRT, it is easy to understand why predicted ridership for BRT on the rail corridor is so much lower than for rail transit.

Other issues

Rail transit supporrs and will result in more bike ridership than BRT. Buses do not provide the same bike carrying capacity nor ease of use for cyclists. For buses, bicycles must be lifted up and onto a rack located at the front or back of a bus, a task many cyclists are unable to complete. On the other hand, bicycles can be simply rolled onto a passenger rail vehicle, a task any cyclist can perform. Accordingly, passenger rail transit will encourage greater use of active transportation than a bus. (Note: When SMART system opened in August of 2017, each 2 car train set had the capacity to carry 22 bicycles. 4 months after starting operation, SMART added a third car to meet the unexpected demand for bicycles)

Rail transit travel times are reliable and BRT travel times are variable. Because BRT substantially relies on surface streets and therefore relies on current AM/PM peak directional traffic patterns which are likely to change as many current commuters will testify, travel time performance estimates of BRT will be more variable and are likely to deteriorate over time as traffic congestion increases on the highway and local surface streets. Because passenger rail transit operates in a dedicated corridor, travel times will be unaffected by changes in traffic patterns. Travel time reliability is valuable.

BRT does not provide significant peak travel time relief. Because BRT transit times are so much longer than that of passenger rail transit, BRT doesn’t appear to provide much, if any, peak travel time advantage to south county commuters particularly during the morning commute (it should be noted: one third of the entire county population lives south of La Selva Beach commonly known as south county)

BRT in the rail corridor will create substantial amounts of new impervious paved areas (8.5 miles at avg 18’ width = 18 acres or if extended to Seascapce Resort, 11.4 miles at 18’ width = 25 acres), a significant environmental issue requiring mitigation. Because railroads are constructed with gap graded ballast, railroads are considered pervious surfaces and therefore require no storm water runoff mitigation.

Because buses are not constrained by tracks and will wander, running buses on the corridor will require a substantially heavier crash protection system separating the busway from the adjacent multiuse trail instead of the visually transparent cable rail fence proposed for use with rail transit. Besides visual impact, BRT crash barriers may present challenges for wildlife crossings.

BRT has limited capacity (BRT will require about 5 times more buses to carry the same number of commuters as a typical passenger rail vehicle – even more if rail transit is scaled up) if residents were worried about 60 trains a day, imagine their reaction when they hear 300 buses a day are coming their way. Rail transit moves more people using less money and energy – per the UCS:

1 rail car OpEx is $547 hr but moves 300+ people
1 bus OpEx is $200/hr but it takes 5 buses to move as many people at cost of $1,000
BRT on the rail corridor has limited scalability (limited bus vehicle capacity combined with the functional throughput limitations where two way traffic occurs on signal controlled one lane sections severely hampers maximum bus passenger throughput)

Rail transit is far more scalable – adding one car to a two car train set adds 50% more capacity at nominal added cost. Doing the same with buses would require 3 more buses at $200/hour each.

Passenger rail transit provides the 80,000 south county residents access to fast, modern, quiet, comfortable rail transit and does not leave them stuck with slower, inferior bus transit. Passenger rail transit improves the balance of social and economic equity.

UCS indicates mode share for passenger rail transit would be 25% higher than for BRT even though UCS considered BRT would run on 15 min frequency vs passenger rail transit would run on 30 min frequency

Without substantial expense to provide both tracks and pavement, implementing BRT on the corridor will eliminate / break the continuous railroad tracks between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. Doing so:

- Denies Roaring Camp (a thriving local business) access to nationwide rail network for replacement rail vehicles and other needs
- Denies freight rail service to customers north of Watsonville. Every freight car replaces 4 highway trucks (saving space on our highways, saving fuel, reducing GHG emissions, and making roadways safer). Moving freight by rail can also give local businesses a competitive advantage in the market.

Rail transit leads to more compact development patterns – reducing sprawl and leading to more efficient use of our most valuable resource, developable land area. Bus routes can be changed without notice and are less dependable over the long term. Transit Oriented Development thrives under rail transit systems that are essentially permanent. Housing providers and other developers like permanent.

Summary

Passenger Rail Transit on the corridor

- attracts more riders and more active transportation users
- offers significantly faster travel times
- offers unparalleled reliability and scalability
- protects the existing rail easements and avoids costly time consuming litigation
- allows the rail trail to be completed ASAP
- is eligible for substantial outside funding
- will require less local money to build and operate
- will give our community the best public transportation system possible

Accordingly, the RTC should focus resources on developing passenger rail transit on the rail corridor combined with an optimized METRO bus system with the goal of transforming the public transportation system serving our community ASAP.
Hello Guy;

Mark Mesiti-Miller forwarded your email address to me. Welcome to the RTC! Nothing like jumping into the middle of a contentious debate, but I have the feeling you’re just the person for the job with your experience.

As for me, I’m the previous chair of FORT, and I’ve got something to share with you about the Scenario analyses that were done recently regarding the rail corridor. Back in November I did a cost-benefit analysis using the numbers given in the Scenario Study, and the results are quite striking. Scenarios B & C have the fastest payback period, B does best in the long term, A sometimes never pays back depending on assumptions, and E does eventually but it can be a very long time. I’ve included the short (2 page) analysis.

I’m sure I’ll meet you in the next couple of weeks with all of the events planned!

Best,

Bruce Sawhill, PhD
Cost/Benefit Analysis of the UCIS Study Alternatives
Bruce Sawhill, PhD • October 21, 2018

The recently released Draft UCIS contains four scenarios for future transportation options on the three main north/south corridors in our County. Since the “I” in UCIS stands for “Investment”, why not attempt to subject the scenarios to the kind of investment analysis that is usually undertaken for more conventional investments, like buying stocks, buildings, farm property, etc.?

Transportation investments are not as simple as most other investments and transportation infrastructure affects many intangibles as well as tangibles. That said, the UCIS has given us several measures of effectiveness that can be translated into dollars. The two largest effects are VMT (“vehicle miles traveled”) and accidents prevented.

For a conventional investment, one looks at the capital cost and the carrying cost – How much something costs to buy and how much it costs to keep it up. A good investment makes enough money to not only exceed the carrying cost but to pay back the capital in a reasonable amount of time. As it turns out, the benefits of all of the scenarios except A exceed the carrying costs, but only two of them “pay back” the capital in a reasonable amount of time.

For the UCIS, we have carrying cost (“operations”) and capital costs, divided into local and non-local components. We also have benefits in terms of VMTs (increase or decrease) and accident reductions, compared to the “No Build” (do nothing, spend nothing) alternative. The costs and benefits are calculated in terms of local quantities.

The following spreadsheet shows the operations and capital costs of each of the four scenarios and the monetized effect of VMT changes as well as accident reductions. The VMTs are priced at the Federal reimbursement rate of 54.5 cents per mile (2018) and the accidents are priced at 68.2% of the $223,700 cost of each accident as quoted in the UCIS. 68.2% is used because that is the indirect cost of each accident, because the reduction in direct costs largely benefits insurance companies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Cap</th>
<th>Ops/yr</th>
<th>Colls</th>
<th>VMT/day</th>
<th>Yearly Net</th>
<th>Net: 20 yrs</th>
<th>Net: 30 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-248</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-540</td>
<td>-550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-366</td>
<td>-80,000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-252</td>
<td>-60,000</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-257</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-607</td>
<td>-514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenarios B and C are clear winners here, with B producing almost $400 million additional benefit over 30 years than C.
The same information can be viewed in graphical form, to show the return on investment of the different scenarios over time. The vertical scale is in millions of dollars.

All of the scenarios start in negative numbers (representing the initial investment) and then change over time by the net gain or loss on operations, VMTs, and accidents. Both Scenarios B and C have a break-even time of about 7 years and generate net positive value after that. Scenario A never breaks even. Scenario E breaks even after 85 years, not shown on the above graphic. After 30 years Scenario B has delivered over $1.2B in value and the spread between the best and worst scenarios (B and E, A) is a whopping $1.8 billion.

In conclusion: A return on investment analysis of corridor scenarios is important for an investment of this size and complexity. Though all of the scenarios are preliminary, it is clear at this point that B is the winner by a significant margin. I feel this is a compelling reason to choose it. — Bruce Sawhill, PhD

References: 1https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/812013

APPENDIX

Testing assumptions: These calculations, like all financial analyses, depend on assumptions. What happens if we change key assumptions like the cost of operating a car or how much financial assistance we get from outside the County?

A) Marginal cost of driving instead of total cost – No lifestyle changes, no cars bought or sold in response to transit or lack thereof – people just use exactly the same number of cars to drive more or less, retaining the costs of car ownership. Replace 54.5 cents/mile with 32 cents/mile. Result: Scenarios B and C pay back in 8 years, A and E in 40-50 years, B ahead of C by $350M in 30 years with a net value of $1.1B. Best to worst spread@30yrs (B vs A): $1.3B

B) Worst case funding scenario: No help from outside, all expenses paid locally. Result: B first to pay back (33 years), Value of B $38M better than C (next closest) at 30 years. Best to worst spread@30yrs (B vs E): $1.9B

C) Perfect storm: Use marginal cost of driving plus no outside financial help: Result: B first to pay back (46 years), C ahead of B at 30 years by $9M. Best/worst spread@30yrs (C&B vs E): $1.4B
Greetings Commissioners,

Please find attached a letter positing why rail and trail not bus rapid transit and trail is the best way forward for our community.

Thanks for your consideration.

Mark

Mark Mesiti-Miller, P.E.
(831) 818-3660
Board Chair, Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail and Trail
Build the Trail – Keep the Rail
www.railandtrail.org
Imagine – 4 min video: https://youtu.be/qe3gRU-bpWY
Top 10 Reasons to Build the Rail Trail ASAP – 80 sec video: http://tiny.cc/TopTenReasons
January 4, 2019

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

Re: Why Rail and Trail not Bus Rapid Transit and Trail is Best Way Forward

Dear Commissioners and UCS Study Team,

Two truths about what is in everyone’s best interest with respect to the rail corridor, have emerged from the UCS process:

1. The multi-use Coastal Rail Trail should be prioritized for construction as soon as possible
2. The railroad tracks should be kept in place for future passenger rail transit use

A deeper dive into the results of the UCS provides clear evidence that the best public transportation to implement in the rail corridor is passenger rail transit fully integrated into our County’s existing public transportation system. An integrated public transportation system using a fast, efficient and economical passenger rail transit spine paired with strategic, timely and flexible bus transit route ribs will move more people, get more people out of cars, get more people using active transportation all while creating a more vibrant, resilient, sustainable community offering a higher quality of life for residents, businesses and visitors alike. Not only that, implementing passenger rail transit requires the least amount of local investment dollars and can be done with minimal disruption to our existing roadways. Accordingly, FORT recommends the RTC take the steps necessary to expedite building the rail trail and to implement passenger rail transit into a fully integrated, robust public transportation system.

A deeper dive into the UCS tell us why passenger rail transit is better than bus rapid transit (BRT).

Ridership for passenger rail transit will be 85% higher than for BRT. The poor showing for BRT ridership is explained in the UCS thus: “The main factors that reduced ridership is that BRT between Watsonville and Santa Cruz is not a dedicated facility for the entire length in both directions and that the travel time for BRT is longer than for rail.”

Travel times for rail transit will be much faster than BRT between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. Average BRT travel time will be 58 minutes, 41% slower than rail transit travel time of 41 minutes. Morning travel times for BRT at 63 minutes, will be 54% slower than rail transit. Given the much poorer travel times, it is easier to understand why predicted ridership for BRT on the rail corridor is so much lower than for rail transit.
Cost to implement rail transit will be lower than the cost for an equivalent BRT system. BRT as proposed in the UCS fails to address the ‘Aptos Strangler’ so clearly identified as the key bottleneck by many, including transportation expert Jarrett Walker. Extending BRT on the corridor to address the Aptos Strangler will cost an additional $83M driving the capital cost of BRT to a total of $348M well beyond the capital cost of $325M for passenger rail transit. Furthermore and most importantly, the UCS did not account for the substantial assistance available from the State, which could drive the local share for rail transit to less than $20M. Far less than the $169M ($252M if BRT is extended) local share for BRT.

Cost to operate passenger rail transit is 30-40% less per passenger mile than for BRT per the National Transit Database published by the Federal Transit Administration. This cost comparison should hold true for our local situation when an apples to apples comparison is provided. In FORT’s previous correspondence dated 12/28/18, the 10:1 imbalance between supporting bus service needed to support rail transit as opposed to serving BRT was discussed. In addition, the UCS does not appear to include the costs for maintaining the one-lane, two-way traffic signal systems, nor the cost of maintaining signal systems at local street crossings nor the higher cost of more frequent bus vehicle replacement (14 year life for a bus vs 39 years for a commuter rail vehicle, source Federal Transit Administration) amongst other considerations.

Cost of litigation and delay was not included in the UCS. As FORT and others have previously argued, a placeholder of at least $100M should be included in any use of the rail corridor due to the inevitable cost of litigating the property rights associated with rail ROW easements. Furthermore, litigation would likely delay construction of the trail by ten years or more. Assuming an average annual inflation rate of 3%, inflation alone would drive the $283M estimated cost of the Rail Trail up by $97M to a total cost of $380M. Can we afford the $97M cost of delaying the Rail Trail? Can we afford the loss of $10M earmarked to build the north cost rail trail? Keeping the rail line avoids the risks and costs of both litigation and delay.

Value of community benefits associated with rail transit are far greater than those provided by BRT and must be monetized should a comparative analysis go forward. For example: 7,000 rail users saving at least 30 minutes a day of commute time at an hourly rate of $15 is equivalent to saving $52,500 per day or $262,500 per week or a whopping $13.7M per year. There are clearly many other benefits that can and should be monetized if rail transit is compared to BRT including, but not limited to:

- Social equity increases for the 80,000 south county residents who are denied or bearing higher costs for equivalent access to the education and employment opportunities in north county.
- Health benefits of increased active transportation – additional users likely to use bicycles for first/last mile as they can roll their bike onto a train as opposed to lifting their bike up
and onto a bus rack. Furthermore, trains can carry more bicycles than buses also leading to increased use.

- Economic prosperity – rail transit ranks far higher than BRT regarding economic impact in every economic metric considered by the UCS. Opportunity for new businesses, business expansions, employee retention and recruitment, support for existing business such as Roaring Camp should be explored and included
- Environmental benefits enjoyed by rail transit arising from substantially less acres of impervious pavement needed, substantially less grading volumes and storm drainage mitigations, less disturbance of environmentally sensitive areas, etc.

Summarizing, FORT urges the Commission to move forward with building the rail trail ASAP, keeping the tracks in place and moving forward with creating a robust public transportation system utilizing a passenger rail transit ‘spine’ and supporting bus transit ‘ribs’ to serve our current and future needs.

A more detailed analysis supporting the points made in this letter, as well as a discussion of other benefits and issues, will be forwarded under separate cover. Should you have any questions or comments or wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me anytime.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Mark Mesiti-Miller, P.E.
Board Chair, Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail and Trail
Professional Civil Engineer

cc: Guy Preston, RTC Executive Director
Board of Directors, Friends of the Rail & Trail
Hi Guy,

I'm attaching the approximately one thousand comments that were collected along with the Greenway petition. They do a good job of demonstrating the deep knowledge and concern the signers have about this issue. Are you available to meet later next week to discuss?

Best,
Manu

--
Manu Koenig, Executive Director
849 Almar Ave, STE 247, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
(831) 234-3922 | www.sccgreenway.org
COMMENTS ON SANTA CRUZ COUNTY GREENWAY PETITION

Almost 1,000 Santa Cruz County residents submitted comments supporting Greenway’s vision for a wide, safe, environmentally friendly, and economically feasible trail through the county. The thoughtful, heartfelt comments are below.

THE PETITION STATEMENT:

We believe, after exhaustive research of all options, that the Trail-Only design is the only solution that gets the most people moving at a cost our community can afford. Why?

- The Trail-Only scenario is projected to move 6,105 bicyclists and 7,462 pedestrians daily compared to 2,750 round trips for passenger rail for about 1/10th of the cost of the Rail-with-Trail plans.
- There are numerous and costly design constraints for any rail option, particularly in the central and southern reaches of the corridor, which include 22 trestles as well as sloughs, steep embankments, sensitive habitats and lots of trees.
- There is a substantial difference in the user experience between walking and bicycling adjacent to an active train versus the Trail-Only approach. The Trail-Only design receives grades of A’s and B’s and the Rail-with-Trail plan receives E’s and F’s (grades A – C are considered acceptable). Rail-with-Trail also forgoes forever the beauty, tranquility and emission-free outcomes of a Trail-Only approach.
- Countless examples from other communities nationwide show the popularity and wisdom of public investments in pedestrian and bike friendly infrastructure.
- There is an option to preserve the right-of-way for use by future transit technologies. It’s called Rail Banking and many communities nationwide use it.
- A complete copy of the study can be downloaded from sccgreenway.org

By signing this petition, you’re agreeing that:

1. I live in Santa Cruz County.
2. I agree with the conclusions of the Great Santa Cruz Trail Study that a multi-use path for pedestrians, bikes and electric bikes is the best use of the rail corridor and that a train does not deliver the ridership, safety, or other benefits to justify its enormous cost.
3. My name can be used publicly as an endorser of the Great Santa Cruz Trail study conclusions.
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COMMENTS

“You have provided real vision rather than fantasy. Thank you.”
– Ted Burke, Capitola

“As a candidate for Capitola City Council, the Trail-Only scenario is best for the residents of Capitola as reflected in the Vision Capitola report.”
– Sam Storey, Capitola

“We need to do everything reasonably possible to encourage our community to turn off their computers and get active.”
– John Martinelli, Watsonville

“As a member of the Regional Transportation Commission, I learned the value of owning the rail corridor. During the process of accomplishing that, I also learned the many, real difficulties, both political and physical, connected with ever using it for passenger rail service. When visiting my hometown, along the Great Allegheny Passage, I saw what can happen when people agree to compromise. It’s time to do that here in Santa Cruz. We have the opportunity to be part of taking a magnificent step forward, creating a legacy for our community and our children. Let’s say ‘yes’.”
– Emily Reilly, Santa Cruz

“The trail-only solution will work! I want to safely ride my bike to work from the Westside of Santa Cruz to Capitola. We don’t need a train.”
– Carrie Birkhofer, Santa Cruz

“The rail-with-trail option would lead to a more expensive, less pleasant trail, that will take much longer to implement. There are better transit options like light-rail on arterial streets, bus-only lanes, and new technologies.”
– Ron Goodman, Santa Cruz
“I am looking forward to a world class trail (ONLY). The alternative to TRAIL-ONLY is a tourist train that will only allow people on the trail in a few sections. None of the trestles will be available to people who want to use the trail, as we will have go below each trestle to places like Capitola. This trail would be a huge tourist destination. Right now bikes can beat cars across town during rush hour. Imagine being able to do the ride without any traffic and threat of getting smashed by a car. The sensible thing to do is to give back the $11 million grant, railbank the tracks, and put all the energy in to making this corridor for pedestrians and bicyclists to enjoy. After seeing other communities use their old rail lines as greenways, it has become clearly evident that this will be the crown jewel of Santa Cruz County! This will be an asset for local residents who need an efficient and safe way to get across town or just to recreate. The biggest bonus is that tourist will come from all over, to enjoy the beauty that it will offer. It’s not just a greenway, but a blue way as well.”

– Barbara Roettger, Santa Cruz

“The cost of rail will make it infeasible.”

– Gayle Ortiz, Capitola

“The Great Santa Cruz Trail will TRANSFORM the way we get to and from work and school, and how we enjoy our spectacular natural wonders. I am pro-rail and public transit but the Coastal Corridor is NOT the place for it.”

– Casey Kirkhart, Santa Cruz

“Rail is a waste of money. Nobody will use it.”

– William Rodoni, Santa Cruz

“The time is now for a great multi-use (walking/biking) trail. Our community already has a significant number of bicycle-only commuters, and this trail could help accelerate that trend, allowing further economic growth without adding additional road congestion.”

– Keri Waters, Santa Cruz
“My experience with the rail converted to bike/ped trail in Monterey is that it has become a cherished resource for locals and tourists. It is one of their main attractions. They realized a train was incompatible with a trail. The same is true here. My students at New Brighton Middle School are forbidden by law to skateboard to school through Capitola. To be able to utilize the (also forbidden) trestle to skate or bike or walk would reduce parent driver traffic and empower kids to be independently mobile. Also, voters can always change the trail to a RxR track in the future. Let’s turn it into a useable resource now rather and a decade out. Let’s open the trestle in Capitola to public use! It is a scenic asset the city should draw attention to. Also, it is the only practical route for bikes and pedestrians, many of whom are students in the Soquel School District, to avoid the Esplanade. There have been numerous collisions between cars and kids in this area (one of whom was my son hit by a car that made a sudden turn left across the heavy commute traffic by Depot Hill). Skateboards have been made illegal for collisions in this area. We need the trestle open, but a train will make it permanently off-limits for bikes and pedestrians.”

– Dean Cutter, Santa Cruz

“This plan is one that works for all. With a bike and pedestrian path and railbanking, this is a feasible and realistic use of the rail corridor to its full potential in our lifetimes.”

– Jackie Nunez, Santa Cruz

“We need a bicycle trail system in Santa Cruz.”

– William Ow, Santa Cruz

“I wholeheartedly support a trail-only initiative.”

– Doug Erickson, Santa Cruz

“I believe that the trail-only is the best future choice for Santa Cruz.”

– Gary Griggs, Santa Cruz
“Proud supporter of Trail-Only!”
– Rose Filicetti, Capitola

“The trail-only solution is the only way forward for the corridor that makes sense for our community. A trail-only use of the corridor will bring amazing and lasting benefits to our community. The train to nowhere is wholly impractical and will never be built.”
– Sebastian Frey, Aptos

“Because the trail-only option makes the most sense for our community and it would be a huge added benefit to both locals and tourists alike. A trail-only option would create such wonderful way to get around town not to mention be a great benefit for both locals and tourists alike. Trying to add a train simply doesn’t make sense for the space of our corridor not to mention all the clear-cutting of trees and added fences separating neighborhoods would be a huge bummer!”
– Tyler Fox, Santa Cruz

“It’s simple: A bicycle and pedestrian safe route with minimal elevation gain will promote more citizens to get out of their cars and into a healthier commute with the added benefit of social interaction.”
– Peter Stanger, La Selva Beach

“A walking and bicycle trail connecting the communities of South County to North County sounds SO amazing! Pedestrian and bicycle friendly and so much safer and more affordable than a trail with a train running along side it!”
– Kym Dewitt, Capitola

“I am signing because I support the trail-only scenario.”
– Susan Westman, Watsonville
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“I’m signing because my husband was killed on the Murray St. Bridge over the harbor while riding his bike (on July 10, 2018). Had there been a trail over the train bridge his death would likely have been prevented. We need to get bikes away from cars (and trains). Bike fatalities make people afraid to ride in town. We need to encourage cycling and the trail-only plan will do that.”

– Tutti Hacking, Santa Cruz

“I agree! Yes trail! No rail! It’s the smart thing to do! I am signing because I think trying the “trail-only” option is certainly worth a try, given the expense and time any sort of rail (besides outmoded diesel freight trains) will entail. We as a community will be able to make a more informed decision when better transportation technologies are available for public transportation.”

– Patrice Boyle, Santa Cruz

“In addition to the above [petition] points, I am also convinced that personal electric devices are a better clean transportation future than trains and can be done in a way that is even more socially equitable at a fraction of the cost.”

– Sibley Simon, Santa Cruz

“I want to be safe while driving my wheelchair to my daily errands.”

– Ernestina Saldana, Soquel

“I’m a bike rider and would like safer streets and paths to ride on with my family. Also it’s time that this expensive county get up to the standards like many other beach communities to have a long safe walking/riding trail for people.”

– Tricia Cross, Capitola

“This is the best idea for our healthy and active lifestyle here in Santa Cruz. Thank God we can all make this happen by our vote, and total commitment to create this world class trail here in SC. This can be available for us now, and our generations to follow.”

– Arthur Faygengoltz, Aptos
“I believe a bike and walk trail will be used by more and the negative impact and blight caused by trains in our tightly packed town will be too much to justify the low ridership.”
– Christine Bowman, Capitola

“I love rail trails, I love walking/running/biking around the tracks, I would love to have a safer, more beautiful place to do so.”
– Amy Rocheleau, Soquel

“I am a woman who commutes to work by bike. I’d like to have a safer and easier way to get across town. I think that best use of the rail corridor is a beautiful park like path for cyclists, walkers and equestrians.”
– Alicia Stanton, Santa Cruz

“I bike from Watsonville to Santa Cruz 2 times a week.”
– Pedro Bonilla, Watsonville

“Trails are user friendly- even though I love trains they do not supplement or significantly improve the community and haven’t for years.”
– T. Leonard Mayer, Soquel

“I love trains, always have. I have traveled by train tens of thousands of miles, commuting, exploring, and simply to get somewhere. At first blush I thought there was a good opportunity to use this infrastructure, but any honest analysis of our community, its needs and future, and the economics involved shows that the trail-only is the best option by Millions of dollars. The train we need is a sensible bus strategy and a bus only shoulder solution on the highway.”
– Charles Wilcox, Santa Cruz

“We don’t have or want the population density needed to support a rail line.”
– Craig Calfee, Watsonville
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“This would be such a beautiful, safe way to ride around Santa Cruz. I would use this trail often! Make it happen!”
– Paula Woods, Santa Cruz

“We love to ride our bikes but there are no safe places. This trail would allow us to get safely from place to place in our county. A train will be too expensive and NOT get used. It is another waste of taxpayers money!”
– Laurie Hunkel, Soquel

“I want to use an e-bike to commute, and this would be much safer and more fun than some of the roads. I like rail, but this one sounds like way too much buck and too little bang.”
– Aaron Clegg, Santa Cruz

“We need this Greenway! No one wants to bike or walk next to a train. Not only will this be a beautiful asset to our community but it will finally be easy and safe for many people to use this corridor to commute to work and do business. What a better way to get where you need to go than driving on our congested roadways and sitting in traffic!”
– Shawn Schaefer Coulson, Santa Cruz

“The Greenway Trail makes sense for people with disabilities, providing accessibility and safety that this county needs.”
– Mary Lou Sanders, Santa Cruz

“I want a safe place to bike and run for myself and my children.”
– Amoreena Laura, Santa Cruz

“This seems like a win-win. We definitely need a safer way for bikes and peds from Santa Cruz to Davenport. The train seems more of a novelty item. We need safe and separated bike lanes everywhere.”
– Saralee McCormick, Santa Cruz
“This is the next use of that corridor. A rail here will be too costly & won’t be used. It’s ok to rethink this one.”  
– Carol Tolbert, Santa Cruz

“I brought my family to Santa Cruz from Orange County, CA in 1977. Forty years later the kids are grown, the grandkids are grown, I’m old, and there are no safe well lit ways to get across town on foot, bike or skates. I think it’s time.”  
– Michelle Miranda, Santa Cruz

“I truly believe this would be a tremendous gift to our county. Giving people an alternative to the highway to travel to work and giving families and tourists a fun and healthy way to explore our beautiful county. Let’s make this happen!”  
– April Hernandez, Watsonville

“Keeping it green, quiet, slow paced life in Santa Cruz; it’s not about quantity but quality.”  
– Kristine Franck, Santa Cruz

“I would love to be able to ride my bike with my kids an not worry about getting hit by a car. Santa Cruz is awful for biking because the bike lanes are too small.”  
– Miranda Myhre, Soquel

“I believe that a “Trail-Only” solution provides the most environmentally friendly solution and delivers the most community benefit the dollars invested from a short term and long term basis. The financial burden and impact of a little used rail system will require us to redirect valuable budget dollars to pay for maintenance of a little used system that benefits a very few. With a Trail-Only corridor, the entire community will be able to leverage it’s create by providing a unique transportation corridor accessible to everyone at all income levels.”  
– Ben Stanger, Capitola
“This is a great way to make Santa Cruz one of the nation’s best communities for an active outdoor based lifestyle. This trail would be absolutely world class. It would put Santa Cruz on the map for promoting the kind of active outdoor lifestyle we love in California. Every small community along the coast would increase its vibrancy and reduce nightmarish parking conditions. Sign me up.”
— Soren Bjorn, Santa Cruz

“I totally support this idea. It is awesome. I am grateful people are working to make a trail-only option come into reality. Thank you.”
— Darcy Thole, Santa Cruz

“My family enjoys biking and want the safest option of a trail-only solution. No rail and no more getting hit by cars. Thanks!”
— Will Hahn, Santa Cruz

“Responsible, safe uses of public space are crucial to the wellbeing of our community. Passenger trains don’t bring the ridership numbers to make good fiscal sense. Shipping fuels by train through the corridor is dangerous to our ecologically-sensitive areas on the Monterey Bay.”
— Kim Jaspers, Watsonville
“Our communities were designed for everybody to use their car to go everywhere all the time. I think we need to correct that horrible mistake, and make bicycles a viable and safe transportation option. Places that are serious about bicycle transportation, like many European cities, realize that segregating bicycles onto their own path is the only to get many people onto their bicycles for routine trips. Having pedestrians and bicycles share a popular highly travelled path is just a recipe for conflict and inefficiency. If you as a car driver wouldn’t want pedestrians routinely strolling down and straddling all the way across the major roads you drive on, why do you think it’s less of an issue for bicyclists? This is the best way to correct our car-only infrastructure mistake of the past. This alone would greatly improve bicycle infrastructure.”
– Bill Martin, Santa Cruz

“Monterey county has a beautiful bike path that runs along the coast and thru the tourist areas. It is wonderful. We should have that here.”
– Mike Lelieur, Santa Cruz

“The trail-only option makes much more sense, especially with railbanking to keep that option if or when transit technology makes it economical to implement.”
– Sandra Caruba, Santa Cruz

“The Greenway will provide a safe way to commute and exercise for all ages. I’ve experienced bicycling a greenway in Indianapolis · the Monon Trail · built on a section of former railroad tracks that went from Indianapolis to Chicago · and it was phenomenal. Tiny cafes, bicycle repair/rental shops and wooden gazebos with benches and picnic tables dotted the path.”
– Rene Denevan, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because I’m a 32 year critical care nurse and I read that non-communicable diseases are reduced by 37% when we walk/bike greater than 500METs per week, and reduces crime, and is sustainable.”
– Tammy Sager, Santa Cruz
“The RTC has hijacked this hoping for big dollars to support a railway that isn’t feasible. Monterey got to build their trail already without train.”
– Bruce Werder, Aptos

“The train will not be an effective use of money to move people where they need to go. Make use of Railbanking for later, and use the trail NOW.”
– Martin Mogaard, Scotts Valley

“A train would run literally against homes in some areas. It would be intrusive & loud. It is not a good choice financially. A green belt would enhance & serve our community & population by offering a beautiful & practical way to get around.”
– Dorothy Smith, Santa Cruz

“I ride my bike and so does my husband who has been hit by a car before. Stay safe.”
– Mallory Baggerman, Santa Cruz

“I would love to have safe bike and pedestrian access from Aptos to other parts of Santa Cruz county for myself and my family!”
– Sharon Kluger, Aptos

“I want our kids and others to have a safe pathway to bike around town for recreation and work. This is a no brainer! It’s the best way, and a train is grossly inappropriate!”
– Al Adamsen, Capitola

“I am a RN and concerned citizen. Love riding, walking, and enjoying our paradise!”
– Elizabeth Magen, Santa Cruz

“I would like my kids to have more safe outdoor spaces to adventure and potentially prolong the need for them to get behind the wheel!”
– Alissa Ingram, Aptos
“There will be much more benefit to the people of Santa Cruz County by having a Trail-Only design. The railroad is a leftover from a bygone era. Time to look forward and move on. We should be setting an example for healthier living, not preserving the investments for whomever stands to profit off of the rail line.”
– Jim Winters, Soquel

“Medically I require the use of a mobility scooter. This trail would provide a huge improvement in my quality of life compared to using public roads and poorly maintained sidewalks with constant drive way diversions.”
– Ronald Bingham, Watsonville

“I am signing because I would love to bike to work. I just signed on at Palo Alto Medical Clinic and it would be a wonderful way for me to commute to work!”
– Naina Biswell, Aptos

“This trail would open Santa Cruz to active commuting on bikes & e-bikes. Love trains but THIS train will preclude a world class trail and be cost prohibitive for our community.”
– Robert Quinn, Santa Cruz

“The Santa Cruz County rail corridor is a magnificent ribbon of land that showcases the beauty of our County. Removing the tracks will allow a world-class trail to be built that everyone in the County can use and enjoy. A pedestrian and bike trail can improve mobility and bring economic benefits to the County through tourism and low-cost alternative commuting. Let’s build this world-class trail now!”
– Ellen Martinez, Aptos

“With all the biking in SC County, this is a good measure to get on a ballot. This would really embrace more cycling in the community.”
– John Burke, Aptos
“Santa Cruz needs to walk the talk and become the progressive town it claims to be. Get this done.”
– Danny Brothers, Felton

“I will enjoy the trail on a regular basis! I would not use a train.”
– Benna Dimig, Watsonville

“Train will never be more than a bloated money sucking tourist gimmick that will do virtually nothing to alleviate our horrible traffic gridlock on Highway One. At least the trail-only option encourages people to get out and exercise and potentially will attract more “green minded” tourists who may park their cars when coming here and consider walking or biking around.”
– Andrea Ratto, Watsonville

“It is good for the county as a whole. It is beautiful, that brings tourists here; that improves local businesses. I would like to see it for the enjoyment of locals. Everyone wins.”
– Mary Ann Sheehy, Soquel

“A safer way to get across town not to mention its beauty will be an attraction for visitors and locals alike!”
– Paige McQuillan, Scotts Valley

“Greenway Santa Cruz is presenting the obvious and best use of the railroad corridor. Currently pedestrian and bicycle transportation across town is dirty, unsafe and inefficient. This plan solves all of these problems and will make Santa Cruz and surrounding areas an even better place to live and recreate.”
– Jared Figurski, Santa Cruz

“I’d like to be able to ride my bike without the rail!”
– Ann Carr, Watsonville
“I believe the freeway should be developed so that there is one lane for buses & multi passenger vehicles; and, the money saved from a railroad boondoggle can go to buses, disabled & bike improvements, county roads, the trail, and the freeway as stated in the first sentence. Both RR trestles over the freeway in Aptos will need to be torn down if their is no rail: that’s good because that stretch of Hwy 1 is now a choke point for the greater number of tradesman coming from Watsonville; and CalTrans estimates that it will cost them some 20 million + more if they have to double decker a highway expansion with the trestles in place because they must dig down to make this work. What is the organization’s policy in this regards?”

– Ben Vernazza, Aptos

“So many years of conversation about implementing a rail system throughout SC County on existent tracks.... I never really felt this option would be a viable choice for members of our community to use on a daily basis for commuting. In addition to the cost associated with that project etc, ...SC doesn’t need a slow moving Napa Wine train with limited transfer service out to the community from the depots. Now, a bike/pedestrian trail can be used by all persons in our community including the disabled community to get exercise, be outdoors knowing they are in a safe corridor, away from traffic! And, less expensive? This makes more sense...can be implemented sooner and hey, connect it with trails that continue south to Monterey! The time for action is now!”

– María Granados-Boyce, Soquel

“I think this will be a good idea for all parties.”

– Eriberto Velasquez, Watsonville

“The trail will strengthen our community and will allow everyone easier access to enjoy the beautiful area we live in.”

– Daniel Gomez, Aptos
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“I use my bike more often than my car and I think that providing citizens with a path will cut fossil fuel use.”
– Isaac Destout-Chavez, Watsonville

“(1) Protecting the environment. (2) Fiscal sanity, the cost would be outrageous and as always, the financial burden would again fall on the community, especially the younger generation.”
– Petronella Van Dam, Santa Cruz

“I ride public transit like crazy and I know that the rail option will never be used for serious commuting unlike a trail-only for bikes.”
– Diego Link, Santa Cruz

“The trail-only/rail-banking option adds immediate value to our communities and is the only practical step forward at this time. Consider the positive impacts of completing the Arana Gulch trail for a glimpse of the possibilities a trail corridor offers us.”
– Craig Wilson, Soquel
“I rode my bike for a living for a long time and rode in major cycling-friendly cities such as San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, and even Oakland. I moved back home to Santa Cruz and was shocked at how horrible the cycling infrastructure is. For such a “progressive” city, SC seems to have no clue as to how to make safe ways for cyclists to get around town. I have continually found myself riding in a bike lane that suddenly disappears with no warning and I am thrown into a car traffic lane with no shoulder. I couldn’t imagine having less confidence in my cycling ability or having children and trying to get around town with them. The main purpose of the whole rail-trail is to get cars off of the road and having a dedicated bike/walking path from Santa Cruz to Watsonville is the best way to do it. It goes through major residential corridors and would be easy to access for a number of people, and is close enough to the commercial corridors that those who choose to use it to go to work would not have to spend much. Also, think about the reduction in beach traffic! People could just ride their bikes there, reducing so much congestion in those neighborhoods that border our beaches.”

– Colleen McLaughlin, Santa Cruz

“We are an active community. Trails would get far more use than a rail system, and at a fraction of the cost.”

– Nicole Ottaviano, Santa Cruz

“To ease traffic congestion we need more pedestrian and bicycle routes across town and this trail will provide that. Let’s get people outdoors walking and biking through the county! The Trail will be most useful for those activities so now give us the trail!”

– Diane Koenig, Santa Cruz

“A safe environment for fitness and mental health.”

– Michael Burns, Santa Cruz
“Help improve health and quality of life in Santa Cruz County! The rail option is too expensive, and, more usable space is required for safe spacing between cyclists and pedestrians.”
– Greg Rauch, Ben Lomond

“I value the preservation of the habitat along the railway corridor and strongly value an option for bikers, runners and walkers to move along the different parts of the County without traveling on Hwy 1 or Soquel Drive.”
– Devin Avey, Aptos

“My family is ready to enjoy the trail now without the train. Pull up those tracks, lay down a pedestrian path and let’s start using the trail. It is safer, quieter, cheaper and more practical as a trail-only. It is the best use and everyone can enjoy it. I love to walk and bike with my family. This trail will give us a safe and efficient connection across the county. Let’s do this NOW.”
– Moshe Vilozny, Santa Cruz

“I would benefit greatly from this path, as someone who already walks around on the train tracks to get around town.”
– Jackson Reitan, Capitola

“Cyclists and pedestrians are the most environmentally sound and health conscience options to our transportation needs.”
– Charles Baylis, Watsonville

“I live by the tracks and want my kids and others to be safe riding all the way to the Boardwalk. Right now it’s not safe, particularly west of Seabright. This reason is on top of what would be low ridership, noise, and a high economic opportunity cost of not having greater mobility around town. I lived in Europe for nearly six years. An evolved, community-first, environmentally respectful society would have had the passage converted to a trail long ago.”
– Ar Adamsen, Capitola
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“There is only room for either a trail or rail, not both. Rail will be a huge money pit for decades due to low ridership, preclude building an attractive trail, and do little to relieve traffic on our roadways. The trail is affordable. It will encourage more people to walk and bike rather than drive for short trips. It will attract tourist just as Rails-to-Trails has in so many other places. Trail-only, please!”
– Stephen Mills, Aptos

“By the time the county is ready for a mass transit solution new technologies will arrive that will make the tracks obsolete. For now, tear out the tracks and get the best use of the corridor- transporting people on bikes, e-bikes, solar scooters and perhaps a small commercial jitney. Increased use of the corridor by walkers and bicyclists should substantially decrease the number of bad characters engaged in illegal activities there.”
– Jennifer Anderson, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because this is a project which would benefit the community right away. Santa Cruz desperately needs safe biking options, and this project would provide that.”
– Spring Smith, Santa Cruz

“Our county will greatly benefit from a trail system: exercise, greater sense of community. I see zero benefit to having a train: expensive, loud, disrupts traffic, doesn’t add to community health. We live in one of the most beautiful places in the world and have perfect weather: why can’t we access all of this by bike? Also, there are almost zero ways for community members to exercise in a fun and easy to access manner.”
– Cari Moore, Watsonville
“I agree with the conclusions of the Great Santa Cruz Trail Study that a multi-use path for pedestrians, bikes and electric bikes is the best use of the rail corridor and that a train does not deliver the ridership, safety, or other benefits to justify its enormous cost.”

– Franks Sharon, Watsonville

“I support the trail-only option now. The cost of retrofitting, excavating, rebuilding, etc. are too high. A scenic multi-use trail is feasible, timely, and will do more to protect the scenic beauty of our Monterey Bay.”

– Sally Smith, Ben Lomond

“I strongly support a pedestrian bike trail. I also strongly support a commuter train but not in this location.”

– Matt Kotila, Santa Cruz

“I believe its the best option for us people to move at basically no cost.”

– Luis Leon, Watsonville

“After visiting many communities that have rail-to-trail recreation areas, I’m convinced that having one in Santa Cruz County will not only get much more use from locals than the rail option, but it will also draw more visitors and encourage healthy and safe activity. We’ve lived--and walked and biked--in this county for over 40 years and I have no doubt that my family would put the trail-only option to good use. On the other hand, I can’t imagine a rail service justifying its existence.”

– Janet Byers, Aptos

“I support railbanking the tracks and building a wide, multi-modal, fenceless, inclusive, ADA supported trail that has open access points throughout.”

– Tim Brattan, Santa Cruz
“Every example of a bike trail has been a success around the country. Very few if any rail lines have been a success. The cost analysis is greatly flawed for a rail line and there is no way a train can go 25MPH which would be needed to meet the proposed timetable.”

– **Greg Crandall, Aptos**

“I’ve done an enormous amount of research on the rail corridor. It is increasingly apparent that a passenger train is not only an inefficient and expensive use of the corridor, it will simply never happen. It is time to use this remarkable resource to benefit our community. The rail corridor could easily become one of the best rail trails in the world. I love trains, but only when they make sense. A short, very expensive train on a single track simply makes no sense. On the other hand, without a train track, there’s plenty of room for a path for pedestrians and a bi-directional path for active transportation (people on bikes, e-bikes, scooters, etc.). Let’s get rid of the tracks and build a world class rail trail now!”

– **Will Mayall, Santa Cruz**

“We need a decent alternative to driving and this is it. Biking on the roads is dangerous.”

– **Sheila McLaughlin-Mayang, Santa Cruz**

“The trail-only option appeals to me as the most affordable plan and more as the best, safest, nicest option for Santa Cruz citizens. I work with disabled adults. When this trail is finished, it will provide a safe way for many people with disabilities to access their community with minimum or no support.”

– **Joe Shimpfky, Santa Cruz**

“Santa Cruz needs this amazing project and will be made richer by it. It will attract even more international visitors to our wonderful Monterey Bay.”

– **Andres Wolff, Santa Cruz**
“Trail-Only! A train would require a place for riders to park, already extremely limited in most areas. Riders would still need their own transportation from a station to their ultimate destination. Trains are noisy and would lower property values along the route, while a trail near a home would increase values. One only needs to see how few people ride our bus system to see how much this train idea would need to be subsidized by more taxes.”
– Dan Brune, Aptos

“I’m tired of taking my life in my hands every time I want to bike in Santa Cruz.”
– Mike Englade, Santa Cruz

“A bike path will make my commute much safer. I don’t know anyone personally that is interested in a train commute from Watsonville to Santa Cruz.”
– Joseph Salgado, Watsonville

“I would love to see a better use of this stretch of land that can be a pleasant corridor of sustainable transportation and enjoyment. I’m in favor of providing affordable, safe and pleasant transportation methods for bikes and pedestrians, as well as a way to promote a beautiful place for all to enjoy the coastline.”
– Tamara Myers, Santa Cruz

“Bike riding in Santa Cruz as it is now is very dangerous and because alternative transportation is good for Mother Earth.”
– Anna McGuire, Santa Cruz

“I believe that a train will: A) not alleviate congestion on Hwy 1 because the quantity of riders will be low; B) be prohibitively expensive to build and maintain; C) a bike trail is a healthier and more enjoyable option for both commuters and recreational cyclists.”
– Michael Manzo, Santa Cruz
“Let’s have a quiet corridor in town. We have enough noise and not another very expensive train which I would never use.”
– Maya Sapper, Santa Cruz

“Once in a lifetime, maybe several lifetimes, opportunity to do the right thing - forward thinking towards a sustainable future, not looking back over our shoulders to a past that will never arrive.”
– Laurie McCann, Santa Cruz

“Santa Cruz needs and will benefit by a trail-only on the rail corridor. This is health-promoting, quiet, beautiful and inexpensive compared to noise and air polluting train options. The trail should be built now. This beautiful greenway will link our communities to enjoy nature and enhance health, without rails or pollution.”
– Glenn Saltz, Aptos

“There needs to be a safe, viable alternative to automobile travel. I shop by bike, ride to restaurants, etc...Build it and they will come for the greatest good.”
– Hans Bruning, Santa Cruz

“I believe the rail plan is too expensive and people will actually use this trail.”
– Elaine Holligan, Watsonville
“A diesel only train will NOT remove enough cars from the freeway, and will NOT be self-supporting by train tickets. This has been studied for 20 years, and all conclude the same. To the SCCTRC: Please listen to your constituents. there is no shame to admit that there are better options in the future for this valuable corridor. But diesel trains on one way tracks are NOT the answer now or in the future. Please retain the right-of-way for Greenway now, and future electric or maybe even Elon Musk’s idea of tubes that are low impact, low carbon, and meet the needs of our very dispersed work force / work place destinations. Numerous studies for last 20 years have shown that a diesel train is NOT cost effective, or even possible. PLEASE listen to the expert studies that us taxpayers have funded! Thank you.”

– Dana Bland, Aptos

“Santa Cruz County’s coastal corridor is an asset which deserves to be used by active recreational and transportation users, which will allow kids to go to school, will connect neighborhoods like never before, will provide a new way route to get around for the disabled, the elderly, plenty of pedal powered or electric assist pedal powered vehicles users to get around to their music lesson, community meetings and of course work! Do not pass on this historical conversion into a greenway within the county to bring in a whole new array of healthier habits for all! Time for a world-class trail now!”

– Sandrine Georges, Santa Cruz

“Because I believe that walking/biking is healthier for us and the environment than train or car emissions in the long run.”

– Socorro Alfaro, Watsonville
“I have traveled to other counties and states and enjoyed those rails that have been converted to trails. As a long term (37 years) resident of Santa Cruz, who also bikes, walks, runs, and hikes, I would use the trail on a daily basis. I further am pleased that this trail will allow persons confined to wheelchairs to get off the streets and roads and enjoy the beauty of the trail. Please join me in supporting the Great Santa Cruz Trail.”
– Theresa Mantz, Santa Cruz

“I ride my bike everywhere, I have seizures and cannot have a license. I have never rode a train from SC to Capitola.”
– Scott Farber, Santa Cruz

“I feel the train is too costly and will not be utilized to it’s full potential. There is a huge need for safe pedestrian and bicycle traffic.”
– Erick Fernandez, Watsonville

“I love trains, but...a train along that corridor doesn’t make much sense. A safe, contiguous 30 mile bike/walk path would be awesome. A 30 mile path broken up by lots of detours onto surface roads would be entirely less awesome.”
– Tony Dean, Santa Cruz

“A Rail to Trail conversion would result in a “Linear Park” that would be the jewel of Santa Cruz County. A world class trail would be a safety corridor for children and adults that want to ride and walk for fitness and transportation. There are better and more cost effective solutions than trains to reduce traffic congestion, improve transit connectivity and lower carbon emissions.”
– William Menchine, Santa Cruz
“After reading the RTC’s feasibility study regarding the costs and benefits of a train use for this corridor, it is clear that a train will cost an unacceptable amount of money and provide the county with very little in the way of transportation solutions or enrichment to our community. A trail-only use would be a visionary choice that actually changes the way our county deals with transportation, public health, environmental stewardship and community building (to name but a few benefits). Don’t allow the fact that energy has been expended on this train idea to blind you to the fact that it is by far not the best choice. Honestly, doing nothing would be a better choice than this train.”
– Monique Kremer, Santa Cruz

“Trail-Only. Also I advocate disbanding the SCCRTC, return the prop 116 funds and return control of the corridor to the County and Cal Trans if possible. The salaries and lack of progress that Dondero and company have demonstrated is appalling. There should be a grand jury investigation.”
– Brian O’Connor, Aptos

“I am signing this petition because after reading pages of documents about Progressive Rail and seeing for myself how the rail would disrupt neighborhoods by widening the trail for accommodating the train and trails, cause noise with whistles, cause traffic delays at road crossings, add a financial burden to our county and allow for a possible “pre-emption” where the rail operator could establish businesses of their choosing located adjacent to the rail with gas or fuel storage is not what is healthy or beneficial to our communities. Who is profiting with a rail that will cost us millions?”
– Elizabeth Karzag, Santa Cruz

“Our county needs this improvement ASAP! Not a rail in 10 years when transportation will have evolved past it already.”
– Todd Anderson, Santa Cruz
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“Thank you for considering this. I am family doctor, and strongly support this as a means of better safety and health for my patients, family, and community.”
– Wendy Sickels, Ben Lomond

“We can implement this sooner and more cost effectively to benefit the most people! Support for a trail-only in the rail corridor is growing as folks realize the substantial obstacles to a train - let the RTC know how you feel!”
– Nadene Thorne, Santa Cruz

“As a medical professional, I agree. Create a beautiful, safe trail that encourages activity and helps decrease the stress in all our lives.”
– Kathleen Jones, Santa Cruz

“I want a safe road to bike with my kids.”
– April Rueppel, Aptos

“I would like to be able to ride my bike safely in Santa Cruz.”
– Janet Starr, Soquel

“I don’t think a rail trail is justified in our community, while a walking/biking trail is perfect for the Santa Cruz life style. A walk/bike trail will also attract millions of tourist dollars.”
– Linda Martin, Capitola

“I am an avid cyclist in Santa Cruz County and would treasure the experience of cycling along the rail corridor without cars, trucks, etc. to contend with.”
– Megan Martinelli, Watsonville

“This is a much needed trail system for Santa Cruz. We can all use with community to bring the area closer and safer for bikers-pedestrians alike! This is really the only real usable solution for our area.”
– Julio Briceno, Santa Cruz
“I LOVE trains. But this one is a waste of money. What this county needs is a bike lane that is away from cars and trains.”
– Barbara Diamond, Santa Cruz

“I believe creating a rail without the demand is a huge waste of tax payer dollars. Any future train would benefit more people going above Hwy 1 and not right next to cyclist. We should have both types of transportation. Cycling corridor and train separate from each other. The current corridor does meet the needs of the mass amount of commuters, as it doesn’t lead where people need to go. People are trying to get to San Jose.”
– Julie Stockwell, Santa Cruz

“Trains & pedestrians/bicyclists are not a good mix. Have you ever walked next to a train? Deafening! Not a pleasant experience at all. A Trail-Only option will allow safe cycling & walking throughout the county while the Trail-Rail will not really get that many folks out of their cars. The “Rails” are too far from many commerce areas or businesses.”
– Theresa Hutmacher, Santa Cruz

“I love the trail idea but think trying to include a train is ridiculous! Who wants to go for a nice walk next to a train? I would never walk or bike next to an active train. I can’t see mother’s wanting their children to do this either. The beautiful, peaceful trail is the best use of the space for everyone in the area.”
– Cheryl Haiflich, Soquel

“The amount of trees that will be required to be removed as part of the rail option is something that I can not support as a Landscaper and Arborist.”
– Justin White, Watsonville
“Trail-only is the only thing that makes sense. I have walked it and it is beautiful. If a train was part of the equation the trail would be awkward at best and road traffic at each crossing would be terrible.”
– Jack Keenan, Aptos

“I want the trail-only, not the light rail.”
– Marie Wegrich, Aptos

“The opening of the Arana Gulch bridge and trail has been wonderful. I work at Santa Cruz Bible Church, which is right at the trailhead, and I love watching all the people use the trail everyday. I want more walking/biking trails in Santa Cruz!”
– Rachel Frankl, Soquel

“I believe this is a much better solution than reintroducing trains into the corridor. Let’s celebrate our culture and beautiful location on foot, at a scale appropriate for our community.”
– Russell Simpkins, Capitola

“I never ride my bike around town because it is too unsafe! A walkway area is exactly what this town needs!”
– Brianna Vargo, Santa Cruz

“I am raising 4 children and would like our family to have a safe place to walk and ride our bikes.”
– Cheryl Winterburn, Capitola

“I would love a trail without a rail for my family to enjoy.”
– Jennifer Greer, Capitola

“I am an avid cyclist and I am tired of literally putting my life on the line any time I want to ride. A trail would allow me a route free from cars. We live in such a beautiful area it is high time people had safe bicycle access.”
– Scott Russo, Aptos
“Walking, Running and Bicycle riding are much better for our health than sitting down and riding in a train. A commuter/tourist train would be expensive to setup and maintain and no one would use it = financial failure. To move people on the tracks would require track and bridge repairs, and parking spaces for cars, bus service to connect. And now we learn that the proposed operator Progressive wants to guarantee the use of FREIGHT TRAINS! In their contract even if the commuter train is not a profitable venture. Give back the $11 million Santa Cruz and do the right thing for our community.”

– David Demorest, Soquel

“The County hasn’t a clue how to run a railroad but may have the skill for a trail to manage.”

– Jeff Brady, Scotts Valley

“The train option is expensive and I don’t believe it would get enough use to support the cost. Paying the $11 million back to the state is a small price to pay considering the train would cost over $100 million. The trail-only option would be an amazing draw and would get massive use!”

– Todd Phillips, Santa Cruz

“I want to be able to ride my bike on a trail where the railroad tracks are from my home in Aptos to my job in Santa Cruz. My boss was run off the road by a car while commuting to work on her bike. She broke her pelvis.”

– Erik Hedstrom, Aptos

“I work and live in Seabright. A bike and pedestrian trail along the old train tracks would be a treasure for the county and its residents. Please do not put in anymore tourist trains. The holiday express train created noise pollution and traffic and misery. The residents need exercise and an alternative route to south county. Please choose the people not the corporate greed. Thx!”

– Brooke Towne, Santa Cruz
“Trail-only is the best option for the vast majority of locals as well as a great draw for tourists. Economically it is the only option for our small community.”
– Evelyn Taylor, Aptos

“As having grown up in Belgium, I’m very familiar with public transportation and it usefulness. However it does not make sense in this situation. There is just not enough convenience nor locations to go to and from. While a trail-only would be perfect, direct and fast. Look at cities like Copenhagen where biking is even more popular than here, thanks to a great trail network. I can’t wait for this trail to be ready to use!”
– Stijn Cattaert, Santa Cruz

“The train makes no economic sense and the trail-only would provide a friendly continuous corridor for walking/biking from north to south county. Plus, if Hwy 1 is ever widened between State Park and Rio del Mar it would be far less costly to construct two new pedestrian bridges than two that would be required to support a train.”
– Scott McInnis, Aptos

“I am longing for a safe place to ride my bike and get great exercise. I’m also excited about bringing tourist dollars to our community.”
– Diana Chapman, Scotts Valley

“Even though I love trains, I really believe that moving forward with the Trail-Only plan will provide great benefit to our community in a cost-effective and realistic way.”
– Irene Van Der Zande, Santa Cruz

“I would ride this trail every single day.”
– Danielle Kile, Aptos
“Santa Cruz needs this! Let us be the example of the future!”
– Sarai Jimenez, Watsonville

“I support the removal of tracks to make room for a Bike / walking path. This would also make the over passes less expensive to rebuild over Hwy 1. Making widening of Hwy 1 more feasible through Aptos. Another great reason for a Trail-Only project is that once the decision is made to build trail-only option the train bridges/overpass between State Park and Rio Del Mar can be removed giving room to widen Hwy 1 to 3 lanes in both directions. Walking/Bike path bridges can be built for much less than new train bridge/overpass.”
– Peter Truman, Watsonville

“We need a safe biking alternative and to preserve the beauty of our coastline. Many reasons.”
– Denise Russo, Aptos

“I believe it is important to have a safe walking riding path in our county. The roads in our area are so congested with commuter traffic as well as tourist traffic that it is unsafe to walk, run or ride safely. This would be great for everyone who lives or visits our community.”
– Denise White, Capitola

“A hugely expensive passenger train service makes absolutely no sense in a small mostly rural county such as Santa Cruz County! Passenger rail service is not viable in a county with 250K residents, two very small cities, many small towns and many very rural neighborhoods. It is tremendously expensive, and ridership surveys point to dismally low usage. We are wasting money and time while the land sits vacant and the tracks and trestles deteriorate---build the Trail Now!”
– Michael Lavigne, Capitola
“I’m signing this because my family rides bikes. Two of my girls have been hit by cars one in Santa Cruz on Water St, the other on Soquel in Capitola. We need safer streets for cyclists.”
– Linda Williams, Felton

“I’m signing because I don’t think that a rail/trail is the best option for the current right-of-way. I think the value returned on our investment will be far higher with a well executed trail, like the Greenway concept, than with a rail/trail, especially over the long haul, as single owner ICE cars are phased out and autonomous vehicles become the norm.”
– Doug Brouwer, Santa Cruz

“It would be a shame to waste tens of millions of dollars on capital costs and then saddle our community with ongoing operating cost subsidies for a train very few will ever ride. I use my bicycle for transportation and would love a safe wide trail. Arana Gulch is an object lesson in why rail and trial will not work. The narrow path forces bikes, strollers, dogs and pedestrians into continual and sometimes dangerous contact. For the trail to really work for bicycles there needs to be a decent separation and six feet is not enough.”
– Ryan Sarnataro, Santa Cruz

“1. A safe environment for fitness. 2. Improved marketability of our towns’ businesses.”
– Caroline Sweeney, Aptos

“I love biking with my two kids, and want better, safer biking routes around and through Santa Cruz.”
– Jennifer Lingens, Santa Cruz
“I lived in Atlanta when a very similar project, the Beltline, was developed. It was incredible to watch how it changed every single neighborhood it went through. It caused a huge shift in the community to get people outside and commuting by bike or foot. It created a much stronger community.”
– Marian Acquistapace, Felton

“I’ve lived in other areas of the state with Rails-to-Trails, and they are huge successes. My family, friends and guests all love the idea.”
– Cynthia Loosley, Aptos

“More safe biking for families and kids.”
– Annette Truong, Santa Cruz

“With a bike trail I would actually go downtown! It would allow access to so many parts of the county that I dread driving to.”
– Scott Lesan, Aptos

“After many years of meditation on this topic and many years of support for the rail trail, I’ve switched and now believe a bike and pedestrian-only trail aka Greenway is the best option. Cheaper, quieter, cleaner, and more future-centric!”
– Philips Patton, Santa Cruz

“A trail, just like Monterey. Anything else would be a giant waste of money.”
– Patrick Darrough, Santa Cruz

“We need better ways to get across town safely and pollution free.”
– Janet Andreasen, Santa Cruz

“Let’s get this done NOW.”
– Matthew Howard, Soquel
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“I’m signing this petition because we have the perfect infrastructure for a world class trail already in place, the unused railroad. This path could be used by thousands and thousands of people. I don’t know why it is taking so long to make it happen?”
– Carol Yvanovich, Soquel

“With a train the trail would be too narrow, it would be like the West Cliff Dr multi user path, no good for bicyclists.”
– Jim Denton, Scotts Valley

“This is the common sense solution for this thoroughfare. It seems to me that the real reason for a rail is to transport service workers into Santa Cruz because they can no longer afford to live here. That is not a reality I am going to encourage.”
– Tighe Melville, Santa Cruz

“I would use this trail all the time. Currently I don’t feel safe riding my bike across town. With this trail I would ride my bike and stop driving my car.”
– Jeremy McCarthy, Santa Cruz

“The rail will be a financial disaster!”
– Maryellen Boyle, Santa Cruz

“Trail: a more sensible, feasible, current up-to-date solution.”
– Robert Bicoff, Santa Cruz

“I want a safe and easy trail for me and the future generation Born and raised in Santa Cruz and would hate for the railroad to ruin the small town vibe we have here.”
– Garrett Manning, Santa Cruz

“NO TRAIN!”
– Iris Moreno, Santa Cruz
“Sustainable transportation access not only benefits our environment but our city as well!”
– Nico Galindo, Santa Cruz

“There is currently a pedestrian/bike trail between Castroville and Lover’s Point. I’d love it to go all the way to Davenport. Providing for a commuter train will not add to our community.”
– Mark Scofield, Santa Cruz

“It’s great for all recreational bike riders and excellent use of the railroad right-of-way.”
– Fred Seamon, Santa Cruz

“The rail line will mean more noise and will once again be a safety hazard. I thought the whole idea of this project was to create a more safe environment for the people of Santa Cruz to enjoy the outdoors. stop this ghastly idea!”
– Margaret Wessels, Aptos

“A train will never happen in Santa Cruz due to the location of the current route and the cost to build and operate a train. A linear park and trail will be the cheapest option and really help build a healthy connected community.”
– Robert Stephens, Aptos

“I do not think that Santa Cruz County has enough potential users to justify the expense of having a passenger rail service. While the density may be there for some areas of the corridor, there just aren’t enough people overall. We cannot afford it.”
– Jim Dixson, Aptos
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“I am signing this petition as the option of a train is not self-sustaining (i.e., it will take on-going tax dollars to continue to run), no reliable demonstration it will alleviate traffic on Hwy 1, no infrastructure exists at planned stops/train stations including no infrastructure to get people from train stations to where they need to be, and the negative impact it will have on local traffic at rail crossings.”
– Ken Lown, Aptos

“100% in support.”
– Mateo Lettunich, Santa Cruz

“It makes the most sense for EVERY commuter to have an active healthy option to get to and from Santa Cruz area destinations.”
– Connie Gardner, Santa Cruz

“Santa Cruz is a bay area traffic bottleneck. Building a rail/trail will ensure that we will be come a bike/pedestrian bottleneck as well. Building a trail-only, on the other hand, creates a crown jewel path. Trains are great, I love trains, but they create no solutions in Santa Cruz!”
– Mike Parisi, Santa Cruz

“I do not want a train going through my neighborhood! I grew up with a train close by, about the same distance to my house now, NOT A GOOD IDEA!”
– Marceline Chaney, Santa Cruz

“Being a freshman at Chico State, the bike lanes throughout the town have been immensely helpful for getting around. This would he a perfect addition in Santa Cruz.”
– Jacob Zivanovich, Watsonville

“I want walking biking trails!”
– Steve Hilleary, Santa Cruz
“Time to get move forward on this.”  
– Brigid Fuller, Santa Cruz

“Rail will not work in SC. It’s not worth the money. This is.”  
– Rossana Bruni, Soquel

“It makes sense to use this as a recreational tourist destination. We should leave the rails for big trees and the boardwalk. Otherwise Santa Cruz is known for its amazing outdoor activities. A trail should be safe for walkers and bicyclists and they shouldn’t have to share the same space.”  
– Amy Harrington, Santa Cruz

“I opt for the trail.”  
– Laura Temple, Santa Cruz

“The pedestrian-bike trail is the most user friendly and green option for the old rail path. It would be awesome if we could learn from our neighbors in Monterey - and maybe (someday) link our trails with campsites along the way.”  
– Terry Turner, Aptos

“I believe that a train will not help with our public transportation issues but instead will bring pollution, noise and danger for our children and pets to our neighborhoods.”  
– Tami Corum, Capitola

“It’s needed and it would be great for the whole county.”  
– Brad Roades, Santa Cruz

“I agree with this!”  
– Ted Holladay, Felton

“I believe a cleaner pedestrian option will be a greater energized to our community.”  
– María Reitano, Santa Cruz
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“This would greatly enhance the community's health and happiness, relieve traffic problems! We need a safe trail!”
– Lisa Fluitt, Soquel

“I am convinced a rail solution would not have sufficient ridership. I would commute almost daily by bicycle from RDM to Live Oak on a scenic bike trail and it would become a tourism destination as is Monterey.”
– Paul Binding, Aptos

“More bikes fewer cars please.”
– Evan Hilton, Scotts Valley

“I grew up on the country’s first rail trail, the Washington & Old Dominion Trail in Northern Virginia. It’s a great trail and we should have one in Santa Cruz, too!”
– Jeremy Neuner, Santa Cruz

“There is simply no safe way to have a freight train and kids on bikes play in such a tiny corridor - time to loose the tracks.”
– Jeffrey Lapierre, Santa Cruz

“Way to expensive to upgrade tracks and bridges for a train that goes from nowhere to nowhere. This does not solve our congested freeway and corridors! Take a look at the Trail in Monterey - they decided to take out the train tracks and look what a fabulous trail they have now! We can do the same thing! Please sign and share with your friends. A train from nowhere to nowhere makes absolutely no sense at all. If you want to deal with traffic in Hwys 1 and 17 then build elevated rails on the median of those freeways, but do not even for a minute assume that running a train along the outskirts of SC will solve the commuter problems. The problems are with the traffic going to and from Hwy 17. That’s where we need to add light rail. We need a safe route for our kids to ride their bikes to school! This corridor is the perfect solution!”
– Wouterina Swets, Santa Cruz
“What a beautiful trail it would be! No one that I talk to wants a train in the picture.”
– Julie Morley, Santa Cruz

“I’d like to see a walking trail.”
– Michele Whizin, Scotts Valley

“Any attempt to include a train will detract from what will could be one of the most beautiful bike trails in the world. Trail-only is the best option for our community.”
– John Wright, Santa Cruz

“This project just makes too much sense not to do it. Long overdue.”
– Sean Estes, Santa Cruz

“This solution is the best use of resources to move the most number of people on an east-west corridor: helping alleviate traffic on Soquel Ave and Hwy 1.”
– Sandra Skees, Soquel

“I care about our community! Trail-only makes sense for the Santa Cruz community environmentally, fiscally and based on the location of tracks it wouldn’t work as a commuter rail because the distance to major hubs of employment.”
– Rosemary Milich, Santa Cruz

“I believe a train - in any of possible configurations - can never serve the needs of enough citizens of SC County to make it even marginally financially viable or successful.”
– Michael Vensel, Watsonville

“I think it will be awesome!”
– Mitch Desjardins, Santa Cruz
“The train is an obsolete idea and we desperately need better pedestrian and bike routes connecting through town. The Rail-to-trail has been a great success in other areas. Yes, let’s get the trail-only option started. We need this.”
– David Harnish, Santa Cruz

“I want to use the corridor in my lifetime.”
– Cook Peter, Santa Cruz

“This is long overdue!”
– Mike Bailey, Santa Cruz

“I want this to pass.”
– Krista Bertetta, Capitola

“Love to bike everywhere!”
– Rachel Morpeth, Aptos

“I am a daily pedestrian for all errands (shopping, banking, library, etc.) as well as attending community meetings, dining out, or volunteering in our community. Walking is a simple and free form of daily exercise and my heath depends on doing so. A transportation corridor free of trains, buses, or cars will entice more people to walk or bicycle, especially with children. This is an investment in community health.”
– Jean Brocklebank, Santa Cruz

“I love the city of Santa Cruz and I think it would greatly benefit from better bicycle access.”
– Bruno De Alba, Santa Cruz

“I want it to be easier and safer to bike across Santa Cruz County.”
– Mindy White, Santa Cruz
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“This will be a great and safe way to take a long ride, locally. Now we have to travel be car to get to a safe trail in Morgan Hill or Monterey County.”
– Ron Rackley, Watsonville

“I believe in a trail for our safety and how it will help our local businesses with small groups wanting to “fuel up” as they continue on the trail.”
– Gina Wheeler, Aptos

“This will help Santa Cruz a lot more than the crap happening on pacific Ave.”
– Shade Byron, Santa Cruz

“It is clearly the best option.”
– Dave Bamford, Aptos

“YES!!”
– Dan Bolger, Santa Cruz

“A jogging and bike trail is the best solution. Let’s do it!”
– David Bartoletti, Aptos

“A trail without trains would be great. For recreational cyclists, it would undoubtedly draw people from throughout the Bay Area, as well as local cyclists. (Especially nice would be a safe alternative to Hwy 1 when riding from Santa Cruz to Davenport.) It would also be a useful recreational and commuting resource for people whose neighborhoods it traverses. It’s hard to imagine how we would pay for the repairs needed by a train and even harder to imagine how such a train could pay for itself. Other than tourists riding to Davenport, who would ride it? It’s not exactly an ideal commuter corridor.”
– Ronald Bourret, Felton

“I’m signing because this trail is less than a mile from me and would be amazing access to my local trails and an amazing way to get across town.”
– James Lapides, Santa Cruz
“I want to walk, ride and skate the trail. I don’t want to ride the train.”
– Robert Carpenter, Aptos

“It’s needed, affordable and there is no demand that would make financial sense for train service in Santa Cruz County.”
– Jackie Whiting, Aptos

“I support the trail-only option for the rail right of way.”
– Kenneth Koll, Santa Cruz

“It makes sense :).”
– Jeanette “Jet” Miller, Santa Cruz

“It’s the wisest use of this great resource. A use proven successful in a number of places.”
– Frank Phantom, Santa Cruz

“It makes the most sense, for the most people.”
– Rachael Brown, Scotts Valley

“This is great for our community! We need to keep growing and beautifying Santa Cruz.”
– Dmitry Kras, Santa Cruz

“Traffic is getting worse in Santa Cruz and we need more bicycle access. Bikes provide a great form of family recreation.”
– Nathan Escoto, Aptos

“This would be such an amazing addition to our community and quality of life here in SC!”
– Rachel Beauregard, Santa Cruz

“I want a better place to live.”
– Juliano Jochims, Capitola
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“It offers an alternative (to an otherwise seemingly unbalanced, senseless scheme). One can only hope that common sense will prevail.”
– Glenn Smith, Scotts Valley

“Santa Cruz needs bicycle only corridors. Many more people would ride, instead of drive, with bicycle only corridors. It does not necessarily have to be the rail corridor. I’m signing this petition because Santa Cruz needs to establish bicycle only corridors.”
– Patrick Carcerano, Santa Cruz

“I mainly bike in Santa Cruz. I live here and work here.”
– Regis McCann, Santa Cruz

“Yes! Santa Cruz County must go green in alternatives for transportation across the county and the rail road is just a good start.”
– Ximena Ospina, Capitola

“I ride!”
– Dane Elliot, Santa Cruz

“This is very much needed in Santa Cruz!”
– Kelley Youmans, Santa Cruz

“I don’t trust this rail company to operate a safe, environment friendly railroad in our community.”
– Jan Burroughs, Aptos

“I am in support.”
– Kathie Stark, Aptos

“It is the right, eco thing to do!”
– Lynnette Witwer, Santa Cruz
“Because “I believe”.”
– John Ballard, Santa Cruz

“My house is 15’ from the tracks! I’m stressed out about a train going by again, I want to see a positive, neighborhood asset, not something appropriate for a large metropolitan area. A ped/bike pathway would be great, m and its about time. I’ve been lagging about even getting involved because I’m RIGHT ON THE TRACKS AND MY FUTURE IS IN THE HANDS OF A LOT OF PEOPLE WHO THINK IT WOULD BE NEAT TO ZIP AROUND ON A TRAIN. The old one went 3 times a week, max, round-trip, and mid-morning/ mid afternoon. It was a trip being 15’ from it, but it had reasonable hrs. I’m stressing.”
– Royce Fincher, Santa Cruz

“I want to ride my bike and rollerblade downtown! I love Santa Cruz! That’s why I live there and the trail seems like the best option :).”
– Lara Bezich, Capitola

“I want to be able to explore more of SC on my bike with my family and dog!”
– Julie Kelly, Scotts Valley

“Santa Cruz would benefit for locals and tourism with this trail. It can reduce traffic by making bike commuting more accessible.”
– Todd Lepinski, Santa Cruz

“A commuter railway would be useless here. A waste of money, completely disruptive and not needed to connect Santa Cruz to Watsonville.”
– Karen Kirby, Santa Cruz

“Please add horse access.”
– Molly Shields, Soquel
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“This is too valuable a community resource to waste on an expensive and disruptive tourist enterprise for private profit. Build the rail trail!”
 – Steven Robins, Felton

“The train is expensive and won’t be used much. Let’s build a great trail and tons of people will love it and use it all the time!”
 – James Schwartz, Santa Cruz

“This is a great opportunity to let people commute in a safe and healthy also have a lot of fun and keep environment happy.”
 – Anna Hughes, Santa Cruz

“The train will not be sufficiently used to pay for itself. A train is ridiculous - would never pay for itself. I support a trail-only.”
 – Rhoda Collins, Capitola

“My husband is an avid cyclist. Should be encouraged.”
 – Margaret Jenkins, Watsonville

“It is the most reasonable and affordable use of the pathway.”
 – Jan Finney, Aptos

“I want a trail.”
 – Miles Wadsworth, Soquel

“We need more safe options for transportation - by foot, by bike. It is critical to do everything we can to reduce cross town traffic and inspire human powered options.”
 – June Fox, Aptos

“We so need a dedicated bike & walking trail in this area! Clean air & safe travel. Use the rail corridor only for bike & walking.”
 – Sheryl Coulston, Capitola
“A trail in place of the tracks makes so much sense for the community. People already use the tracks to get from place to place with a trail they can ride their bikes or skateboards.”
– Candice Koshman, Santa Cruz

“I grew up with a great greenway in Denver, it will be the best thing for this community, lot of fun.”
– Deeanne Purchase, Felton

“I’ve been hearing about the Rail Trail almost since I moved to Santa Cruz, right before the earthquake. Just been to Copenhagen, which has worse weather but puts Santa Cruz to shame for bike transport. Enough discussion, build a decent bike path already.”
– Chris Niemitz, Santa Cruz

“Biking and walking is great!”
– Flora Lawrence, Santa Cruz

“It’s the right time for this project.”
– Andrew Paulin, Santa Cruz

“I’m an avid Santa Cruz (live in Watsonville) bike rider and would LOVE a safe, no cars, bike trail to ride with my wife!”
– Jim Ramin, Watsonville

“We have one opportunity to do this right - a trail-only design is affordable and the best option for our county.”
– Matt Hyde, Santa Cruz

“I am a biking enthusiast and would love to see a rail trail built for the pleasure and benefit to our community!”
– Nancy Valek-Corbett, Santa Cruz
“I ride my bike from my home near the boardwalk to Pleasure Point about once a week. I do not feel safe on the roads, especially since everyone these days are on their phone’s while driving. We need a safe way to bike along the coast.”  
– Ryan Glanville, Santa Cruz

“Infrastructure for bikes is an excellent investment.”
– Camilo Werlin, Santa Cruz

“This would be great for Santa Cruz.”
– Cynthia Stark, Aptos

“This trail is the best and healthiest solution for our community!”
– Dave Miller, Aptos

“A train would be a ridiculous waste of resources. Trail-only is by far the best, most cost-effective option.”
– Lee May, Aptos

“More bikes! Trail-only is our best plan.”
– Sara Swenson, Santa Cruz

“A trail dedicated to walking and biking that connects the coastal dairies to Monterey will provide an economic boom in tourism and will revitalize our community.”
– Michael Kaye, Santa Cruz

“I live here and I want to see this happen.”
– Daniel Hettick, Aptos

“The trail is doable, the train is not.”
– Martha Vickers, Santa Cruz

“It just makes sense!”
– Joyce Parr, Watsonville
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“There is not enough safe space for both a train and a path. If you have a path you want enough room to accommodate both a cycling and pedestrian path. The train although nice in theory is not realistic given ridership and corridor width in certain areas. The lack of planning for infrastructure makes this the only viable option.”
– Kathleen Bortolussi, Aptos

“Even though I feel really sentimental about the old train, the tracks have become disgusting over the past decade, and an alternative way to commute from one end of town to the other seems like a real solution for our growing road congestion.”
– Kim McGinty, Santa Cruz

“I agree with the proposed solution and love my town!”
– Rebecca Borghi, Capitola

“It is the only reasonable choice for utilization of the existing rail corridor.”
– Russ Harris, Santa Cruz

“We need a coastal bike path / pedestrian trail in this town, not a train.”
– Michael Kretsch, Aptos

“I would love to safely bike around Santa Cruz.”
– Laurel Henderson, Felton

“I live on the tracks in Rio Del Mar. Having access to a trail means that I would be on my bike to work, parks, and shopping far more than I am now.”
– Steve Hambright, Aptos

“The more people on bikes the less people on the road causing traffic.”
– Christopher Haley, Soquel

“I would love to see this bike trail come to fruition. It’s an amazing idea for the unused rail way.”
– Brandon Hughes, Soquel
“I live in Live Oak near the railroad tracks and work on the west side - I would love to have access to this trail for getting across town as well as to other areas in both north and south county.”
– Kristin Bogart, Santa Cruz

“Best thing going to get some relief on highway congestion before the end of the decade.”
– Ben Faus, Santa Cruz

“We need a safe, cross county, bike path w/o autos! Getting cars off the road; providing a safe way for bikes and walkers to get across the county and getting the job done NOW...should be our highest priority!”
– Ed Spurr, Capitola

“I strongly believe the best service to our community is a first rate bike/pedestrian tail. A train is expensive and impractical. I remember the train to Christmas town...It was a total offense to all of the Westside! Common sense dictates a multi-use trail without the burdens, expense, noise, and infrastructure of a train! Please make a sensible decision here!”
– Jeremy Ertl, Santa Cruz

“It is the best solution.”
– Kate Raymundo, Capitola

“This is much needed, and will make a great contribution in tying Santa Cruz County together as a place to live and enjoy. Bicycling from the San Lorenzo Valley to Santa Cruz is particularly sketchy.”
– Jerel Smith, Boulder Creek
“I ride my bike in Santa Cruz on a daily basis and we need safe trails for cyclists. It would help ease some of the traffic congestion to have a safe and efficient non-automobile way of commuting.”
– Vicki Orendurff, Santa Cruz

“I think the trail will be better without a train. It makes more sense than having to share a narrow corridor with a train on the trail.”
– Geoffrey Smith, Santa Cruz

“I feel that the bike path would be the most cost affective and be used the most to benefit the community.”
– Steve Johnson, Watsonville

“Because I would also like to have a trail.”
– Diana Ochoa, Santa Cruz

“It would be a fabulous idea. OMG, let’s make it happen!”
– Sofia Spadafora, Santa Cruz

“Our family would use a trail not a useless train for this area.”
– Dan Altman, Aptos

“A train is not going to work. Build a trail and attract tourist $$ from all over, plus we can ride/walk/wheel chair to points all over!”
– Amy Anderson, Aptos

“This is the most practical and cost-effective use of the existing rail line, that will benefit literally thousands of Santa Cruz county residents and visitors.”
– Kelly Shafsky, Santa Cruz
“I’ve lived in Santa Cruz county most of my life, and over the years I’ve witnessed the livability drop in our fair corner of the state, as our roads become clogged with increased commuters and visitors alike. It becomes an ordeal just to cross town to do routine errands, and you find yourself plotting circuitous routes down side-streets and lesser known thoroughfares to avoid the crush on Hwy 1, or else abandoning trips altogether because you can’t face another minute in the car. And let’s be honest, what other option is there? Even if you’re inclined to jump on the bike to get to work or grab a bite to eat, you’re still out there on those same clogged roads - risking your life to fight for a few inches of asphalt, and watching eagle-eyed for that one careless driver who drifts into the bike lane or makes a blind right turn across your path. Biking in Santa Cruz county (as it stands now) is not for the weak of heart, and certainly not for the casual rider. This bike-trail is a huge step in making this co.”
– Ian Moody, Soquel

“This will be a fantastic addition to Santa Cruz County!”
– Patricia Kaiser, Watsonville

“Walking and biking. No train.”
– Timothy Fisher, Aptos

“It would be a wonderful way for people of all ages to safely travel from one side of town to another- using no gas and lessening the traffic congestion.”
– Nancy Port-Gaarn, Soquel

“Best and least expensive option for this corridor! Exercise!”
– Francis Colligan, Soquel

“I believe bikes and walking solve a lot of societal problems.”
– Matt Merrifield, Santa Cruz
“I agree and live in SC county.”  
– Norian Valencia, Santa Cruz

“It’s about time we have a safe, zero carbon footprint way to get across town for work, school, shopping and pleasure!”  
– Cecilia Pinheiro, Santa Cruz

“The train idea does not pass the common sense test. To think enough passengers will ride this train to cover the HUGE expenses involved is unrealistic. In addition, the train idea gets in the way of a brilliant trail plan that WILL work beautifully with an entirely reasonable price tag.”  
– Bill McBride, Santa Cruz

“Let’s do this Santa Cruz!”  
– Alison Hayes, Ben Lomond

“I believe this is what Santa Cruz really needs!”  
– Alanna Maldonado, Santa Cruz

“I already use a portion of the Trail between my house and North & South in Santa Cruz. Safe and Sensible. Excellent report BTW.”  
– Niall Macken, Santa Cruz

“It is needed.”  
– Davidminton Silva, Santa Cruz

“I think the trail would be a great thing for the Monterey Bay communities. I’ve visited friends that the RTT near their houses and they are wonderful places to walk and ride bikes, especially with the amount of car traffic on the main roads.”  
– Kellee Livingston, Capitola

“A bike trail from Santa Cruz to Monterey is what I want my future to be like.”  
– Tiffany Theden, Aptos
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“As bad as I’d like to have both a light rail train and bike/pedestrian path from one end of SC to the other I believe economically going with just the path is the best option. I’m signing this because: (1) I ride my bike everywhere. (2) I want my family to be able to ride across town safely. (3) Trains are expensive.”
– Ernest Henderson, Aptos

“I support the trail-only option.”
– Ian Waters, Santa Cruz

“This is a good and practical idea to make Santa Cruz a lot more efficient. Having a complex network of bike/skate paths would optimize transportation around town and across town. Because it will be easier to travel by bike foot or skate board more people will do it, decreasing Santa Cruz’s carbon footprint.”
– Josiah Evert, Aptos

“No train!”
– Kevin Jordan, Santa Cruz

“I love our lovely coastline views and being able to run/walk along it!”
– Vanessa Walker, Aptos

“The trail would be a great asset to the county.”
– Misael Barba, Watsonville

“Keep Santa Cruz green.”
– Sonya Reed, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing this petition because I want to use more walking and biking paths as soon as possible in and around Santa Cruz. Let’s get moving!”
– Lawrence Holland, Santa Cruz

“I’d like to see riding a bike be safer than it is!”
– Teri Ruegg, Santa Cruz
“The total design/construction cost of building a passenger rail system in Santa Cruz County will be way too much now and in the future for the local taxpayer to accept. It will cost too much and do too little. More or less options is not a valid response. Be specific and back it up with some reason and logic. More or less options allows the bureaucracy to continue to spend money on overpriced consultants who will write propaganda. Its not about being great or not or right or not. Trains costs a lot and in a small community like SC, it would BK this place.”

– Robert Schneider, Soquel

“As a lifelong resident of Aptos, I support the trail-only option! No freight trains! And passenger rail will not solve our traffic problems unless it goes to Silicon Valley, not happening!”

– Bradley Macdonald, Aptos

“If you think this is a good idea, I have two tunnels in the delta and a high speed rail in the valley I would also love to waste your money on. When 1/3 of workers leave the county every morning at 5am to drive towards San Jose, a train between Watsonville and Davenport would truly be a tourist train to nowhere. Look up the facts on commuter rail’s in America. It’s a waste of taxpayer money.”

– Mike Sargenti, Santa Cruz

“It will be safe and fun to the pedestrian and bike users having a friendly infrastructure.”

– Jessica Rocha, Santa Cruz

“It’s necessary.”

– Matt Seligmann, Scotts Valley

“I fully support a trail-only option. The noise from the train whistle is deafening when it runs on the holidays. I would love to ride my bike on the trail.”

– Bill Schoenbart, Santa Cruz
“Having a trail makes the most sense.”
– James Calcagno, Santa Cruz

“ITS A NO BRAINER!”
– Tyler Cronin, Santa Cruz

“Moving to that area would love to see bikers take over the gross tweaker den. This will make that area feel safe again.”
– Grace Garcia, Aptos

“I would love to see a trail not tracks!”
– Suzi Mahler, Santa Cruz

“The freight train is a huge mistake--stop it from happening!”
– Ken Shelden, Santa Cruz

“I would like to see it done before I die.”
– Paul Schraub, Santa Cruz

“I am signing because I believe the purchase and ongoing expense of the train tracks and any planned use of it for any reason is foolish; but, if anything is to be done with the right of way other than a road for cars I will have to opt for the trail-only.”
– David Rauen, Santa Cruz

“No stinky, loud, and expensive train. I want clean, quiet and less expensive trail with nature for my use. Thank you.”
– Suzanne Johnson, Santa Cruz

“I believe a bike/pedestrian trail-only is the right answer. Rail would require too much money and subsidy.”
– Craig French, Santa Cruz
“It’s the only plan that makes sense. Both the usage numbers and costs prove that. Non-rail is the only way that won’t bankrupt us all, keeping that rail infrastructure functioning.”
– Mark Woodhead, Santa Cruz

“I am a thirty year resident and I love this town. I want to be able to get around freely and easily while enjoying the beautiful natural surroundings.”
– Gretchen Bach, Santa Cruz

“It would be awesome.”
– Ezra Koch, Capitola

“Good plan!”
– Laurie Lotusbeam, Aptos

“Let’s get the bike/walking trail functional as soon as possible. I want to use it! The train needs more infrastructure and more studies to see if it will be used. Railbanking is a good idea.”
– Sandra Baron, Watsonville

“Yes! Let’s do this. I think it will be a safe and fun way to enjoy our beautiful city.”
– Broomfield Julie, Capitola

“I would love to have a rail trail in Santa Cruz.”
– Donna Crivello, Capitola

“I’m signing because I am a cyclist/bike commuter. Each day, I am in jeopardy due to texting while driving etc.”
– Marilyn Rockey, Watsonville
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“I believe the rail corridor is best suited for a trail without rail. Too often outdated infrastructure is earmarked for revival just because it’s there, and not because it presents the “best” alternative. A bus and HOV lane/adjustable commute lane in the Hwy 1 corridor would be an alternative to such a large endeavor as rail, and far less misplaced as it relates to the areas travel corridors.”
– Carla Bentley, Santa Cruz

“Who could say no to a safe place to ride, run, and cruise?!”
– Jane Walker, Aptos

“It would be an awesome place to jog!”
– Mark Haynes, Santa Cruz

“I bike commute with my kids and I want a safe way to do it! I want to be able to ride across the trestles rather than the dangerous roads with small bike lanes and distracted, rushed drivers! Trail Now!”
– Aaron Cole, Santa Cruz

“The rail trail offers more opportunity for Santa Cruz county residents than any other option.”
– Everett Mudgett, Capitola

“Because very few people will ride a train!”
– Grace Nigh, Santa Cruz

“We need a safe place for cyclists to ride!”
– Malia Horn, Capitola

“My wife and I are avid bike riders and believe that Santa Cruz needs a bike trail like Monterey. The train option doesn’t make sense, too expensive and not enough ridership numbers.”
– Peter Whiting, Aptos
“Yes! A solution! Think Amsterdam, think health!”
– Andrea Riordan, Santa Cruz

“I live along the tracks.”
– Chad Kaesemeyer, Santa Cruz

“The trail is something my family and I would use! We live very close to the corridor and would love to use it for recreation. The train is not viable...we do not have the population necessary to sustain it, and it would not take riders to shopping or other suburban amenities.”
– Anne Sherwood, Aptos

“It would be great to have beautiful scenic route to walk and bike from la selva to Santa Cruz.”
– Steven McManus, Watsonville

“It’s the perfect solution! and I ride a bike.”
– Anne-Marie Jackson, Aptos

“This is the best option for the tracks!”
– Kristi Korven, Aptos

“I support the greenway!”
– Julie Scurfield, Watsonville

“We would take advantage of this and right now it’s unsafe riding!”
– Teyara Hardy, Santa Cruz

“I think railway is impractical as it is proposed. I, for one, would likely never use it.”
– Diane Evans, Santa Cruz
“I’m signing because I believe in open trails and alternative ways to roads. It’s priceless for the community. Light rail within Aptos to Santa Cruz doesn’t solve the traffic problem.”
– Megan Stewart, Ben Lomond

“I would use that with my kids.”
– Bevan Docherty, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because I live in the neighborhood where the railroad tracks go through the westside of Santa Cruz. Having trains carrying fuel through residential neighborhoods is a disaster waiting to happen. Don’t let this happen.”
– Lydia Cunningham, Santa Cruz

“I want a bike path.”
– Shane Kloepfer, Aptos

“I wish to preserve as much of natural, pristine value of our area as possible and the trail-only option serves this goal.”
– Bob Larsen, Watsonville

“We need this and we need this now!”
– Gregory Braithwaite, Santa Cruz

“As bad as I’d like to have both a light rail train and bike/pedestrian path from one end of SC to the other I believe economically going with just the path is the best option. I’m signing his because...1. I ride my bike everywhere, 2. I want my family to be able to ride across town safely, 3. Trains are expensive.”
– Jason Morvay, Santa Cruz

“I live SCC and love trails.”
– Mariann Williamson, Scotts Valley
“Trail-only: $30M (bridges included) rail w/trail: $130M (plus excavation and no bridges). It’s a no brainer, especially when you add a rail will cost $1B over 30 years.”
– Carey Pico, Aptos

“I’m an outdoor enthusiast (biking hiking walking). The best thing to do with the outmoded railway system.”
– Frank Johnson, Ben Lomond

“A trail-only approach has so many advantageous without all the disadvantages of rail including cost.”
– Alan Fox, Santa Cruz

“I’m a cyclist and have lived in areas that have done this. It is great.”
– Walter Haynes, Freedom

“This Is a great idea.”
– Shane Heath, Aptos

“Forward thinking.”
– Alison Gold, Capitola

“I want a bike path because it would be an amazing place to go and exercise while also having fun. It would also decrease traffic as well.”
– Maddy Miller, Aptos

“The trail is the highest and best use of the corridor.”
– Mike McClellan, Santa Cruz

“We need a rail trail for safe access in our county and to help get more cars off our too crowded roadways, helping both traffic issues and the environment. We need a safe biking & pedestrian corridor in our area, not freight trains.”
– Debie Chirco-Macdonald, Aptos
“This is common sense. Sadly, common sense seems to be in short supply these days!”
– Leigh Selby, Aptos

“Reduces pollution and global warming and is healthy.”
– David Brown, Ben Lomond

“Monterey county has a trail separating it from car traffic which makes for less bike/car related accidents. One of the reasons I don’t ride since I moved to Santa Cruz is the lack of such a safety corridor and the narrowness of the bike path adjacent to car traffic.”
– Neno Villamor, Soquel

“I think this is the best use of the corridor. The train will cost too much money and will not be used. A bike path with NO DIVERSIONS will probably result in more decreased traffic on Hwy 1 than a train will.”
– Peter Goodman, Aptos

“I support the trail.”
– Donna Heyl, Boulder Creek

“I’m signing because I support the trail-only option!”
– Jennifer McNulty, Davenport

“To support bikers like myself, so we can have more lanes and routes for us to bike on.”
– Lara Latourelle, Santa Cruz
“I’m signing because I use my bicycle almost daily to get around. I commuted for 24 years to work and still do. Our Bike to School days are scarcely attended because parents don’t want to risk their children’s lives on a bike ride to school. Building the trail would reduce traffic greatly by encouraging a safer ride to school and work for thousands in our community. Let’s do this now!”

– Tim Donovan, Aptos

“Definitely trail-only! No track please!”

– Dexter Hardcastle, Santa Cruz

“I live along the rail corridor. My family would thrive with access to a pedestrian and bicycle trail. A rail option would force us to move from our lovely beach home.”

– Michael Schwieterman, Aptos

“I am in support of the trail-only option.”

– Jake O’Gorman, Watsonville

“This is the only option.”

– Spencer Hays, Aptos

“This would be a wonderful feature to enjoy with family and friends and it’s one of the most spectacular views along the coast!”

– Michael Gorman, Ben Lomond

“The trail would be a great way to move people and cyclists, while getting them off the roadways.”

– Kittleson Tom, Aptos

“Bikes are awesome! Bike trails are better than roads.”

– Issac Barrios, Santa Cruz
“I want to ride my bike on a trail and not a street. I do not ride on streets and therefore am very limited.”
– Dania Moss, Soquel

“I want a safe way to ride my bike to work and through the county.”
– Tiffany Burns, Capitola

“The most users, the least cost and the best experience. It just makes sense.”
– Steven Venturini, Soquel

“I’ve lived in two communities with rail trails and miss them! This kind of trail offers so many opportunities and I’d like to see it here soon!”
– Amanda Stiles Branecki, Santa Cruz

“Trial-only is the smart way to supply routes provide a car free system.”
– Terry Gripton, Santa Cruz

“I believe in the power of the rail trail-ONLY.”
– Rayette Andrews, Aptos

“I agree. Remove the tracks, build the bike corridor that will further make Santa Cruz an attractive, healthy and commutable town.”
– Doug Leon, Aptos

“This option makes the most sense in all regards.”
– Lance Anderson, Capitola

“Bike and walkways are the best return on our tax dollars and public transit options are already running at a massive deficit in this county.”
– Derek Jensen, Felton
“This would be good for business via visitors and tourism, for the environment, for locals’ enjoyment, for safety...but most important...it would happen MUCH quicker and easier, providing something immediately and at relatively low cost that will have big, positive impact.”
– Evan McGown, Santa Cruz

“Santa Cruz needs bike and walking trails like other towns, not more trains.”
– Roger Douglass, Santa Cruz

“I’d use this trail a few times a week and I’m absolutely sick of the horrendous traffic in our county, especially during the summer!”
– Carter Jones, Aptos

“This trail will be of far greater benefit to the community than any other discussed options for the rail corridor.”
– Nathaniel James, Santa Cruz

“I’m a bicyclist.”
– Rene Ramirez, Soquel

“Trail-only and ASAP, please.”
– Dean Morrow, Santa Cruz

“I would like to use this bike trail.”
– Colin Parsons, Santa Cruz

“I support bikes.”
– Peter Stroet, Santa Cruz

“We need this!”
– Jasmin Rocha, Watsonville
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“The train option is not realistic and not practical. Trains are noisy. Noise is unpleasant for people living near the tracks. And the tracks need to have fences and walls. Fences and walls are ugly.”
– Catharina Marlowe, Santa Cruz

“I have been a cyclist all my life and would love to rid to south county etc. I really think the trail should be for biking and walking the train idea is expensive and way to costly for what it would actually accomplish!”
– Kurt Skelton, Santa Cruz

“I support the trail and the many benefits it offers both the environment and the community.”
– Ryan Colligan, Capitola

“I love to walk in Santa Cruz!”
– Deborah Baloff, Santa Cruz

“We need safe transportation corridors for both pedestrians and bicyclists. The only way to do that is to keep them separate. Moreover, I suspect the train would be a boondoggle. I favor the path of lower cost and quieter, safer transportation driven by human muscles.”
– Jude Todd, Santa Cruz

“I live in Santa Cruz and love cycle no and running. I’d love a new scenic trail as opposed to normal road running.”
– Ryan Bailey, Santa Cruz

“It was a wonderful addition to the community.”
– Barbara Temsamani, Soquel

“I love waking.”
– Sydney Gladu, Santa Cruz
“Converting the rail corridor into a pedestrian and cycling corridor would be wonderful!”
– Bruce Burroughs, Watsonville

“Safe areas for biking and walking are always a good thing for the community!”
– Tamara Tahara, Capitola

“It’s the right thing.”
– Gavin Hunt, Watsonville

“I’m signing because DUH.”
– Joel Wheeler, Aptos

“One of the main reasons is that I developed a, “Desal Alternative”, plan to utilize recycled water, which involves using the corridor for distribution pipelines. It would not be economically feasible to place these high pressure water mains near a train, because it would require expensive double containment of the pipelines. These pipelines can provide the means to wholesale up to 10 million gallons a day of water to sell, store, or inject into the ground water basin to stop saltwater intrusion. They can also connect to the “Deep Water Desal” plant being built in Moss Landing. This would essentially end the water shortage problems during drought, and need for, “conjunctive use/Lochquifer” water from the San Lorenzo Valley/Scott’s Valley are, which also has its share of a lowering ground water basin level problems.”
– Bill Smallman, Felton

“The corridor space isn’t suitable for a train. A bike path is a better use for this space and community.”
– John Fangary, Santa Cruz

“I want to be able to bike from Aptos to Santa Cruz.”
– Buff McCharen, Aptos
“A bike path and hiking trail would be a wonderful addition to Santa Cruz County.”
– Harry Domash, Aptos

“Walking and riding bikes keep the air clean!”
– Jacquie Armendariz, Aptos

“We do not need this. Where is the money coming from? I do not think the rail will be used. The trail would not be pleasant if we had to walk or bike next to a diesel train.”
– Sheryl Palmer, Aptos

“We just biked 64 miles round trip on the Fulton-Sacramento bike/walk/run trail. I’d love to have a local version. It’s a win-win for everybody.”
– Dondi Gaskill, Aptos

“I love the connection between our neighborhoods. Keep people active.”
– Brett Cornell, Santa Cruz

“I want to bike to work from my house in Pleasure Point to my work on the west side safely and with my kids!”
– Ann-Marie Osterback, Santa Cruz

“It’s a much better and healthier idea than a train.”
– Karyl Rader, Felton

“We need safe bike paths in Santa Cruz!”
– Paul Allen, Santa Cruz

“We need it!”
– Ann Ferrante, Aptos
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“We need a safe zone to ride bikes and walk in Santa Cruz county. Green painted lanes are not enough and this valuable resources is wasting away while waiting for a utopian rail plan that our population cannot afford to implement. We need a protected space to safely ride bikes in Santa Cruz. A train is outdated and not suited for this area. We can do so much more to help public transportation by expanding Hwy 1 for a bus and carpool lane.”
– Jack Brown, Aptos

“I feel by adding the Greenway it would be a substantial upgrade to the City of Santa Cruz. Thanks!”
– Rose McPherren, Santa Cruz

“We need this infrastructure desperately. We need this infrastructure now and for the future.”
– Jan Caldarella, Capitola

“I want a bike trail as soon as possible!”
– Michael Forster, Santa Cruz

“I ride with my two young boys all the time and there is no good way to get across town safely on a bike. This is desperately needed!”
– Tim Clayman, Santa Cruz

“We need more bike infrastructure now.”
– Ted Lorek, Santa Cruz

“Bikes are healthy for people, communities, and the environment.”
– Joshua Dibble, Santa Cruz

“Santa Cruz needs this. The rail trail is the perfect solution for safer bicycling and avoiding Hwy 1 traffic to get between south, east, and west sides.”
– Kevin Karwick, Aptos
“I bike a lot and the bike trail would be great!”
– Paul Dionne, Felton

“I do not believe rail travel will ever be viable, but a trail for people would have a tremendous value.”
– Lloyd Stephenson, Watsonville

“I believe a trail would promote health, community and a more financially sustainable choice for the city. A rail would be unaffordable, underused and extremely obtrusive to nearby residents and farmers.”
– Jill Borba, Capitola

“Bike trails will be an awesome addition to Santa Cruz!”
– Amy Steinberg, Santa Cruz

“I want a biking and walking trail to move about safely.”
– Garrett Presley, Santa Cruz

“The route and width of this trail makes no sense for a train. It does, however, make great sense as a walking and biking trail.”
– Christine Altermann, Santa Cruz

“Safe, dedicated bike paths and pedestrian paths are essential in a thriving community.”
– Molly Shaw, Santa Cruz

“I’d love to have a safe corridor to walk and ride bikes away from the crazy amount of cars on the inadequate road systems in Santa Cruz.”
– Karri Breslin, Santa Cruz
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“I don’t believe a train system would work. We need to get a transport system that gets people exercising and has low maintenance costs, as well as meeting the transport demands.”
– Toby Ferguson, Santa Cruz

“I love this idea.”
– Lance Hulsey, Ben Lomond

“I agree with this being the only solution that gets the most people moving at a cost our community can afford, and it gives us the option for Railbanking.”
– Luci Gray, Santa Cruz

“I think this is the right and affordable mix for our community.”
– Lisa Warshaw, Santa Cruz

“A coastal trail in Santa Cruz county is sorely needed and will benefit the community and tourists alike for generations.”
– Chris Nebo, Santa Cruz

“It will bring that corridor to use more quickly and cheaply. By doing this, it does not mean a train can never go there. However waiting for the train to appear while not utilizing the right of way is nuts. Bike trails in all other locations have had positive economic impact on the local community. Let’s do the trail now!”
– Robert Wyland, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing this petition to have a world class trail on par with Pacific Grove created in Santa Cruz. This is something my whole family would use almost everyday!”
– Leanne Butka, Santa Cruz

“I’ve experienced rails to trails programs be successful in other cities.”
– Curtis Ami, Santa Cruz
“Simple, smart and cost effective.”
– Lisa Sheridan, Soquel

“I want my town to be a better place to take my family.”
– Leigh-Anne Lehrman, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because I would like to get healthier and ride my bike more, and it’s become very dangerous on the streets here...I would love to ride more for short trips to the store as well; taking cars off the streets every little bit helps. It would also be totally more in line with what the people of Santa Cruz WANT! Thanks!”
– Margery Moran, Santa Cruz

“How awesome this would be for Santa Cruz county!”
– Shelly Ritchie, Capitola

“I want to see the trail a reality while I still can enjoy it be it by bike or walking.”
– Cynthia Carabba, Aromas

“I believe that this could really benefit the cycling community.”
– Rachel Strawn, Santa Cruz

“I would love a safe route to ride my bike around Santa Cruz to get to work during the summer.”
– Kees Horn, Santa Cruz

“Leaving those tracks in place is insane! Get them up and have a REAL bike trail up and running soon. NO commuter train will ever be built. Those people from “Friends of the Rail Trail” are zombies spouting lies.”
– Jeff Stallings, Soquel

“I am signing because I commute Capitola-Watsonville.”
– Martin Martinez, Capitola
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“I’m signing because I would like to have a clear bike path that lessens the danger of biking on a shared road.”
– Veronica Manuel, Santa Cruz

“Lets get this thing built already.”
– Alexander Martinez, Santa Cruz

“Rail is too costly and won’t be utilized.”
– David Criswell, Boulder Creek

“I want safer options for getting around on my bike. This just plain makes sense.”
– Terrie Sima, Santa Cruz

“I would like to be able to bike safely through town with my kids!”
– Marissa Swett, Aptos

“I think it is smart to have a safe way to navigate through out Santa Cruz. I suggested this after the earthquake when they were developing a plan for the recovery of Santa Cruz. It is about time. I suggested this during the recovery plan after the earthquake.”
– Carmen Mulholand, Santa Cruz

“We need something that works for our county and its people.”
– Joseph Ward, Watsonville

“I’d love to see a fast, easy route from Capitola to the Westside. Help us get out of our cars.”
– Devon Ricks, Capitola

“I would love to be able to walk, run, ride safely through town with my kids.”
– Jenae Replogle, Santa Cruz
“A beautiful bike trail would enhance the healthy lifestyle of our coastal town. I do not want a train making noise, creating pollution, and blocking traffic.”
– Anita Heath, Aptos

“This is a tremendous opportunity to create an amazing resource and the only scenario that actually makes sense.”
– Peter Townsend, Aptos

“I ride bikes to and from campus.”
– Kevin Le, Santa Cruz

“Would be used by many more people than tourist train. Safe avenue for bikes and pedestrians.”
– Alison Fuhrman, Santa Cruz

“The rail trail is an attempt to fit a quart into a pint pot. It’s also a great waste of a wonderful community resource to let the timeline for a walking/cycling trail to be held up by the much longer timeline for a railway. the rail trail.”
– John Boulton, Aptos

“Seems like a healthy, restorative project in the hands of capable, qualified young planners (and dreamers) Will contribute with prayers for God’s help.”
– Norma Wolff, Santa Cruz

“It sounds like a good idea and a safe way to get around.”
– Jonathan Fulcher, Santa Cruz

“I would love a safe place to ride with my family away from busy street traffic.”
– Melissa Lausen, Aptos

“I want a trail.”
– Charles Smith, Santa Cruz
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“I think bike path can happen - rail service too risky and expensive. We would enjoy the bike path frequently.”
– *Sharen Barrett, Aptos*

“I believe a trail-only option is the best way to go! If RTC wants a train so bad, develop an electric train parallel to Hwy 1.”
– *Gina Colfer, Aptos*

“This sounds like an excellent option for healthy, inexpensive exercising and allowing people to observe and appreciate their surroundings in an enjoyable way.”
– *Diana Cooper, Santa Cruz*

“Our community needs safe bike lanes and transportation across town. A safe and attractive trail for bikers and walkers would be a huge asset to our community.”
– *Terri Mayall, Santa Cruz*

“My kids are going to Cypress High school and we love them to go to school safely by bicycle following San Lorenzo river and then go toward east side following the railroad track.”
– *Denis Pochet, Santa Cruz*

“It’s good for the community.”
– *Noah Dillman, Santa Cruz*

“I want a trail, duh!”
– *Jennifer Heinlein, Aptos*
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“This whole project is a complete disaster. It should be renamed “Our great grandchildren’s trail” since most of us will be dead by the time you folks get off your asses and get it done. I am extremely disappointed that all we hear about is new studies needed. These are career study’s appointees who never get anything done. Forget the rail corridor, remove the damn tracks and get a bike and pedestrian trail built while we are all still young enough to use it!”

– William Conklin, Santa Cruz

“I believe that a trail without a train is going to be the best solution for our community.”

– Brian McElroy, Davenport

“I’m signing because riding a bicycle is FUN!”

– Frank Church, Santa Cruz

“I lived in Monterey and Pacific Grove. The bike path was a great resource.”

– Pete Hunkel, Watsonville

“I bike and think this is the right choice.”

– Jeremy Lezin, Soquel

“The trail-only option makes the most sense to me aesthetically and safety wise.”

– Andrew Alness, Santa Cruz
“I feel very strongly about these points: I do not want the “rail” option taken off the table. Leave it be for now, but leave the option for the future, if the need arises. Pave over the rails, modify the trestles, work around what we have, but don’t destroy it. Bicycle commuting, and pedestrian uses are incompatible. These uses must be given ample elbow room. Leaving the tracks dormant gives us the most space to separate these uses. Bicycle commuters travel at 15 to 20 mph. These two uses are typically excluded in high use areas (it’s illegal to ride your bike on the sidewalk downtown). It should be our highest priority to build the trail NOW. Once built, the trail will be the greatest public works project of many generations. There are no downsides, and endless positives, to getting this project completed. Leaving the rail transit option sleep, until its need becomes clear, is our best option for getting this trail built immediately.”

– Tom Davis, Santa Cruz

“I live in Whistler BC half the year and they have an awesome trail system to walk and bike. It reduces car traffic and is a huge benefit to locals and tourists. In BC, they just build things and get them done. What’s the issue here? Just do it!”

– Elizabeth Turner, Santa Cruz

“I’m a biker!”

– Keerti Ayakannu, Santa Cruz

“Because I need to!”

– Carolyn Maddux, Santa Cruz

“I believe a trail-only scenario will provide the best value to the county and offer Santa Cruz hikers and bikers a great option for a healthy, environmentally friendly way to commute and get around.”

– Chris Bush, Santa Cruz

“I would use this almost everyday.”

– Brian O’Dell, Santa Cruz
“Trail and Pedestrian walk/bikeway is a better way to spend my tax payer money. A train is to costly to build and maintain, will slow traffic at crossings, not to mention noise pollution.”
– Richard Whitcomb, Aptos

“I love safe biking! I commute or train on my bike 2-3 times per week.”
– Miranda Ganci, Santa Cruz

“I love cycling. Santa Cruz is such a beautiful place. It deserves some serious bike trails for enjoyment.”
– Janene Forsyth, Ben Lomond

“As a cyclist, we need this!”
– John Doty, Santa Cruz

“I would love to see a train in Santa Cruz that connects transit centers, high density neighborhoods, and major commercial centers. The coastal corridor (unfortunately!) connects none of these, and it’s therefore best utilized as a trail our community can be proud of. This would be one of the finest trails in the country.”
– Keith Trainor, Santa Cruz

“The trail is the only thing that makes financial sense. It is the best use for the rail line. Spending tens of millions of dollars for further studies is a waste of tax payers money. A trail-only solution makes complete sense.”
– Joseph Morici, Aptos

“It simply makes sense!”
– Axel Loelhoeffel, Santa Cruz

“Please build a trail without the rail.”
– Douglass Weymouth, Santa Cruz
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“It would be wonderful to have the train corridor to ride on and many other bike trails too!”
– Susan Lynch, Santa Cruz

“Trains make no sense in this community because of the excessive costs and lack of population density. They pollute, smell bad and make too much noise. They’ll also cost us a $1B and take 20 years to come to fruition. The best/only solution is a bike/e-bike trail, [which can happen soon/inexpensively].”
– G Craig Vachon, Aptos

“Public transportation is important for us all.”
– Dawn Castello, Santa Cruz

“Its becoming more and more impossible to drive across town. We need a safe route for bicycles.”
– Joanne Hutson, Santa Cruz

“I do not want a train! I am very strongly supportive of tearing out the tracks and putting in a trail the county can be proud of. It is the only cost-effective option.”
– Robert Jones, Aptos

“I want a trail-only solution.”
– Julie Pillack, Santa Cruz

“It would be a tremendous asset to the county, for residents and visitors alike.”
– Christy Brune, Aptos

“I want trail for skating bicycle less drive bad gas need healthy for Santa Cruz.”
– Raymond Welsh, Capitola

“I like to walk!”
– Melissa Snyder, Santa Cruz
“I don’t see any train and trail actually getting completed in my lifetime. I vote for a trail-only now.”
– Jim Cumming, Santa Cruz

“This is totally wasted and degraded space, I ride bikes for transportation with my children and would be able to do so more often, to more locations and more safely with a path as suggested.”
– Shannon Freed, Santa Cruz

“As an avid bicyclist I view this approach to be a more cost efficient and reasonable approach to a big problem especially of single rider commuters.”
– Michael Beumer-Browner, Santa Cruz

“We need a pedestrian/bike trail, not a diesel polluting train that will not solve the traffic issue.”
– Elena Rubalcaba, Aptos

“Seems like the best use of this resource.”
– Randall Finchum, Aptos

“This is a great idea. I would definitely use the biking trail for work.”
– Gabriel Austin, Watsonville

“It is the right way to proceed.”
– Thomas Brandow, Santa Cruz

“This idea will keep costs down and it will provide a safe route across town for bicyclists and pedestrians.”
– Raj Khokhar, Santa Cruz
“I’ve lived in a town with a safe biking/walking trail. It joins people from the various neighborhoods, gets people outside, and allows a commute path for many. It can be done NOW. I know we will love it.”
– Joan Love, Aptos

“Drive foe.”
– Christopher Lanagan, Watsonville

“Why not?! More people need to be able to commute safely. Less traffic. Less pollution. Healthier people. Cleaner air. Yes please!”
– Christina Haslam, Felton

“My mom loves to bike.”
– Morgan Matias, Santa Cruz

“I believe having a trail along the rail corridor will make Santa Cruz an even better place to live.”
– Claire Kleffel, Aptos

“This is what we need.”
– Collin Currie, Santa Cruz

“I don’t want a train.”
– Gonzalo De Elizalde, Watsonville

“We need a safe way to commute on bicycles and a nice trail to walk on.”
– Scott Andersen, Soquel

“This trail would mean a LOT to the community!”
– John Strobel, Santa Cruz

“I live in Santa Cruz. Bikes rock.”
– Jose Jimenez, Ben Lomond
“Need to facilitate this great community asset now.”
– Steve Pereira, Aptos

“I want to be able to bike safely from home to downtown for work.”
– Christopher Teague, Aptos

“We need safe places to ride and for adults and kids of all ages! For fun and for transportation.”
– Marni Pitt, Santa Cruz

“I’d like to see more immediate use of the corridor.”
– Rochard Spencer, Capitola

“I want more safe biking routes in Santa Cruz! :D.”
– Amanda Moe, Santa Cruz

“I’d like a safe and designated area for people to be travel through Santa Cruz County whether on foot or on a bicycle.”
– Yesenia Curiel, Watsonville

“I like the plan.”
– Jon Sisk, Santa Cruz

“Stay Green.”
– Jose Luis Padilla, Watsonville

“A running/bike trail would enhance the community, and allow a safe avenue for walkers, runners, and cyclists.”
– Joan Darroch, Aptos

“I’m an everyday commute cyclist and weekend road warrior! I’d love to see some nice bike paths so I can stop worrying about getting murdered by some idio not paying attention in his SUV.”
– Chris Freeny, Santa Cruz
“I would love to ride to and from work downtown to Soquel without almost being killed daily by distracted drivers.”
– Gregory Dolder, Soquel

“I want a safe way to bike across Santa Cruz...and biking on Soquel Ave./Dr. is anything but safe. And I think the train idea is too expensive and not practical for a town the size of Santa Cruz.”
– Michele Goodwin-Hooks, Santa Cruz

“Accept the facts already! Travel will be faster and more enjoyable with e-bikes.”
– Manu Koenig, Santa Cruz

“I’d love to see a bike and ride trail.”
– Joelle Treanor, Santa Cruz

“Biking is better.”
– Theresa Rainey, Watsonville

“The special interest behind rail use needs to be defeated. There is no demand and it would be too costly and disruptive.”
– Joe Stoken, Aptos

“Take a look at what they did in Ventura County with the trail from Ojai to Ventura. We would benefit and welcome this in Santa Cruz County!”
– Lori Siegmund, Santa Cruz

“I want to be able to decrease my carbon foot print while commuting to work or running errands. I would like to have pride in my city for taking action to create a more bikable city.”
– Samantha Monaco, Aptos

“Want trail-only.”
– Roger Anderson, Santa Cruz
“If left unfettered, Don Lane will spend a billion dollars on his pet train project...while providing an incremental service (to the existing failing bus service) for less than 10% of taxpayers.”
– Douglas Doherty, Santa Cruz

“I use the trails the roads and the pathways all over Santa Cruz County for walking, cycling, fitness, contemplation and socializing. Pure gold, more pure than gold! This is another community effort that is thinking through the tough questions and forming incredibly appropriate solutions.”
– John Sliney, Santa Cruz

“Keeping the rail tracks is a lot like bring back coal to power a locomotive. Other cities such as Seattle, WA created pedestrian and bike trail on former railway right of ways and did not try to accommodate a seasonal Xmas train.”
– Alan Alpert, Santa Cruz

“I will use the trail!”
– Michael Grabill, Capitola

“I am a bike rider, and I want to be able to commute through town.”
– Jennifer Clinite, Watsonville

“I'm signing because I support the use of space that has been vacated by the railway system for years. This could provide a safer route for children, pedestrians and cyclists.”
– Brittney Mignano, Santa Cruz

“I love bike riding and a bike/ walking path can be enjoyed by residents and tourists. I bike the multipurpose path in Kapaa, HI often and it is great to enjoy the scenery without all of the traffic! I love the Arana Gulch path as well!”
– Nancy Kaneg, Santa Cruz
“Tired of traffic.”
– Judith Dew, Capitola

“We need this now!”
– Becky Herry, Santa Cruz

“Simply because I would use it. Great for people that are traveling to work here in town. safe place for bicyclist. I can go on and on!”
– Julio Ortiz, Santa Cruz

“I want to start riding my bike. I’m 60 and don’t feel safe riding my bike around this county.”
– Leslie Evans, Aptos

“This is the most sensible use of the train tracks.”
– Alexander Newell, Santa Cruz

“Because I believe in a greener way to live. To encourage safe biking from pleasure to work commuting. With a population ever growing we need to find new ways to de-congestion our roadways.”
– Caroline Groux, Santa Cruz

“Enabling safe and efficient bike transportation is imperative for any modern community.”
– Christopher Woldemar, Santa Cruz

“There needs to be a trail that connects Santa Cruz, Capitola and Aptos.”
– Kevin Painchaud, Aptos

“The train is a crazy waste of money. People who live and pay taxes would use the trail, the train would be for tourist mostly.”
– Sean Moriarty, Aptos
“We need safer places to bike and walk.”
– Tiffany Lindsay, Aptos

“I like mountain biking.”
– Henry Magee, Soquel

“Love...I was born and raised here. I love my home. We must always take care of people and places we love. :).”
– Patricia Romo, Capitola

“We are the town for this!”
– Robin McDuff, Santa Cruz

“We are in desperate need of a safe, fun, and healthy way to get around town! How do we not have a trail yet? I currently drive Monterey, Fremont, and the East Bay to use their bike trails.”
– Lindsey Keough, Santa Cruz

“Only way to go · trail-only. Love the name Greenway.”
– Edda Tusinac, Aptos

“I would love safe and scenic riding for my family and I.”
– Tira Brown, Aptos

“We need this bike path. The East Bay Bike Trail on the east bay in Rhode Island support both bikes and pedestrians. It is well used by both and works very well. They cab coexist.”
– Paul Bellerjeau, Watsonville

“Better use of funds and more opportunity for community use.”
– Robert Ellenwood, La Selva Beach
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“I would love to be able to ride my bike from the east side to the west side in the summer and not have to deal with all the traffic.”
– Jake Newman, Santa Cruz

“This trail would be such an awesome asset to our county in so many ways! I would use it all the time. A safe, healthy and beautiful way to travel the county either by bike, ebike, walk, run or skate.”
– Greg Heath, Aptos

“Great petition and plan.”
– Pablo Castro, Santa Cruz

“This trail would be a huge win for pedestrians and cyclists in Santa Cruz county!”
– Venessa Coffaro, Aptos

“Probably get me on my bike again!”
– Gregory Tarsy, Santa Cruz

“It makes sense!”
– David Montgomery, Watsonville

“Because I ride my bike all the time.”
– David Mondragon, Santa Cruz

“Trail-Only is the ONLY viable solution that serves the present-day needs of ALL Santa Cruz county residents.”
– Christopher Lucas, Watsonville

“We want a trail not a nasty diesel train.”
– Sam Pederson, Santa Cruz

“I ride my bike more than the train that doesn’t exist.”
– Sean Romero, Santa Cruz
“Keeping the rail is a bad idea. Adding a trail system in its place would be a real positive for the entire county.”
– Kent Thrasher, Aptos

“This would be wonderful. It would bring people out and add to our community. Yes.”
– Gary Linville, Capitola

“I’ve been riding my bike in Santa Cruz for 42 years. It’s time to make it safe!”
– Mark Lang, Santa Cruz

“I too would love the option of riding/walking from point A to point B safely in this county. Less road traffic the better!”
– Holly Angell, Santa Cruz

“It’s simple and what we truly need. Rail just won’t have the usage to justify the complications. I’ve ridden a bike on rail corridor conversions elsewhere and they were great. Plenty of room for pedestrians and bikes.”
– Scott Bongiorno, Santa Cruz

“I would use my bike to safely commute, shop and for daily healthy recreation.”
– Jeff Powers, Aptos

“I’m signing because it’s the smart thing to do. And it reminds me of being in, Copenhagen where there were many bike trails like this and it was wonderful.”
– Denise Shaw, Santa Cruz

“I will use it!”
– Annie Moon, Aptos

“This would improve traffic conditions, community health, and happiness. If approved, I would purchase a bike!”
– Shannon Marsh, Santa Cruz
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“I bike commute from Aptos to Santa Cruz daily.”
– Chris Carothers, Aptos

“I bike around all the time and think that this would be amazing!”
– Samuel Williamson, Santa Cruz

“I want a car free safe bike trail for my family.”
– Michele Claussen, Watsonville

“I’m always commuting to work with my bike, this would create a safer & faster passageway for commuting bikers/ or walkers.”
– Kathryn Crelan, Capitola

“Guy is the man! Thank you for bringing this initiative to us.”
– Bradley Bowden, Santa Cruz

“I love to run and bike.”
– Sue Martin, Watsonville

“We need this support for fostering an active community.”
– Jennifer Bloom, Scotts Valley

“Trail-ONLY is the right choice for a beautiful Santa Cruz experience.”
– Lec Log, Santa Cruz

“The train is a pipe dream and a waste of money and time.”
– Daniel Forshner, Santa Cruz

“This is a great option for the county.”
– Diane Christman, Capitola

“Simple is best!”
– Michael Matthews, Santa Cruz
“I don’t think that many people would use the train.”
– Lucille Heathorn, Santa Cruz

“I want a trail not a rail line at all. Trail-only! No train!”
– Keith Schuler, Capitola

“A train is not the type of mass transit needed in Santa Cruz County. A trail would serve a purpose.”
– Steve Dunlap, Watsonville

“I work downtown and more pedestrian and bike friendly options makes my company a better place to work, and makes it easier to hire new employees.”
– Barry Dobyns, Santa Cruz

“I believe this to be a great idea and something I would use frequently. I know many of my friends and family would as well.”
– William Cotton, Santa Cruz

“It just makes sense!”
– Mary Tucker, Santa Cruz

“I would welcome the reality of transporting myself around town, on my bike, in a safe environment...something that I feel we don’t have currently.”
– Mary Berkana, Capitola

“I believe that the train tracks are wasted space.”
– Cole Barbour, Santa Cruz

“I believed US should have a GOOD transportation system.”
– Sanchez Delsy, Watsonville
“A train would lead to more traffic congestion because of all the major streets it crosses. A bike and walking path would reduce pollution and promote biking across town.”
– Laura McEntee, Santa Cruz

“I want a rail trail!”
– Chandler Harris, Soquel

“I’ve visited, vacationed and lived in other cities, islands and areas that have already done this, and it’s wonderful. Now we have the opportunity to do this for our own county! It not only makes sense, but it would be a HUGE asset. Trail, not rail. Besides, it would keep a lot of the cyclists out of traffic and might save a life or two!”
– Deanna Seagraves, Soquel

“I’d love to ride my bike safely in Santa Cruz. I’ve lived here 40 years and never feel safe enough on the streets.”
– Colette Grey, Santa Cruz

“It’s the right thing to do!”
– Wheeler Edwards, Aromas

“A rail line is not sustainable. People in this town won’t use it after the novelty wears off. I would use a Trail every day. The roads in this town are dangerous for bike riding, and that trail would be ideal.”
– J Eldredge, Aptos

“I think this is a wonderful idea I love riding my bike and it is so good for the environment and generations to come.”
– Jane Ferguson, Santa Cruz

“Not a population that could support a train. Trail is sustainable.”
– Janice Thorpe, Capitola
“I want a place to ride bikes for long distances with my kids. The city streets are too dangerous, even for adults.”
– Jaron Ballard, Capitola

“My family and I have personally experienced the benefits of a rail to trail conversion. A world-class trail and the community benefits it provides outweighs all other options. Pull the rail and Build the trail!”
– Rick Bar, Aptos

“After attending a meeting with “experts” on “rail”, I believe they are not focused on the realities of the Santa Cruz environment. I commuted to San Jose for years on the Hwy 17 Express and observed the development of the “Lite Rail”. It was not successful until the service became every :07 minutes. A Santa Cruz version, which provides service only every :30 minutes, will never be successful and will have to be financially supported by local communities and would bankrupt other needed services. We need this project to be successful!”
– Michael Light, Aptos

“I’m signing because I am a cyclist who is tired of the lack of safe bike infrastructure in our community.”
– Erica Murphy, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because I’m a Cabrillo student that lives on the west side of town and would love to have a more direct and safe route to campus and home. And also with tourist traffic getting to opposite sides of town is a hassle.”
– Crystal Archibeque, Santa Cruz

“The trail-only option is the best for our community.”
– Sally Dyrdahl, Aptos
“It is time. After spending the weekend in Tahoe, which has a tremendous biking trail (even with various weather conditions), Santa Cruz needs this and needs to make it a priority.”
– Allison Deagen, Santa Cruz

“We would be thrilled to have a dedicated trail for walking and cycling. Our former community did a major rails-to-trails project which was absolutely transformative to many areas of the county. Great for citizens and great for nearby merchants. We would love to see the same in Santa Cruz!”
– Mary Hesketh, Santa Cruz

“I believe a walking/bike trail would be good for local citizens and attract tourists as well.”
– Mary Warren, Watsonville

“Because...it would be amazing and great for our community.”
– Tyler Newell, Santa Cruz

“I believe the trail option is needed and adds value to the community, while the rail option wastes money and erodes the tranquility for far too many people.”
– Bruce Burroughs, Santa Cruz

“We need to make room for innovation. A rail train will waste time and money. A trail instead of that rail will open up a new infrastructure that will give us a space for green innovation, connecting the Monterey Bay from tip to tip!”
– Todd Anderson, Cardiff

“I would prefer to ride my bike than see and ugly noisy train or ride it.”
– Presley Heath, Aptos

“This is the single best thing for Santa Cruz county.”
– Nathaniel Len festey, Aptos
“I support a trail-only solution.”
– Stanley Wilson, Santa Cruz

“I cannot think of a better way for all residents and visitors to enjoy the beauty and tranquility of our most special county.”
– Peter Emanuel, Capitola

“Santa Cruz County needs a safe, dedicated multi use trail. The rail corridor provides the perfect route.”
– Michael McBride, Aptos

“I want a safer way to commute to work that doesn’t take an hour.”
– Nancy Yellin, Aptos

“I bike and walk. They do not make noise or cost $$$$$$.”
– Foley Weems, Aptos

“I believe that people need to be able to choose whenever there is a large development in their neighborhood.”
– Timmi Pereira, Santa Cruz

“I believe the trail without rail is the best approach.”
– Victoria Erickson, Aptos

“I’m signing because this world class area deserves a world class pedestrian and bike trail to match.”
– Larry Bercovich, Aptos

“I’m signing because I believe the trail-only is the best option for our community.”
– Paul Lennon, Santa Cruz

“I would use this trail all the time. I have already used the Monterey section of this trail quite a few times.”
– Kenyon Kluge, Ben Lomond
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“I would like to see more parks and opportunity for recreation in our town and I don’t think a train is a benefit to our community since it will not solve the traffic problems with Hwy one.”
– Dagmar Leguillon, Watsonville

“I want the trail because it will be practical, environmentally friendly, and uniting for all of Santa Cruz county. Also the train is stupid.”
– Matthew Quinn, Aptos

“I believe the studies show that a trail installed now will preserve the corridor for future technologies.”
– Randal Kleis, Aptos

“Agree!”
– Leland Olson, Santa Cruz

“I would like a safer option to riding my bike to work!”
– Jessica Cannarozzi, Santa Cruz

“Santa Cruz native, bike lover, community spirit.”
– Dylan Brody, Santa Cruz

“It’s about time Santa Cruz did something that makes sense!”
– Richard Caldarella, Capitola

“I’d like to be able to bike around safer, especially to Cabrillo.”
– Olivia Maennche, Santa Cruz

“It needs to be!”
– Valerie Leal, Santa Cruz

“This would really help our community by allowing those of us to bike around rather than sit in our cars in traffic!”
– Dianthe Harris, Boulder Creek
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“I like biking and I live in Santa Cruz.”
– Jeremt Piss, Soquel

“Because as a lifelong resident of Santa Cruz county I believe the trail would be an asset for residents and visitors alike. It would provide safe and efficient means to cross the county and would better preserve the environment than a train.”
– Trevor Heath, Aptos

“Yes! Trail-only!”
– Karen Menehan, Santa Cruz

“I love my town!”
– Kyriea Giegerich, Santa Cruz

“It will be used and enjoyed by both county residents and county visitors and makes both environmental and economic sense.”
– Ken Kambic, Watsonville

“I don’t care if it has a public transport aspect or not. Let’s just do something with this resource. Its a win either way. I feel public transport addition will be great but lets start somewhere.”
– Ray Evert, Aptos

“This would be awesome, pull the tracks, pave it, use it NOW! Love the super imposed images of the trail in use! Keep doing this.”
– Neal Woods, Santa Cruz

“Santa Cruz needs a world class biking trail. The trail should not run parallel to a train that is not going anywhere and for the most part will be empty. Remember the proposed train does not go to UCSC, Cabrillo, downtown, the county buildings, Capitola mall or Dominican. A train/trail is not the best use of this property!
TRAIL-ONLY PLEASE!”
– Susie Peoples, Aptos
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“It’s affordable and best case scenario for our future. We all want to hike/bike this trail, no one wants/needs an expensive noisy train.”
– Susan Dormanen, Santa Cruz

“Too few will use the train at a huge cost.”
– Joe Raley, Felton

“I’m looking forward to seeing the next walking adventure. Safety is very important to me and the beauty of Santa Cruz outdoors needs to be available to everyone.”
– Linda McPherson, Santa Cruz

“I want to see more options for safe and efficient travel for all in Santa Cruz.”
– Kathy Idoine, Santa Cruz

“I believe in trails for bikes and walkers/runners through awesome cities like ours (quite embarrassing that we don’t already have one!).”
– Lara Kilpatrick, Watsonville

“I ride my bike almost daily and I have kids and Santa Cruz is currently very unsafe for cyclists. We need a trail and not a train!”
– Daniel Bennett, Santa Cruz

“I am concerned about the future of Santa Cruz County and walkability of streets in order to get from one place to another.”
– Rose White, Watsonville
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“As much as I would love transit service within Santa Cruz County and to destinations beyond, as a Planner I do not see that Santa Cruz currently has or is likely to soon develop the appropriate density to sustain passenger rail service let alone shoulder the enormous cost of installation. Reserve space for the train where available and plan for new train bridges as will be needed, but prioritize the trail now to give residents and tourists alike an unparalleled sustainable transportation route along the coast. Hard infrastructure for rail will continue to divide neighborhoods, to say nothing of the cost of construction, noise of operation, and massive subsidies which will be needed to support rail serving the relatively low housing densities found in Santa Cruz and along the coast. A well designed trail and active transportation route will provide much greater environmental and human health benefits and will act as a catalyst for economic development. Appropriately designed for permeability and in relation to the varied neighborhood context, a trail can be a draw for tourism, a carbon free daily commuter route, and a placemaking element to encourage the development of more walkable communities. In more urban areas where the trail connects with other existing trails, the potential to reduce traffic and related emissions through more active transportation, further compounds the real environmental benefits and can be realized in the short term.”

– David McCormic, Santa Cruz

“I live on the tracks and would enjoy a bike path in my back yard.”

– Kelly Liebenthal, Santa Cruz

“Because this has the option to be a world class bike trail.”

– Jason Anderlite, Santa Cruz

“I believe the rail trail would be good for Santa Cruz residents.”

– John Distefano, Santa Cruz
“I live right by the tracks, and don’t want a regular train service running behind my house. Also, traffic is terrible...but I’d ride my bike to Santa Cruz in a moment if there was a bike trail that connected Aptos and Santa Cruz.”
– Aaron Lazenby, Aptos

“I believe in bicycle transportation.”
– Matt Darton, Capitola

“We don’t need a train.”
– Heather Goodman, Aptos

“A dedicated trail will serve all of Santa Cruz County’s residents with a safe alternative commute corridor.”
– Tom & Paula Medeiros, Aptos

“I used to own a home in South San Jose with a train behind. It was VERY loud, put nasty exhaust in the air, was a danger to pedestrians, and the Caltrain cars went by nearly empty on that part of the route.”
– Katherine Barr, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because most of the pro-rail people I’ve spoken with think the rail goes to Silicon Valley. It doesn’t.”
– Christopher Risley, Santa Cruz

“I believe we should use the rail for hiking and biking.”
– Joyce Kutcher, Santa Cruz

“No rail. Only trail.”
– Jeffrey Forman, Aptos
“It is unlikely that we would actually figure out the rail option—needed repairs to existing track and trestles, stations and parking at stops. It appears to me that there wouldn’t be enough usage to come even close to pay for it. It would be great to use this beautiful strip of land in a way that so many people could enjoy it; not to mention more economically viable.”
– Suzanne Jensen, Aptos

“We need this type of development in our community.”
– Trevor Storey, Santa Cruz

“I want the trail and not the train!”
– Phillip Rupp, Capitola

“I support the trail-only scenario.”
– Beth Martinez, Watsonville

“I agree that a trail-only brings the best option to the residents of Santa Cruz County. The negative results of initiating a train traveling through our county are countless while a trail makes sense for the health and safety of our citizens. We may as well kiss goodbye saving our flora and fauna if a train roars through the county. Look at other cities that have trains and discover that the cities move hundreds of thousands of workers each day. Santa Cruz does not compare to these places and consequently should abolish the idea of train travel in Santa Cruz County. The instigators should move east with their ideas and stop making fools out of the residents and tax payers in Santa Cruz.”
– Beverley Pearce, Santa Cruz

“We need the trail now!”
– Christy Tall, Aptos
“The traffic in SC is getting out of hand as each of the four corridors gets built up. That’s poor planning. But a greenway is not.”
– Alysia Sharief, Santa Cruz

“Rebuilding trestles to rail cars needs is prohibitive and until zoning leads to drastic changes in the buildings along the route, as well as parking issues, make rail a poor option. Put all the trestle money into better bus system.”
– Dennis Speer, Santa Cruz

“I believe this is the best option. I live close to the tracks, cycle to work and downtown daily, and would love to see this happen in our community.”
– Katherine Isbister, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because...BIKES!”
– Daniel Stewart, Santa Cruz

“It’s worth it.”
– Taren Loftis, Santa Cruz

“Make a trail big enough to actually be feasible as a means of commuting by bike.”
– Boris Baggerman, Santa Cruz

“Rail trails enhance the appearance of communities from Vancouver to Monterey. This is a REAL attraction that makes sense environmentally and economically.”
– Margaret McCulley, Santa Cruz

“Let’s do this Santa Cruz.”
– Kelli Cole, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because a trail-only option makes the most sense for future generations, financially, environmentally, as well as for enjoyment and safety. No trains!”
– Richard Armendariz, Aptos
“I’m very much in favor of increased bike infrastructure everywhere, especially infrastructure that supports medium- and long-range trips.”
– Bryant Mairs, Santa Cruz

“We need a safe trail through our county to walk, run, skate and ride on. It’s the healthiest and the most environmentally friendly option for our community.”
– Rachel Heberly, Soquel

“Great idea!”
– Katelyn Gagne, Santa Cruz

“I believe the Case the Group presents is factually correct and right for our citizens.”
– John Dowdell, Santa Cruz

“Santa Cruz County needs a pedestrian and bicycle friendly infrastructure. Riding my bicycle on the street poses a hazard for me and motorists. This would be a wonderful addition to providing safety and pleasure to our citizens and entice everyone to enjoy our beautiful environment.”
– Ellen Todd, Santa Cruz

“The train plan just doesn’t work.”
– Donald Radcliffe, Santa Cruz

“Train rails and bridges on a crumbling coast · dumb.”
– Robert De Lapp, Aptos

“I am in total support!”
– Joe Armando Rubalcaba, Capitola
“I have lived in a community that has bike and walking trails. They create a fantastic way for the community to get around without sharing the roads with cars. A train would be a big mistake.”
– Laura Brown, Santa Cruz

“I love biking!”
– Matthew Sloan, Santa Cruz

“A pollution free train from north to south county. What’s not to like!”
– David Giannini, Santa Cruz

“Tail only will make money but Train will cost money/ Lots of money.”
– Glen Stribling, Felton

“I like to commute via bicycle around Santa Cruz.”
– Crissly Crisostomo, Santa Cruz

“I love biking around my town but hate having to share the road with traffic. This is a great solution to getting people out of their cars.”
– Jill Schontag, Santa Cruz

“I would love to have a safe, beautiful transportation option in Santa Cruz county that is also environmentally friendly!”
– Emily Lefèbvre, Santa Cruz

“It is the right thing to do!”
– Carolyn Conklin, Santa Cruz

“It’s the future!”
– Laurie Vanderwoude, Aptos

“We need better faster and safer ways to bike our community.”
– Nicole Beck, Soquel
“I’m signing because a trail-only solution makes sense and cents. I can’t wait to ride my bike to handle all of my errands. Let’s make a Wide, World Class TRAIL in Santa Cruz County a reality Soon. TRAIN = WAY too much $$$, Fencing & Noisy. It will stunt the trail portion. It won’t head where commuter need to go...like over the Hill. A world class TRAIL is the solution to Santa Cruz’s branch line. Let’s get this county Moving!”
– Andrea Miller, Aptos

“Rail Service is not practical. Bike travel is.”
– Tim Hartnett, Soquel

“I want to see a bike path that goes all the way through Santa Cruz.”
– Ben Grove, Santa Cruz

“We need to save and fix Santa Cruz. Born and raised here and we should be doing much better. More housing, more buildings, more corporations and technology. 21st century! This is America! The people need this in Santa Cruz. We need to fix and make our city better and this is a good step in the right direction.”
– Jerry Toste, Santa Cruz

“It’s unsafe to walk in front of my house and on East Cliff Drive.”
– Gerlinde Debroekert, Santa Cruz

“I’d rather have a trail for biking and walking, than a train.”
– Emily Cohan, Santa Cruz

“Our community needs more bike access!”
– Devona Floodman, Santa Cruz

“This is obviously a great an improvement that serves all of “we the people! Let it be! Everything we do every day changes our world. What are you doing? (Love is “the answer! Free & easy!)”
– Melody Record, Aptos
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“The train aspect is not a viable means of transportation and much too costly on a long term basis.”
– Susan Kincaid, Aptos

“More bikes is good.”
– James Langley, Santa Cruz

“I've been hearing about this for years and it would be an amazing addition to our already very beautiful habitat which is Rio Del Mar, Santa Cruz.”
– Kevin Conway, Aptos

“Trains are a great resource, but they’re not right for every community. Santa Cruz deserves better, and we deserve it sooner than never (which is when a train would go in).”
– Damon O’Hanlon, Santa Cruz

“I would use it every day. Please make it happen. Thanks.”
– Chris Grenier, Santa Cruz

“I want to see more bike paths and trails for future UCSC students and current SC residents. More exercise, more beauty, less emissions and waste.”
– Zachary Kawagoe, Santa Cruz

“I walk along the rails to get around town anyways. Might as well make it a trail.”
– Brandon Kempf, Capitola

“To help people commute by bike so they can be healthy, help the environment, reduce traffic, and have fun.”
– Michael Dahlberg, Santa Cruz

“Moving to SC from Aptos in 3 weeks. Definitely in for the Greenway.”
– Suzi Morgan, Aptos
“Great idea.”
– Sukhmeet Singh, Santa Cruz

“Keep the peace, save the trees, encourage moving your body via walking, cycling, running, and focus the other expenses on cleaning up the drug camps.”
– Breann Sampson, Santa Cruz

“A trail-only is clearly the best way to go for all to enjoy the environmental diversity we share within this beautiful community.”
– Bill Scurich, Santa Cruz

“It’s a great idea.”
– Miguel Canizal, Soquel

“WE NEED THIS!”
– Kate Lemega, Santa Cruz

“The original proposal was for a dedicated, safe, bicycle commute path across Santa Cruz and eventually to Aptos. After all the years and mutations; millions spent and a bureaucracy established with job security; it is good to get back to a reasonable vision that can actually work, and accomplish something for Santa Cruz. Simple.... bike path.... commute and enjoy the fresh air!”
– Merritt Edmunds, Santa Cruz

“Trail-trail-only is the only viable use for this vital resource.”
– David Hooks, Santa Cruz

“A trail would greatly enhance our community.”
– Clark Clark, Aptos
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“I’m signing because as Santa Cruz county gets more and more populated and congested with cars we need a safe alternative solution for our active community to move about our city and county! And we do not need to be spending a large amount of money and resources on a train that would not be as positive and useful for our community.”
– Genevra Peyser, Santa Cruz

“It makes sense like Monterey’s great trail by the sea.”
– Greg Frauenhofer, Aptos

“I believe our traffic and community needs will be best addressed and served by a well-designed trail-only connection throughout the county.”
– Andrew Wulf, Capitola

“It’s a great idea. The train tracks attract crime. If we fix it up we can improve the city.”
– Jesse Williams, Capitola

“I prefer trail without the train.”
– Michael Sullivan, Santa Cruz

“The passenger train will be cost prohibitive. Many can use a trail greenway. Biking throughout most of Santa Cruz can be dangerous. The greenway will provide a safe biking and walking route which is badly needed. Many towns throughout California have protected biking and walking trails. Santa Cruz County is falling behind with safe alternatives. It is a smart move to use the greenway for bikes, skateboarders, scooters and walkers.”
– S. Burk, Santa Cruz
“As a physical therapist in support of an active lifestyle, I believe in this amazing and worthwhile project that is great for the environment and the health and wellbeing of our community!”
– Sherri Betz, Santa Cruz

“I want to see Santa Cruz embrace healthy lifestyles and the train will not help that. There is no use for passenger train based on our population. Trail now.”
– Ben Rumsey, Aptos

“I’ve walked a lot of the tracks, and there’s no room and tons of sections!”
– David Multer, Santa Cruz

“Seems like a win-win to me, and a bike and pedestrian corridor could be a reality much sooner than a train...which will never happen anyway.”
– Roberta McGann, Aptos

“To maintain a train is extremely expensive and rather stupid. Several states have made successful trails. Several states have excellent bike/pedestrian trails which pass through commercial/restaurant areas. The trails are easily accessible, well maintained, and bring extra income to the adjacent areas. They also attract tourists. A trail through our wonderful area would do likewise. A train would bankrupt us and would be little used.”
– Janet Perry, Aptos

“So great.”
– Rachel Wisotsky, Santa Cruz

“This just needs to happen. It’s good for everyone.”
– Michael Gardner, Santa Cruz

“I don’t think our county needs a railroad. I believe electric bikes are the future and the path will need to be large enough to have walkers and bikers.”
– Alison Ekers, Santa Cruz
“This is the only rational plan.”
– Guy Cochrane, Santa Cruz

“We need a safe bike commute option in Santa Cruz!”
– Patrick Golliher, Santa Cruz

“A passenger train makes no sense when all the facts are taken into account. Yet a trail will serve the community well.”
– Elke Riesterer, Santa Cruz

“Its obvious.”
– Patrick Thomas, Santa Cruz

“I would use this trail happily & regularly!”
– Corrine Flanagan, Soquel

“The trail-only approach will create a transit corridor for cyclists and result in fewer car trips. The train is too expensive and would take forever to complete. We need this trail soon!”
– Jennifer Green, Santa Cruz

“Biking is a healthy and non congesting alternative to the already bloated automobile traffic Santa Cruz already has to deal with on a daily basis.”
– Greg Montoya, Santa Cruz

“Traffic is only getting worse throughout the county. The trail-only option is clearly the best choice for getting people out of their cars and on a safe path.”
– Tauna Grinager, Ben Lomond

“This is a no-brainer.”
– Jeff Jackson, Santa Cruz

“Because why not?!”
– Morgan Miller, Capitola
“A trail-only solution is what’s best for our community. Diesel trains are outdated and not what is called for.”
– Carson Combs, Aptos

“I’m an avid bike rider, my husband is a cyclist and our little boy loves to ride his bike. We love Santa Cruz and believe in the dream of riding safely all over the town.”
– Clare Wheadon, La Selva Beach

“I agree with the petition for Trail-Only.”
– Arturo Navarro, Watsonville

“I want a place to ride, skate, and walk my dog safely and responsibly.”
– Suan Salinger, Santa Cruz

“With our year around nice weather, this trail/path will relieve traffic pressure around town.”
– Jason Gingery, Santa Cruz

“Makes perfect sense for Santa Cruz County.”
– Doreen Odonovan, Aptos

“A passenger train in this service makes no sense and would be a money pit without significant benefit.”
– Charles Selvidge, Santa Cruz

“I think it will promote safer cycling, provide recreation and access for walkers, joggers, and cyclists, and allow for a commute option for those who want to safely cycle to work.”
– Leslie Strohm, Aptos
“There are countless benefits of turning the rail into a trail and providing more consistent and safer walking and biking corridors. It will only become more expensive. Now is the time!”
– Edgardo Leblond, Soquel

“I’m signing because I fully support this wonderful plan.”
– Patrice Beckstrom, Santa Cruz

“Every community that has a trail like this is enhanced by the trail. If there was a quick flat bike/walking to get between our communities people would use it and get off the road. Build this and then market the safe biking alternative.”
– Amie Forest, Capitola

“I support bike paths and trails away from car traffic in Santa Cruz county.”
– Gary Hart, Santa Cruz

“A bike path would make Santa Cruz safer and more fun and increase community.”
– Ryan Hughes, Santa Cruz

“I strongly agree with a trail-only design, based on my experience of living in 3 other cities which successfully implemented similar designs.”
– Nathan Ciarleglio, Santa Cruz

“As it stands, it will likely be nearly as fast to cycle on a trail that to drive from mid-county to S. C. Great draw for tourism. Less invasive and noisy than a train.”
– Shahe Moutafian, Capitola

“I want to bike from West Cliff to East Cliff without worrying about being hit by a car. And I want more people biking and walking. It would help make Santa Cruz even more special.”
– Dan Marston, Santa Cruz
“I love to ride my bike but traffic can make for a dangerous ride in Santa Cruz.”
– Forest Aritchita, Santa Cruz

“No train. Yes rail-trail.”
– Brian Peoples, Aptos

“We need this trail-only option!”
– Rebecca Botelho, Capitola

“This a great idea for our community!”
– John Devlin, Santa Cruz

“Santa Cruz County pales by comparison to other counties that take trails seriously. Just look at our neighbors in Monterey. It’s never been more needed in SC than today. Join the effort to make it happen!”
– Christopher Klein, Watsonville

“The rail with trail does not make sense on any level.”
– Tom Brandow, Santa Cruz

“I love running in Santa Cruz. Another car-free option that is safe and wide enough would be amazing!”
– Jennifer Willoughby, Aptos

“There will never be a useful trail if the bridges, through cuts, and causeways are not used for the TRAIL. It’s unconscionable to think you can shove recreational and commuter humans out onto side walks or bike lanes where cars WILL collide with “trail” users who are denied the use of the RR corridor.”
– Patty Ciesla, Soquel

“Let’s keep Santa Cruz from becoming overrun - see how great it has worked in Monterey!”
– Lawrence Rosenbaum, Santa Cruz
“I enjoy walking, running, and biking.”
– Jesse Williams, Ben Lomond

“I love to bike and we need more bike trails!”
– Jane Hood, Boulder Creek

“We do not need a train going thru the village. Will ruin Aptos for sure!”
– Patricia Trayer, Aptos

“I’m signing this petition because as a cyclist who commutes and rides to and from trails, I have experienced the dangers and pollution of riding alongside motorists for over 15 years. We want to ride our bikes away from vehicle traffic and enjoy an efficient and pleasurable ride across town. Thanks.”
– Forrest Toshikian, Aptos

“I would like a trail not a train so I can use my bike to travel around the county. The path needs to be wide enough for bikes, baby joggers and walkers. Thank you.”
– Michelle Bradley, Soquel

“Train doesn’t make sense.”
– Joanie Deneffe, Santa Cruz

“Traffic in Santa Cruz needs more creative solutions like this.”
– John Shea, Santa Cruz

“I don’t want trains.... !”
– Dave Turner, Aptos

“I am 100% for the rail trail. This has been a long time coming. A safe bike pedestrian path across our county is exactly what we need.”
– Greg Cross, Santa Cruz

“I would love to be able to ride and avoid traffic. It would help traffic on Hwy 1 too.”
– Pamela Anderson, Boulder Creek
“It’s a good idea.”
– Michael Miranda, Santa Cruz

“A “trail-only” would be a tremendous asset to our county. It would be environmentally sound, a healthy option for transportation and overall, a community minded addition to SC County. A train would be noisy, create parking and intersection congestion, destroy native landscape and cost residents more than we can afford! Trail Now! Trail Now!”
– Susan Moen Penprase, Aptos

“Want a biking/walking trail.”
– Vickie Winkler, Santa Cruz

“I also like the suggestion of putting down base rock or decomposed granite as a temporary measure. Save us years of waiting and obviously money. We need this trail now, not in the far off future.”
– Cherie Bobbe, Aptos

“Hiking and Biking only! No train.”
– Marilyn Churchill, Capitola

“Rational minds at work, finally. Rail is an economic panacea. A bike/ped trail will transform the county and create a valuable mobility and tourism asset.”
– Bill Wiseman, Watsonville

“Make it happen!”
– Doug Heath, Santa Cruz

“It would help my commute.”
– Chris Page, Santa Cruz
“When I contemplate how cyclists and trains could easily collide if the cycling path were placed next to the train tracks through home neighborhoods in Live Oak, where I live and similar areas, I really get scared. I lived for two years in Bellevue, WA, on the east shore of Lake Washington, across the lake from Seattle. When living there, I used to ride to Seattle and back several times a week around the north shore on a rail trail build on an abandon rail line. I can’t imagine how this ride would have been if I’d been forced to share the trip with trains! I did have to share the trail with pedestrians, but there were very strict right-of-way rules regarding bike and pedestrian interaction. For example, cyclists were expected to ring their bells when passing pedestrians.”

– Peter Belew, Santa Cruz

“I’ve lived in Santa Cruz my whole 34 years of life and always wished there was a bike trail along the tracks. Let’s make it happen!”

– Naomi Dresser, Aptos

“I agree.”

– Marilu Radilla, Capitola

“Trail-only is the only option which will truly reduce traffic. Trains will congest already choked neighborhood intersections. Pedestrians, and especially cyclists, will only likely use a friendly trail, which means full size, no train.”

– Tom King, Santa Cruz

“YES!”

– Margaret Hellmann, Santa Cruz

“I want to use this trail and I think it would be a tremendous improvement to the community.”

– Beau Barcus, Santa Cruz
“A pragmatic solution to Santa Cruz congestion in both an economic and environmental context. It’s also quite feasible and relatively cheap to build on the railroad compared to that nonsense idea of a train where the funding, feasibility, and sustainability simply aren’t there. Let’s make this happen!”

– Sam Roberts, Santa Cruz

“Trail-only makes sense. Rail-trail does not.”

– Peter Ackerman, Santa Cruz

“This is so important to Santa Cruz.”

– Laurie Pimentel, Aptos

“I’m into trails not rails. Trains are a big and stinky 19th century technology and doesn’t yield to anything or anyone. This county doesn’t have the density to support viable passenger rail. White elephant.”

– Mark Davidson, Scotts Valley

“We need more riding paths so we can get off of the roads and maybe save more lives.”

– Willam Hopkins, Watsonville

“It’s the only option that makes sense to the community, and will make Santa Cruz a bike first community and will actually cars off the road.”

– Elliot McDonald, Santa Cruz

“I think that other alternatives to the Rail Trail should be considered.”

– Charles Hawley, Santa Cruz

“This is a wonderful idea, let’s get it done.”

– John McCrary, Santa Cruz

“I think a trail-only option should be part of the planning process.”

– Thomas Spaulding, Santa Cruz
“I believe this is the best use for the corridor.”
– Bob Landry, Santa Cruz

“I think the rail trail would greatly improve the town of Santa Cruz!”
– Eric Tucker, Santa Cruz

“Adding a dedicated carpool and bus lane to Hwy 1 will be really expensive but makes a lot more sense than having a defunct set of train tracks ruining our cross town bike path. If you go and actually look at the corridor a train and path will never fit, endless litigation with encroaching neighbors will hold up progress forever. The RTC has been misleading the public all along, a single set of worn out tracks going over failing bridges is not an option. Technology is on the brink of changing transportation dramatically, let’s look forward and stop dreaming.”
– James Cook, Santa Cruz

“I love riding my bike and if I had a decent, safe path I would ride it to the grocery store and to the beach instead of driving.”
– Margaret Seibert, Aptos

“Greenway is beautiful, safe, healthy, sustainable and maintainable in the long-term. Emerging e-vehicles will transform the speed and mobility of users of Greenway. It’s necessary to think ahead and accommodate what’s coming, not look to the past. Greenway will be THE most popular tourist attraction in the county and also provide an essential commuter link for thousands daily. Let’s be great and build Greenway soon, instead of spending millions of dollars “studying” a train, which we’ve already studied for 30 years with no result or transportation use of the corridor.”
– Bud Colligan, Santa Cruz

“Avid cyclist.”
– Carin Hanna, Santa Cruz
“I’ve been thinking the same direction. I don’t see how we can justify the tracks.”
– Sandra Taylor, Santa Cruz

“Rail is a negative in this situation.”
– Scott Owen, Santa Cruz

“Enough pork! Let’s get the trail done now!”
– Ashley Greenley, Aptos

“I believe a well-built, off-street bicycle commuting path will improve the quality of life for people who live and work in Santa Cruz. Let’s build the Greenway!”
– Gail McNulty, Santa Cruz

“It’s the right way to go!”
– Clifford Barrett, Scotts Valley

“Hope for a skateboard, scooter, bike/trike, wheelchair, or walker trail: NOT an inaccessible train. Slow heavy trains are past history. Tons of brussel sprouts as well as aggregates for cement has pretty much ruined safety of train tracks which were a nearly hourly sight of mine in the mid-1960s. Time to move on! Electric recumbent trikes began for me in 1980, growing to an electric velomobile (enclosed trike). Current electric scooters are dangerous for me when hitting ever camber an pothole our roads have to offer while darting through large cars or trucks- even an empty bus or two. Having a trail without having to weave through bumper to bumper traffic would be fantastic! Matters of safety and health is more important than cars (especially to me- a car accident victim). Commuting is ridiculous anyway to me; never have, and never will. However: I will use and enjoy a trail: “the sooner the better!”
– Chris Jordan, Santa Cruz

“Trail now, preserve right of way for future cost effective options.”
– Debora Friedman, Aptos
“After growing up in Santa Cruz, and as of this year becoming an avid cyclist, this TRAIL-ONLY proposal would bring a major advancement to Santa Cruz that it is currently extremely lacking. After crossing the country on my bicycle this year, 4,500 miles later, I experienced the endless joys of 20+ mile long “rail trails,” old railroads replaced with amazing paved and/or crushed limestone bike/ped paths. They were in communities all the way from Illinois to NYC, and a major refuge from being forced to bike in areas that were solely developed for travel by car (namely highways). To stay out of the way of cars was the biggest blessing of these trails, not to mention the rails had a pre-established clearing leading to most of the places one would need to get. It all just made so much sense, and these trails were such a beautiful use of space! After seeing so many great public solutions throughout the country, I was bummed to come back to Santa Cruz County, my home, and to see the lack of development we have made as.”

– Deana Alloin, Soquel

“I believe a train is wasteful spending and not necessary for our community. The money is better spent on the trail-only approach and widening Hwy 1. A trail-only approach is consistent with the culture and values of Santa Cruz.”

– Justin McNabb, Santa Cruz

“Santa Cruz County needs more biking and hiking trails rather than roads and railways.”

– Daniel Rola, Santa Cruz

“I love the idea of riding my bike cross Santa Cruz County on an old train Corridor, I don’t love the idea of the extra cost of a train system.”

– Barry Sihler, Santa Cruz

“Let’s make Santa Cruz more bikeable!”

– Veronica Zaleha, Santa Cruz
“Santa Cruz needs this trail system. It will greatly enhance the quality of life for ALL in this county.”
– Eve Eden, Santa Cruz

“I live in Santa Cruz and would love to be able to ride to 41st without having to deal with cars.”
– Zack Reed, Santa Cruz

“Finally convinced this is the best option for our community health now! Don’t need to wait or vote anymore. Let’s get it done!”
– Kathryn Scott, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because a bike path would be incredibly useful, help create a safe space for bicycles, and help build a sustainable community.”
– David Ezroj, Santa Cruz

“I am signing because I think this trail will absolutely transform our county in the most positive way. I look forward to years of using the proposed path with my friends, family, dogs, and children.”
– Allison Reiter, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because I think this is going to help alleviate traffic, be an eco-choice, and it’s going to bring our county together.”
– Tiffany Smith, Santa Cruz

“Rail is economically unsound and will make a mess of neighborhood environments.”
– Marty Demare, Santa Cruz

“This is common sense and the traffic is horrible. More trails, more exercise and less cars.”
– Melinda Hodges, Soquel
“It is needed.”
– Michael Toland, Soquel

“It’s the right thing to do.”
– Daniel Friedman, Santa Cruz

“This is a great plan for SC.”
– Judy Male, Aptos

“I’d love to use that trail!”
– Bonnie Murphy, Santa Cruz

“This is the smartest option there is!”
– Sean Fyock, Capitola

“We don’t need or want a TRAIN. Pull up tracks. Sell the iron. Use the funds to build a trail that most of the residents want.”
– Ralph Torrisi, Aptos

“I have wanted this since I moved here, 20 years ago!”
– Kat Ennis, Capitola

“I’m excited about biking to the beautiful places along the corridor, and I don’t think trains will enhance our community.”
– James Barrett, Aptos

“I live in Santa Cruz, and commute to Watsonville. Would much rather take a path than the roads with traffic like I currently do on my bike.”
– Adam Stepanovic, Santa Cruz

“Trail-only is the best solution.”
– David Warren, Soquel
“I sign this mention because a bike trail/walking path is far more fitting to Santa Cruz and the Santa Cruz culture than a Railed Transportation.”
– Cole Lemke, Aptos

“This plan just makes more sense. It is less costly, better on the environment, more neighbor friendly, and supports an active & healthy lifestyle for the people of our community.”
– James Tucker, Aptos

“It won’t be a peace trail to enjoy the wildlife on if you have a train going by while you are listening to nature.”
– Jason Hooz, Santa Cruz

“Let’s use the trail now for the benefit of everyone!”
– Jim Booth, Watsonville

“I’m just not yet convinced regarding the rail business plan. And I am “convinced” by great urban trails such as in Merced, CA.”
– Richard Josephson, Santa Cruz

“I am signing because I see the necessity for a bike path in Santa Cruz. A passenger train in this small seaside community? No thanks!”
– Janice Thurston, Santa Cruz

“It’s a great idea!”
– Christian Zajac, Santa Cruz
“I'm signing because I firmly believe that the rail option would be an egregious economic burden on the taxpayers without anywhere near the patronage necessary to reduce usage of Hwy 1 and provide associated environmental benefits throughout the future of our County. A trail for hiking and cycling would link the wonderful parks in our county; it would link to the California coastal trail system. It would make for a healthier community. (Rail would be a costly transportation “Titanic” because, given the scarcity of water and other resources, our county will never have the population density requisite for ridership. Commuters are addicted to driving. Hoping that OTHER commuters will go by train, they will continue to drive - and hardly anyone will take the train. The beneficiaries of the train will be engineering & construction companies while taxpayers foot the bill over 30 years w/o any reduction in highway congestion.) Trail-only, please!”

– Lou Rose, Aptos

“I would utilize this trail everyday!”

– Samantha Reek, Aptos

“The tracks aren’t safe or policed. That space should be used for good and safe for tax paying citizens, not the drug users that currently occupy much of the tracks. We used to live on 30th and had an attempted break-in by a transient.”

– Melanie Kitchen, Soquel

“We need a trail! I’m hoping for a first class bike path that spans from La Selva to Natural Bridges.”

– Michelle Van Schoick, Aptos

“Trail-only, Rail does not make sense at all.”

– Peggy Moore, Soquel

“I would probably use the bike path and maybe do some walking, but not use the rail.”

– Jon Hudson, Santa Cruz
“The Trail would benefit the environment.”
– Robert Xiques, Santa Cruz

“We must have safe alternatives to cars. Because we all need to find alternative ways to move around this county.”
– Karen Card, Santa Cruz

“This plan will contribute positively to commuters, traffic, local exercise, site seeing, our environment, our health and it’s just an all around win win for Santa Cruz County residents.”
– Kelly Finneran, Soquel

“I would love to cycle on/through the rail corridor.”
– Carolyn Deboer, Santa Cruz

“I want to have a safe bike path home.”
– Tiffany Smith, Soquel

“I do not want trains running through the neighborhoods of Santa Cruz · train traffic would increase the risk of serious injury, negatively impact traffic, and do little to alleviate commuter traffic. I support a trail.”
– Ron Record, Santa Cruz

“A dedicated rail trail will improve my quality of life. I am in full support of the trail-only Option.”
– Josh Williams, Aptos

“Safer and more economical transportation!”
– Daniel Barraza, Santa Cruz

“This plan makes the most sense. It’s affordable and expeditious. I promise to make use of it several times a week. Do it now!”
– Damian Delezene, Aptos
“I want the rail trail. Would love to be able to ride my bike safely through town and beyond.”
– Jason Nevin, Santa Cruz

“A passenger train would never cover the needs it would have to serve where as bike friendly infrastructure doesn’t adhere to the same dilemmas. It will be more efficient and cost effective for a bike and pedestrian trail.”
– David Gordon, Santa Cruz

“I fully support a trail-only approach.”
– James Penprase, Aptos

“I can’t stand auto traffic. It is out of control and I love my bike.”
– James Salvino, Capitola

“We have two homes in Aptos and delight in walking in both the Rio del Mar area and the Day Valley area. The trail will be a delight for all who live and visit this area.”
– Judith Hoelscher, Santa Cruz

“It’s the only logical way to use the existing space. And what a great trail it would be for so many to enjoy for both work and pleasure. I will for sure use it to and from work where I would not use a train.”
– Tom Haid, Santa Cruz

“I want this as a person who only cycles! I don’t drive and I fell this is a great safe option for us!”
– Kiyo Gaza, Santa Cruz

“I cycle a lot and would really enjoy a safer option to move about.”
– Kathleen Dempsey, Soquel
“I think we need a trail without the rail. It is too expensive and take too long to build. Use the trail now.”
– Leonard Foreman, Santa Cruz

“I am an avid biker and the community can benefit from this (businesses, health of residents, social connectivity of residents, good use of funding vs function...etc.).”
– Paul Boyer, Santa Cruz

“I think more people would get places on foot or bike. It would be more practical, pleasant, and better for people who live by the tracks.”
– Jennifer Mauerman, Felton

“I really really want a trail-only scenario. I used to ride my bikes all the time (former triathlete), and want a safe, safe, place to ride. A trail-only scenario will be wonderful! I would never ride my bike right next to a train.”
– Elisabeth Russell, Capitola

“The county roads are gridlocked and I’m tired of it. I will never ride a train. Widen Hwy 1 NOW.”
– Geoffrey Wells, Santa Cruz

“It’s the most environmentally sensible plan that could actually be implemented.”
– Joe Krammer, Santa Cruz

“Rail commuting is not economically feasible in Santa Cruz for the foreseeable future. We need to concentrate our efforts towards realistic solutions.”
– John Van De Veer, Santa Cruz

“I’m a native of Santa Cruz and I completely believe in this future project and all’s it’s supporters! We need everyone to jump on board, NOW!”
– Irene Rinaldi, Santa Cruz
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“I don’t want tax dollars spent on a train that few will ride. The cost is too expensive.”
– Tona Drewes, Santa Cruz

“For pedal power! It seems like the best solution. I sold a property on the corridor and after a good deal of personal analysis, and discussion with potential buyers, it seems that the potential for minimal traffic reduction (or possible increase) is not worth the cost and disruptiveness for a rail. Bike and pedestrian option would be awesome!”
– Ted Egner, Santa Cruz

“I’d use this daily.”
– Jason Schock, Santa Cruz

“I’m signing because rail will not solve the traffic problem. So it makes sense to do what other communities have done (Monterey) and create a safe place for bikers and runners.”
– Jamie Marks, Watsonville

“We need better, more sustainable transportation solutions in our community.”
– Andy Benkert, Ben Lomond

“I now live on the west side of Santa Cruz. The number of cyclists and pedestrians is much higher here but many of the roads are unsafe. I believe more people would get outdoors and enjoy the beautiful community in which we live if we had a safer option. I do not think a rail system is right for our community.”
– Patricia Barnett, Soquel

“Trail-only makes sense. Rail would serve little purpose. I love the trail that stretches from Marina to Pacific Grove.”
– Lauren Leff, Aptos
“I am a biker in Santa Cruz!”
– Ryan Silsbee, Santa Cruz

“I love walking and hiking! This will make our city more active and beautiful.”
– Tara Parcella, Santa Cruz

“I work downtown Santa Cruz and live close to the rail in Capitola. It would be an ideal route for bike commuters.”
– Susan Dayton, Capitola

“I love to ride my bike and I think more people would commute via bicycles if there was a safe, accessible bike path!”
– Miranda Gilmore, Santa Cruz

“I do not want a train through my back yard. I ride my bike on dangerous roads 15 miles a day 4 days a week. I only drive 15 miles a day 2 days a week.”
– Mike Lyon, Aptos

“With the growth of this town, it is important to help our city keep our culture of bike riders safe!”
– Raquel Talarico, Capitola

“I believe that a trail-only solution would be the greatest gift to our community. A place where we can walk and ride bikes for long stretches in peace, alone or with family and friends, will nurture our souls and bodies!”
– Purea Koenig, Corralitos

“I bike.”
– Scott Wilson, Aptos

“Trail, no train, no tracks.”
– Bryan Cockel, Santa Cruz
“We need a trail not a train!”
– Chris Peoples, Aptos

“I believe that a trail-only solution is a cost effective approach that will benefit the greatest number of community members and tourists without negatively impacting quality of life for local residents.”
– Cindy Melter, Santa Cruz

“This option is the best as it is trail-only and the cost is reasonable compared to the train option.”
– Todd Skelton, Santa Cruz

“Don’t waste a great right of way!”
– Thomas Bonura, Capitola

“Cycling is a part of my family’s daily life and I’d love to have a path for my children to ride on safely to explore our great home!”
– Nick Gosseen, Capitola

“I would use it several times a week.”
– Peter Chester, Santa Cruz

“I ride my bike daily and want the trail now! I do not want any train by my trail! Go trail now!”
– Pamela Matuas, Santa Cruz

“I want a trail-only bike and walk path. Let’s get going on trail-only option NOW.”
– Jeffrey Werner, Santa Cruz

“A bicycle and walking trail as I have experienced in Monterey and also in Minneapolis is an inexpensive way to improve life style and community wellness we could use here in Santa Cruz county.”
– Leann Bjelle, Scotts Valley
“My house borders the railroad. I don’t want a train there - I want a place where people can walk, bike, skate, etc.”
– Kathy McClure, Santa Cruz

“Practically demands that the rail system not be built. It will be incredibly expensive and there’s been no real data on the expected usage of such a system.”
– Linda Gilcrest, Capitola

“The rail plan is not financially feasible, nor compatible with a safe walking / biking trail.”
– Lyn Hood, Santa Cruz

“I use my bike to get around and having a corridor like this would be amazing. I’d love to see one continue north along the old Davenport cement railway.”
– Keelan Franzen, Santa Cruz

“Go rail to trail!”
– Beth Mason, Santa Cruz

“A great idea!”
– David Moore, Aptos

“I think that in this point in time, the train option is ineffective. If we still had Wrigley’s, Texas Instruments, and Lipton, with large workforce needs on the west side it might be different. At this time, the train would be little more than a very expensive novelty.”
– Charles Steele, Santa Cruz

“I do like the trail idea I do not like the train idea. I would be in favor of a rapid transit bus along that Corridor eventually as well.”
– Jaime Garfield, Santa Cruz
“The cost of having a train is exorbitant, a trail-only solution is best.”
– Wink Saville, Soquel

“I’m a local looking for less congested place to excersize.”
– Laura Wood, Santa Cruz

“It will be an awesome edition to our active community.”
– Suzanne Mace, Aptos

“It’s too late for passenger rail and we are the wrong scale for it.”
– Eric Schmidt, Santa Cruz

“We don’t need a train.”
– Cheryl Weeland, Aptos

“The rail plan makes no economic sense. This should be used for hiking and biking only.”
– John Parda, Capitola

“This is important.”
– David Scott, Santa Cruz

“In favor and hoping this trail won’t become infested with drug addicts like the San Lorenzo River levee project.”
– John Larse, Aptos

“We can’t afford to spend money on a train that will not ease traffic congestion at all. Let’s spend our tax dollars repairing our roads!”
– Karen Hall, Aptos

“The trail will be good for people, the environment and our local economy.”
– Sally-Christine Rodgers, Watsonville
“I’m always in favor of more trails for hiking and biking. I would love to see this happen.”
– Charlotte Multer, Santa Cruz

“I am opposed to the train. Please, trail NO rail!”
– Susan Reddington, Santa Cruz

“We absolutely need this. Safe biking and walking trails should be everywhere here in the county.”
– Rebecca Nolan, Santa Cruz

“Trail-Only makes the most fiscal and environmental sense and railbanking preserves options for the future.”
– Douglas Picard, Santa Cruz

“It would be an amazing addition to a community that already likes to be active. This helps get more cars off the road and keep pedestrians and cyclists safe.”
– Anne Marie Weiss, Santa Cruz

“Santa Cruz has a huge bike community and it surprises me there isn’t a bike designated path/trail to explore Santa Cruz. Santa Cruz County such as 26 mi. The Strand bike trail in L.A. County. I would like to get into leisurely bike riding and I feel that this - which has such a huge bike community - needs a designated bike path.”
– Sunny Cardona, Santa Cruz
“I also would like a trail for pedestrians and bikers. For me, the only rail option that could make sense down the road would be a solar powered electric monorail high above the pedestrians and bikers. I understand the desire to preserve the option to bring back train tracks. But the cost of doing this will be unbelievably high. Upgrading bridges along the trail will run into the 100’s of millions; and at the same time it will greatly degrade the quality of the trail option. My preference is the trail portion: getting people out for walks, bike rides, next to mother nature and our wonderful ocean front. This could be done relatively quickly and for a very affordable cost to our communities.”
– Mark Jaffee, Santa Cruz

“I care about clean, quiet, accessible and affordable transportation options.”
– Austin McClure, Santa Cruz

“Walking and bike trails are an important way to get out and exercise.”
– Ellen Dobbs Everlove, Watsonville

“I support BIKES over cars/trains, and People’s health over expensive loud machinery.”
– Andrew Webster, Santa Cruz

“Sorely needed improvement to our community.”
– Ian Butler, Santa Cruz

“Its right.”
– Adam Price, Santa Cruz

“I want our family to have a nice place to walk: no train (i. e. “rail) Just quiet lovely ambience.”
– Eleanor Hilberman, Santa Cruz
Comments on Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

“We have an opportunity to have a gorgeous bike and pedestrian trail that connects our community, is safe, and economical. A train is the definition of a boondoggle! Pull out the tracks and let's get Santa Cruz moving!”
– Deb Molina, Santa Cruz

“This biking and walking path would benefit this community immensely. What an incredible way to get the family Outdoors together...This is a no-brainer.”
– Frank Ives, Capitola

“I like walking and biking!”
– Isabel Wilson, Santa Cruz

“I love to ride around Santa Cruz.”
– Sandy Moretto, Santa Cruz
Dear Commissioners,

Please put transit and active transportation investments ahead of projects that increase auto capacity. The latter increase traffic, greenhouse gases, and fail to reduce travel time beyond the short term. Detailed letter attached.

Thank you,
Pauline Seales, Santa Cruz Climate Action Network

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

Dear Commissioners,

Please delete Highway 1 expansion projects from your preferred investment scenario. Instead, invest in projects that improve transit service and make streets safe for bicycles and pedestrians.

The California Air Resources Board commissioned a survey of highway expansion studies by UC Davis researcher Susan Handy. She reports, “Adding capacity to roadways fails to alleviate congestion for long because it actually increases vehicle miles traveled.” After expansion, more vehicles take to the highway and traffic clogs once again.

More vehicle miles traveled on the highway means more greenhouse gases. The Air Resources Board reports that vehicle miles traveled per capita has been rising since 2012 and with it, CO₂ per capita. This is despite cleaner fuels and more electric cars.

The good news is that there are alternatives to widening Highway 1:

- Bus-on-Shoulder of Highway 1 has the potential to reduce travel time, making bus travel competitive with auto travel. This can be implemented at great cost savings without widening the highway for auxiliary lanes.
- Increasing bus frequency and prioritizing bus travel on roads throughout the County and especially on Soquel Dr./Freedom Blvd. are immediate, moderate-cost strategies that can make a difference.
• Transit vehicles on the rail corridor (train, bus or other) alongside a bike/pedestrian trail, can use the dedicated right-of-way to avoid congested roads.

All areas of our County are unsafe for bicycling and walking. Watsonville has the worst rate of injuries to pedestrians of 103 California cities of similar size. Santa Cruz is not far behind. Santa Cruz has the worst rate of injuries to bicyclists. And bicycling and walking in our mountain communities are perilous as well. Every dollar spent on the futile attempt to reduce congestion on Highway 1 is a dollar that could make a real difference in our community safety.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,  Pauline Seales , organizer

Santa Cruz Climate Action Network / Red de Acción Climática de Santa Cruz
Website: http://SCruzClimate.org   Email:paulineseales120@gmail.com
Facebook: SantaCruzClimateActionNetwork
Dear Commissioners,

The Campaign for Sustainable Transportation unanimously approved the following letter at our last meeting.

Thanks for your consideration,
Rick Longinotti, Co-Chair

Dear Commissioners,

On November 16, 2016, the METRO Board of Directors unanimously supported five recommendations for adoption by the Regional Transportation Commission. The Campaign for Sustainable Transportation (CFST) also supports the five METRO recommendations listed in italics below.

1. Support Bus Rapid Transit Lite operational improvements in the Soquel Ave/Dr.-Freedom Blvd corridor.
This corridor should be a priority for investment since it includes the major destinations of Downtown Santa Cruz, Dominican Hospital complex, Cabrillo College, as well as key activity centers: Soquel Village; Aptos Village; and Freedom Blvd. We recommend that the RTC set a goal of a bus priority lane on this corridor to be implemented in the long term, so that current improvements might contribute to the long term vision.

2. **Support pursuit of a Bus-on-Shoulder facility on State Route 1.**

We want to call your attention to the fact that a Bus-on-Shoulder facility is not dependent on the construction of auxiliary lanes. The design for auxiliary lanes includes paving enough width on Hwy 1 to accommodate four lanes in each direction—far more than what is necessary for a shoulder. We recommend allocating the Measure D funds for Highway 1 improvements to the minimal paving that Bus-on-Shoulder would require. The savings from not building the auxiliary lanes could go to reconstruction of overpasses and bridges that constrain the bus shoulder.

3. **Commit to a public transit service and facility in the Rail Corridor and begin implementation planning by conducting in the near term a comprehensive alternatives analysis to determine the most appropriate mode of public transit for the Rail Corridor and to support efforts to secure funding from federal and other sources, and adding a full analysis of operations funding sources as part of the alternatives analysis.**

We support a detailed and thorough analysis of the possible modes on the corridor, including automated transit vehicles.

4. **Support mass transit use in the rail corridor in which mass transit would run adjacent to bike and pedestrian facilities, but not under the “rail-banking” concept.**

As we understand it, there are significant legal constraints to using the corridor for a purpose other than rail transit. We urge you to preserve the active status of the rail line in order to protect future transit options on the corridor and embark on the comprehensive alternatives analysis, including integrating transit on the corridor within the local and regional transit network.
5. **Support an RTC policy that would commit to funding METRO [from current funding sources] at current percentage levels in perpetuity.** It is important that METRO service not be diminished by redirection of funding towards a new transit project on the rail corridor. In addition, we believe that METRO is the appropriate agency to operate whatever transit emerges on the rail corridor.

We note the obvious, that transit on the rail corridor, Bus-on-Shoulder, and bus prioritization on Soquel/Freedom are alternatives to widening Highway 1. We note that the California Environmental Quality Act requires consideration of alternatives to a project. We request that the RTC not approve a Highway 1 project with an EIR that does not take into account these alternatives.
From: Piet Canin
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 10:16 AM
To: Ginger Dykaar <gdykaar@sccrtc.org>; Grace Blakeslee <gblakeslee@sccrtc.org>
Cc: Kirsten Liske <kliske@ecoact.org>
Subject: EA UCS Scenario comment letter

Hello Ginger and Grace,
Happy Holidays!
Please find EA’s letter commenting on the latest version of the UCS preferred scenario and our stated preferences to make our transportation system more sustainable and equitable. Please consider our comments in your final draft of the RTC staff recommended preferred scenario.

Thank you for all your good work on the UCS.
Dear Guy Preston,

Ecology Action (EA) appreciates the RTC staff and consultants for their work on the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS). Given that the recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report says we must pursue "rapid, far-reaching and unprecedented changes in all aspects of society" to drastic cutback GHG emissions, EA requests the RTC staff prioritize high impact carbon minimizing strategies such as more emphasis on electrifying transportation while also increasing investments in active transportation and transit. We also believe focusing staff and funding resources on climate solution projects and programs that can be implemented in the next 5 to 7 years is crucial for turning back the tide of increasing GHG emissions.

Ecology Action realizes there are still many unknowns and ever-changing mobility technologies that may alter the RTC's preferred Scenario's ability to deliver equitable, sustainable, convenient, and economically feasible transportation options from now until 2035. Given what we do know and where we hope the Unified Corridor Investment Plan will lead us, EA believes that an active transportation, public transit and electrifying transportation modified Scenario B is the best way forward - *this differs from the RTC staff modified Scenario B*.

Scenario B has the lowest rate of GHG emissions, the lowest number of collisions, highest projected bike and transit trips compared to the other UCS Scenarios. Scenario B offers improvements for all road users while shifting investment priorities to sustainable transportation modes. EA’s recommended modifications to Scenario B will increase the community and environmental benefits of B. This Scenario has a good mix of improvements that move us towards better sustainable transportation options. We support the RTC staff recommendation to fund and build protected bikes and bike/pedestrian improved intersections in the Soquel/Freedom corridor

Ecology Action actively campaigned for Measure D which funded bike, walk and transit improvements as well as Highway 1 auxiliary lanes but 3 new auxiliary lanes and HOV lanes on Highway 1 don’t align with GHG emissions goals. There is limited funding and staff resources to complete all UCS projects so bike, walk, transit, TDM, and electrification projects should be prioritized.

EA requests the following modifications to improve Scenario B:

**Protected bike lanes on Soquel/Freedom Corridor:** Protected bike lanes (i.e. having a physical barrier that separates bicyclists from motorists) in high crash locations be included and budgeted.

**EV Education and Market Acceleration:** There is a dearth of public funding for consumer education and market acceleration solutions for EV ownership/leasing which is the easiest way for most people
to drastically reduce their GHG emissions. The UCS states that EV adoption is the highest impact method for reducing GHG emissions from transportation. This is especially true now that Monterey Bay Community Power is providing carbon-free electricity to Santa Cruz. Please provide a program details and budget for this EV education and market acceleration.

**Employer based sustainable transportation education and encouragement:** a proven strategy for helping to reduce high impact commuter peak traffic is to work with employers to encourage and support their employees to reduce their drive alone commuter trips. Work with employees to move them to carpooling, telecommuting, transit, biking and walk. Santa Cruz County needs greater investment in this initiative that can generate results in the next few years while capital projects will take 5 to 15 years to implement.

**Train electrification:** The passenger rail service is priced for diesel trains, but the public voiced a preference for electric trains during the 2015 passenger rail feasibility study. Electric trains cost more than diesel powered transit but emit less GHG emissions.

**Train in rail corridor over Capitola Trestle:** The UCS indicates that the trail will be diverted off the rail corridor onto streets through Capitola Village. Clarify the cost and estimated timeline for building the Rail Trail (separate from car traffic) across Soquel Creek.

On November 2nd, EA sent RTC staff a longer list of requested modifications to the UCS and prioritize GHG reducing projects that can be completed in the short and medium term (2 to 6 years).

Given that many in the community have focused on the UCS’s Rail Trail vs. Trail Only analysis, EA recognizes the benefits of Trail Only as it would allow for a wider trail, as documented by the UCS, therefore better separating faster moving ebikes and cyclists from slower moving walkers and kids on bikes, would generate more bike and pedestrian trips and cost less. However, the Trail Only approach lacks a transit option in the corridor, would take many years to undo current policy, requires returning rail funds, and faces uncertain litigation due to property rights and reversal of policy so Ecology Action supports keeping the RR tracks in place and retaining the option for public transit in the corridor.

We believe a modified Scenario B with more emphasis on sustainable transportation will do the most to serve the varied transportation needs of our community while improving quality of life, environmental and individual health, and shrink our carbon footprint by reducing our dependence on drive alone gasoline fueled car trips.

Thank you for your consideration,

Piet Canin
Vice President of Transportation
Ecology Action
From: Mark Mesiti-Miller
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 4:00 AM
To: john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; 'Zach Friend' <zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us>; 'Ryan Coonerty' <ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; 'Randy Johnson' <rlj12@comcast.net>; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; 'Cynthia Chase' <cchase@cityofsantacruz.com>; openup@cats.ucsc.edu
Cc: tony.gregorio@santacruzcounty.us; 'Lowell Hurst' <lowell.hurst@cityofwatsonville.org>; dlindslind@earthlink.net; 'Patrick Mulhearn' <patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us>; rmoroyan@cityofsantacruz.com; ladykpetersen@gmail.com; david.reid@santacruzcounty.us; darothwel@cabrillo.edu; 'Andy Schiffrin' <andy.schiffrin@santacruzcounty.us>; Guy Preston <gpreston@sccrtc.org>; George Dondero <gdondero@sccrtc.org>; Ginger Dykaar <gydkaar@sccrtc.org>; Grace Blakeslee <gblakeslee@sccrtc.org>; Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>; UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Friends of the Rail & Trail support for UCS Scenario B+ and comments on the Draft Preferred Scenario

Chair Bottorff, Commissioners, Commissioner Alternates and Unified Corridor Study project team,

Please find attached a letter from Friends of the Rail & Trail regarding our continued support for Scenario B and commentary on the Draft Preferred Scenario. Attachments to this letter are also attached as separate files.

As long time community advocates representing the entire County, we trust you will carefully and deliberately consider our remarks and incorporate them into the final preferred scenario.

Thank you,

Mark

Mark Mesiti-Miller, P.E.
(831) 818-3660
Board Chair, Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail and Trail
Build the Trail – Keep the Rail
www.railandtrail.org
Imagine – 4 min video: https://youtu.be/qe3gRU-bpWY
Top 10 Reasons to Build the Rail Trail ASAP – 80 sec video: http://tiny.cc/TopTenReasons
December 28, 2018

Chair Leopold and Commissioners
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Support for UCS Scenario B and Draft Preferred Scenario Commentary

Dear Chair Leopold and Commissioners,

The Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail (FORT) wishes to thank the RTC for producing the comprehensive *Unified Corridor Investment Study - Step 2 Analysis Results*. We appreciate the work staff has done to develop the Draft Preferred Scenario presented at the 12/6 meeting of the RTC. After carefully reviewing the Draft Preferred Scenario, **FORT strongly urges the Commissioners to promptly adopt Scenario B with adjustments** over the Draft Preferred (DP) Scenario and move us to a better, more equitable and more sustainable transportation system as soon as possible.

Our reasons for recommending Scenario B over all scenarios are many and will not be repeated here. (copies of previously submitted documents attached). Our reasons for recommending Scenario B over the DP Scenario are summarized below:

- **Best for Equity** – 32% higher annual Transit Vehicle Miles Travelled and a higher Share of Investment Benefit for Disadvantaged Population
- **Best for Public Transit** – 11% higher mode share for public transit
- **Best for the Environment** – a larger reduction of VMT, CO2e, Total Criteria Pollutants and less impact on Environmentally Sensitive Areas
- **Best for the Economy** – ranked two full steps higher for positive economic impact
- **More Affordable** – $64M less total capital cost and would require far less local tax dollars to implement especially if the substantial $1.5 Billion in funding targeted at the Central Coast to implement regional rail connecting Monterey and Santa Cruz to the Statewide Rail Network as stipulated in the 2018 State Rail Plan was included.

![Table 6.4 '2040 Capital Projects Details' in the 2018 State Rail Plan. Dollar figure in thousands.]

---

Above copied from Table 6.4 ‘2040 Capital Projects Details’ in the 2018 State Rail Plan. Dollar figure in thousands.
As previously articulated, Scenario B would be improved by adding and clarifying a few items. FORT recommends the following additional adjustments be included in Scenario B+ over the DP Scenario.

1. **State a preference for electrified passenger rail service**
2. **Specify protected rather than buffered bike lanes in the Soquel / Freedom corridor**

We applaud the DP Scenario for including the following two adjustments FORT had previously recommended:

A. **Clarifying the Rail Trail will go across or adjacent to the Capitola Trestle per the MBSST**
B. **Including Freight Rail Service along the rail corridor**

We also applaud the implementation prioritization matrix provided for the various scenario elements included in the DP Scenario staff report. Given California’s stated preference for funding railway expansion and not highway expansion, we urge the commission to prioritize building the planned Rail Trail and implementing passenger rail service on the existing rail corridor above all other projects. Both of these projects are transportation game changers and can be constructed with minimum impact on existing transportation systems and thereby minimizing any inconvenience to the public.

**Let’s do this.** The community has been waiting a very long time for the Rail and Trail, has demonstrated their interest when they voted for Measure D which dedicated 25% of funds raised be spent on the Rail and Trail and, we are running out of time to address global warming.

Lastly, do not delay this decision and **do not delay the Rail Trail any longer.** Select Scenario B+ and let’s get to work on the best possible future for us and all those who will follow behind us.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Mesiti-Miller, P.E.
Board Chair, Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail and Trail
Professional Civil Engineer
35 year resident of the City of Santa Cruz
Statement on the SCCRTC’s Unified Corridor Investment Study – Step 2 Analysis Results

Friends of the Rail & Trail has reviewed the over two hundred pages, including five appendices, from the Unified Corridor Investment Study – Step 2 Analysis Results recently published by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC). This comprehensive study confirms using the rail corridor for both rail and trail is far and away the best option when considering public safety, protecting the environment, promoting cycling, improving social equity, increasing use of public transit and benefiting the local economy. Below are a few of the most important findings from the study.

BEST FOR PUBLIC SAFETY: Under the Rail with Trail Scenario B, the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) predicts there would be a total of 118 fewer collisions every year than under the Trail Only Scenario A, 114 fewer than under the Bus Rapid Transit Scenario C. In other words, with Rail with Trail there would be one less collision every 3 days and that means safer travel for everyone. As stated in the UCS, “Safety is a critical measure for community well-being, quality of life, and particularly in the case of active transportation facilities, accessibility.” We agree, making travel safer for everyone, especially for our loved ones, is at the top of the list. In addition to making travel safer, the study tells us that reducing collisions will save us a whopping $26 million every year over the trail only scenario. Saving lives and money is a win-win, but the Rail with Trail Scenario B provides even more benefits.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR: The Rail with Trail Scenario B will result in a reduction of 230,000 Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) every single day when compared to the Trail Only Scenario A. This is huge and much better than we had expected. Thinking annually, this means there would be a total of 84,000,000 fewer vehicle miles traveled within our County year after year under the Rail with Trail plan. Reducing VMT is widely recognized by experts as the most important metric to consider when evaluating transportation projects, and explains why the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research now requires VMT to be used as the primary evaluation metric under CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act). Reducing VMT by 84 million every year would be like planting a forest of trees every year.

MOST CYCLISTS: Under the Rail with Trail Scenario B, the study predicts the share of people riding bicycles would be higher than under both the Trail Only Scenario A and the Bus Rapid Transit Scenario C. While this prediction may surprise some, it fits with the common experience that more people will use bikes when cycling is an integrated part of a multi-modal transportation system such as that provided by the Rail with Trail scenario.

MOST EQUITABLE: Under the Rail with Trail Scenario B, the mode share for public transit will be 46% higher than the Trail Only Scenario A and 25% higher than Bus Rapid Transit Scenario C. This metric is the best indicator of how much more public transit will be used under the Rail with Trail plan. Greater mode share of public transit is an excellent measure of the superior reliability and efficiency offered by multimodal public transit systems. Similarly, predicted total public transit vehicle miles traveled under the Rail with Trail Scenario B will be almost 16% greater than under the Trail Only Scenario A reflecting how much more accessible and equitable a rail with trail transportation system would be.

MOST ECONOMIC BENEFITS: The Rail with Trail Scenario B really shines when it comes to benefitting the local economy. Under every economic metric considered, Scenario B came out on top. Because tourism is an important part of our local economy, the UCS examined the increase in visitor generated tax revenue associated with each scenario. What the UCS found was the increase in visitor related tax revenue under the Rail with Trail Scenario B will be as much as 60% greater than the other scenarios. Clearly, Rail with Trail Scenario B will be good for local business and good for local government.
Other Issues
The benefits outlined above provide a compelling case for why the Rail with Trail Scenario B is far and away the best way forward for our community. The UCS explored many other issues including funding. We offer the following comments on this important aspect of the study:

**LOCAL SHARE OF COST:** While the local share cost predicted for Rail with Trail Scenario B is not the lowest (bus heavy Scenario C is the lowest) the local share cost of Rail with Trail Scenario B is estimated at $141 million less than the cost of Trail Only Scenario A. Furthermore, the UCS did not account for the probable funding available through the 2018 State Rail Plan (SRP) adopted only a few weeks ago. The SRP specifically allocates $1.5 billion targeted at the Central Coast of CA to “Implement Regional Rail Connecting Monterey and Santa Cruz to the Statewide Rail Network” amongst other projects (SRP p.194). To put that $1.5 billion figure in perspective, that is about five times what is needed to pay for adding modern commuter rail service between Santa Cruz and Watsonville estimated at about $325 million in the UCS. It is our opinion that if SRP funds are taken into consideration, implementing the Rail with Trail Scenario B is likely to be hundreds of millions less than the Trail Only Scenario A and may well be substantially less than Bus Rapid Transit Scenario C.

**PUZZLING OPERATING COSTS:** Surprisingly, the UCS predicts the ongoing operating cost of the Rail with Trail Scenario B are highest, higher even than the Bus Heavy Scenario C. This prediction is surprising as it contradicts the operating cost figures found in the National Transit Database published last October 2017 by the Federal Transit Administration. An analysis of these figures indicates the per passenger mile operating costs for rail service are only about 60% of the operating costs for bus service. We have contacted the SCCRTC for additional information and an explanation of these figures.

**LITIGATION RISK:** One obvious big money issue that has been overlooked in the UCS is the question of property rights litigation associated with both the Trail Only Scenario A and the Bus Heavy Scenario C. Both of these scenarios require abandonment of all or part of the existing rail right of way. As has been previously documented by the SCCRTC, about two thirds of the existing rail right of way exists as easements granted for the construction, maintenance and operation of a railroad. When the rail line is abandoned these easements will likely cease, leading to substantial litigation to re-establish these easements for trail only and/or bus use. The cost in both time and money to settle the inevitable property rights litigation arising from abandoning the rail line are likely to be substantial. For example, as reported in the Seattle Times in 2014, settling this type of litigation in the East Regional Corridor (a rail corridor very similar to ours), cost $140 million. Given the magnitude of probable litigation costs arising in our local real estate market, we suggest a $100 million “place holder” be included in the costs for both Scenarios A and C. One clear advantage of the Rail with Trail Scenario B is the rail line remains eliminating the expensive and time consuming property rights litigation associated with Scenarios A and C. This issue alone may well be one of the best reasons to support the Rail with Trail Scenario B.

**Summary**
The substantial benefits offered by the Rail with Trail Scenario B over all other Scenarios, especially over the Trail Only Scenario A, is convincing evidence that building the trail and keeping the rail is the best path forward especially when you consider safety, environmental sustainability, social equity and local economic benefits. Rail with Trail is simply the best at addressing climate change, providing equity for everyone, supporting economic vitality and developing a truly sustainable transportation system that will serve Santa Cruz County now and well into the future.

Friends of the Rail & Trail will continue evaluating the findings of the UCS and will issue updated statements after the upcoming SCCRRTC public workshops and public hearings have been completed and/or as otherwise needed to keep the community informed. For example, one obvious modification to the proposed Scenario B would be to add freight rail service. Adding freight rail service to Scenario B should be a no cost add and will get trucks off our roads further improving safety and further reduce GHG emissions.

Stay tuned…
November 2, 2018

Chair Leopold and Commissioners
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Support for UCS Scenario B

Dear Chair Leopold and Commissioners,

The Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail (FORT) wishes to thank the RTC for producing the comprehensive Unified Corridor Investment Study - Step 2 Analysis Results. After carefully reviewing the results, participating in public workshops and a community focus group, FORT strongly recommends the RTC adopt Scenario B, with a few adjustments, as the preferred scenario moving forward.

Our reasons for choosing Scenario B over all other scenarios are many. Because our reasons have been discussed in other recent correspondence to the RTC, we simply summarize them below:

- **Best for Public Safety** – over 100 fewer collisions and saving us $26 million annually
- **Environmentally Superior** – greatest reduction of VMT, CO2e, Total Criteria Pollutants
- **Best for Cyclists** – highest mode share for cycling
- **Best for Transit** – highest mode share for public transit
- **Best for Equity** – highest annual transit VMT and investment benefit for disadvantaged
- **Best for the Economy** – only scenario earning straight A’s across every economic metric
- **Minimizes Litigation Risk** – tracks remain eliminating risk of property rights litigation
- **Connects Us to the Future** – takes full advantage of the 2018 State Rail Plan

Scenario B could be improved by adding and clarifying a few items. FORT recommends the following adjustments be included in Scenario B.

1. **State a preference for electrified passenger rail service**
   When the time comes for us to select a passenger rail vehicle, there is ample evidence in today’s market place that battery electric light rail vehicles will be cost competitive with the diesel-electric units considered and the extra expense of overhead power lines assumed in the UCS will be eliminated and maintenance costs will be substantially reduced. An all-electric
passenger rail system would be powered by 100% carbon-free electricity furnished by Monterey Bay Community Power, further reducing GHG emissions and global warming.

2. **Specify protected rather than buffered bike lanes**
The modest increase in cost for protected over buffered bike lanes would be a good investment as protected bike lanes dramatically increase safety and bike ridership leading to an even greater increase in mode share for cycling.

3. **Clarify the Rail Trail will go across the Capitola Trestle as illustrated in the MBSST**
As there seems to be some confusion in the community regarding whether or not the Rail Trail will cross Soquel Creek on the Capitola Trestle alongside the railroad tracks, please clarify that is the intention of the RTC and the MBSST Master Plan. One way of so doing would be to include an allowance for the cost of modifying or replacing the Capitola trestle to support Rail and Trail.

4. **Freight Rail Service should be included**
This no cost addition to Scenario B will allow local businesses to continue taking advantage of access to the Santa Cruz Branch Line and the reduced cost of shipping/receiving various goods using freight rail services. We understand more than 600 jobs are currently dependent on freight rail service. Furthermore, because every rail car replaces 3 to 4 highway trucks and because moving goods by rail is 16 times safer than moving goods by truck, adding freight rail service will make our roads safer, preserve the capacity of our existing roads and further reduce GHG emissions that are causing global warming.

**Let’s do this.** The community has been waiting a very long time for the Rail and Trail, has demonstrated their interest when they voted for Measure D which dedicated 25% of funds raised be spent on the Rail and Trail and, we are running out of time to address global warming. Do not delay your decision, do not delay the Rail Trail any longer. Select Scenario B and let’s get to work on the best possible future for us and those who will follow behind us.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Mesiti-Miller, P.E.
Board Chair, Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail and Trail
Professional Civil Engineer
35 year resident of the City of Santa Cruz

cc: George Dondero, RTC Executive Director
    Board of Directors, Friends of the Rail & Trail
From: Gillian Greensite  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 5:39 PM  
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Sierra Club comments on the Unified Corridor Study

Dear RTC commissioners and staff,

Please find attached, comments on the UCS from the Sierra Club. Thank you for your consideration. We hope to see our comments reflected in your deliberations and final decisions.

Sincerely,

Gillian

Gillian Greensite, Chair  
Sierra Club, Santa Cruz County Group

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY GROUP  
Of The Ventana Chapter  
P.O. Box 604, Santa Cruz, CA

[Logo]

95061  
https://ventana2.sierraclub.org/santacruz/  
e-mail: sierraclubsantacruz@gmail.com

December 27th. 2018

To: RTC Commissioners and staff  
From: Sierra Club  
Re: Comments on the Unified Corridor Investment Study

Dear Commissioners and RTC staff,
Transportation is the greatest source of CO₂ emissions in the United States and in Santa Cruz County. Transportation choices also create some of the greatest environmental impacts for wildlife and natural habitats. Sierra Club Transportation Policy states that transportation strategies must:

“protect natural systems and open space, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and promote environmental and economic justice and access for all, including low-income communities and those most impacted by pollution.”

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), similarly, must consider environmental impacts in choosing which elements best accomplish its goals, consistent with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) scoping protocols.

In crafting preferred scenarios for the Unified Corridor Investment Study, the RTC should prioritize transit and active transportation by:

- eliminating auto-centric projects including the HOV Lane, auxiliary lanes, ramp metering for Highway 1, and Mission street intersection expansion, all of which are subject to failure due to induced travel effects
- retaining transit and a trail on the rail corridor
- designing all projects to enhance pedestrian and bicyclist safety and comfort
- aiming to reduce existing VMT, rather than generate new excursion or growth opportunities.

We note that higher property values should be considered an undesirable byproduct, not a goal, of transit improvements. Specifically, the Sierra Club supports efforts to "attract and enable new, high intensity development (UCS p.111)" only if these efforts focus on truly affordable housing, consistent with current local employment opportunities. In taking action on the UCS, the RTC should thus make a commitment to study and implement policies to counteract gentrification and displacement. We are inspired by the example of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in forming the Committee to House the Bay Area to make policy on comprehensive regional solutions to the housing affordability crisis.

Furthermore, we ask that the RTC conduct a comprehensive analysis of alternatives that also satisfies programmatic environmental review
requirements under CEQA. This analysis should include, but not be limited to:

- Ridership, total public transit mode share, cost/benefit, total cradle to grave energy costs, cost and energy efficiency per person mile, scalability, reliability, impact on associated active transportation modes such as walking and cycling, consistency with regional and state transportation goals, plans and policies, and total greenhouse gas emissions of bus rapid transit, rail transit, transit electrification, and any other viable public transportation options, before choosing preferred transit mode on the rail corridor;
- Protection of biological resources, including avoiding fragmentation and disturbance of local sensitive wildlife habitats and natural communities;
- Assessment and avoidance of impacts on, among other concerns:
  - Population/housing, including displacement of low-income communities, gentrification and potential for growth into agricultural lands;
  - Transport, emissions and storage of hazardous materials;
  - Cumulative impacts;
  - Ownership status of the rail corridor easements;
    - The public’s ownership of the existing rail corridor must not be put at risk nor subject to expensive, lengthy property rights litigation.

In sum, the Sierra Club is enthusiastic to support a robust process that ensures that the Unified Corridor Investment Study is useful and successfully identifies strategies to carry Santa Cruz County into this new millennium, sustainably and effectively.

Thank you very much for your ongoing support for the environment.

Sincerely,

Gillian

Gillian Greensite, Chair

Sierra Club, Santa Cruz County Group
Dear Shannon,

Attached is our statement in reply.
Thanks and Happy Holidays,

Manu
Greenway’s Response to Statement Provided by RTC Staff to the Press

RTC: The RTC is always pleased to hear from members of our community. As with all community input we receive, the petition from Santa Cruz County Greenway will be given to our commissioners who consider it all when planning for the transportation future of our county.

Greenway’s response: The RTC staff says they are interested in community input, but have been reluctant to consider factual information provided to it by Alta Planning and Design and Nelson Nygaard, two of the most respected names in transportation planning. For example, Alta provided the RTC staff with a detailed calculation of the cost of trail only which amounted to $98M vs. $219M calculated by Kimley Horn in the UCS. Alta provided all of its assumptions to arrive at its number. Although changes were made in revised versions of the UCS on other cost figures, no changes were made to reflect Alta’s input and, more importantly, no feedback was provided on why the Kimley Horn numbers differed nor why they are accurate.

RTC: However, there are a few things we would like to address and clarify in the press release Greenway distributed.

Greenway stated that the preferred Scenario includes a $1 billion+ passenger train over 30 years. However, the capital costs in the UCS were estimated at $325 million for passenger rail service between Santa Cruz and Pajaro Station, and the operating costs were estimated at $15 million per year.

Greenway’s response: The RTC response of $325M for a train is misleading.

From the RTC’s FAQ on the UCS:

“The capital costs for passenger rail service with diesel multiple units and excursion rail service is $339.8 million. Electrifying rail for passenger rail service between Santa Cruz and Pajaro is estimated to cost a total of $549.5 million for passenger rail service and excursion rail service with electric multiple units.”

Virtually every train proponent, including the past Executive Director of the RTC, insists any train will be electric. So putting out a number for a diesel train, without saying diesel, is telling half the story. Equally disingenuous is quoting only one year of operating and maintenance expense.

From Table 40 in the UCS, we can see that annual operating and maintenance expense for a train is $16.2M and first mile/last mile bus connections to make the train effective are $12.1M annually, for a total of $28.3M in annual expense.

Any tax to pay these annual operating expenses will extend for some period of time, most similar to the Measure D timeframe of 30 years. $28.3M times 30 years is $849M. What
percent of this amount will be covered by the fare box? A good estimate would be 25% if
SMART is used as an example (CalTrain’s population and density makes it incomparable), which
would reduce $849M to $637M. So for an electric train, the capital and operating cost over 30
years would be $1.2 billion and for a diesel train $1 billion.

By stating “facts,” but not providing the big picture, the RTC does not provide the information
the public needs to arrive at an informed opinion.

[Although we are using the RTC’s numbers, we must note that the ~$13M/mile capital cost is
below the lowest national cost for light rail.]

RTC: **Greenway stated that the UCS “makes no reference to the need for a new tax to support
passenger rail service.” This is incorrect. On page 99 of the UCS draft document under Public
Investment, it states, “New revenues to implement scenarios is required if the estimated
scenario cost is greater than potential funding. New public investments would come from new
state or federal grant programs, or locally generated funding sources, such as a new sales tax,
new parcel tax, or new vehicle registration fees.”**

**Greenway’s Response:** We agree the UCS does make a single reference to new taxes on page
99. However, in the greater context of the debate on rail vs. trail, this fact is rarely heard. Most
of the public does not read the UCS, and even those who do would have a hard time finding this
one sentence in a 230 page report. The fact remains that the UCS does not discuss the risk
associated with tax-based funding sources and the resulting risk to projects that depend on
them.

RTC: **Greenway also stated that in the RTC online survey, 54 percent of respondents opposed rail
transit and 63 percent opposed freight rail in north county. This is incorrect as the questions that
were asked were not simple yes or no for or against passenger or freight rail questions. The
questions in the survey asked respondents to mark on a scale of 1 to 5 their support for rail and
freight service, so it is misleading to say that a certain percentage is opposed when they marked
their level of interest on a scale.**

**Greenway’s response:** The RTC makes a distinction without a difference. Any reasonable
person would interpret rankings of 1 & 2 as “strongly against” and “against” and rankings 4 & 5
as “for” and “strongly for” respectively, with a ranking of 3 being neutral. Most online surveys
are conducted in this way and the public responds accordingly. Greenway’s characterization of
the RTC’s survey is not misleading and is in fact representative of the way the public feels. One
can arrive at nearly the same percentages by looking at two different questions asked in the
same survey/chart. This is not random.

RTC: **Additionally, the RTC sees the public engagement process as being extremely important to
good decision making. For every project we work on, extensive public outreach is done as was**
the case with the Unified Corridor Study (UCS). Since the last two years, we have held four public meetings, eight focus group meetings with members of local community organizations, and several stakeholder meetings, distributed three online survey which approximately 2,000 people completed, received over 600 written comments, and heard over several hundred verbal comments at our monthly RTC meetings. We also regularly attended community meetings and events where we spoke to hundreds of people from all over the county about the UCS.

Greenway’s response: The RTC has not received even close to 10,000 responses on any aspect of the rail vs. trail debate. The “public input process” is not effective if it doesn’t lead to a dialogue which effectively takes into account strong documented opposition to the staff preferred scenario (e.g. a good example of how the process could have worked is the Santa Cruz Water Commission).

We are not saying that the staff must agree with positions opposed to its point of view, but it must reflect a minimum of consideration and its point of view must be informed by such strong opposition. This has not been true during the entire UCS process, from the creation of “scenarios” to the politicization of the study conclusions.

Actions speak louder than words, and the constant refrain about “valuing” input is not supported by the actions of the staff in responding to that input. If the RTC response to Greenway’s press release is provided to Commissioners, please also provide these responses to the Commissioners (we are copying members of the press).

RTC: We value all of the input we received throughout the UCS process, and it was all considered by our staff as they worked on finalizing the preferred scenario that was presented to RTC Commissioners at the Dec. 6 meeting. RTC staff is still seeking community input on the draft Step 2 scenario analysis and a preferred scenario for the UCS to be considered in the development of the final staff recommendation and by the commission in the action on the preferred scenario on Jan. 16.

Deadlines for public comment to be submitted are:

Dec. 28, 2018, 5 p.m.: For consideration by staff in development of the final staff recommendation of preferred scenario and draft final report to the RTC on Jan. 17, 2019.

Jan. 16, 2019 12 p.m.: For consideration by the commission in the action on the preferred scenario on Jan. 17, 2019.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Manu Koenig, Executive Director
Phone: (831) 234-3922
Email: manu.koenig@sccgreenway.org

GREENWAY PRESENTS 10,000 PETITION SIGNATURES TO RTC
Petition says county residents want trail, not train

Santa Cruz, CA, December 17th, 2018 – On Tuesday, December 18th, 2018, at 10:30 am Santa Cruz County Greenway will present a petition with over 10,000 signatures of county residents to Guy Preston, Executive Director of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) at the RTC’s office: 1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.

The petition says:

"I agree with the conclusions of the Santa Cruz County Greenway Study that a multi-use path for pedestrians, bikes and electric bikes is the best use of the rail corridor and that a train does NOT deliver the ridership, safety, or other benefits to justify its enormous cost."

The signatures are being officially submitted to the RTC one month before the commission’s planned vote on the “train plan” at their January 17th meeting. RTC Staff is seeking approval for a scenario which includes a $1 billion+ passenger train over thirty years and spending $15 million immediately to repair the old tracks so that freight rail service could operate throughout Santa Cruz County. A ‘Yes’ vote would trigger a 10 year contract with freight operator Progressive Rail. “If the RTC approves the ‘train plan,’ the rail corridor won’t get used for serious public transportation anytime in the next 10 years,” said Manu Koenig, Executive Director of Santa Cruz County Greenway. A potential passenger train wouldn’t run for at least seventeen years (2035), and would only have 3,698 round trips per day, compared to HWY 1’s over 100,000 round trips per day.

The 10,000 signatures dwarf the RTC’s own public outreach efforts, which Koenig calls “not representative.” The RTC held just two public presentations with limited input on its recommended scenario, one in Live Oak on Monday, October 15, 2018 and another in Watsonville on Tuesday, October 16, 2018. The RTC also lists fourteen other presentations as opportunities for public input, but unfortunately, “public input” is limited to two minute sound bites ignored by the RTC. “The bottom line is that the RTC hasn’t talked to everyday people — Greenway has. The message from voters is resoundingly clear, voters will not pay for a billion dollar train boondoggle," said Koenig.
The passage of Measure L on November 6, where voters favored the use of the Capitola Trestle for bikes and pedestrians, confirms that Greenway is correct about voter preference. "Elections provide statistically representative data about the will of the voters," said Koenig. Greenway invites our County Supervisors to put the issue to a county-wide vote in 2020.

The RTC has also ignored its own public opinion data in moving forward with proposed passenger and freight rail. In an online survey of 1,596 residents, the largest public survey the RTC has conducted for the Unified Corridors Study (UCS), 54% of respondents opposed rail transit and 63% opposed freight rail in north county (UCS Draft Step 1 Analysis – Public Workshop and Survey Input October-November 2017). "Why is our public transportation agency spending thousands of dollars to collect this data only to ignore it?" Koenig asks.

![Figure 6: Rail Right-of-Way](image)

Data from the UCS Draft Step 1 Analysis – Public Workshop and Survey Input, Oct.-Nov. 2017

The RTC’s Unified Corridors Study (UCS) makes no reference to the need for a new tax to support passenger rail service despite the fact that BART, SMART, and other California rail projects have all required matching local funds. Measure D, the county’s 2016 self-help transportation funding measure, prohibits use of funds for building or operating a passenger train. "They’re avoiding the most important question," Koenig said, “will the voters pay for it?"

###

*Santa Cruz County Greenway is a 501(c)4 non-profit advocacy organization whose mission is “to create a spectacular Greenway as the backbone of an active transportation and transit network.”*
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aage Delbanco</th>
<th>Abel Perez</th>
<th>Adrian Serrano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Alden</td>
<td>Abigail Bacon</td>
<td>Adrian Silva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Brookes</td>
<td>Abigail Griffiths</td>
<td>Adriana Rennels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Cavagnolo</td>
<td>Abigail Oxendine</td>
<td>Adriana Serratos Valdivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Clegg</td>
<td>Abigail Putnam</td>
<td>Adrianna Venegar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Cole</td>
<td>Aby Enriquez</td>
<td>Adrienne Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Ford</td>
<td>Acacia Fruitgarden</td>
<td>Adrienne Bolles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Glick</td>
<td>Achevia Grell</td>
<td>Adrienne Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Grail</td>
<td>Ada Goericke</td>
<td>Adrienne Dahlmeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Hernandez</td>
<td>Adam Gordon</td>
<td>Adron Beene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Johnson</td>
<td>Adam Andrus</td>
<td>Aedan Allen-Brower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Kiefer</td>
<td>Adam Atkins</td>
<td>Aguirre Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Kruse</td>
<td>Adam Borcherdng</td>
<td>Agustin Sosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Lakey</td>
<td>Adam Christoherprice</td>
<td>Ahna Rivas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Lanes</td>
<td>Adam Clarke</td>
<td>Ahmi Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Lazenby</td>
<td>Adam Enos</td>
<td>Ahna Backstrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Liugeu</td>
<td>Adam Gentz</td>
<td>Aica Asgari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Morse</td>
<td>Adam Hayes</td>
<td>Aican Guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Safronoff</td>
<td>Adam Hughes</td>
<td>Aileen Guzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Sale</td>
<td>Adam Myers</td>
<td>Aimee Frizell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Schellenberg</td>
<td>Adam Price</td>
<td>Aimee Merrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Simkin</td>
<td>Adam Rose</td>
<td>Aimee Shuffler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Sonnenshine</td>
<td>Adam Sanchez</td>
<td>Airolg Mejia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Stein</td>
<td>Adam Stepancic</td>
<td>Aisha Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Sullivan</td>
<td>Adam Tenney</td>
<td>Ajita Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Van Brun</td>
<td>Adam Weber</td>
<td>Akemi Chee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaydeed Maldonado</td>
<td>Addyson Phan</td>
<td>Akira Starks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Andersen</td>
<td>Adedbyo Agbelekale</td>
<td>Al Adamsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbie Aribas</td>
<td>Adela Flores</td>
<td>Al Cheney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbie Beane</td>
<td>Adela Najarro</td>
<td>Al Quintero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbie Miller</td>
<td>Adele Peer</td>
<td>Al Sehorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbie Silva</td>
<td>Adelina Diaz</td>
<td>Alajandra Rocha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Lambretti</td>
<td>Adeline Davis</td>
<td>Alan Alpert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Oliver</td>
<td>Adrianz Ampil</td>
<td>Alan Arreola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbygale Gonzalez</td>
<td>Adrian Combs</td>
<td>Alan Baiocchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe Van Vliet</td>
<td>Adrian Fischer</td>
<td>Alan Behrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe Vliet</td>
<td>Adrian Martinez</td>
<td>Alan Chisam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel Espinoza</td>
<td>Adrian Proca</td>
<td>Alan Christenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel Gates</td>
<td>Adrian Rodriguez</td>
<td>Alan Fox</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alan Giglio</th>
<th>Alejandro Zavala</th>
<th>Alexandra Chartier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Goates</td>
<td>Aleka Hadzis</td>
<td>Alexandra Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Heit</td>
<td>Alekz Londos</td>
<td>Alexandra Kilekas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Kaneg</td>
<td>Alena Scoffone</td>
<td>Alexandra Moskow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Pfeil</td>
<td>Alex Aranburu</td>
<td>Alexandra Naess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Tirado</td>
<td>Alex Cecil</td>
<td>Alexandra Ooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Wolf</td>
<td>Alex Dez</td>
<td>Alexandra Santini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Ziegler</td>
<td>Alex Fernandez</td>
<td>Alexandra Schroeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana Favre-Rice</td>
<td>Alex Ireland</td>
<td>Alexandra Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana Truax</td>
<td>Alex Juntado</td>
<td>Alexandria Barrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alanna Maldonado</td>
<td>Alex Mazariegas</td>
<td>Alexis Aguilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Yanira Rivas</td>
<td>Alex Mckenzie</td>
<td>Alexis Daoussis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Hoga</td>
<td>Alex Migues</td>
<td>Alexis De Chambrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Kordesch</td>
<td>Alex Miller</td>
<td>Alexis Haller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Lotze</td>
<td>Alex Perl</td>
<td>Alexis Lovell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Milam</td>
<td>Alex Serna</td>
<td>Alexis McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Tully</td>
<td>Alex Swift</td>
<td>Alexis Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Veronica</td>
<td>Alex Vazquez</td>
<td>Alexis Navarro Sanchez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Guarno</td>
<td>Alex Verdin</td>
<td>Alexis Teplick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Guzman</td>
<td>Alex Walker</td>
<td>Alexandrua Baltezar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Manriquez</td>
<td>Alex Zavala</td>
<td>Alfonso Santana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldo Monroy</td>
<td>Alexa Houchins</td>
<td>Alfred Slians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldo Rocha</td>
<td>Alexa Shockley</td>
<td>Alfredo Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleah true</td>
<td>Alexa Soenen</td>
<td>Alfredo Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alec Sherrod</td>
<td>Alex Chan</td>
<td>Ali Fallahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alecy Cruz</td>
<td>Alexander Berckefeldt</td>
<td>Ali Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra Guerrero</td>
<td>Alexander Burr</td>
<td>Ali Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra Vargas</td>
<td>Alexander Connelly</td>
<td>Alice Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Abundes</td>
<td>Alexander De Almeida</td>
<td>Alice Crumrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Aranda</td>
<td>Alexander Edens</td>
<td>Alice Gallup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Cedeno</td>
<td>Alexander Hirschi</td>
<td>Alice Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Ferrera</td>
<td>Alexander Hughes</td>
<td>Alice McCarley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Jacobo</td>
<td>Alexander Kaliczkak</td>
<td>Alice Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Melchor</td>
<td>Alexander Martinez</td>
<td>Alice Vega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Mendoza</td>
<td>Alexander Nemchonok</td>
<td>Alice Wilkerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Montejano</td>
<td>Alexander Newell</td>
<td>Alice Wojtkiewicz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Paramo</td>
<td>Alexander Pearce</td>
<td>Alicia Gurnee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Torres</td>
<td>Alexandra Alvarez</td>
<td>Alicia Guzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandra Armstrong</td>
<td>Alicia Madrid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Alicia Martinez
Alicia Rocha
Alicia Segura
Alicia Stanton
Alicia Steinhardt
Alicia Wheelock
Alicia Wornicov
Alicia Young
Alida Canale
Alina Kieu
Alina Lombardo
Alina Willis
Alisha Dodds
Alishia Dauterive
Alisia Barajas-Carter
Alisia Carter
Alison Altmann
Alison Bortcosh
Alison Casey
Alison Costello
Alison Day
Alison Ekars
Alison Fuhrman
Alison Garcia
Alison Gee
Alison Gold
Alison Herdocia
Alison Holmes
Alison Lynch
Alison Pepper
Alison Richards
Alison Ross
Alissa Ingram
Alissa Withrow
Allan DeJesus
Allee Pitaccio
Alleen Schwab
Allen Olivera
Allen Rogers

Allen Schlumbrecht
Alli Webster
Allida Taylor
Allie Howard
Allison Bennett
Allison Deagen
Allison Knox
Allison Marconi
Allison Miward
Allison Pfefferkorn
Allison Reiter
Allison Royal
Allison Stevens
Allison Van Den Hout
Allyn Rictherman
Allyne Hammers
Alma Barcenas
Alma Jeronimo
Alma Partida
Alteaa Hines
Alyandro Ramirez
Alycia Kennedy
Alysha Birss
Alysia Sharief
Alyson Hanson
Alyson Heim
Alyssa Forman
Alyssa Green
Alyssa Mendoza
Alyssa Perez
Alyssa Ponce
Alyssa Steiner
Alyssa Haskins
Amalia Hubbert
Amalia Ruiz
Amanda Andrade
Amanda Ares
Amanda Andrade
Amanda Ares
Amanda Boe
Amanda Branecki
Amanda Cohen
Amanda Crawford
Amanda Drake
Amanda Engeldrum
Magana
Amanda Gaban
Amanda Gamban
Amanda Grant
Amanda Lackides
Amanda Maples
Amanda Masterton
Amanda Mcknight
Amanda Moe
Amanda Sandoval
Amanda Schader-Wilson
Amber Anjali
Amber Celeste Ventura
Amber Cortes
Amber Del Rosario
Amber Evans
Amber Fipps
Amber Lennon
Amber Martin
Amelia Adams
Amelia Foster
Amelia Georgieva
Amelia Goudberg
Amelia Nash
Ami Curtis
Amie Breed
Amie Forest
Amie O'Donovan
Amina Valenziano
Aminta Ramos
Amit Jain
Amit Saxena
Amoreena Laura
Amparo Yodar

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
### Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

**Recipient:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**Letter:** Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amy Anderson</th>
<th>Ana Kitsos</th>
<th>Andrea Lambros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy Biggs</td>
<td>Ana Leos-Jimenez</td>
<td>Andrea Leon-Aviles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Boyd</td>
<td>Ana Lilia Pineda</td>
<td>Andrea Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Burris</td>
<td>Ana Luna</td>
<td>Andrea Norred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Chirman</td>
<td>Ana Melgoza</td>
<td>Andrea Pisani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Do</td>
<td>Ana Ramos</td>
<td>Andrea Ratto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Estrada</td>
<td>Ana Schaffer</td>
<td>Andrea Riordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Gaylord</td>
<td>Ana Valencia</td>
<td>Andrea Roth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Gonzalez</td>
<td>Ana Villafuerte</td>
<td>Andrea Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Goodhue</td>
<td>Anabel Rivas</td>
<td>Andrea Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Graglia</td>
<td>Anabel Smith</td>
<td>Andrea Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Hanley</td>
<td>Anabelle Drda</td>
<td>Andreas Marden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Harrington</td>
<td>Anabellin Avalos</td>
<td>Andreia Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Hawes</td>
<td>Analuisa Morales</td>
<td>Andres Bocaletti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Hille</td>
<td>Anastasia Daellenbach</td>
<td>Andres Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Huyck</td>
<td>Anastasia Elgina</td>
<td>Andres Solis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Ivey</td>
<td>Anastasia Steinberg</td>
<td>Andres Stephens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Levy</td>
<td>Anatalia Avila</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Litz</td>
<td>Anders Cochran</td>
<td>Andrew Aness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Loudon</td>
<td>Anderson Pestana</td>
<td>Andrew Barber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Mandell</td>
<td>Anderson Shepard</td>
<td>Andrew Beye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Moran</td>
<td>Andi Coniglio</td>
<td>Andrew Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy O'Leary</td>
<td>Andrea Farstad</td>
<td>Andrew Calciano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Orlando</td>
<td>Andre Juncal</td>
<td>Andrew Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Pearce</td>
<td>Andre Nagel</td>
<td>Andrew Crabtree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Pine</td>
<td>Andrea Berbera</td>
<td>Andrew Darrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Red Feather</td>
<td>Andrea Block</td>
<td>Andrew Dioccco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Rocheleau</td>
<td>Andrea Burrell</td>
<td>Andrew Dubois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Rosen</td>
<td>Andrea Castro</td>
<td>Andrew Fuentes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Rumsey</td>
<td>Andrea Farkas</td>
<td>Andrew Gans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Schelhorse</td>
<td>Andrea Fazel</td>
<td>Andrew Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Smiley</td>
<td>Andrea Freund</td>
<td>Andrew Gersh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Steinberg</td>
<td>Andrea Gifford</td>
<td>Andrew Giorgianni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Valdez</td>
<td>Andrea Gold</td>
<td>Andrew Gruver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Wynes</td>
<td>Andrea Hernandez</td>
<td>Andrew Hedding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Zhang</td>
<td>Andrea Holtz</td>
<td>Andrew Jarvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Esquivel</td>
<td>Andrea Hutson</td>
<td>Andrew Knutsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Guzman</td>
<td>Andrea Jacobs</td>
<td>Andrew Massie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Harris</td>
<td>Andrea Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anna Hughes</th>
<th>Annette Spear</th>
<th>Anusha Sri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna Izmailova</td>
<td>Annette Steiner</td>
<td>Anya Spear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Jenkins</td>
<td>Annette Truong</td>
<td>April Choi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Lin</td>
<td>Annette Woarner</td>
<td>April Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Lovato</td>
<td>Annie Chapin</td>
<td>April Hyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna McGuire</td>
<td>Annie Morris</td>
<td>April Kaszubski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Mendoza</td>
<td>Annika Holm</td>
<td>April Leveque Derpich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Osihn</td>
<td>Anniken Hansen</td>
<td>April Rueppel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Ruggiero</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>April Stearns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Ruiz</td>
<td>Anprea Lewis</td>
<td>Araceli Castillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Silva</td>
<td>Antonia Carpelli</td>
<td>Araceli Silva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Soave</td>
<td>Anthony Alcala</td>
<td>Aracelly Bibl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Spix</td>
<td>Anthony Breckenridge</td>
<td>Aran Nichol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Swan</td>
<td>Anthony Castiglioni</td>
<td>Araya Bonner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Urling</td>
<td>Anthony Ford</td>
<td>Arcadio Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annabelle Drda</td>
<td>Anthony Gemigniani</td>
<td>Arcelia Cisneros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Allegretti</td>
<td>Anthony Hesketh</td>
<td>Archer Koch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Austin</td>
<td>Anthony Kuspa</td>
<td>Archie Webber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Bachar</td>
<td>Anthony Mendoza</td>
<td>Arda Akman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Boheler</td>
<td>Anthony Nunn</td>
<td>Ardelyn Fauni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Drake</td>
<td>Anthony Orlando</td>
<td>Aretha Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Elder</td>
<td>Anthony Oster</td>
<td>Ari Crawford-Levis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Hallinan</td>
<td>Anthony Park</td>
<td>Ari Freedlaender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Harrison</td>
<td>Anthony Rovai</td>
<td>Ari Taub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Hutchison</td>
<td>Anthony Russo</td>
<td>Aria Di Salvio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Kato</td>
<td>Anthony Sicola</td>
<td>Aria Linville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Marie Hallal</td>
<td>Anthony Vicar</td>
<td>Ariana Boostani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Marie Weiss</td>
<td>Anthony Vitale</td>
<td>Ariana Carrothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Mark</td>
<td>Anthony Williams</td>
<td>Ariana Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Martinette</td>
<td>Anthy Tellschow</td>
<td>Ariana Medeiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Pitts</td>
<td>Anton Fleig</td>
<td>Ariana Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Ritchey</td>
<td>Antonia Astone</td>
<td>Ariel Betz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Sherwood</td>
<td>Antonia Miano</td>
<td>Ariel Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Spence</td>
<td>Antonin Giraud</td>
<td>Ariel Maayan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Striffler</td>
<td>Antonio Belmont</td>
<td>Ariel Rojas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Marie Jackson</td>
<td>Antonio Cozzolino</td>
<td>Ariela Najman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annee Hall</td>
<td>Antonio Nunez</td>
<td>Arielle Bittman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Masters</td>
<td>Antonio Olivas</td>
<td>Aristeo Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Saiz</td>
<td>Antonio Violich</td>
<td>Arleen Wittkinds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature 1</th>
<th>Signature 2</th>
<th>Signature 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlene Auerbach</td>
<td>Ashlyn Lange</td>
<td>Baldomero Meza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene De Leon</td>
<td>Ashlyn Wedde</td>
<td>Ball Steeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlie Takahashi</td>
<td>Asia Stautz</td>
<td>Baltazar Portillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando Rivera</td>
<td>Asiel Reyes</td>
<td>Balwinder Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Sanchez</td>
<td>Athena Gam</td>
<td>Barb Frisch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Nathan</td>
<td>Athena Woodrow</td>
<td>Barb Roettger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemia Toledo</td>
<td>Aubrey Connelly</td>
<td>Barbara Alaimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemio Campos</td>
<td>Aubrey Kuehne</td>
<td>Barbara Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Alvarez</td>
<td>Audrey Huang</td>
<td>Barbara Apolskis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Cooke</td>
<td>Audrey Redle</td>
<td>Barbara Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Dover</td>
<td>Audrey Vosseler</td>
<td>Barbara Bernard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Faygenholtz</td>
<td>Aurora Barber</td>
<td>Barbara Bossak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Kinsolving</td>
<td>Aurora Barbor</td>
<td>Barbara Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Melvin</td>
<td>Austen Kliwer</td>
<td>Barbara Chatfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Porcella</td>
<td>Austin Acosta</td>
<td>Barbara Diamond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Rolston</td>
<td>Austin Carter</td>
<td>Barbara Falco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artur</td>
<td>Austin Duncan</td>
<td>Barbara Gerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo Navarro</td>
<td>Austin Johns</td>
<td>Barbara Goza Chemers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo Perez</td>
<td>Austin Provansal</td>
<td>Barbara Hilderbrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo Reyes-Carrillo</td>
<td>Austin Smith Ford</td>
<td>Barbara Hodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asenat Amos Ventura</td>
<td>Austin Swift</td>
<td>Barbara Ingman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asenat Ramos Ventura</td>
<td>Austin Talbert</td>
<td>Barbara Jacobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asher Brauner</td>
<td>Autumn Kelly</td>
<td>Barbara Litsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Braley</td>
<td>Autumn Roberge</td>
<td>Barbara Lockwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Enos</td>
<td>Autumn Sun</td>
<td>Barbara Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gooch</td>
<td>Autumn Winship</td>
<td>Barbara Newsome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Greenley</td>
<td>Avani Arorn</td>
<td>Barbara Polhamius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Lindsey</td>
<td>Avira Wenn</td>
<td>Barbara Sanguinetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Moran</td>
<td>Axel Loelhoefel</td>
<td>Barbara Shean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Ramirez</td>
<td>Ayshae Tuncan</td>
<td>Barbara Sonnenshine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Ritchie</td>
<td>Azael Huerta</td>
<td>Barbara Sylvester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Rowe</td>
<td>Azael Reyes-Morales</td>
<td>Barbara Tajima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Soria</td>
<td>Azam Abedi</td>
<td>Barbara Temsamani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Sparkman</td>
<td>Azani Pusina</td>
<td>Barbara Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Taylor</td>
<td>Azia D'Asdenz</td>
<td>Barbara Vautier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Tennant</td>
<td>Babs Kingsley</td>
<td>Barbara Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Thompson</td>
<td>Bacilio Santoyo</td>
<td>Barbaro Lindblom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Tomeck</td>
<td>Bahar Hanjani</td>
<td>Barbro Lindblom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashly Daniel</td>
<td>Baker Carroll</td>
<td>Bardee Capitanich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnaby Clark</th>
<th>Ben Rumsey</th>
<th>Betsy Bowerman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrett James</td>
<td>Ben Schoettgen</td>
<td>Betsy Gladish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett Sharen</td>
<td>Ben Snyder</td>
<td>Betsy Maggini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barri Boone</td>
<td>Ben Stanger</td>
<td>Betsy Riker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Beckemeyer</td>
<td>Ben Teeple</td>
<td>Betsy Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Dobyns</td>
<td>Ben Toker</td>
<td>Betty Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Sihler</td>
<td>Ben Van Dale</td>
<td>Betty Malks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Williams</td>
<td>Ben Vernazza</td>
<td>Betty O'Donnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Young</td>
<td>Ben Woody</td>
<td>Bettylouise Sturm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates Marshall</td>
<td>Benjamin Cardenas</td>
<td>Bevan Docherty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beau Baiocchi</td>
<td>Benjamin Cogan</td>
<td>Beverley Pearce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beau Barcus</td>
<td>Benjamin Ely</td>
<td>Beverly Brito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beau Lawrie</td>
<td>Benjamin Giessow</td>
<td>Beverly Fleming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becca Moeller</td>
<td>Benjamin Leguillon</td>
<td>Beverly Grova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becka Gibbons</td>
<td>Benjamin Morgan</td>
<td>Beverly Huber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Herry</td>
<td>Benjamin Rivero</td>
<td>Beverly Overton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Hughes</td>
<td>Benjamin Rubio</td>
<td>Beverly Sleeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Nutt</td>
<td>Benjamin Velasquez</td>
<td>Bhakti Leavitt-Mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Sullivan</td>
<td>Benjamin West</td>
<td>Bhakti Sati Leavitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beila Krow</td>
<td>Benna Dimig</td>
<td>Bhumika Gupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belia Acosta-Marquez</td>
<td>Bennett Bilgere</td>
<td>Bianca Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Rubaclava</td>
<td>Bennie Giattino</td>
<td>Bianca Monroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Rubalcava</td>
<td>Bernabe Camacho</td>
<td>Bibiana Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Atkinson</td>
<td>Bernice Bernstein</td>
<td>Bill Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Blanchette</td>
<td>Bert Faucher</td>
<td>Bill Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Clayden</td>
<td>Bert Galaw</td>
<td>Bill Erickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Clemens</td>
<td>Berta Godinez</td>
<td>Bill Farrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben De Leon</td>
<td>Berta Rodriguez</td>
<td>Bill Fernald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben DeLeon</td>
<td>Bertha Rodriguez</td>
<td>Bill Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Ely</td>
<td>Beth Bakerman</td>
<td>Bill Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Green</td>
<td>Beth Blosser</td>
<td>Bill Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Grove</td>
<td>Beth English</td>
<td>Bill McBride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Haid</td>
<td>Beth Martinez</td>
<td>Bill McFarland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Heistin</td>
<td>Beth Mason</td>
<td>Bill McNulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Long</td>
<td>Beth Quinn</td>
<td>Bill Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Oneto</td>
<td>Beth Rajala</td>
<td>Bill Schoenbart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Page</td>
<td>Beth Schatzman</td>
<td>Bill Scurich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Riga</td>
<td>Bethany Lantis</td>
<td>Bill Simpkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Roeder</td>
<td>Betsi Ramirez</td>
<td>Bill Smallman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Bill Spence  Bob Young  Bradley Olin
Bill Wiseman  Bobbe Martin  Brady Turner
Billy Christian  Bobbi Burns  Brand Ens
Billy O’driscoll  Bobbi Losee  Brandon Van Valer
Billy Rodoni  Bobbie Allen  Brandon Bailey
Birgitta Khan  Bobby Hultz  Brandon Belgard
Blaine Bowman-Lacey  Bon Elliott  Brandon Cheney
Blake Carpenter  Bonilla Pedro  Brandon Cole
Blake Evans  Bonnie Bear  Brandon Diniz
Blake Keys  Bonnie Blumenfeld  Brandon Hemmig
Blake Rouillard  Bonnie Cho  Brandon Hughes
Blanca Alvarez  Bonnie Coben  Brandon Hunter
Blanca Cassidy  Bonnie Devarco  Brandon Kempf
Blanca Compoginis  Bonnie Doran  Brandon O’Sullivan
Blanca Melchor  Bonnie Holmer-Orange  Brandon Quattlebaum
Blanca Valle  Bonnie Jones  Brandon Reitzel
Blanca Melchor  Bonnie La Valle  Brandy Baird
Blandy Merrill  Bonnie Linden  Brandy Wright
Boaz Vilozny  Bonnie Mor  Brayden Estby
Bob Boettiger  Bonnie Murphy  Breann Sampson
Bob Brainard  Bonnie Willis  Breege Drees
Bob Cayton  Bonny Weiner  Brenda Berini
Bob Ciotti  Boris Baggerman  Brenda Davis
Bob Fabbi  Brad DeHaven  Brenda De La Cruz
Bob Fifield  Brad Ens  Brenda Dilloughery
Bob Lamonica  Brad Hoffeld  Brenda Dodson
Bob Landry  Brad Kava  Brenda Fulkerson
Bob Larsen  Brad Leinenbach  Brenda Kasani
Bob Lilley  Brad Peterson  Brenda Ramirez
Bob Meads  Brad Piper  Brenda Redrovan
Bob Messmorf  Brad Poff  Brenda Rysdam
Bob Metallia  Brad Richey  Brenda Wright
Bob Mitchell  Brad Rodas  Brenda Zeller
Bob Norton  Brad Smith  Brendan Harrison
Bob Schneider  Brad Taylor  Brendan Klaver
Bob Spisak  Bradley Bowden  Brendan Short
Bob Tatum  Bradley Frey  Brendon Harris
Bob Van Dyk  Bradley MacDonald  Brendon Liebenthal
Bob Welch  Bradley Mueller  Brenna Ramirez
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Brennie Spencer  Brian Laufer  Briana Barnes
Brent Anderson  Brian Lavelle  Briana Mosbacher
Brent Elder  Brian Madden  Brianna Berringham
Brent Graflund  Brian Martinez  Brianna Donofrio
Brent Grefe  Brian McCutchen  Brianna Egan
Brent Laucher  Brian McElroy  Brianna Moger
Brent Lay  Brian McHaney  Brianna Riley
Brent Paris  Brian Meek  Brianna Vargo
Brent Roman  Brian Munn  Brice Dahlmeier
Brent Willett  Brian O’connor  Bridey Best
Bret Bailey  Brian O’dell  Bridget Thorpe
Bret Hancock  Brian Orr  Bridget Ulrich
Brett Cornell  Brian Palahang  Bridgettes Payne
Brett Dinovo  Brian Peoples  Brie Reiter
Brett Graessle  Brian Peternell  Brier Basilico
Brett Graf  Brian Pierson  Brigid Fuller
Brett Marshall  Brian Politron  Brigid Perhach
Brett Pearson  Brian Rico  Brigitte Harte
Brian Alvarez  Brian Schulze  Brigitte Schlatter
Brian Arthur  Brian Scheck  Britain Wilson
Brian Baer  Brian Sheckler  Britnee Russo
Brian Band  Brian Sidwell  Brittany Bowers
Brian Beck  Brian Skeel  Brittany Cowling
Brian Brooks  Brian Smith  Brittany Craft
Brian Brunelli  Brian Snow  Brittany Sparks
Brian Coronado  Brian Spence  Brittnee Aten
Brian Driscoll  Brian Stocks  Brittney Carlton
Brian Eastwood  Brian Sugue  Brittney Mignano
Brian Flores  Brian Thompson  Brock Dickie
Brian Friedmann  Brian Treece  Brock Rulifson
Brian Friel  Brian Versteegen  Brooke Bergland
Brian Garcia  Brian Waters  Brooke Casipit
Brian Garvey  Brian Watrous  Brooke Corry
Brian Grocott  Brian Wells  Brooke Diehl
Brian Hales  Brian Whiteside  Brooke Hofkins
Brian Heath  Brian Wiese  Brooke Johnson
Brian Heim  Brian Williams  Brooke Matteson
Brian Khalaj  Brian Wunez  Brooke Sanders
Brian King  Briana Ackerman  Brooke Towne
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Brooke Velasquez  
Brooks Lambert  
Broomfield Julie  
Bruce Abt  
Bruce Blodgett  
Bruce Brownstein  
Bruce Bundy  
Bruce Burroughs  
Bruce Chorba  
Bruce Cory  
Bruce Cyr  
Bruce Duarte  
Bruce Glass  
Bruce Hunter  
Bruce Koosta  
Bruce Kootstra  
Bruce McKay  
Bruce McMorran  
Bruce Mitchell  
Bruce Steen  
Bruce Taylor  
Bruce Werder  
Bruno Casillas  
Bruno De Alba  
Bruno Delgado  
Bryan Barton  
Bryan Cockel  
Bryan Earl Kinchen  
Bryan Hughes  
Bryan Krogger  
Bryan Kurek  
Bryan Lopez  
Bryan Lovegren  
Bryan Mackenzie  
Bryan Myers  
Bryan Patrick  
Bryan Richter  
Bryan Weinstein  
Bryana Espinoza  
Bryan Garcia  
Bryanna Loza  
Bryant Mairs  
Bryn Kanar  
Bryn Young  
Bryna Berkowitz  
Bryson Drake  
Bud Colligan  
Budai Szilvia  
Buff Mccharen  
Burleigh Cooper  
Burt Nanus  
Buzz Roberts  
Buzz Anderson  
Byron Grisel  
Byron Thomas  
C. Joe Andrews  
Cailleen Daugherty  
Cailltin Gigliotti  
Cailltin Jeffs  
Cailltin Matthews  
Cailltin Matthews  
Cailltin McCarick  
Cale Klemme  
Cale Hanson  
Caleb Martin  
Caleb Siemens  
Calleen Baca  
Calvin Jenkins  
Cameron Bacher  
Cameron Carothers  
Cameron Fitzpatrick  
Cameron Garrott  
Cameron Jackson  
Cameron Johl  
Cameron Mardis  
Cameron Mumper  
Camila Fischer  
Camilla Campos  
Camille Dehne  
Camille Gonzales  
Camille Johnson  
Camille Sobalvarro  
Camilo Buraglia  
Camilo Werlin  
Candice Bruner  
Candice Koshman  
Candy Dela Hunt  
Candy DelaHunt  
Cara Fite  
Cara Hipkskind  
Caren Nessen  
Carey Pico  
Cari Moore  
Carin Hanna  
Carina  
Carina Hull  
Carissa Kelley  
Carl Broderick  
Carl Casey  
Carl Cull  
Carl Freeman  
Carl Hartman  
Carl Moroney  
Carl Ratliff  
Carl Veninga-Zaricor  
Carla Bentley  
Carla Bolger  
Carla Carstens  
Carla Dolores  
Carla Fresquez  
Carla Martinez  
Carleen Neuman  
Carlo Beronio  
Carlo Deuls Reyes  
Carlos Avina  
Carlos Carillo  
Carlos Carrillo
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Carlos Chagolla
Carlos Cosio
Carlos Daza
Carlos Echeuerra
Carlos Guitierrez
Carlos Melgoza
Carlos Mercado
Carlos Plascencia
Carlos Reyes
Carlos Roman
Carlos Santalaya
Carlos Torres
Carlos Zumora
Carlo Baker Jr
Carly Cheap
Carly DeMartini
Carly Minor
Carly Norris
Carly Palmer
Carly Todisco
Carma Haston
Carmelita Schreher
Carmen Herrera Mans
Carmen Herrera-Mansir
Carmen Leon
Carmen McIntyre
Carmen Mulholand
Carmen Nuzum
Carol Agneessens
Carol Alexander
Carol Arrioca
Carol Barnes
Carol Boland
Carol Caminata
Carol Canaris
Carol Carson
Carol Cloud
Carol Corbin
Carol Davis
Carol DuBois
Carol Dudley
Carol Felton
Carol Glenn
Carol Heinze
Carol Ismail
Carol Jnelson
Carol Jordan
Carol Kent
Carol Laflin
Carol Latta
Carol Libby
Carol MacFarland
Carol Marchbank
Carol Martin
Carol Marting
Carol Merritt
Carol Merrtil
Carol Monkendor
Carol Moore
Carol Olson
Carol Oneil
Carol Osborne
Carol Polhamus
Carol Polletier
Carol Reid
Carol Rosenoff
Carol Rowberg
Carol Sichak
Carol Stevens
Carol Strang
Carol Tara
Carol Tolbert
Carol Yvanovich
Carole Cook
Carole Hagen
Carole Kramer
Carole Lake
Carole McDowell
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## Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carli Collins</th>
<th>Catherine Garcia</th>
<th>Celeste Tillman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Harrington</td>
<td>Catherine Hudson</td>
<td>Celia Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Burr</td>
<td>Catherine Ito</td>
<td>Celine Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Combs</td>
<td>Catherine Milazzo</td>
<td>Celine Glon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson Kermode</td>
<td>Catherine Olsen</td>
<td>Celine Molina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Hayes</td>
<td>Catherine Orgain</td>
<td>Celso Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Jones</td>
<td>Catherine Perrin</td>
<td>Centa Atencio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryl Smittt</td>
<td>Catherine Ramirez</td>
<td>Cerridwyn Mclaglen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryn Gagarin</td>
<td>Catherine Reiter</td>
<td>Cesar Castillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryn Yue</td>
<td>Catherine Rumpanos</td>
<td>Cesar Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Feickert</td>
<td>Catherine Tait</td>
<td>Cesar Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Gaynor</td>
<td>Catherine Vanrhee</td>
<td>Cesar Guerrero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Gerstle</td>
<td>Catherine Wolpert-Adams</td>
<td>Cesar Herrera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Hawkins</td>
<td>Cathie Dominguez</td>
<td>Cesar Magdaleno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Kirkhart</td>
<td>Cathie Jarosz</td>
<td>Cesar Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Lightner</td>
<td>Cathleen Glass</td>
<td>Cesar Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey O'Brien</td>
<td>Cathleen Lucid</td>
<td>Cesario Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Stockel</td>
<td>Cathy Cameron</td>
<td>Chad Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Vandenheuvel</td>
<td>Cathy Crystal</td>
<td>Chad Falsetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casidee McDonough</td>
<td>Cathy Holdaway</td>
<td>Chad Kaesemeyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casimira Salazar</td>
<td>Cathy Krizik</td>
<td>Chad Kaltinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Ertl</td>
<td>Cathy Levonius</td>
<td>Chad Kecy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Johnson</td>
<td>Cathy Parisie</td>
<td>Chad Misunas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Phillips</td>
<td>Cathy Sierra</td>
<td>Chad Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Tangherlini</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chad Sanden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy Blanca</td>
<td>Cathy Toldi</td>
<td>Chai Bryce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy Foley</td>
<td>Cathy Young</td>
<td>Chaim Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Caborn</td>
<td>Caylin Calle</td>
<td>Chance Schenk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Haberle</td>
<td>Cazyana Pelham-Bush</td>
<td>Chandler Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Chrysler</td>
<td>Cean McGuire</td>
<td>Chandra Brantley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina Regalado</td>
<td>Cebe Loomis</td>
<td>Chanel Enriquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharina Marlowe</td>
<td>Cecilia Carrillo</td>
<td>Chantal Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharina Wessels</td>
<td>Cecilia Gonzales</td>
<td>Char Boger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Koepke</td>
<td>Cecilia Pinheiro</td>
<td>Char P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Brothers</td>
<td>Cecilia Van Wickler</td>
<td>Charie Nash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Crawford</td>
<td>Cecily Cahill</td>
<td>Charie Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Dennis-Leigh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charity Dasenbrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Fennell</td>
<td>Cedele Percin</td>
<td>Charleen Marden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Frederick</td>
<td>Celeste Baross</td>
<td>Charlene Darish Donahue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celeste Krilanovich Cook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Wiebe-Heit</td>
<td>Cheri Oneil</td>
<td>Chris Coulson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Adams</td>
<td>Cherie Bobbe</td>
<td>Chris Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Baylis</td>
<td>Cherie Hann</td>
<td>Chris Dietz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Beauchamp</td>
<td>Chermae Small</td>
<td>Chris Duarte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Gorman</td>
<td>Cherry Johnson</td>
<td>Chris Elsten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Grenier</td>
<td>Chery Gomez</td>
<td>Chris Finelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hawley</td>
<td>Cheryl Bartee</td>
<td>Chris Freeny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Jones</td>
<td>Cheryl Calcagno</td>
<td>Chris Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Loftis</td>
<td>Cheryl Dediego</td>
<td>Chris Greene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Logan</td>
<td>Cheryl Hadland</td>
<td>Chris Grenier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Mallinckrodt</td>
<td>Cheryl Haiflich</td>
<td>Chris Groh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles McIntyre</td>
<td>Cheryl Hanley</td>
<td>Chris Hadland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles McLeod</td>
<td>Cheryl Keenan</td>
<td>Chris Hargens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Melton</td>
<td>Cheryl Mennen</td>
<td>Chris Haskins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Peoples</td>
<td>Cheryl Pettigrew</td>
<td>Chris Herman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Selvidge</td>
<td>Cheryl Smith</td>
<td>Chris Hinck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Steele</td>
<td>Cheryl Snyder</td>
<td>Chris Hofmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>Cheryl Talley-moon</td>
<td>Chris Hunoemer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Ukestad</td>
<td>Cheryl Vaughn</td>
<td>Chris Hutcherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles White</td>
<td>Cheryl Weeland</td>
<td>Chris Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Wilcox</td>
<td>Cheryl Winterburn</td>
<td>Chris Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Bloom</td>
<td>Chester Lwosz</td>
<td>Chris Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Kiel</td>
<td>Cheyenne Tracey</td>
<td>Chris Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Smith</td>
<td>Chick Webb</td>
<td>Chris Lofano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlott Webb</td>
<td>Chito Pascua</td>
<td>Chris Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Burns</td>
<td>Chloe Gamboa</td>
<td>Chris Manss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Kenny</td>
<td>Chris Balmes</td>
<td>Chris Melcer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Multer</td>
<td>Chris Biakanja</td>
<td>Chris Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Tierney</td>
<td>Chris Bond</td>
<td>Chris Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Bourque</td>
<td>Chris Brewer</td>
<td>Chris Nebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Lumbert</td>
<td>Chris Brumfield</td>
<td>Chris Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chayton Clark</td>
<td>Chris Buich</td>
<td>Chris Niemitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Kintz</td>
<td>Chris Bush</td>
<td>Chris Parsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Lopez</td>
<td>Chris Cain</td>
<td>Chris Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Mandell</td>
<td>Chris Caputo</td>
<td>Chris Poynter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Robbins</td>
<td>Chris Cardinal</td>
<td>Chris Rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cher Watson</td>
<td>Chris Carey-Stronck</td>
<td>Chris Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chere Robinson</td>
<td>Chris Carothers</td>
<td>Chris Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheri O'neil</td>
<td>Chris Conners</td>
<td>Chris Rom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chris Schmidt</th>
<th>Christina Rincon</th>
<th>Christopher Klein</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Seymour</td>
<td>Christina Shaw</td>
<td>Christopher Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Singer</td>
<td>Christina Stone</td>
<td>Christopher Korbein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Sterling</td>
<td>Christina Thurston</td>
<td>Christopher Lanagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Stubendorff</td>
<td>Christine Altermann</td>
<td>Christopher Laxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Summa</td>
<td>Christine Baillie</td>
<td>Christopher Lohead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Tedesco</td>
<td>Christine Bush</td>
<td>Christopher Lochhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Tuosto</td>
<td>Christine Contreras</td>
<td>Christopher Lucas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Wagner-Jauregg</td>
<td>Christine Fahrenbach</td>
<td>Christopher Mabee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris White</td>
<td>Christine Feaster</td>
<td>Christopher Marcotullic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Woods</td>
<td>Christine Hawley</td>
<td>Christopher Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ziegler</td>
<td>Christine Hurster</td>
<td>Christopher Monteith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrissie Bowman</td>
<td>Christine Jones</td>
<td>Christopher Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christa Manor</td>
<td>Christine Kramer</td>
<td>Christopher Risley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Alexio</td>
<td>Christine Krynak</td>
<td>Christopher Stack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Carrillo</td>
<td>Christine Matheny</td>
<td>Christopher Stallard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Caruso</td>
<td>Christine McBrook</td>
<td>Christopher Teague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Escalera</td>
<td>Christine McCran Ross</td>
<td>Christopher Walters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Fajardo</td>
<td>Christine Morrell</td>
<td>Christopher Wentling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Lowson</td>
<td>Christine Ramirez</td>
<td>Christopher Wheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Nicoletti</td>
<td>Christine Watson</td>
<td>Christopher Woldemar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Zajac</td>
<td>Christine Wooley</td>
<td>Christopher Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianna Hunnicutt</td>
<td>Christopher Antweiler</td>
<td>Christy Brune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie Donaldson</td>
<td>Christopher Bay</td>
<td>Christy Buckholdt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie Kissinger</td>
<td>Christopher Boling</td>
<td>Christy Mccurdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie McCullen</td>
<td>Christopher Boman</td>
<td>Christy Tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie McMullen</td>
<td>Christopher Chapman</td>
<td>Christy Wilkening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Canavan</td>
<td>Christopher Cirillo</td>
<td>Chuck Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Cervantez</td>
<td>Christopher Cottle</td>
<td>Chuck Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Doubek</td>
<td>Christopher De Heer</td>
<td>Chuck Staedler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Gibbs</td>
<td>Christopher Gardner</td>
<td>Chyna Darby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Gonzales</td>
<td>Christopher Goena</td>
<td>Ciera Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Grant</td>
<td>Christopher Gunst</td>
<td>Cierra Bellisomi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Haslam</td>
<td>Christopher Haley</td>
<td>Cierra Ryczek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Koda</td>
<td>Christopher Harbster</td>
<td>Cindy Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina McGlashan</td>
<td>Christopher Holm</td>
<td>Cindy Crivelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina McNamara</td>
<td>Christopher Hughes</td>
<td>Cindy Dachel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Melgares</td>
<td>Christopher Kelly</td>
<td>Cindy Jarrold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Killen</td>
<td>Cindy Kaskey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cindy Kus</th>
<th>Clark Barber</th>
<th>Cole Fukai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Macconnell</td>
<td>Clark Brigham</td>
<td>Cole Hudson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Meekis</td>
<td>Clark Clark</td>
<td>Cole Lemke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Mekis</td>
<td>Claudia Ayala</td>
<td>Cole Margerum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Melter</td>
<td>Claudia Bloom</td>
<td>Coen Beduya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Morley</td>
<td>Claudia Graziano</td>
<td>Coette DeDonato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy O'brien</td>
<td>Claudia Moldonado</td>
<td>Coette Grey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Plasman</td>
<td>Claudia Noble</td>
<td>Coen Allison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Rebecca Meehan</td>
<td>Claudia Riege</td>
<td>Coen Herrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Rose</td>
<td>Claudia Silva-Doo</td>
<td>Coen Honess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Sherrett</td>
<td>Claudia Stefani</td>
<td>Coen Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Timberlake</td>
<td>Claudia Vestal</td>
<td>Colleen Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Trousdale</td>
<td>Claudia Zambrano</td>
<td>Colleen Gilmartin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinthia DeLeon</td>
<td>Claudia Zavala</td>
<td>Colleen Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clair Secomb</td>
<td>Claudio Perez</td>
<td>Colleen Kosling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Andrews</td>
<td>Clay Campbell</td>
<td>Colleen Kumada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Bacher</td>
<td>Clay Heberly</td>
<td>Colleen Lunsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Conklin</td>
<td>Clay Johnson</td>
<td>Colleen Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Conulin</td>
<td>Clayton Anderson</td>
<td>Colleen McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Crawley</td>
<td>Clayton Boyer</td>
<td>Colleen Rastatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Crossett</td>
<td>Clayton Nicholson</td>
<td>Colleen Reichmuth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Hoff</td>
<td>Clayton Ryon</td>
<td>Colleen Riggen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Kleffel</td>
<td>Cleo Herb</td>
<td>Colleen Rubi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Lerner</td>
<td>Cliff Walters</td>
<td>Colleen Sass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire McCoy</td>
<td>Clifford Barrett</td>
<td>Colleen Stobbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Mitchell</td>
<td>Clifford Jue</td>
<td>Collin Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Roberts</td>
<td>Clifton Livingston</td>
<td>Collin Currie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Schneeberger</td>
<td>Clint Angus</td>
<td>Conner Molinar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Trybom</td>
<td>Clint Dilts</td>
<td>Connie Breakfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Whitelaw</td>
<td>Clint Pardoe</td>
<td>Connie Filippou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Billups</td>
<td>Clover Wilson</td>
<td>Connie Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Neal</td>
<td>Clyde Curley</td>
<td>Connie Godinez Eells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Choate</td>
<td>Clyde Fields</td>
<td>Connie Hendry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Depoe</td>
<td>Cody Hartsook</td>
<td>Connie Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Finelli</td>
<td>Cody Marchessault</td>
<td>Connor Castro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Wheadon</td>
<td>Cody Mcclintock</td>
<td>Connor Montalbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarissa Lisboa</td>
<td>Colby Barr</td>
<td>Connor Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clariza Delgadillo</td>
<td>Cole Barbour</td>
<td>Connor Vanzant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connor Obrien</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conrad Scott-Curtis</th>
<th>Craig Hausmann</th>
<th>Cynthia Faulk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conrad Seales</td>
<td>Craig Honda</td>
<td>Cynthia Figueroa-Garibay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constanze Frei</td>
<td>Craig Johnson</td>
<td>Cynthia Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Peter</td>
<td>Craig Mitchell</td>
<td>Cynthia Frost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora Olson</td>
<td>Craig Pearson</td>
<td>Cynthia Furr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Stewart</td>
<td>Craig Reinaman</td>
<td>Cynthia Gelke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coralee Meyer</td>
<td>Craig Springbett</td>
<td>Cynthia Gorski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett Wright</td>
<td>Craig Steel</td>
<td>Cynthia Gustin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Cherry</td>
<td>Craig Vachon</td>
<td>Cynthia Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Chrysler</td>
<td>Craig Venable</td>
<td>Cynthia Koontz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Miller</td>
<td>Craig Wilson</td>
<td>Cynthia Landry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Morello</td>
<td>Craig Gray</td>
<td>Cynthia Liebenthal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Pope</td>
<td>Cris Mariani</td>
<td>Cynthia Loosley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Salzman</td>
<td>Crissly Crisostomo</td>
<td>Cynthia Manzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Spadaccini</td>
<td>Cristal Narez</td>
<td>Cynthia McCarley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corina Calderon</td>
<td>Cristie Love</td>
<td>Cynthia Mendoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinna Harrison</td>
<td>Cristin Carter</td>
<td>Cynthia Ogg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Charters</td>
<td>Cristin French</td>
<td>Cynthia Ortiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Evans</td>
<td>Cristina Castellanos</td>
<td>Cynthia Pauleen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Goossens</td>
<td>Cristina Gamboa</td>
<td>Cynthia Plumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Gossens</td>
<td>Cristina Murillo</td>
<td>Cynthia Quintero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Keuper</td>
<td>Cristina Wooley</td>
<td>Cynthia Quist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Mathiesen</td>
<td>Cristine Kirlin</td>
<td>Cynthia Rothmeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrine Flanagan</td>
<td>Cristine Vroman</td>
<td>Cynthia Sauced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Cherk</td>
<td>Cruz Cirenia</td>
<td>Cynthia Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Ramsey</td>
<td>Crystal Archibeque</td>
<td>Cynthia Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coryndon Coles</td>
<td>Crystal Birns</td>
<td>Cynthia Vargas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosme Marquez</td>
<td>Crystal Evans</td>
<td>Cynthia Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Golts</td>
<td>Crystal Everhart</td>
<td>Cynthia Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Nachtel</td>
<td>Curt Smeland</td>
<td>Cyrus Hiatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Oreb</td>
<td>Curtis Christenson</td>
<td>Cynthia Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Wachtel</td>
<td>Curtis Staggs</td>
<td>D. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Broadhurst</td>
<td>Curtiss Swain</td>
<td>Dacota Drake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Calfee</td>
<td>Cydney Jonson</td>
<td>Dacotah Rae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Drizin</td>
<td>Cyleste McKeen</td>
<td>Dafny Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Forrest</td>
<td>Cyndie Lane</td>
<td>Dagmar Leguillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Foster</td>
<td>Cynthia Bentley</td>
<td>Daisy Camarena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig French</td>
<td>Cynthia Bently</td>
<td>Daisy Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Grant</td>
<td>Cynthia Copple</td>
<td>Daisy Huerta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Daisy Loreto
Daisy Robles
Daivd Barnes
Dak McAfee
Dakota Osborne
Dale Bieser
Dale De Rosa
Dale Fisher
Dale Flowers
Dale Leite
Dale Paris
Dale Perosa
Dale Robinson
Dale Strom
Dalen Rolfe
Daleth Foster
Dalmai Cudney
Damian Delezene
Damiao Nunes
Damon O’hanlon
Damon Williams
Damon Woodward
Dan Altman
Dan Bolger
Dan Brune
Dan Chen
Dan Crask
Dan Czech
Dan Darroch
Dan Demicell
Dan Denevan
Dan Densley
Dan Festa
Dan Hancock
Dan Hoppenfeld
Dan Johnson
Dan Kamalani
Dan Kerwin
Dan Lahnmeyer
Dan Marston
Dan McCall
Dan McCrea
Dan McMahon
Dan Moffatt
Dan Murphy
Dan O'Connor
Dan Race
Dan Rutan
Dan Siddens
Dan Stevenson
Dan Trigilio
Dan Whelan
Dana Abbott
Dana Bland
Dana Bronstein
Dana Cox
Dana Faiez
Dana Gorath
Dana Hoffman
Dana Ingersoll
Dana Jones
Dana Mallory-Reckers
Dana Newman
Dana Reed
Dana Schmidt
Dana Thomsen
Dane Elliot
Dane Gray
Dane Scurch
Danette Lawrence
Dani Craighead
Dania Moss
Daniel Ackerstein
Daniel Allen
Daniel Atwell
Daniel Baca
Daniel Barraza
Daniel Beagle
Daniel Bennett
Daniel Buecher
Daniel Callaway
Daniel Carrillo
Daniel Feldman
Daniel Firth
Daniel Forshner
Daniel Friedman
Daniel Gomez
Daniel Goodwin
Daniel Guerra
Daniel Hansen
Daniel Heppner
Daniel Hernandez
Daniel Hettick
Daniel Houston
Daniel Joesten
Daniel Kobesky
Daniel Koebesky
Daniel La Point
Daniel Laggner
Daniel Landry
Daniel Lange
Daniel Lizardo
Daniel Lopez
Daniel Magee
Daniel Mata
Daniel McKenzie
Daniel Min
Daniel Morgensen
Daniel Nutt
Daniel Pao
Daniel Quijano
Daniel Quintana
Daniel Ramirez
Daniel Rodriguez
Daniel Rola
Daniel Ryan
Daniel Schmeltzer
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Daniel Schmidt  
Daniel Sheldon  
Daniel Silberberg  
Daniel Spero  
Daniel Steinberg  
Daniel Steinrube  
Daniel Stewart  
Daniel Suess  
Daniel Thomas  
Daniel Weiser  
Daniel Wirls  
Daniel Wornicov  
Daniel Wright  
Daniela Mendoza  
Daniela Tsvetanova  
Daniela Werlin-Martinez  
Danielle Buckler  
Danielle Crain  
Danielle Crill  
Danielle Deanda  
Danielle Duarte  
Danielle Duppen  
Danielle Faroala  
Danielle Garcia  
Danielle Garland  
Danielle Haddock  
Danielle Kile  
Danielle Knight  
Danielle Meidan  
Danielle Miller  
Danielle O'brien  
Danielle Randle  
Danielle Sanchez  
Danielle Shaefker  
Danielle Shupe  
Danielle Singh  
Danielle Vincent  
Danielle Ynstroma  
Danny Alvarez  
Danny Brothers  
Danny Hosea  
Danny Jay  
Danny Keith  
Danny Kent  
Danny Stone  
Danny Wallen  
Danny White  
Daphine White  
Dara Herrick  
Darci Morris  
Darcy Thole  
Darcy Valby  
Daren Barry  
Darene Parker  
Dari Vogel  
Darien Heron  
Darien Martin  
Darin Peterson  
Darius Mohsenin  
Darla Gustails  
Darla Mobley  
Darleen Borst  
Darlene Beal  
Darlene Duggan  
Darlene Samakse  
Darlene Zanker  
Darnell White  
Darren Eam  
Darren Sasscer  
Darrick Gitomer  
Darrin Caddes  
Darshan Gooch  
Daryl Beengin  
Daryl Isacs  
Daryn Smeta  
Dave Bamford  
Dave Barrera  
Dave Benham  
Dave Bohn  
Dave Cote  
Dave Date  
Dave Dominguez  
Dave Gorman  
Dave Herndon  
Dave Hesselberg  
Dave Hurley  
Dave Mckay  
Dave Miller  
Dave Misunas  
Dave Murphy  
Dave Potter  
Dave Riggs  
Dave Sullivan  
Dave Turner  
Dave Wardle  
Dave Watsow  
Daven Haywood  
David Allen  
David Anderson  
David Barauna  
David Barnes  
David Bartoletti  
David Beatty  
David Bernard  
David Berry  
David Bowen  
David Box  
David Brooks  
David Brown  
David Bruce Nolen  
David Bucci  
David Bushnell  
David Butts  
David Byer  
David Calicchio  
David Calleri  
David Campbell

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>David Caplin</th>
<th>David Goss</th>
<th>David Pope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Carlson</td>
<td>David Gray</td>
<td>David Rauen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Castillo</td>
<td>David Guerrero</td>
<td>David Raynaud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cerna</td>
<td>David Gutierrez</td>
<td>David Reese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Chandler</td>
<td>David Harnish</td>
<td>David Reetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Chesluk</td>
<td>David Harris</td>
<td>David Regan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Clark</td>
<td>David Haussler</td>
<td>David Rench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Clark-Riddell</td>
<td>David Hill</td>
<td>David Rodrigues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Claypool</td>
<td>David Hooks</td>
<td>David Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cook</td>
<td>David Hunt</td>
<td>David Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Coombs</td>
<td>David Johnston</td>
<td>David Salinas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cooper</td>
<td>David Jones</td>
<td>David Schumacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Copp</td>
<td>David Joseph</td>
<td>David Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Criswell</td>
<td>David Kewitt</td>
<td>David Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David De Teso</td>
<td>David King</td>
<td>David Stearns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Decher</td>
<td>David Kumec</td>
<td>David Steinmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Delries</td>
<td>David Kunis</td>
<td>David Stilley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Delucchi</td>
<td>David Le Van</td>
<td>David Tang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Demara</td>
<td>David Leone</td>
<td>David Tavares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Demorest</td>
<td>David Lewis</td>
<td>David Teigen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Dennis</td>
<td>David Lo</td>
<td>David Tofig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Dent</td>
<td>David Lockwood</td>
<td>David Tomasello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Dills</td>
<td>David Lomeli</td>
<td>David Treichel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Doolin</td>
<td>David Love</td>
<td>David Troetschler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Draeger</td>
<td>David Marinez</td>
<td>David Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Dressler</td>
<td>David McCavitt</td>
<td>David Verner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Dunbar</td>
<td>David Mcclay</td>
<td>David Wallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Eads</td>
<td>David McCormic</td>
<td>David Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Earle</td>
<td>David Minton Silva</td>
<td>David Williamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Emberson</td>
<td>David Mintz</td>
<td>David Wirths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Esparza</td>
<td>David Mondragon</td>
<td>David Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ezroj</td>
<td>David Moore</td>
<td>David Yvarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Floodman</td>
<td>David Multer</td>
<td>David Zink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Flores</td>
<td>David Norris</td>
<td>David Zucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Folch</td>
<td>David Ohanesian</td>
<td>Davina Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Fournier</td>
<td>David Ortiz</td>
<td>Dawn Binder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gardner</td>
<td>David Palmer</td>
<td>Dawn Castello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Giannini</td>
<td>David Passaro</td>
<td>Dawn Dealvarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gordon</td>
<td>David Pate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dawn Krenz
Dawn Mokracek
Dawn Morrow
Dawn Mzkolyski
Dawn Pellerin
Dawn Shubert
Dawn Wilson
Dayana Bolbolla
Dayasia Bandy
De Anna Rumple
Dea Santa-Croce
Deadra Cline
Dean Bussiere
Dean Cutter
Dean Hoppe
Dean Khambatta
Dean Morozowski
Dean Morrow
Dean Pryce
Dean Verheyen
Dean Woolstenhulme
Deana Alloin
Deana Rabiah
Deanna Avila
Deanna Boos
Deanna Davidson
Deanna Lopez
Deanna Seagraves
Deanna Seitz
Deanne Carl
Deb Avila-White
Deb Gillespie
Deb Menicos
Deb Molina
Deb Shulman
Debbie Blankenship
Debbie Brechel
Debbie Carson
Debbie Cedillo

Debbie Dietz
Debbie Harrell
Debbie Hunt
Debbie Chirco-Macdonald
Debora Friedman
Deborah Allen
Deborah Baker
Deborah Baloff
Deborah Bauman
Deborah Bossio
Deborah Bryant
Deborah Collins
Deborah Connell
Deborah Diersch
Deborah Eaton
Deborah Guardian
Deborah Hansen
Deborah Hopewell
Deborah Iverson
Deborah Marty
Deborah McArthur
Deborah Paolini
Deborah Polverino
Deborah Reichle
Deborah Secrest
Deborah Tablak
Deborah Tracy-Proulx
Deborah Wine
Deboraha Stanley
Debra Brackeen
Debra Brown
Debra Brownstein
Debra Feldstein
Debra Finfer
Debra Hagerman
Debra Henn
Debra Jones
Debra Mapes
Debra Marlow
Debra McIlwain
Debra Menta
Debra Monroe
Debra Seltzer
Debra Smith
Debra Wiesner
Debrav Hutchings
Dee Woodward
Deeanne Purchase
Deedre McRobie
Deedre McRobie
Deither Pasag
Depana Fernandes
Delee Brubeck
Delevett Ama
Deiia Escutia
Deilia Reyruetel
Deia Davis
Dephord Peeples
Demetria Whisenhunt
Demri Frias
Demian Sherinian
Demir Worthington
Dena De Rosa
Denis Pochet
Denis Webb
Denise Alexander
Denise Becker
Denise Brouwer
Denise Bukowski
Denise Burgoyne
Denise Cote
Denise Flores
Denise Henry
Denise Ledyard
Denise Magana
Denise Mcmillan
Denise Pancurak
Denise Russo
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denise Shaw</th>
<th>Devin Runneals</th>
<th>Diane Humphrey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denise Silva</td>
<td>Devin Tomcik</td>
<td>Diane Koenig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Thompson</td>
<td>Devin Zavala</td>
<td>Diane Landy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Wheeler</td>
<td>Devon Linneman</td>
<td>Diane Levin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise White</td>
<td>Devon Ricks</td>
<td>Diane McGillin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deniz Rudin</td>
<td>Devona Floodman</td>
<td>Diane Milczarek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Browohto</td>
<td>Dexter Hardcastle</td>
<td>Diane Noland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Chamberlain</td>
<td>Diana Adamic</td>
<td>Diane Pacholski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Douglass</td>
<td>Diana Aguilar</td>
<td>Diane Rigoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Erickson</td>
<td>Diana Bailey</td>
<td>Diane Rivas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Etler</td>
<td>Diana Chapman</td>
<td>Diane Russel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Freitas</td>
<td>Diana Chavez</td>
<td>Diane Sanny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Gonzalez</td>
<td>Diana Cooper</td>
<td>Diane Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Hurley</td>
<td>Diana Deacon</td>
<td>Diane Sherwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Johnson</td>
<td>Diana Dean</td>
<td>Diane Shoemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Knight</td>
<td>Diana Hayden</td>
<td>Diane Slivkoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Lopez</td>
<td>Diana Hernandez</td>
<td>Diane Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Mellander</td>
<td>Diana Ireland</td>
<td>Diane Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Porath</td>
<td>Diana Kawamoto</td>
<td>Diane Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Pramstaller</td>
<td>Diana Leclair</td>
<td>Dianna Glidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Prieto</td>
<td>Diana Mena</td>
<td>Dianna Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Smith</td>
<td>Diana Ochoa</td>
<td>Dianne De Lisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Speer</td>
<td>Diana Rodriguez</td>
<td>Dianthe Skurko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Wade Williams</td>
<td>Diana Rogers</td>
<td>Dick Luxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Soetiono</td>
<td>Diana Steller</td>
<td>Dick Vittitow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deondre Dunkerson</td>
<td>Diana Thomas</td>
<td>Diego Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derald Myers</td>
<td>Diana Vandaveer</td>
<td>Diego Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Jensen</td>
<td>Diana Walsworth</td>
<td>Diego Rosillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Ridpath</td>
<td>Diana Wilson</td>
<td>Diem Tran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Staley</td>
<td>Diane Barnes</td>
<td>Dieter Rothmeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deryn Harris</td>
<td>Diane Beaty</td>
<td>Diev Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiree Farnal</td>
<td>Diane Berry-Wahrer</td>
<td>Dillon Driggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiree Mardis</td>
<td>Diane Bouchet</td>
<td>Dilma Dover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destiny Castillo</td>
<td>Diane Canepa</td>
<td>Dina El Dessouky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deva Laggner</td>
<td>Diane Christman</td>
<td>Dina Scoppettone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deven Siggins</td>
<td>Diane Cooley</td>
<td>Dinah Walters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin Avey</td>
<td>Diane Duey</td>
<td>Diogenes Jasso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin Carlson</td>
<td>Diane Evans</td>
<td>Dirk Osborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin Kato</td>
<td>Diane Furtado</td>
<td>Dixie Gansel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

**Recipient:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**Letter:** Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dj Somers</th>
<th>Donald Mordasini</th>
<th>Donna Ruiz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Edmonds</td>
<td>Donald Nichols</td>
<td>Donna Tanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Ledesma</td>
<td>Donald Picard</td>
<td>Donna Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Portillo</td>
<td>Donald Rocha</td>
<td>Donna Wolper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Smithem Cicholas</td>
<td>Donald Roland</td>
<td>Donna Zucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Takemoto</td>
<td>Donald Sanders</td>
<td>Donovan Albright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Amsden</td>
<td>Donald Schmitz</td>
<td>Dora Acero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Boinich</td>
<td>Donald Simpson</td>
<td>Dora Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Churchillin</td>
<td>Donald Vollrath</td>
<td>Doreen Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica Gotelli</td>
<td>Donaven Staab</td>
<td>Doretta McWethy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique Bertrand</td>
<td>Dondi Gaskil</td>
<td>Doris Holve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique De Leon</td>
<td>Donelida Gaskill</td>
<td>Doris Palma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominique Hollister</td>
<td>Donn Shallenberger</td>
<td>Doron Brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Alvord</td>
<td>Donna Bernardi</td>
<td>Dorothy Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Bugni</td>
<td>Donna Clem</td>
<td>Dorothy Stilwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Campbell</td>
<td>Donna Crivello</td>
<td>Dora Shahaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Carman</td>
<td>Donna Dillon</td>
<td>Dory Mansfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Dickerson</td>
<td>Donna Dodds</td>
<td>Doug Barsanti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Edison</td>
<td>Donna Dreher</td>
<td>Doug Brouwer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hess</td>
<td>Donna Entze</td>
<td>Doug Chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hoernschemeyer</td>
<td>Donna Flores</td>
<td>Doug Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Honda</td>
<td>Donna Groot</td>
<td>Doug Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Oregan</td>
<td>Donna Gross</td>
<td>Doug Erickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Radcliffe</td>
<td>Donna Harris</td>
<td>Doug Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Redman</td>
<td>Donna Heyl</td>
<td>Doug Huskey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Redmon</td>
<td>Donna Hipkins</td>
<td>Doug Hutmacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Schneider</td>
<td>Donna Holt</td>
<td>Doug Kaplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Stone</td>
<td>Donna Jacoby</td>
<td>Doug Kiesch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Willet</td>
<td>Donna Jensen</td>
<td>Doug Leon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Woods</td>
<td>Donna Kaelin</td>
<td>Doug Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dona Ternai</td>
<td>Donna Kimball</td>
<td>Doug McPhie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Waltman</td>
<td>Donna Lee</td>
<td>Doug Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Bear</td>
<td>Donna Lohrmann</td>
<td>Doug Putnam-Pile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Burhans</td>
<td>Donna Lopiano</td>
<td>Doug Spinelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Hershberger</td>
<td>Donna Miles</td>
<td>Doug Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Hicks</td>
<td>Donna Miller</td>
<td>Doug Whitmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Love</td>
<td>Donna Moon</td>
<td>Doug Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Miller</td>
<td>Donna Murray</td>
<td>Douglas Ardley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Mix</td>
<td>Donna Richardson</td>
<td>Douglas Bowman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Douglas Cole
Douglas Doherty
Douglas Fox
Douglas Hahn
Douglas Hessel
Douglas Kane
Douglas Kantor
Douglas Keegan
Douglas Kyle
Douglas Lang
Douglas Lynn
Douglas Picard
Douglas Pio
Douglas Smith
Douglas Stephan
Douglass Weymouth
Dr Mann
Drea Vazquez
Drew Burnham
Drew Cunningham
Drew Gagnier
Drew Mcwilson
Duane Ayers
Dubith Likely
Dugless Johnson
Duke Eberly
Dulce Lizarraga
Dulse Pardo
Duncan Anderson
Dustin Dimauro
Dustin Howell
Dustin Thuringer
Dusty Baker
Dusty Fohs
Dwayne Dawson
Dwayne Free
Dwight Goss
Dwight Gowin
Dwight Gowing

Dylan Aramburu
Dylan Brody
Dylan Fetzer
Dylan Manning
Dylan Martisius
Dylan McManus
Dylan Morrish
Dylan O'leary
Dylan Taylor
Dylan Vahradian
E. Bevan
E. McCallum
E. Whetstone
E. Willen
Ed Bacher
Ed Colligan
Ed Gilbert
Ed Goulet
Ed Guzman
Ed Hightower
Ed Hoffman
Ed Knapp
Ed Laughlin
Ed Morrison
Ed Ortega
Ed Renner
Ed Schehl
Ed Shapiro
Ed Spurr
Ed taylor
Ed Van Der Zande
Edda Tusinac
Eddie Casimro
Eddie Star
Edgar Sandoval
Edgardo Linares
Edison Dudoit
Edith Laumeister
Edmund Clark

Eduardo Diaz
Eduardo Limon
Eduardo Martinez
Edward Brauhnht
Edward Chirco
Edward Durkee
Edward Gibson
Edward Hernandez
Edward Kanzler
Edward Ramirez
Edward Spoon
Edward Star
Edward Thorp
Edwin Fench
Efren Ramirez
Efren Serra
Eileen Forster
Eileen Grieb
Eileen Lacey
Eileen McCann
Eileen O'connor
Eileen Sambrasilo
Eileen Wagley
Einar Vollset
Eivind Finney
Ekarat Phisit
Elaine Bennett
Elaine Della
Elaine Evans
Elaine Holligan
Elaine Kjos
Elaine Lee
Elbina Rafizadeh
Eleanor Hilberman
Eleanor Kenimer
Eleanor Perazzo
Electra Stockwell
Elena Rubalcaba
Elena Wolfenden
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## Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eli Cirino</th>
<th>Elizabeth Baron</th>
<th>Elizabeth Vasquez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eli De Los Santos</td>
<td>Elizabeth Baumhefner</td>
<td>Elizabeth Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Newman</td>
<td>Elizabeth Bilo</td>
<td>Elizabeth Wellerstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Young</td>
<td>Elizabeth Brotz</td>
<td>Elizabeth Xilonzochilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elia Ruiz</td>
<td>Elizabeth Burkhart</td>
<td>Elizabeth Zenteno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliana Juarez Tapia</td>
<td>Elizabeth Clifton</td>
<td>Elke Riesterer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elida Guerrero</td>
<td>Elizabeth Coler</td>
<td>Elke Waltz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliece Horton</td>
<td>Elizabeth Dasher</td>
<td>Ellen Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Berkowitz</td>
<td>Elizabeth De Puydt</td>
<td>Ellen Bauerle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Hinman</td>
<td>Elizabeth DelGrande</td>
<td>Ellen Everlove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Levi</td>
<td>Elizabeth Eakman</td>
<td>Ellen Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Levy</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ellzondo</td>
<td>Ellen Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Naramjo</td>
<td>Elizabeth Esalen</td>
<td>Ellen Hilbrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah Veal</td>
<td>Elizabeth Fabian</td>
<td>Ellen Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elina Felich</td>
<td>Elizabeth Farlas</td>
<td>Ellen Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Knox</td>
<td>Elizabeth Gilbert</td>
<td>Ellen Obrien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Orona</td>
<td>Elizabeth Gonzalez</td>
<td>Ellen Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Tesam</td>
<td>Elizabeth Gonzalves</td>
<td>Ellen Vogt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Bertrand Russell</td>
<td>Elizabeth Haffa</td>
<td>Ellen Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Cowan</td>
<td>Elizabeth Kodad</td>
<td>Ellen Zeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Ostrow</td>
<td>Elizabeth Levy</td>
<td>Ellery Fink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Rettenwender</td>
<td>Elizabeth Lopez</td>
<td>Ellery Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Rubin</td>
<td>Elizabeth magen</td>
<td>Ellica Nash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Russell</td>
<td>Elizabeth Martin</td>
<td>Ellie Cesario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Tatum</td>
<td>Elizabeth McIntire</td>
<td>Ellie Escalante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Wood</td>
<td>Elizabeth Murphy</td>
<td>Ellie Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabetta Strada</td>
<td>Elizabeth Nowicki</td>
<td>Ellie Schoelen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Garrett</td>
<td>Elizabeth Pelrine</td>
<td>Elliot Mcdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Hughes</td>
<td>Elizabeth Perline</td>
<td>Elliott Sidey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Jadrnicek</td>
<td>Elizabeth Powers</td>
<td>Ellis Hepburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Mcewan</td>
<td>Elizabeth Rea</td>
<td>Ellison Wilkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Scheuermann</td>
<td>Elizabeth Rhoades</td>
<td>Elizabeth Kodad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Williams</td>
<td>Elizabeth Romero</td>
<td>Ellowyn Leete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Powers</td>
<td>Elizabeth Sanoff</td>
<td>Elmer Lobre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Reiter</td>
<td>Elizabeth Schwartz</td>
<td>Eloise Bowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Yanik</td>
<td>Elizabeth Smith</td>
<td>Elsa Aguilera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Anderson</td>
<td>Elizabeth Spencer</td>
<td>Elsa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Aparicio</td>
<td>Elizabeth Turner</td>
<td>Elsa Nunez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Barajas</td>
<td>Elizabeth Valencia</td>
<td>Elva Matamoros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elva Parr</td>
<td>Emily Roffler</td>
<td>Eric Kerslake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elvira Quintana</td>
<td>Emily Trexel</td>
<td>Eric Kollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyse Coursen</td>
<td>Emilyanne Rodgers</td>
<td>Eric Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel Almazan</td>
<td>Emma Beck</td>
<td>Eric Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel Marshran</td>
<td>Emma Beckstrom</td>
<td>Eric Mendelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emelia Miguel</td>
<td>Emma Cintz</td>
<td>Eric Mikkelsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emiguel Nunez</td>
<td>Emma Compton</td>
<td>Eric Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilga Gamboa</td>
<td>Emma Davis</td>
<td>Eric Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emiliano Hernandez</td>
<td>Emma Hirst</td>
<td>Eric Nielson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilie Cavallari</td>
<td>Emma Hoban</td>
<td>Eric Noel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emillao Aguillr</td>
<td>Emma Juncosa</td>
<td>Eric Norlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilsa Aguilar</td>
<td>Emma Murphy</td>
<td>Eric Olsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Albaugh</td>
<td>Emma Padalino</td>
<td>Eric Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Alvarez</td>
<td>Emmanuel Almazan</td>
<td>Eric Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Balli</td>
<td>Emmanuel Diaz</td>
<td>Eric Pederson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Bianchini</td>
<td>Emmanuel Fonseca</td>
<td>Eric Ressler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Burt</td>
<td>Emmanuel Garcia</td>
<td>Eric Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Chapman</td>
<td>Emmy Cushnir</td>
<td>Eric Swartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Chappelear</td>
<td>Emy Stewart</td>
<td>Eric Thorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Clark</td>
<td>Emy Fehmi</td>
<td>Eric Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Cohan</td>
<td>Enda Brennan</td>
<td>Eric Van Vliet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Davis</td>
<td>Enid Brock</td>
<td>Eric Walz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily De Vries</td>
<td>Ennio Matera</td>
<td>Eric Wulff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Durden</td>
<td>Enrique Arzaluz</td>
<td>Eric Yepez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Figurski</td>
<td>Enrique Melgoza</td>
<td>Eric Zais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Kirk</td>
<td>Erendira Cerrmeno</td>
<td>Erica Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Koch</td>
<td>Erendira Rubin</td>
<td>Erica Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Lauerman</td>
<td>Eriberto Velasquez</td>
<td>Erica Cassidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Lefevre</td>
<td>Eric Baade</td>
<td>Erica Drew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Lyman</td>
<td>Eric Baker</td>
<td>Erica Glenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Martin</td>
<td>Eric Branecki</td>
<td>Erica Hohman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily McKinnon</td>
<td>Eric Brighton</td>
<td>Erica Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Morrow</td>
<td>Eric Day</td>
<td>Erica Kermode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Newton</td>
<td>Eric Denton</td>
<td>Erica Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Parsons</td>
<td>Eric Evans</td>
<td>Erica Ow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Propert</td>
<td>Eric Grabel</td>
<td>Erica Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Quinn</td>
<td>Eric Grove</td>
<td>Erica Sommers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Reilly</td>
<td>Eric Heckert</td>
<td>Erick Becerril</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Reynolds</td>
<td>Eric Jacoby</td>
<td>Erick Calderon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Erick Fernandez
Erik Borrowman
Erik Bowman
Erik Erickson
Erik Hagen
Erik Haston
Erik Hedstrom
Erik Lehmer
Erik Lowe
Erik Muir
Erik Nielsen
Erik Otwell
Erik Sambrailo
Erik Strong
Erik Williams
Erika Carpenter
Erika Lara
Erika Madrigal-Carri
Erik Dreyer
Erin Adams
Erin Allen
Erin Amato
Erin Apodaca
Erin Brandon
Erin Corbal
Erin Farrar
Erin Foley
Erin Hoben
Erin Keenan
Erin Kirkpatrick
Erin Knopp-Sargoni
Erin Koch
Erin Levi
Erin Levy
Erin Maler
Erin Micchichi
Erin Peters
Erin Reese
Erin Sullivan
Erin Welty
Erinn Hicks
Ernest Amos-Jackson
Ernest Avelar
Ernest Cicogna
Ernest Hardy
Ernest Henderson
Ernest Prochnow
Ernestina Gonzalez
Ernestina Saldana
Ernesto Alaniz
Ernesto Alvarado
Ernesto Castro
Ernesto Ramirez
Ernie McCoy
Erno Mayer
Erron McCurdy
Esberalda Valdez
Esmeralda Ramirez
Esmeralda Ramirez
Esmeralda Valdez
Estela Rodriguez
Esthela Bautista
Esther Arvizu
Esther Lauer
Esther Pak
Esther Schrank
Esther Wilson
Ethan Abelar
Ethan Lemon
Ethan Nagel
Ethan Reavis
Ethan Star
Eu Rice
Eugene Ghio
Eugene Page
Eugene Veteska
Eulalio Perez
Eva Boettcher
Eva Echenique
Eva Hudson
Eva Lopez
Eva Millykovic Ammann
Eva Quevedo
Eva Strnad
Evan Adams
Evan Dickson
Evan Hilton
Evan McGown
Evan Pears
Evan Powell
Evan Rockow
Evan Shanbrom
Evan Shanbrum
Evan Siroyk
Evan West
Evangeline Vogara
Eve Eden
Eve Ortiz
Evelyn Hall
Evelyn Kempski
Evelyn Taylor
Everardo Romero
Everett Balian
Everett Mudgett
Ewoud Leeuwen
Ewoud Van Leeuwen
Ezra Koch
Fabian Eggers
Fabian Leonor
Fabian Lopez
Fabiola Alvarez Cervantes
Fabrizio Tani
Faisal Fazilat
Faith Delgado
Falcon Magaña
Fannie Boulanger
Fardad Vazini
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Fatima Daniel
Fausto Romero
Favio Zarate
Faviola Fernandez
Fay Fernandez
Fay Levinson
Faye Perry
Federico Couarrubias
Federico Moncloa
Felicity Ruiz
Felipe Albarran
Felipe de Luna
Felipe Miranda
Felipe Schuler
Felix Jimenez
Felix Sorrentino
Felize Guarino
Fermin Guillen
Fern Van Sant
Fernando
Fernando Arevalo
Fernando Cisneros
Fernando Encizo
Fernando Fernandez
Fernando Lopez
Fernando Martinez
Fernando Ochoa
Fernando Orozio
Fidel Covarrubias
Filip Pizlo
Filomena Olivera
Finessa Watkins
Finley Chopman
Finnessa Watkins
Fiona Handler
Fiona Salazar
Fiona Sanguinetti
Flavia Jimenez Lo
Flo Schilb
Flora Lawrence
Florence Jaffrain
Florentino Mendoza
Floyd Davis
Foley Weems
Forest Arichita
Forest Roberts
Forrest Cook
Forrest Hirtzel
Forrest Myatt-Paul
Forrest Rosener
Forrest Toshikian
Fortino Foros
Foster Andersen
Fran Livermore
Frances Bruce
Frances Cuvi
Frances Hughes
FrancesSha
Francesca Franco
Francesca Garbagnati
Francine Byers
Francis Battaglia
Francis Colligan
Francisca Wilhelm
Francisco Barrosa
Francisco Guzman
Francisco Herrera
Francisco Rojas
Francisco Ruelas
Franco Voza
Francoise Seftel
Frank Andrews
Frank Bien
Frank Blaskovich
Frank Church
Frank Cozzu
Frank Ives
Frank Jacinto
Frank Johnson
Frank Kline
Frank Oneill
Frank Palacios
Frank Phantom
Frank Smith
Frank Steinmueller
Frank Wessels
Franks Sharon
Fred Burr
Fred Seamon
Frederick Erickson
Frederick Kleffel
Frederick Kleman
Frederick Mayer
Frederick Meyer
Frederick Thompson
Freitas Ondino
Freja Rasmussen
Freny Cooper
Froly Valencia
G. Freeman
G. McCarthy
Gabby White
Gabe Reyes
Gabriel Arzouni
Gabriel Austin
Gabriel Benjamin
Gabriel Cassaro
Gabriel Garcia
Gabriel Gonzalez
Gabriel Mata
Gabriel Padilla
Gabriel Rapisardo
Gabriel Rocha
Gabriel Wolff
Gabriela Jordi Quera
Gabriela Rodriguez
Gabrielle Greiner
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## Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Letter: **Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gael Hall</td>
<td>Gary James</td>
<td>Geoffrey Lindauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Atlansky</td>
<td>Gary Johnson</td>
<td>Geoffrey Rilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Castello</td>
<td>Gary Lee Akridge</td>
<td>Geoffrey Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Davis</td>
<td>Gary Lindeke</td>
<td>George Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Evans</td>
<td>Gary Limville</td>
<td>George Bortd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Gondreau</td>
<td>Gary Lovell</td>
<td>George Horner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail McNulty</td>
<td>Gary Ransone</td>
<td>George Janour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Nekunam</td>
<td>Gary Rather</td>
<td>George Koenig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Rinn</td>
<td>Gary Riggs</td>
<td>George Mccombie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Silvers</td>
<td>Gary Roberts</td>
<td>George Pease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Gorski</td>
<td>Gary Sprague</td>
<td>George Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Gorsky</td>
<td>Gary Sultana</td>
<td>George Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen Roll</td>
<td>Gary Whizin</td>
<td>George Treugr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galina Wells</td>
<td>Gary Yules</td>
<td>George Urbano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamze Yazgan</td>
<td>Gavin Hunt</td>
<td>George Wilbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrecht Williams</td>
<td>Gavin McClure</td>
<td>George Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Winter</td>
<td>Gavin Mosquito</td>
<td>George Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Badano</td>
<td>Gayla Pius</td>
<td>George Zeleny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Cordes</td>
<td>Gayle Ivanovich</td>
<td>Georgia Dowgert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Jaeger</td>
<td>Gayle Michael</td>
<td>Georgia King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Manning</td>
<td>Gayle Ortiz</td>
<td>Georgia Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Presley</td>
<td>Gelf Nicoastro</td>
<td>Georgianna Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth Taylor</td>
<td>Gen Haid</td>
<td>Georgie Alton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Albo</td>
<td>Gen Peyser</td>
<td>Georgina Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Alldredge</td>
<td>Gena Cunetto</td>
<td>Georjean Sinopoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Bertowe</td>
<td>Genaro Lopez</td>
<td>Gerald Dunn Silvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Bichard</td>
<td>Genesis Valdez</td>
<td>Gerald McIntyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Brown</td>
<td>Geneva Sarvis</td>
<td>Gerald Olsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Carr</td>
<td>Geneva Wilson</td>
<td>Gerald Shanahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Conley</td>
<td>Genevieve Healer</td>
<td>Gerald Stryker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Cox</td>
<td>Genevieve Woo</td>
<td>Gerald Swenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Croft</td>
<td>Genie Garcia</td>
<td>Gerald Valker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Griggs</td>
<td>Genoa Faber</td>
<td>Geraldine O'Hara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Gross</td>
<td>Geoff Arens</td>
<td>Geraldine Wegener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Hart</td>
<td>Geoff Eisenberg</td>
<td>Geraldine Wyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Heath</td>
<td>Geoff Gilbert</td>
<td>Gerardo Valencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Hirthler</td>
<td>Geoff Smith</td>
<td>Gerhard Gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Host</td>
<td>Geoffrey Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Isaacs</td>
<td>Geoffrey Hughesins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Gerlinde Debroekert
Gerret Nelson
Gerry Valadez
Gertrud Cushing
Giancarlo Thomae
Gianna Balistreri
Gianna Matthews
Gilad Avidov
Gilbert Arias
Gilbert Starr
Gilbert Young
Gilberto Duran
Gillian Kincheloe
Gina Brown
Gina Cerruti
Gina Colfer
Gina Cuneo
Gina Fiallos
Gina Frugoli
Gina Gurley
Gina Jaeger
Gina Marini
Gina Ramirez
Gina Scott
Gina Turley
Gina Wheeler
Gina Willner-Pardo
Ginger Noland
Ginger Ramin
Ginny Aragon
Gino Riccabona
Gino Rinaldi
Giovanna Morelli
Giselle Mora
Giulia Favia
Giuseppe Corbino
Gjon Feinstein
Glen Locke
Glen Stribling
Glen Wilcox
Glenallen Hill
Glenda Byrd
Glenda Hurtado-Cruz
Glenn Banta
Glenn Garland
Glenn Saltz
Glenn Smith
Glenn Soto
Glenn Stewart
Glenn Wall
Glenna Costa
Gloria Jimenez
Gloria Purvis
Gomez Carla
Gondie Chavez
Gonzalo De Elizalde
Gonzalo Haro
Gord Yamashita
Gordie Schwartz
Gordon Collet
gordon geesey
Grace Garcia
Grace Garrard
Grace Geddes
Grace Greenbach
Grace Hyde
Grace Kyle
Grace Ley
Grace Mundy
Grace Nigh
Grace Nunez
Grace Olin
Grace Woods
Gracie Chavez
Grant Benton
Grant Butcher
Grant Codiga
Grant de la Motte
Grant Hueth
Grant Keyser
Grant Margerum
Grant Riker
Greer Barnes
Greg Becker
Greg Bono
Greg Borrego
Greg Buie
Greg Clarke
Greg Crandall
Greg Cross
Greg Devecchio
Greg Duff
Greg Frauenhofer
Greg Grabost
Greg Heath
Greg McCarthy
Greg Montoya
Greg Rauch
Greg Reuter
Greg Roche
Greg Stevens
Greg Tennant
Greg Van Deusen
Greg Weber
Gregg Ginsburg
Gregg Schlaman
Gregory Alle
Gregory Braithwaite
Gregory Dolder
Gregory Dougherty
Gregory Galvin
Gregory Glasgow
Gregory Hamilton
Gregory Heichel
Gregory Lafferty
Gregory Len
Gregory Neudecker
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## Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

**Recipient:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**Letter:** Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gregory Reeve-Wilson</th>
<th>Haley Borneman</th>
<th>Heather Doeker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Savage</td>
<td>Haley Coopergard</td>
<td>Heather Ernst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Tarsi</td>
<td>Haley Hurst</td>
<td>Heather Failing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Wilkinson</td>
<td>Halimah Martin</td>
<td>Heather Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretta Hughes</td>
<td>Hallie Richmond</td>
<td>Heather Hedstrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Bach</td>
<td>Hamid Martin</td>
<td>Heather Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Morse</td>
<td>Hamsa Merlet</td>
<td>Heather Hitchison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Reyes</td>
<td>Hank Miller</td>
<td>Heather Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Schultz</td>
<td>Hank Niles</td>
<td>Heather Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Werner</td>
<td>Hannah Anderson</td>
<td>Heather McBride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretel Palmerin</td>
<td>Hannah Brown</td>
<td>Heather Putnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Conway</td>
<td>Hannah Caisse</td>
<td>Heather Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Cruz</td>
<td>Hannah Forbus</td>
<td>Heather Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Gallardo</td>
<td>Hannah Gruell</td>
<td>Heather Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Luna</td>
<td>Hannah Idelis</td>
<td>Heather Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Zarate</td>
<td>Hannah Newburn</td>
<td>Heather Votava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guajardo Jonathan</td>
<td>Hannah Sinoway</td>
<td>Heather Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermina Santos</td>
<td>Hannah Smalltree</td>
<td>Heather Whisman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Alvarez Jr</td>
<td>Hannah Stubblefield</td>
<td>Hector Caban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Rivera</td>
<td>Hannah Wilson</td>
<td>Hector Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Torres</td>
<td>Hans Bruning</td>
<td>Hector Huizar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnar Roll</td>
<td>Hans Helmutd</td>
<td>Hector Madriz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurtis Gavin</td>
<td>Hans Loese</td>
<td>Heide Nicola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavo Quepmonds</td>
<td>Hans Van Housen</td>
<td>Heidi Claypool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavo Valdivia</td>
<td>Hardy Penzer</td>
<td>Heidi Hanich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavo Zavala</td>
<td>Harold Mancusi-Ungaro</td>
<td>Heidi Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Chanda</td>
<td>Harpreet Mahli</td>
<td>Heidi Marini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Cochrane</td>
<td>Harriet Maglin</td>
<td>Heidi Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Opie</td>
<td>Harry Day</td>
<td>Heidi Montoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Tiphane</td>
<td>Harry Domash</td>
<td>Heidi Nyburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen Berliner</td>
<td>Harry Salzberg</td>
<td>Heidi Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen Heskett</td>
<td>Harry Smeenk</td>
<td>Heidi Renteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwyneth Thomas</td>
<td>Harvey Walton</td>
<td>Heidi Schriefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hai Phan</td>
<td>Harvey Weeks</td>
<td>Heidi Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hailey Kephart</td>
<td>Healey Cypher</td>
<td>Heidi Soto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hailey Partridge</td>
<td>Heather Aalgaard</td>
<td>Heidi Springbett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Moseley</td>
<td>Heather Ang</td>
<td>Heidi Stigum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Stanger</td>
<td>Heather Braga</td>
<td>Heidi Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haley Azevedo</td>
<td>Heather Cook</td>
<td>Heidi Toutner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

**Recipient:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**Letter:** Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isabelle Ansari</th>
<th>Jack Huffman</th>
<th>Jacob Sinnott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isai Hernandez</td>
<td>Jack Jenkins</td>
<td>Jacob Teeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Vega</td>
<td>Jack Keenan</td>
<td>Jacob Tinetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaias De La Rosa</td>
<td>Jack Kellythorne</td>
<td>Jacob true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isai Ambrosio</td>
<td>Jack Pineo</td>
<td>Jacob Zivanovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isbal Singh</td>
<td>Jack Smith</td>
<td>Jacqueline Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isha Yisrael</td>
<td>Jack Specht</td>
<td>Jacqueline Ellison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Castro</td>
<td>Jack Waldman</td>
<td>Jacqueline Eryn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isidro Garcia</td>
<td>Jack Wright</td>
<td>Jacqueline Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isidro Navarro</td>
<td>Jackelyn Rodriguez</td>
<td>Jacqueline Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isis Greenspan</td>
<td>Jackie Allen</td>
<td>Jacqueline Ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismael Avila</td>
<td>Jackie Busse</td>
<td>Jacqueline Moga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismael Hernandez</td>
<td>Jackie Cervantes</td>
<td>Jacqueline Plechot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel Navarro</td>
<td>Jackie Ferreira</td>
<td>Jacqueline Stoddard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issac Barrios</td>
<td>Jackie Hansman</td>
<td>Jacquelyn Pio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Barrera</td>
<td>Jackie Hansmann</td>
<td>Jacquelynn Rust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Mendoza</td>
<td>Jackie Núñez de Villavicencio</td>
<td>Jacquie Armendariz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Napoles</td>
<td>Jackie Oda</td>
<td>Jacqueline Balthazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Patterson</td>
<td>Jackie Valadez</td>
<td>Jacyn Siebert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iveth Navarro</td>
<td>Jackie Whiting</td>
<td>Jade Aritchita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivo Obregon</td>
<td>Jackson Reitan</td>
<td>Jade Cecil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Young</td>
<td>Jackson Snyder</td>
<td>Jade Hickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwgelise Rowe</td>
<td>Jackson Wolfe</td>
<td>Jadeane Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izabelly Santos</td>
<td>Jaclyn Etchevery</td>
<td>Jadyn Solis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Lape</td>
<td>Jacob Sherman</td>
<td>Jaelleen Bennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Olson</td>
<td>Jacob Abrahams</td>
<td>Jaime Jolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Portillo</td>
<td>Jacob Adams</td>
<td>Jaime Campos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Sola Sarmiento</td>
<td>Jacob Anderson</td>
<td>Jaime Garfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Sutherland</td>
<td>Jacob Arnold</td>
<td>Jaime henerera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A. Starr</td>
<td>Jacob Bayani</td>
<td>Jaime Heredia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabin Higgins</td>
<td>Jacob Casarez</td>
<td>Jaime Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacalin Marchese</td>
<td>Jacob Gottlieb</td>
<td>Jaime McMillan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Aho</td>
<td>Jacob Kramer</td>
<td>Jairo Restrepo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Brown</td>
<td>Jacob Martinez</td>
<td>Jake Angonoldo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Carroll</td>
<td>Jacob Michaelsen</td>
<td>Jake Bonney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Cross</td>
<td>Jacob Nelson</td>
<td>Jake Burmeister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Driver</td>
<td>Jacob Sidman</td>
<td>Jake Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Geier</td>
<td>Jacob Siefke</td>
<td>Jake Gooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jake Loudon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS**
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Jake Newman
Jake O'gorman
Jake Vankennen
Jamal Hunt
James
James Albrecht
James Allen
James Antonelli
James Aschbacher
James Austin
James Bennett
James Bentley
James Bogard
James Brock
James Brudnick
James Calcagno
James Cardosa
James Cavanagh
James Cervelli
James Chrislock
James Christofferson
James Claussen
James Cook
James Cox
James Danella
James Downey
James Downing
James Drees
James Dupre
James Durbin
James Duty
James Everingham
James Gagnon
James Gallagher
James Greiner
James Hall
James Heilig
James Henderson
James Hennessee-Bresett

James Herbert
James Heth
James Hobbs
James Holdeman
James Hrica
James Jorgensen
James Kelly
James Krueger
James Lapides
James Laudenslager
James Lawrence
James Lloyd
James Love
James Maguire
James Matalone
James Mayer
James McClure
James Morgan
James O'Nell
James Peters
James Plastina
James Quist
James Reichmuth
James Richards
James Sadler
James Salvino
James Schetzler
James Schwartz
James Shepherd
James Speir
James Susaimuthu
James Tanner
James Templeton
James Tucker
James Upton
James Weisenstein
James White
James Williams
James Williamson

Jami Kumar
Jamie Allen
Jamie Aron
Jamie Bassmann
Jamie Bazner
Jamie Campos
Jamie Fend
Jamie Garcia
Jamie Herrmann
Jamie Jeffries
Jamie Johnson
Jamie Koch
Jamie Kustadia
Jamie Lesan
Jamie Marks
Jamie Martindale
Jamie Martinez
Jamie Mintzer
Jamie Nick
Jamie Nickerson
Jamie Walbridge
Jamie Yin
Jamieson Porter
Jamilynn Williaman
Jamison Saint John
Jamolle Courtemanche
Jamyrson Pittori
Jan Burroughs
Jan Caldarella
Jan Charles
Jan Edward
Jan Finney
Jan Foreman
Jan Goericke
Jan Greene
Jan Mintz
Jan Olafsson
Jan Raffety
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Jan Rosen  Janet Downs  Jared Bogaard
Jan Shirchild  Janet Geyer  Jared Booye
Jan Warne  Janet Miller  Jared Bradley
Jana Klein  Janet Moncrief  Jared Copher
Jana Mogor-Lessard  Janet Perry  Jared Day
Jane Amaral  Janet Raether  Jared Figurski
Jane Bruce-Munro  Janet Reedy  Jared Hajduk
Jane Conklin  Janet Rosas  Jared Ingraham
Jane Devine  Janet Silvergate  Jared Marks
Jane Duryea  Janet Singer  Jarod Foskett
Jane Farrar  Janet Starr  Jaron Ballard
Jane Ferguson  Janet Yantis  Jarret Winter
Jane Freedman  Janette Peters  Jasmin Hovey
Jane Goddard  Janette Rosales  Jasmin Rocha
Jane Hartman  Janette Schwabenland  Jasmine Averrero
Jane Hood  Janete Vazquez  Jasmine Carmona
Jane Joel  Janette Waters  Jasmine Casey
Jane Nile Keller  Janice Crompton  Jasmine Desiderio
Jane Niswonger  Janice Hathaway  Jasmine Desidierio
Jane Peace  Janice Manabe  Jasmine Powell
Jane Roberts  Janice Manion  Jasmine Rojas
Jane Scanlan  Janice Parrish  Jasmine Saldana
Jane Schymeinsky  Janice Phister  Jasmine Strong
Jane Scurr  Janice Serilla  Jason Alaga
Jane So  Janice Spencer  Jason Anderlite
Jane Walker  Janice Stewart  Jason Beatty
Jane Walton  Janice Thorpe  Jason Byers
Janella Payumo  Janice Thurston  Jason Constans
Janene Forsyth  Janice Weaver  Jason Davis
Janet Acevedo  Janine Church  Jason Gingery
Janet Allinger  Janine Canada  Jason Glickman
Janet Andreason  Janis Bolt  Jason Golditch
Janet Angulo  Janis West  Jason Grimm
Janet Bagby  Janna Hoadley  Jason Hajduk-Dorworth
Janet Brooks  Jannet Reyes-Zamora  Jason Hooz
Janet Buderus  Janyce Johnson  Jason Kaye
Janet Byers  Janyce LePire  Jason Kolb
Janet Crossé  Jaqueline Mendoza  Jason Levin
Janet Culp  Jared Aizawa  Jason Morgan
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jason Morvay</th>
<th>JC Muniz</th>
<th>Jeff Dagan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Nevin</td>
<td>JD Marioni</td>
<td>Jeff Davidson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Padilla</td>
<td>Jean Adams</td>
<td>Jeff Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Pearman</td>
<td>Jean Aitken</td>
<td>Jeff Denny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Regan</td>
<td>Jean Anderson</td>
<td>Jeff Devitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Ritchey</td>
<td>Jean Antisdel</td>
<td>Jeff Drake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Schock</td>
<td>Jean Brocklebank</td>
<td>Jeff Fiorovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Sherbundy</td>
<td>Jean Clarke</td>
<td>Jeff Goelitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Smith</td>
<td>Jean Mahoney</td>
<td>Jeff Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Smyth</td>
<td>Jean Manning</td>
<td>Jeff Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Villanueva</td>
<td>Jean Tarr</td>
<td>Jeff Hammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Whitmire</td>
<td>Jean Taylor</td>
<td>Jeff Heicksen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Wichelmann</td>
<td>Jean Tripier</td>
<td>Jeff Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasvir Kaur</td>
<td>Jeanne Turner</td>
<td>Jeff Iobst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Avitua</td>
<td>Jeanette Alvarez</td>
<td>Jeff Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Gonzalez</td>
<td>Jeanette Bell</td>
<td>Jeff Kimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Hernandez</td>
<td>Jeanette Bocanegra</td>
<td>Jeff Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Najera</td>
<td>Jeanette Magana</td>
<td>Jeff Kirkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Paramo</td>
<td>Jeanette Miller</td>
<td>Jeff Langston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Fowler</td>
<td>Jeanette Wenger</td>
<td>Jeff Lapiere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Freiermuth</td>
<td>Jeanie Vogelzang</td>
<td>Jeff Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Karimi</td>
<td>Jeanine Dermer</td>
<td>Jeff Manzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Martin</td>
<td>Jeanine Shanahan</td>
<td>Jeff Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Meisel</td>
<td>Jeanne Byrne</td>
<td>Jeff Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Reyes</td>
<td>Jeanne Conner</td>
<td>Jeff Matlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Spakoski</td>
<td>Jeanne Gillespie</td>
<td>Jeff McNeil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Weisblatt</td>
<td>Jeanne Ikemoto</td>
<td>Jeff Moreno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaye Drizin</td>
<td>Jeanne Jelcick</td>
<td>Jeff Nealon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayna Whiteman</td>
<td>Jeanne Manss</td>
<td>Jeff November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayne McCreadie</td>
<td>Jeannie Reopol</td>
<td>Jeff Oberdorfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaynelle Tirocchi</td>
<td>Jed Myall</td>
<td>Jeff Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaysa Burros</td>
<td>Jeff Wind</td>
<td>Jeff Pohlem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayson Mendoza</td>
<td>Jeff Armstrong</td>
<td>Jeff Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazmin Hernandez</td>
<td>Jeff Belden</td>
<td>Jeff Purdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazmin Jauregui</td>
<td>Jeff Boisen</td>
<td>Jeff Rosczynski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazmin Rocha</td>
<td>Jeff Boyajian</td>
<td>Jeff Rosendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazmin Velez</td>
<td>Jeff Brady</td>
<td>Jeff Schmelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazmine Diaz</td>
<td>Jeff Byers</td>
<td>Jeff Schwerdtfeger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jc Collins</td>
<td>Jeff Cameron</td>
<td>Jeff Singer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Jeff Stallings  Jennifer Gibson  Jennifer Green
Jeff Stanger  Jennifer Mohler  Jennifer Greer
Jeff Stranger  Jennifer Murdock  Jennifer Guido
Jeff Tavangar  Jennifer Thompson  Jennifer Hallett
Jeff Valdez  Jenna Keating  Jennifer Hannibal
Jeff Warrick  Jenna Langseth  Jennifer Haraja
Jeff Watson  Jenna Mabry  Jennifer Harn
Jeff Wille  Jennier Howland  Jennifer Harris-Anderson
Jeff Yurek  Jennie Harms  Jennifer Heinlein
Jefferson Hancock  Jennifer Arena  Jennifer Hennig
Jeffery Allen Ott  Jennifer Astone  Jennifer Hoye
Jeffery Ott  Jennifer Atkinson  Jennifer Hunter
Jeffery Wheelock  Jennifer Becker  Jennifer Jackson
Jeffff Filiault  Jennifer Bennett  Jennifer Jaeger
Jeffr Easter  Jennifer Bisht  Jennifer Johnston
Jeffrey Adler  Jennifer Bloom  Jennifer Jou
Jeffrey Discipolo  Jennifer Boone  Jennifer Karno
Jeffrey Forman  Jennifer Brown  Jennifer Katz
Jeffrey Fotheringham  Jennifer Caddes  Jennifer Keller
Jeffrey Fry  Jennifer Cameron-Sanclementi  Jennifer Kollen
Jeffrey Moore  Jennifer Bisht  Jennifer Krebs
Jeffrey Nelson  Jennifer Campbell  Jennifer Lape
Jeffrey Parry  Jennifer Carson  Jennifer Larzelere
Jeffrey Perez  Jennifer Clinite  Jennifer Lewis
Jeffrey Reynolds  Jennifer Colfer  Jennifer Lingens
Jeffrey Roehling  Jennifer Collins  Jennifer Lipina
Jeffrey Schwertley  Jennifer Cross  Jennifer Matlock
Jeffrey Stonehill  Jennifer Crotwell  Jennifer Mauerman
Jeffrey Wellerstein  Jennifer Dildine  Jennifer McNulty
Jeffrey Werner  Jennifer Douglas  Jennifer Miranda
Jeff Palsgaard  Jennifer Eisele  Jennifer Mitchell
Jen Astone  Jennifer Eldredge  Jennifer Nerida
Jen Clark  Jennifer Flaniken  Jennifer O'leary
Jen Gomez  Jennifer Garofolo  Jennifer Oatey
Jen Kelly  Jennifer Giorgi  Jennifer Ostrowski
Jen May  Jennifer Golden  Jennifer Perry
Jen Wagner  Jennifer Gonzalez  Jennifer Pitino
Jenae Replogle  Jennifer Goudge  Jennifer Post
Jennifer Butler  Jennifer Goulett
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Jennifer Proudfoot
Jennifer Rebhan
Jennifer Rich
Jennifer Rieke
Jennifer Rohwer-Mccord
Jennifer Rubin
Jennifer Santillana
Jennifer Stanley
Jennifer Sugarwoman
Jennifer Thompson
Jennifer Trotter
Jennifer Watkins
Jennifer Whitney-Olson
Jennifer Willoughby
Jennifer Willson
Jennifer Wilson
Jennifer Yarrow
Jennifer Young
Jennifer Lewis
Jenny Call
Jenny Dangelo
Jenny Freedman
Jenny Gonzalez
Jenny Job
Jenny Lee
Jenny Marini
Jenny Murphy
Jenny Nadaner
Jenny Petter
Jens Williford
Jensen Hastings
Jeramie Foster
Jere Patterson
Jerel Smith
Jeremiah Coil
Jeremiah Daniels
Jeremiah Foley
Jeremy Anthony
Jeremy Britton
Jeremy Davis
Jeremy Ertl
Jeremy Gauger
Jeremy Hohengarten
Jeremy Lee
Jeremy Lezin
Jeremy McCarthy
Jeremy Neuner
Jeremy Orozco
Jeremy Orvik
Jeremy Page
Jeremy Paiss
Jeremy Powell
Jeremy Price
Jeremy Sanford
Jeremy Stotter
Jeremy Toman
Jeremy Wise
Jeremy Woodling
Jeremy Young
Jeri Jensen
Jerilyn Bock
Jermaine Hein
Jerob Chop
Jerome Neu
Jerome Power
Jerri Willett
Jerry Allen
Jerry Chiang
Jerry Clark
Jerry Connery
Jerry Finney
Jerry Hollars
Jerry Jaspar
Jerry Stolaroff
Jerry Toste
Jerry Warning
Jesiena Deleon
Jess Ha
Jesse Bentz
Jesse Borges
Jesse Colombo
Jesse Dresbach
Jesse Dybenko
Jesse Harrison
Jesse Heaton
Jesse Jimenez
Jesse Offermann-Sims
Jesse Perez
Jesse Stryker
Jesse Walker
Jesse Williams
Jessi McKee
Jessi Soto
Jessica Aguilar
Jessica Benn-Towle
Jessica Berg
Jessica Cambell
Jessica Cannarozzi
Jessica Carlson
Jessica Carroll
Jessica Cohn
Jessica Collins
Jessica Davis
Jessica Dominguez
Jessica Fonesca
Jessica Fonseca
Jessica Gallione
Jessica Garcia
Jessica Ghio
Jessica Gilbert
Jessica Guajardo
Jessica Hansen
Jessica Hosking
Jessica Johnson
Jessica Laing
Jessica Lawless
Jessica Lee
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Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jessica Marks</th>
<th>Jill Carr</th>
<th>Jim Reslokok</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Miller</td>
<td>Jill Denner</td>
<td>Jim Reslock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Monteiro</td>
<td>Jill Donnelly</td>
<td>Jim Sanguinetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Murray</td>
<td>Jill Fox</td>
<td>Jim Singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Pasko</td>
<td>Jill Gallo</td>
<td>Jim Thoits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Perez</td>
<td>Jill Gillespie</td>
<td>Jim Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Petersen</td>
<td>Jill Hansen</td>
<td>Jim Winters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Rawlings</td>
<td>Jill Heppner</td>
<td>Jim Zachos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Rocha</td>
<td>Jill Illidge</td>
<td>Jimi Gleitsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Wilkins</td>
<td>Jill Pozzi</td>
<td>Jimmy Cannizzaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Zovar</td>
<td>Jill Schontag</td>
<td>Jina Baer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie Barbin</td>
<td>Jill Teaford</td>
<td>Jingyoung Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Aguilea Vitela</td>
<td>Jill Valarcel</td>
<td>JL Janes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Garcia</td>
<td>Jillian Aronstam</td>
<td>Jo Ann Cacace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Gomez</td>
<td>Jillian Holtzclaw</td>
<td>Jo Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Gonzalez</td>
<td>Jillian Hortzclaw</td>
<td>Jo King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Ivan Bustamanto</td>
<td>Jillian Osland</td>
<td>Jo Pirie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Jimenez</td>
<td>Jim Black</td>
<td>Joahn Rubens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Lar</td>
<td>Jim Booth</td>
<td>Joan Agostinelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Pantoja</td>
<td>Jim Bozanich</td>
<td>Joan Bosworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Rameno</td>
<td>Jim Bushneff</td>
<td>Joan Brennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Reyes</td>
<td>Jim Callahan</td>
<td>Joan Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Rocha</td>
<td>Jim Carter</td>
<td>Joan Culver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Torres</td>
<td>Jim Cruddas</td>
<td>Joan Darroch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Torres III</td>
<td>Jim Cumming</td>
<td>Joan Enriquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Touar</td>
<td>Jim Debord</td>
<td>Joan Ling-Zwissler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Valdez</td>
<td>Jim Denton</td>
<td>Joan Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jevan Gray</td>
<td>Jim Dixon</td>
<td>Joan Lowden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF Dronne</td>
<td>Jim Dumont</td>
<td>Joan O'Keefe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhonee Fillmore</td>
<td>Jim Genes</td>
<td>Joan Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jia Patton</td>
<td>Jim Goularte</td>
<td>Joan Staffen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jianna Mader</td>
<td>Jim Langley</td>
<td>Joan Steele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jianna Marder</td>
<td>Jim Latorre</td>
<td>Joan Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiaying Hao</td>
<td>Jim Molina</td>
<td>Joan Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jilda Loomis</td>
<td>Jim Monroe</td>
<td>Joana Del Villar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Beckett</td>
<td>Jim Moser</td>
<td>Joanie Deneffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Bohnen</td>
<td>Jim Pease</td>
<td>Joanna Baumgartner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Borba</td>
<td>Jim Penprase</td>
<td>Joann Colombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Burton-Donnelly</td>
<td>Jim Ramin</td>
<td>Joann Ford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Joann King
Joann Peterson
Joann Roeder
Joann Williams
Joanna Bremser
Joanna Davis
Joanna Erickson
Joanna Eskilson
Joanna Ferraro
Joanna Mana
Joanne Bauer
JoAnne Binding
Joanne Cardoza
Joanne Eldreth
Joanne Hutson
Joanne Klock
Joanne Madigan
Joanne Walters
Joanne Weigel
Joanne Wittwer
Joaquin Bridges
Joaquin Martinez
Jocelyn Brown
Jocelyn Hoy
Jocelyn Levy
Jocelyn Sicairos
Jodey Pini
Jodi Green
Jodi Pleck
Jodie Sanchez
Jody Garcia
Jody Heckenbach
Jody Russo
Jody Work
Joe Andrews
Joe Barnhart
Joe Callero
Joe Connell
Joe Downie

Joe Evans
Joe Gruber
Joe Guernaccini
Joe Hayes
Joe Holmes
Joe Jean
Joe Kaplow
Joe Krammer
Joe Manfre
Joe Martinez
Joe Nama
Joe Nigos
Joe Quigg
Joe Raley
Joe Rubalcaba
Joe Sherer
Joe Shimpfky
Joe Slafkosky
Joe Stoken
Joe Tosta
Joe Vazquez
Joe Ward
Joel Acker
Joel Akin
Joel Avila
Joel Barnes
Joel Boutros
Joel Hedgpeth
Joel McKown
Joel Postman
Joel Rider
Joel Shanches
Joel Smith
Joel Tapia
Joel Wheeler
Joel Zermeno
Joel Hallowell
Joelle Sipes
Joelle Trenor

Joey Williams
Joh Rathbun
Johaan Ryberg
Johanna Bowen
JoHanna Leonard
Johanna Lighthill
Johanna Rochn
Johanna Ronsse
John Aboytes
John Alexiou
John Balawejder
John Ballard
John Barbieri
John Basile
John Blackner
John Boland
John Boulton
John Brady
John Burke
John Cairns
John Chard
John Chavez
John Chilton
John Clements
John Cook
John Coomes
John Cunniff
John Dannehil
John Davis
John Dawson
John De Sousa
John Del Rey
John Devlin
John Distefano
John Dodds
John Doty
John Dowdell
John Falkenroth
John Fangary
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Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

John Faraola
John Fay
John Fisher
John Fox
John Freedman
John French
John Gabriel
John Gates
John Gillingham
John Goggin
John Gotthardt
John Govsky
John Grady
John Gryspos
John Hanley
John Happee
John Harte
John Hauk
John Heal
John Heinle
John Hickey
John Holcombe
John Hopkins
John Hultgren
John Idstrom
John Jordan
John Jr.
John Kenny
John Laing
John Lardinois
John Larse
John Larson
John Larwood
John Laturno
John Lavelle
John Leonard
John Levitt
John Locatelli
John Lynch
John Machado
John Marshall
John Martinelli
John McAlpine
John McCravy
John Meade
John Medeiros
John Mense
John Moore
John Morrison
John Moscatel
John Mudd
John Munnerlyn
John Orlando
John Pacholski
John Pain
John Parda
John Paulsen
John Perry
John Plunkett
John Poole
John Price
John Putica
John Rawlingson
John Robbins
John Rodriguez
John Ruble
John Ryan
John San Filippo
John Scalo
John Scanlon
John Sheibley
John Shewfelt
John Skillicorn
John Sliney
John Smith
John Stanton
John Stege
John Strobel
John Teeple
John Thomas
John Tripodi
John Van De Veer
John Van Seggern
John W Mcdonald
John Williams
John Witt
John Wittenberg
John Wright
John Wurster
John Yantis
John Zitterman
Johnatha Anderson
Johnathan Garza
Johnathon Martins
Johnnie Wilson
Johnny Schot-Martins
Johnston Terry
Johon Cabrera
Jolan Miller
Jolene Mendelsohn
Jolie Downs
Jon Bullock
Jon Cucio
Jon Dietz
Jon Fatula
Jon Guy
Jon Heeley
Jon Hudson
Jon Keesey
Jon Kennedy
Jon Longsworth
Jon Mondor
Jon Rodriguez
Jon Sisk
Jon West
Jon Winston
Jonah Lepak

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
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Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Jonathan Barclay
Jonathan Bernokeits
Jonathan Boudreau
Jonathan Cesena
Jonathan Fulcher
Jonathan Garcia
Jonathan Gick
Jonathan Henandez
Jonathan Landaw
Jonathan Merolla
Jonathan Messer
Jonathan Nunez
Jonathan Riley
Jonathan Rubin
Jonathan Schalze
Jonathan Wilson
Jonathan Worrell
Jonathon Landeck
Joni Steele
Jonnie Ribera
Jordan Jackee
Jordan Kepler
Jordan Le
Jordan Lipaz
Jordan Norrbom
Jordan Pastor
Jordan Paulus
Jordan Rager
Jordan Riley
Jordan Smith
Jordan Vascones
Jordan Welsh
Jordana Fischer
Jorel Keefauver
Jorge Bru
Jorge Carmen
Jorge Cruz
Jorge Doranta
Jorge Duque
Jorge Madrigal-Magana
Jorge Mata
Jorge Ramirez
Jorge Rivera
Jorge Vazquez
Josanne Van Der Wilk
Jose Alejandro
Jose Arreola
Jose Avalos
Jose Avila
Jose Cadenas
Jose Camacho
Jose Cuevas
Jose Diaz
Jose Garcia
Jose Gomez
Jose Iniguez
Jose Jimenez
Jose Juan Velazquez
Jose Machuca
Jose Maciel
Jose Marquez
Jose Martinez
Jose Montoya
Jose Muniz
Jose Nino
Jose Olivera
Jose Padilla
Jose Perez
Jose Quevedo
Jose Rodriguez
Jose Santana
Jose Urzua
Jose Valencia
Jose Velazquez
Jose Zepeda
Josef Sekon
Josefina Madrigal
Josefina Sandez
Josefine Laksson
Joseph Aguero
Joseph Altmann
Joseph Antos
Joseph Bookshier
Joseph Brookshier
Joseph Crossen
Joseph Damico
Joseph Donatini
Joseph Ferrigno
Joseph Gagliano
Joseph Geist
Joseph Graney
Joseph Leonard
Joseph Martinez
Joseph Marvin Jr
Joseph Micburn
Joseph Moddelmog
Joseph Morici
Joseph Mount
Joseph O’Wren
Joseph Olmeda
Joseph Parisie
Joseph Pinpin
Joseph Salgado
Joseph Spinelli
Joseph Whalen
Josephine Palmer
Josh Balaweijder
Josh Becker
Josh Jacquard
Josh Jones
Josh Lopez
Josh Lounsberry
Josh Morgan
Josh Pearlman
Josh Ptashne
Josh Schelhorse
Josh Storrer
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition
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Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joshua Tuthill</th>
<th>Joyce Kutcher</th>
<th>Judith Poole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josh Walden</td>
<td>Joyce Mangohney</td>
<td>Judith Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh White</td>
<td>Joyce Newkirk</td>
<td>Judson Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Williams</td>
<td>Joyce Parr</td>
<td>Judy Brenis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Busick</td>
<td>Joyce Roby</td>
<td>Judy Dorosin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Conner</td>
<td>Joyce Tyler</td>
<td>Judy Dudley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Cranmer</td>
<td>Joyce Vissell</td>
<td>Judy Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Dibble</td>
<td>JR Sanchez</td>
<td>Judy Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Edwards</td>
<td>Juan Arteaga</td>
<td>Judy Hettick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Forsythe</td>
<td>Juan Carlos Escutia</td>
<td>Judy Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Hathaway</td>
<td>Juan Fernandez</td>
<td>Judy Jamison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Hernandez</td>
<td>Juan Garcia</td>
<td>Judy Klamecki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Martinez</td>
<td>Juan Gonzalez</td>
<td>Judy Littlefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Morris</td>
<td>Juan Guennero</td>
<td>Judy Locke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Najmi</td>
<td>Juan Macias</td>
<td>Judy Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Nay</td>
<td>Juan Martinez</td>
<td>Judy Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Norman</td>
<td>Juan Montanez</td>
<td>Judy Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Pizzica</td>
<td>Juan Morales</td>
<td>Judy Nilsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Smith</td>
<td>Juan Sacas</td>
<td>Judy Owen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Strong</td>
<td>Juan Vera</td>
<td>Judy Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Taylor</td>
<td>Juanita Alejandro</td>
<td>Judy Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Waltrip</td>
<td>Juanita Camarena</td>
<td>Judy Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josi Campo</td>
<td>Jude Todd</td>
<td>Judyth Bechtell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah Evert</td>
<td>Judi Wyant</td>
<td>Julia Apgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie Bruce</td>
<td>Judi Monis</td>
<td>Julia Bernal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie Clerfond</td>
<td>Judi Tiser</td>
<td>Julia Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josue Escoto</td>
<td>Judith Allen</td>
<td>Julia Clapham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josue Fuentes</td>
<td>Judith Astone</td>
<td>Julia Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josue Sanchez</td>
<td>Judith Dew</td>
<td>Julia Elman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Talkovic</td>
<td>Judith Gonzales</td>
<td>Julia Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Babich</td>
<td>Judith Hoelscher</td>
<td>Julia Hodges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Baker</td>
<td>Judith Kinst</td>
<td>Julia Horner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Chapman</td>
<td>Judith Masters</td>
<td>Julia Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Dunn</td>
<td>Judith Murdoch</td>
<td>Julia Lindsay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Jones</td>
<td>Judith Muschkovich</td>
<td>Julia McCardell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Luikart</td>
<td>Judith O'Clair</td>
<td>Julia Modorsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joya Winwood</td>
<td>Judith Orbach</td>
<td>Julia Ragen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Blaskovich</td>
<td>Judith Orbach</td>
<td>Julia Ramos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Goldsworthy</td>
<td>Judith Phillips</td>
<td>Julia Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Letter:** Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julia Selker</th>
<th>Julie Scott</th>
<th>Justin Laing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia Soares</td>
<td>Julie Scurfield</td>
<td>Justin Luong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian De La Rua</td>
<td>Julie Shattuck</td>
<td>Justin Mcckelland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Feeley</td>
<td>Julie Snaman</td>
<td>Justin Mcleod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliane Neiderhiser</td>
<td>Julie Stockwell</td>
<td>Justin McNabb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana Chavez</td>
<td>Julie Tatowicz</td>
<td>Justin Moss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julianne Colligan</td>
<td>Julie Taurainen</td>
<td>Justin Payton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julianne DiCocco</td>
<td>Julie Thompson</td>
<td>Justin Ried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julianne Foxworthy</td>
<td>Julie Tobin</td>
<td>Justin Saltis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliano Jochims</td>
<td>Julie Wilson</td>
<td>Justin Vargas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Bated</td>
<td>Julie Young</td>
<td>Justin Wadstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Broder</td>
<td>Juliet Goldstein</td>
<td>Justin White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Curley</td>
<td>Julietta Matea</td>
<td>Justin Yannone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Dickson</td>
<td>Julietta Mattea</td>
<td>Justine Hosmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Elkins</td>
<td>Julietta Sabharwal</td>
<td>K. Perlman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Francis</td>
<td>Juliette Lossky</td>
<td>Kacey Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Gallant</td>
<td>Julio Briceno</td>
<td>Kacie Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie James</td>
<td>Julio Cesar Guzman</td>
<td>Kai Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Johnson</td>
<td>Julio Harvey</td>
<td>Kai Slawinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Jones</td>
<td>Julio Ortiz</td>
<td>Kai Workman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Kanagy</td>
<td>Julio Sanclemente</td>
<td>Kaile West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Kelly</td>
<td>Julio Valencia</td>
<td>Kaimana Carney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Kersey</td>
<td>Juliza Gonzalez</td>
<td>Kaitelynn Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Lambert</td>
<td>Juls Goodwin</td>
<td>Kaitlyn Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Lazor</td>
<td>June Fox</td>
<td>Kaitlyn Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Lockwood</td>
<td>June House</td>
<td>Kaitlyn Van Etta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Lolmaugh</td>
<td>June Ralph</td>
<td>Kailani Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Maxwell</td>
<td>June Smith</td>
<td>Kaiya Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie McCargar</td>
<td>Jung Watson</td>
<td>Kala Buthman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Meearsar</td>
<td>Justin Baker</td>
<td>Kala Ketchum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Morley</td>
<td>Justin Bonner</td>
<td>Kalisa Beagle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Nalezny</td>
<td>Justin Bryant</td>
<td>Kamran Ajir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Nolte</td>
<td>Justin Clark</td>
<td>Kamron Mojabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie O'reilly</td>
<td>Justin Cortez</td>
<td>Kandi Lippert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Packard</td>
<td>Justin Davis</td>
<td>Kaori Herrera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Pillack</td>
<td>Justin Engle</td>
<td>Kara Blum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Raskin</td>
<td>Justin Folsom</td>
<td>Kara D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Ruiz</td>
<td>Justin Foutts</td>
<td>Karah Ammann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Santana</td>
<td>Justin Henson</td>
<td>Kareem Ayyad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karen Amicarelli</th>
<th>Karen Sanguinetti</th>
<th>Kate Crow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Andersen</td>
<td>Karen Schultz</td>
<td>Kate Friel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Bachan</td>
<td>Karen Semingson</td>
<td>Kate Hochler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Bercaw</td>
<td>Karen Sommerfeld</td>
<td>Kate Lemega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Bezerra</td>
<td>Karen Ward</td>
<td>Kate Pavao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Bish</td>
<td>Karen Weiske</td>
<td>Kate Perence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Bria</td>
<td>Karen White</td>
<td>Kate Raymundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Cabral</td>
<td>Karen Wilson</td>
<td>Kate Roberson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Cane</td>
<td>Kari Duggins</td>
<td>Kate Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Card</td>
<td>Kari Kiely</td>
<td>Kate Scanlon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Chamberlain</td>
<td>Kari Lochhead</td>
<td>Kate Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Conley</td>
<td>Kari Olandese</td>
<td>Kate Sonnenfeldt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Corsino</td>
<td>Karin Ashby</td>
<td>Kate Terrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Donovan</td>
<td>Karin Grobe</td>
<td>Kate Tirado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Egan</td>
<td>Karin McGuire</td>
<td>Kate Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Goehringer</td>
<td>Karin Yien</td>
<td>Kate Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Goldman</td>
<td>Karina Madrigal</td>
<td>Kate Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Guest</td>
<td>Karina Vogen</td>
<td>Kate Winters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hall</td>
<td>Karine Gonzales</td>
<td>Katelyn Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hargrove</td>
<td>Karishma Shah</td>
<td>Katelyn Gagne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hart</td>
<td>Karissa Rheuby</td>
<td>Katelyn Taubman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hegerle</td>
<td>Karl Kosling</td>
<td>Katera Rutledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Holderbein</td>
<td>Karl Shubert</td>
<td>Katherine Barr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Huang</td>
<td>Karl Zeise</td>
<td>Katherine Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Jarman</td>
<td>Karla Gaona</td>
<td>Katherine Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Johansson</td>
<td>Karla Oliveira</td>
<td>Katherine Feurtado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Katz</td>
<td>Karla Villarreal</td>
<td>Katherine Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kirby</td>
<td>Karlene Ruggles</td>
<td>Katherine Friedman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Korba</td>
<td>Karley Pope</td>
<td>Katherine Greenwald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Laing</td>
<td>Karolyn Myers</td>
<td>Katherine Hawker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Lykebo Peterson</td>
<td>Karri Breslin</td>
<td>Katherine Hitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Marin</td>
<td>Kary Herman</td>
<td>Katherine Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Menehan</td>
<td>Karyl Rader</td>
<td>Katherine Isbister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Moeller</td>
<td>Karyn Bristol</td>
<td>Katherine Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Moreno</td>
<td>Kassandra Rodriguez</td>
<td>Katherine Lennon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Muchamuel</td>
<td>Katayun Saleni</td>
<td>Katherine Loggins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Navarro</td>
<td>Kate Butler</td>
<td>Katherine Massena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Nielsen</td>
<td>Kate Castelli</td>
<td>Katherine Mullikin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen O'hanlon</td>
<td>Kate Connor</td>
<td>Katherine Ota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition**

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Katherine Smith</th>
<th>Kathryn Sanchez</th>
<th>Katie O'Regan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Uvalles</td>
<td>Kathryn Scott</td>
<td>Katie Peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathie Brown</td>
<td>Kathryn Steel Glynn</td>
<td>Katie Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathie Stark</td>
<td>Kathy Allen</td>
<td>Katie Reese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Armstrong</td>
<td>Kathy Astromoff</td>
<td>Katie Schowengerdt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Bortolussi</td>
<td>Kathy Ballard</td>
<td>Katie Shank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Dammann</td>
<td>Kathy Balthazar</td>
<td>Katie Sieckman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen De Hart</td>
<td>Kathy Bidwell</td>
<td>Katie Silva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Dempsey</td>
<td>Kathy Cook</td>
<td>Katie Solorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Ennis</td>
<td>Kathy Dana</td>
<td>Katie Teese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Epperly</td>
<td>Kathy Deteso</td>
<td>Katie Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Fisher</td>
<td>Kathy DiBenedetto</td>
<td>Katinka Hurley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Hansen</td>
<td>Kathy Elder</td>
<td>Katlyn Moyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Howard</td>
<td>Kathy Gonzales</td>
<td>Katrina Castro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Johnson</td>
<td>Kathy Hensley</td>
<td>Katrina Honeywell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Jones</td>
<td>Kathy Idoine</td>
<td>Katrina Joesten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Lynch</td>
<td>Kathy Jacobs</td>
<td>Katrina King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen MacDonald</td>
<td>Kathy Johnson</td>
<td>Katrina London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Maxwell</td>
<td>Kathy Lamothe</td>
<td>Katy Garner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen McGarraugh</td>
<td>Kathy McClure</td>
<td>Katy Oursler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Middleton</td>
<td>Kathy Pearson</td>
<td>Katy Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Ratcliff</td>
<td>Kathy Ransom</td>
<td>Katya Tashma-Rapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Roberts</td>
<td>Kathy Sandidge</td>
<td>Kay Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Sanmiguel</td>
<td>Kathy Sinnott</td>
<td>Kayla Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Smyth</td>
<td>Kathy Wells</td>
<td>Kayla Childers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Troeller</td>
<td>Kati Bays</td>
<td>Kayla Cromer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Zavella</td>
<td>Kati Graham</td>
<td>Kayla Cromwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Boone</td>
<td>Katie Baker</td>
<td>Kayla Matsuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Crelan</td>
<td>Katie Beckett</td>
<td>Kayla Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Ellis</td>
<td>Katie Behrendt</td>
<td>Kayla Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Fraser</td>
<td>Katie Bergh</td>
<td>Kaylee Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Gestri</td>
<td>Katie Cordes</td>
<td>Kaylin Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Llewellyn-Herne</td>
<td>Katie Cote</td>
<td>Kayrea Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn McCullen</td>
<td>Katie Digirolamo</td>
<td>Keana Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Metz</td>
<td>Katie Feickert</td>
<td>Keegan Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Mowbray</td>
<td>Katie Feurtado</td>
<td>Keelan Franzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Nance</td>
<td>Katie Jacobson</td>
<td>Keely Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Paul</td>
<td>Katie Kelly</td>
<td>Keenan Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Poethig</td>
<td>Katie Lage</td>
<td>Keerti Ayakannu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kees Horn</th>
<th>Kelly Kowalski</th>
<th>Kendra King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Balthazar</td>
<td>Kelly Liebenthal</td>
<td>Kendra Mcqueen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Bonzelaar</td>
<td>Kelly Meyer</td>
<td>Kendra Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Houchen</td>
<td>Kelly Nestlen</td>
<td>Kendra Wolfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Kirk</td>
<td>Kelly Pagano</td>
<td>Kenji Kurita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Koenig</td>
<td>Kelly Pound</td>
<td>Kenju Suzuki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Lachennyer</td>
<td>Kelly Richardson</td>
<td>Kenneth Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Martin</td>
<td>Kelly Robinson</td>
<td>Kenneth Chau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Maynard</td>
<td>Kelly Rush</td>
<td>Kenneth Coppedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Meek</td>
<td>Kelly Sauder</td>
<td>Kenneth Garges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Miller</td>
<td>Kelly Scherf</td>
<td>Kenneth Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Mori</td>
<td>Kelly Shafsky</td>
<td>Kenneth Grimsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Redfield</td>
<td>Kelly Siegel</td>
<td>Kenneth Hubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Schuler</td>
<td>Kelly Skye</td>
<td>Kenneth Koll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Smith</td>
<td>Kelly Smith</td>
<td>Kenneth Konviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Trainor</td>
<td>Kelly Sumner</td>
<td>Kenneth Margolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellee Livingston</td>
<td>Kels Simons</td>
<td>Kenneth Nordgren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey Beer</td>
<td>Kelsa Hawkins</td>
<td>Kenneth Rapaport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley Lauritzen</td>
<td>Kelsey Grimsley</td>
<td>Kenneth Weisner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley Linn</td>
<td>Kelsey Higgins</td>
<td>Kenny Kusumoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley Trousdal</td>
<td>Kelsey Kraus</td>
<td>Kent Edler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley Trousdale</td>
<td>Kelsy Skade</td>
<td>Kent Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley Youmans</td>
<td>Kelvin Nesheim</td>
<td>Kent Thrasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keli</td>
<td>Ken Averill</td>
<td>Kenyon Kluge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelli Cole</td>
<td>Ken Burson</td>
<td>Keri Crask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelli Sebastian</td>
<td>Ken Craft</td>
<td>Keri Spiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelli Smart</td>
<td>Ken Ignatowicz</td>
<td>Keri Waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Alpert</td>
<td>Ken Kambic</td>
<td>Kerri Colbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Andrews</td>
<td>Ken Kraft</td>
<td>Kerri Fong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Arana</td>
<td>Ken Lown</td>
<td>Kerri Hendrickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Arbor</td>
<td>Ken Martin</td>
<td>Kerrie Dawn Ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Beer</td>
<td>Ken Miller</td>
<td>Kerry Sheldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Burns</td>
<td>Ken Newman</td>
<td>Kerry Lafountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Donahoe</td>
<td>Ken Shelden</td>
<td>Kerry Nehls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Farris</td>
<td>Ken Surber</td>
<td>Kerry Obrien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Finneran</td>
<td>Ken White</td>
<td>Kevin Carney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Foos</td>
<td>Ken Winters</td>
<td>Kevin Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Herrera</td>
<td>Kendall Byington</td>
<td>Kevin Conway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Huang</td>
<td>Kendall Saville</td>
<td>Kevin Craft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
**Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition**

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

**Letter:**
Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

| Kevin Crews | Khrystina Horn | Kimberly Butts |
| Kevin Cruz | Kieran Horn | Kimberly Carlton |
| Kevin Desmond | Kieran Shook | Kimberly Gaines |
| Kevin Dunn | Killarney Clary | Kimberly Goddard |
| Kevin Fennimore | Kim Arnerich | Kimberly Ortiz |
| Kevin Flowers | Kim Avnerich | Kimberly Owens |
| Kevin Givens | Kim Barry | Kimberly Sweat |
| Kevin Gonzales | Kim Bierman | Kimberly Wainscoat |
| Kevin Grossman | Kim Bollinger | Kimi Robertson |
| Kevin Hanks | Kim Bradbrook | Kimmal Nunnery |
| Kevin Hogue | Kim Brosing | Kira Henifih |
| Kevin Jeffery | Kim Chase | Kira Martin |
| Kevin Jonker | Kim Clarke | Kira Walker |
| Kevin Jordan | Kim Corneille | Kira Wampler |
| Kevin Kahler | Kim Griffin | Kirch Martin |
| Kevin Karwick | Kim Guiley | Kirk Woelke |
| Kevin Kealri | Kim Harbo | Kira Paskins |
| Kevin King | Kim Hecko | Kirsten Erickson |
| Kevin Koch | Kim Helmer | Kirsten Guinn |
| Kevin Le | Kim Henry | Kirsten Qualey |
| Kevin Lockwood | Kim Jaspers | Kirsten Rinaldi |
| Kevin Maguire | Kim Juarez | Kirstin Gagarin |
| Kevin McKeever | Kim Juneau | Kirstin Guinn |
| Kevin Painchaud | Kim Malone | Kisandra Line |
| Kevin Parks | Kim McCready | Kit Rutter |
| Kevin Patxi Le Bras | Kim Mcginty | Kit Soetaert |
| Kevin Robertson | Kim McReady | Kithy Chavez |
| Kevin Ruffler | Kim Molloy | Kitty Dowgert |
| Kevin Saxton | Kim Phillips | Kiyoga Gazza |
| Kevin Shannon | Kim Rawlings | Klaudia Moreno |
| Kevin Smith | Kim Rodriguez | Koinonla Solano |
| Kevin Springer | Kim Stewart | Kory Van Unen |
| Kevin Stover | Kim Tunson | Koy Wilson |
| Kevin Sullivan | Kim Utile | Kris Ayer |
| Kevin Suriano | Kim Wu | Kris Clemson |
| Kevin Thatcher | Kimarie Madvig | Kris Holden |
| Kevin Zavala | Kimberlee Franca | Kris Schilpsoort |
| Kezia Jiranek | Kimberley Bermender | Kris Sheehan |
| Khandan Giessow | Kimberly Bishop | Krishna Feldman |

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
## Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

**Recipient:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**Letter:** Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Krishna Leikind</th>
<th>Kristina Hunken</th>
<th>Kyle Martin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kriss Silva</td>
<td>Kristina Kada</td>
<td>Kyle Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krissie Olson</td>
<td>Kristina Loveman</td>
<td>Kyle Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Bertetta</td>
<td>Kristina Mitchell</td>
<td>Kyle Thierrmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Cole</td>
<td>Kristina Quilici</td>
<td>Kylie Wyldboore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Cook</td>
<td>Kristine Beck</td>
<td>Kym De Witt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Kessler</td>
<td>Kristine Franck</td>
<td>Kym Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Newberry</td>
<td>Kristine Macdonald</td>
<td>Kyon Kazemi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Whitman</td>
<td>Kristopher Willis</td>
<td>Kyriea Giegerich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristaan Felder</td>
<td>Krystal Guzman</td>
<td>Lachheb Sabrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Barrett</td>
<td>Krystal Martinez</td>
<td>Lael Ambrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Caraway</td>
<td>Krystina Avalos</td>
<td>Lagene Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Carraway</td>
<td>Krystle Gunton</td>
<td>Lain Lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Collishaw</td>
<td>Kully Mandon</td>
<td>Laine Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Hussey</td>
<td>Kumiko Maxson</td>
<td>Laine Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Koenig</td>
<td>Kurt Almendras</td>
<td>Lalaine Delfin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Maya</td>
<td>Kurt Grundner</td>
<td>Lal Sinjur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen McLaughlin</td>
<td>Kurt Jensen</td>
<td>Lalitha Parameswaran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Pocock</td>
<td>Kurt Nelson</td>
<td>Lamonica Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Rice</td>
<td>Kurt Pipal</td>
<td>Lana Schoter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Rinaldi</td>
<td>Kurt Skelton</td>
<td>Lance Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Stewart</td>
<td>Kurt Soenen</td>
<td>Lance Bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristene Roberson</td>
<td>Kurt Stiehl</td>
<td>Lance Hulsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristi Korven</td>
<td>Kurt Workman</td>
<td>Lare Suelton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristia Wolf</td>
<td>Kwd Geocoga</td>
<td>Larette Felsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristianne Diehl</td>
<td>Kyla Piramoon</td>
<td>Lari Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristie Carruthers</td>
<td>Kyle Aldrich</td>
<td>Lara Bezich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Allen-Farmer</td>
<td>Kyle Boyd</td>
<td>Lara Brooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Bogart</td>
<td>Kyle Brown</td>
<td>Lara Kilpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Clark</td>
<td>Kyle Falconer</td>
<td>Lara Latourelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Clifton</td>
<td>Kyle Griffith</td>
<td>Lara Struthers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Evans</td>
<td>Kyle Harder</td>
<td>Laree Magginetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Koenig</td>
<td>Kyle Hardwick</td>
<td>Laretta Lovett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Tosello</td>
<td>Kyle Josephson</td>
<td>Larry Bercovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Wyatt</td>
<td>Kyle Jouras</td>
<td>Larry Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Campbell</td>
<td>Kyle Lapp</td>
<td>Larry Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Delic</td>
<td>Kyle Leach</td>
<td>Larry Drury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Hamill</td>
<td>Kyle Liebenberg</td>
<td>Larry Duimstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Hanna</td>
<td>Kyle Lutz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Larry Gibson</th>
<th>Laura Martin</th>
<th>Lauren Leff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry Goodman</td>
<td>Laura Mccentee</td>
<td>Lauren Linkemyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Gray</td>
<td>Laura Meyer</td>
<td>Lauren Matias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Hibbard</td>
<td>Laura Miller</td>
<td>Lauren Mclaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Leeder</td>
<td>Laura Milosevich</td>
<td>Lauren Mygatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Martinez</td>
<td>Laura Mitchler</td>
<td>Lauren Naess-Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Pearson</td>
<td>Laura Molanchon</td>
<td>Lauren O'brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Steele</td>
<td>Laura Nelson</td>
<td>Lauren Reedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Takemoto</td>
<td>Laura Nilson</td>
<td>Lauren Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Wells</td>
<td>Laura Nunez</td>
<td>Lauren Ruby Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Aluniz</td>
<td>Laura Parks</td>
<td>Lauren Twisselman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Amsden</td>
<td>Laura Pendergraft</td>
<td>Lauren Valentino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Anderson</td>
<td>Laura Prang</td>
<td>Lauren Westjohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Bair</td>
<td>Laura Prisbe</td>
<td>Laurence Cohen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Bogaard</td>
<td>Laura Ramirez</td>
<td>Laurence McGann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Brown</td>
<td>Laura Soellner</td>
<td>Laurence Lambert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Cheatham</td>
<td>Laura Sutherland</td>
<td>Laurie Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Ferguson</td>
<td>Laura Taylor</td>
<td>Laurie Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Fisner</td>
<td>Laura Temple</td>
<td>Laurie Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura German</td>
<td>Laura Van Der Linde</td>
<td>Laurie Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Godoy</td>
<td>Laura Whitson</td>
<td>Laurie Hunkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Grassi</td>
<td>Laura Wood</td>
<td>Laurie Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hartwick</td>
<td>Laura Young Hinck</td>
<td>Laurie Maciel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Harvey</td>
<td>Laura Zonis</td>
<td>Laurie Magarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Heins</td>
<td>Laurel Hayne-Miller</td>
<td>Laurie McCann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Iwanaga</td>
<td>Laurel Henderson</td>
<td>Laurie McCullough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Jean</td>
<td>Laurel Jarnagan</td>
<td>Laurie Merrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Johnson</td>
<td>Laurel Perotti</td>
<td>Laurie Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Johnston</td>
<td>Laurel Thornton</td>
<td>Laurie Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Jones</td>
<td>Lauren Araujo</td>
<td>Laurie Penzias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Kasa</td>
<td>Lauren Baker</td>
<td>Laurie Pimentel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Kennedy</td>
<td>Lauren Bollinger</td>
<td>Laurie Radovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Koonin</td>
<td>Lauren Brigham</td>
<td>Laurie Vanderwoude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Kurek</td>
<td>Lauren Cannon</td>
<td>Laurie Welty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Lamprecht</td>
<td>Lauren Cooney</td>
<td>Laurisa Kanzler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Laughlin</td>
<td>Lauren Crux</td>
<td>Laryn Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Livingston</td>
<td>Lauren Cutter</td>
<td>Laverne Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Macleod</td>
<td>Lauren Granlund</td>
<td>Lawrence Blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Marini</td>
<td>Lauren Kelley</td>
<td>Lawrence Fogel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Lawrence Goldfarb  
Lawrence Holland  
Lawrence Kaplan  
Lawrence Rosenbaum  
Layla Dawson  
Lea Taddionio  
Lea Tillman  
Leah Anderson  
Leah Daugherty  
Leah Kaltzas  
Leah Levin  
Leah Lutz  
Leah Noble  
Leah Perlin  
Leah Piper  
Leah Teschner  
Leana Calderon  
Leann Bjelle  
Leanna Dejong  
Leanne Butka  
Lec Log  
Lee Bruce  
Lee Carnahan  
Lee De Lapp  
Lee Degraw  
Lee Denton  
Lee Griffiths  
Lee Heathorn  
Lee Hoover  
Lee May  
Lee Rhoades  
Lee Rossi  
Lee Solomon  
Lee Vaage  
Leeann Buck  
Leezza Leilani Miller  
Leigh Langley  
Leigh Selby  
Leigh-Anne Lehman  
LeighAnn Work  
Leighanna Pickrell  
Leila Kramer  
Leila McFadden  
Leila Nafissi  
Leilani Zehnder  
Leinaala Waikiki  
Lejla Borovac  
Lela Crandall  
Lelah Welfring  
Leland Olson  
Lena Kauert  
Lennin Naranjo  
Lennon Caleb  
Lennox Smith  
Leo Galaza  
Leo Jed  
Leo Martinez  
Leo Webber  
Leonard Anderson  
Leonard Dreyer  
Leonard Foreman  
Leonardo Ramirez  
Leora Fromm  
Les Brady  
Les Forster  
Les Israow  
Lesario Ruiz  
Lesha Kubacki  
Leslee Bassin  
Lesley Gunnells-Ramos  
Lesley Snyder  
Lesley Sudduth  
Lesley Tipton  
Leslie Alman  
Leslie Burnham  
Leslie Chow  
Leslie Cooper  
Leslie Corona  
Leslie Cucuel  
Leslie Downs  
Leslie Evans  
Leslie Fellows  
Leslie Glass  
Leslie Haws  
Leslie Jaquith  
Leslie Koostra  
Leslie Kootstra  
Leslie Lafollette  
Leslie Lico  
Leslie Muirhead  
Leslie Nakajima  
Leslie Paulides  
Leslie Read  
Leslie Sandoval  
Leslie Smith  
Leslie Strohm  
Leslie Taylor  
Leslie Telles  
Leslie Walter  
Leslie Yepez  
Leslye Lawrence  
Leslie Mudgett  
Lester Espinosa  
Leta Vandenheuvel  
Leticia Harty  
Leticia Juarez  
Leticia Rogers  
Leticia Serrano  
Lettia Davis  
Levi Heid  
Lex Van Den Berghe  
Lezanne Jeffs  
Liane Bauer  
Libby Reed  
Libi Kavanah  
Lidia Avelar  
Lidia Cioffi
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lidia Rich</th>
<th>Linda Kimball</th>
<th>Lindsey Amos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lidia Rodriguez</td>
<td>Linda Knechtel</td>
<td>Lindsey Cramer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilia Arana</td>
<td>Linda Lareau</td>
<td>Lindsey Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilia Campbell</td>
<td>Linda Larson</td>
<td>Lindsey Keough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilia Chagolla</td>
<td>Linda Leum</td>
<td>Lindsey Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilia Croghan</td>
<td>Linda Maderis</td>
<td>Lindsey Westjohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilia Gallardo</td>
<td>Linda Martin</td>
<td>Lindsy Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilia Gutierrez</td>
<td>Linda Mathis</td>
<td>Lindy James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilian Oberdorfer</td>
<td>Linda McPherson</td>
<td>Lindy Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liliana Zamora</td>
<td>Linda Montalvo</td>
<td>Linn Phan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Beggs</td>
<td>Linda Moore</td>
<td>Linnaea Boone Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Leanos</td>
<td>Linda Morales</td>
<td>Lisa Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Wilson</td>
<td>Linda Mosso</td>
<td>Lisa Alloin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Barnett</td>
<td>Linda Nadeau</td>
<td>Lisa Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Brown</td>
<td>Linda Nugent</td>
<td>Lisa Barclay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Hasebe</td>
<td>Linda Owens</td>
<td>Lisa Barner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Vasquez</td>
<td>Linda Padilla</td>
<td>Lisa Barrera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Zhong</td>
<td>Linda Piera</td>
<td>Lisa Beaudreau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linck Zingale</td>
<td>Linda Pol</td>
<td>Lisa Beebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Russin</td>
<td>Linda Rossi</td>
<td>Lisa Berman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln West</td>
<td>Linda Sprowl</td>
<td>Lisa Bunin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Amaris</td>
<td>Linda Switzer</td>
<td>Lisa Cadenasso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Anderson</td>
<td>Linda Thompson</td>
<td>Lisa Carlton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Beatham</td>
<td>Linda Tillery</td>
<td>Lisa Crouch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Beltramo</td>
<td>Linda Unger</td>
<td>Lisa Dallimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Berman</td>
<td>Linda Valdez</td>
<td>Lisa Daniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Care</td>
<td>Linda Vaughan</td>
<td>Lisa Duque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Corcoran</td>
<td>Linda Villanueva</td>
<td>Lisa Figgord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Curtis</td>
<td>Linda Weaver</td>
<td>Lisa Flitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Dennis</td>
<td>Linda Williams</td>
<td>Lisa Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Des Jardins</td>
<td>Linda Youmans</td>
<td>Lisa Gerber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Desjardins</td>
<td>Lindsay Behr</td>
<td>Lisa Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Dewitt</td>
<td>Lindsay Goldsmith</td>
<td>Lisa Gunther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Fernandez</td>
<td>Lindsay Hinck</td>
<td>Lisa Harvey-Duren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Francis</td>
<td>Lindsay Mangold</td>
<td>Lisa Holcombe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Gilcrest</td>
<td>Lindsay Patel</td>
<td>Lisa Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Griffith</td>
<td>Lindsay Patten</td>
<td>Lisa Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Johnson</td>
<td>Lindsay Storrer</td>
<td>Lisa King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Kiesler</td>
<td>Lindsay Torres</td>
<td>Lisa Klaric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Lisa Kodat
Lisa Lachlan
Lisa Lewis
Lisa Lilley
Lisa Lindeman
Lisa Martinez
Lisa McAndrews
Lisa McCallister
Lisa Meyer
Lisa Mosely
Lisa Mosley
Lisa Moss
Lisa Patebaum
Lisa Pennington
Lisa Phelps
Lisa Plunkett
Lisa Podesto
Lisa Powell
Lisa Price
Lisa Salinero
Lisa Shaver
Lisa Sheridan
Lisa Smith
Lisa Stevenson
Lisa Stormoen
Lisa Stout
Lisa Tabachnick
Lisa Theriot
Lisa Todd
Lisa Tonetti
Lisa Tripp
Lisa Vicar
Lisa Vieira
Lisa Wallace
Lisa Warshaw
Lisa Warzeka
Lisa Welch
Lisa Wilson
Lisa Zee

Lisa Zlotski
Lisha Erez
Livero Guerrero
Livia Bocchino
Livia Monelleone
Livia Monteleone
Livia Peras
Liz Aielo
Liz Baginski
Liz Ballew
Liz Celeste
Liz Devins
Liz Donatini
Liz Karzag
Liz Milazzo
Liz Roenning
Liz Torres
Liz Whiteley
Liza Brownstone
Liza Mchugh
Liza Scully
Lizbeth Tapia
Lizette Rocha
Lizzie Adams
Lizzie Schlarmann
Llesiia Rocha-Fernandez
Lleticia Hernandez
Lloyd MacPherson
Lloyd Stephenson
Lloyd Tabb
Lloyd Wilson
Lluvia Acevedo
Logan Byara
Logan Chambers
Logan Hart
Logan Mella
Logun Fagundes
Lois Overton
Lois Springsteen
Lois Widom
Lois Winters
Lolly Belanger
Lona Carter
Lora Bate
Loree Mathews
Lorelei Janis
Loren Goodman
Loren Rosen
Loren Schwinge
Loren Young
Lorena Castillo
Lorena Garcia
Lorena Quiroz
Lorenzo Holquin
Loretta Angobaldo
Lorhg Vyvyan
Lori Bell
Lori Bohl-Penniket
Lori Brown
Lori Canton
Lori Clinchard
Lori Gandolfo
Lori Iverson
Lori Johnson
Lori Oates
Lori Price
Lori Ray
Lori Rolon
Lori Seal
Lori Siegmund
Lori Sullivan
Lori Teller
Loris Nolan
Lorna Campion
Lorna Horton
Lorna Jordan
Lorna Kohler
Lorna Torkos

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
## Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

**Recipient:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**Letter:** Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lornah Brown</th>
<th>Lucia Haro</th>
<th>Lynn Dunn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Gaudin</td>
<td>Lucia Torres</td>
<td>Lynn Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Jacquard</td>
<td>Lucie Hemmen</td>
<td>Lynn Guenther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Lavelle</td>
<td>Lucille heathorn</td>
<td>Lynn Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Selvaratnam</td>
<td>Lucinda Cannon</td>
<td>Lynn Howerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Valdez</td>
<td>Lucretia Hall</td>
<td>Lynn Ramirez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Wallace</td>
<td>Lucy Carr</td>
<td>Lynn Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorrie Nunez</td>
<td>Lucy Casillas</td>
<td>Lynn Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lossky Juliette</td>
<td>Lucy Fernandez</td>
<td>Lynn Rouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Bermingham</td>
<td>Lucy Ferneyhough</td>
<td>Lynne Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Caviglia</td>
<td>Lucy Rojas</td>
<td>Lynn Soriano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Custodio</td>
<td>Lucy Sierra</td>
<td>Lynne Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Rose</td>
<td>Luis Amador</td>
<td>Lynne Holloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loues Perez</td>
<td>Luis Ayad</td>
<td>Lynne Lenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louie Johnston</td>
<td>Luis Flores</td>
<td>Lynne Strudlowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Barnes</td>
<td>Luis Herrera</td>
<td>Lynnett Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Cannarozzi</td>
<td>Luis Leon</td>
<td>Lynnette Mello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Cannarozzi</td>
<td>Luis Mendoza</td>
<td>Lynnette Witwer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Compoginis</td>
<td>Luis Miranda</td>
<td>Lysa Tabachnick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Oppido</td>
<td>Luis Ortiz</td>
<td>Lyudmila Spivak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Winters</td>
<td>Luis Sanchez</td>
<td>M. Scontriano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa Disheroon</td>
<td>Luke Debrito</td>
<td>Mable Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Durham</td>
<td>Luke Rissacher</td>
<td>Maddie Spears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Johnson</td>
<td>Luke Silberman</td>
<td>Maddy Barreto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Kegg</td>
<td>Lupe Cano</td>
<td>Maddy Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise McCarthy</td>
<td>Lupe Flores</td>
<td>Maddy Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Wallock</td>
<td>Lupe Gutierrez</td>
<td>Madelaine Feduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Mendoza</td>
<td>Lupe Nobel</td>
<td>Madeleine Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovene Wood</td>
<td>Lusijah Sutherland Darrow</td>
<td>Madeleine Heassler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu Baloun</td>
<td>Lydia Cunningham</td>
<td>Madeline Casteel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luann Martin</td>
<td>Lydia Walking</td>
<td>Madeline Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luanna Lee</td>
<td>Lyle Broschat</td>
<td>Madeline Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luc De Faymoreau</td>
<td>Lyn Hood</td>
<td>Madeline Marlatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Lehman</td>
<td>Lynda Lewit</td>
<td>Madison Gotthardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Santos</td>
<td>Lynda Montgomery</td>
<td>Madison Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucette Spitzer</td>
<td>Lynda Parker</td>
<td>Mae Beth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luchy Valencia</td>
<td>Lynda Williams</td>
<td>Magdalena Nowosielska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luci Gray</td>
<td>Lynette Sanchez</td>
<td>Maggie Edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucia Bruer</td>
<td>Lynn Barker</td>
<td>Maggie Hellmann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Maggie Rose
Mai Dao
Mala Entropo
Maiana Lasevicius
Maira Montoga
Makana Curtiss
Makena Foulger
Malcolm Roberson
Malcom Macaulay
Malcom Northcott
Malia Horn
Malia Mendiola
Malin Ashby
Malinda Lawrence
Mallory Alvarez
Mallory Miller
Mallory Newell
Mana Vizcaino
Mandara Kane
Mandy Spitzer
Manoj Mistry
Mansefsadmikari
Manu Koenig
Manuel Arrona
Manuel Escobar
Manuel Meneses
Manuel Perez
Manuel Quiroz
Manuel Rosas
Manuel Zavala
Mara Curry
Maranda Luman
Marc Bernall
Marc Chow
Marc Darrow
Marc De Giere
Marc Krovetz
Marc Manger
Marc Pamias
Marc Reining
Marc Smith Sacks
Marcela Martinez
Marceline Chaney
Marcelino Gutierrez
Marcella M
Marcello Hutchinson
Marcelo Adas
Marcelo Nogueira
Marcelo Peralta
Marci Cobo
Marc Sebourne
Marcia Barclay
Marcia Burns
Marcia Caetano
Marcia Heath
Marcia Heinegg
Marcia Lipsenthal
Marcia Manzo
Marcia Nicholson
Marcia White
Marcia Zigman
Marciano Guiterrez
Marciano RamierzCruz
Marcie Hughes
Marco Carmona
Marco Diaz
Marco Estrada
Marco Gonzales
Marco Hernandez
Marco Luna
Marcus Hooten
Marcus Lindeke
Marcus McDonough
Marcus Rein
Marcus Serrano
Marcus Solbes-Moran
Marcy Brenkowitz
Margaret Brodsky
Margaret Caldwell
Margaret Campodonico
Margaret Carr
Margaret Hetherington
Margaret Jenkins
Margaret Julien
Margaret Lynn
Margaret McCulley
Margaret McGuire
Margaret Mitchell
Margaret Moore
Margaret Price
Margaret Rosa-Santner
Margaret Rosas
Margaret Seibert
Margaret Semaria
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Margarita Monroy
Margarita Orsi
Margarita Rivas
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.
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Maria Basilio
Maria Bonsall
Maria Borges
Maria Brandt
Maria Buak
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Martin Monrox Perez</th>
<th>Mary Hesketh</th>
<th>Mary Tucker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Soukup</td>
<td>Mary Hillemeier</td>
<td>Mary Viet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Whitmore</td>
<td>Mary Jacoby</td>
<td>Mary Volk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Zepeda</td>
<td>Mary Jane Perko</td>
<td>Mary Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina Lin</td>
<td>Mary Jo Connolly</td>
<td>Mary Winters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina Mueller</td>
<td>Mary Keelin</td>
<td>Mary-Lynn Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina O'Sullivan</td>
<td>Mary Kline-Kaye</td>
<td>MaryAnn Martinsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty Demare</td>
<td>Mary Light</td>
<td>Maryanne McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty Lico</td>
<td>Mary Lou Weidlich</td>
<td>Marybeth Dicarlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Brandt</td>
<td>Mary Lyons</td>
<td>Maryellen Boyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anderson</td>
<td>Mary Magee</td>
<td>MaryLou Avelar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann McLean</td>
<td>Mary Maier</td>
<td>Marylou Lamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Sheehy</td>
<td>Mary Mann</td>
<td>Marysarah Locatelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anne Sawi</td>
<td>Mary Manuele</td>
<td>Mason Redd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Barrett</td>
<td>Mary Mccarthy</td>
<td>Mat Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Bennion</td>
<td>Mary McMullen</td>
<td>Mateo Lettunich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Berkana</td>
<td>Mary Miranda</td>
<td>Matha Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Bolton</td>
<td>Mary Najera</td>
<td>Matt Ammann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Brownstein</td>
<td>Mary Palmer</td>
<td>Matt Arnoldi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Burdette</td>
<td>mary paulis</td>
<td>Matt Bradbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Camarillo</td>
<td>Mary Peddle</td>
<td>Matt Brower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Carrera</td>
<td>Mary Petersen</td>
<td>Matt Chabalko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Crawford</td>
<td>Mary Ramirz</td>
<td>Matt Clifton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Dalton</td>
<td>Mary Reyes</td>
<td>Matt Darton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Delgado</td>
<td>Mary Ryan</td>
<td>Matt Estrada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Dillonbeck</td>
<td>Mary Ryniewicz</td>
<td>Matt Farrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Donovan</td>
<td>Mary Samuel</td>
<td>Matt Gomez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Drew</td>
<td>Mary Sanders</td>
<td>Matt Healy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Emmet</td>
<td>Mary Schweitzer</td>
<td>Matt Hofman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Feist</td>
<td>Mary Selby</td>
<td>Matt Hyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary French</td>
<td>Mary Serra</td>
<td>Matt Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Fukai</td>
<td>Mary Shartle</td>
<td>Matt Kaminsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Furnish</td>
<td>Mary Silver</td>
<td>Matt Kotila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Garcia</td>
<td>Mary Sousa</td>
<td>Matt Linton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Gaulke</td>
<td>Mary South</td>
<td>Matt Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Griffen</td>
<td>Mary Squires</td>
<td>Matt McClintock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Griffin</td>
<td>Mary Straley</td>
<td>Matt Merrifield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hansell</td>
<td>Mary Talpas</td>
<td>Matt Nicholson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Henschell</td>
<td>Mary Tambellini</td>
<td>Matt Ninninger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matt O'brien</th>
<th>Matthew Ryan</th>
<th>Maya Sapper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt O'leary</td>
<td>Matthew Salinger</td>
<td>Maylynn Tam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Penchuk</td>
<td>Matthew Shelton</td>
<td>Mayra Bermudez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Propert</td>
<td>Matthew Sloan</td>
<td>Mayra Guzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Quinn</td>
<td>Matthew Sutton</td>
<td>Mayra Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Richards</td>
<td>Matthew Taylor</td>
<td>Mayra Ruiz-Valtierra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Rogers</td>
<td>Matthew Wall</td>
<td>Mayrebelle Lukins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Sargent</td>
<td>Matthew West</td>
<td>MC Shuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Seitzler</td>
<td>Matthew Zehnder</td>
<td>Meadow Haughey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Seligmann</td>
<td>Matti Peoples</td>
<td>Meagan Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Stodard</td>
<td>Mattratt Schrodetz</td>
<td>Mechaela Martin-Roberson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Tognoli</td>
<td>Maura August</td>
<td>Medwin Schreher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Vecchione</td>
<td>Maura Matera</td>
<td>Meg Henchel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Vork</td>
<td>Maureen Dunphy</td>
<td>Meg Kobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Weld</td>
<td>Maureen Ferry</td>
<td>Meg Vollema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Wyman</td>
<td>Maureen Mackin</td>
<td>Megan Adney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Wynakoop</td>
<td>Maureen Moore</td>
<td>Megan Cesena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Alexander</td>
<td>Maurice Peel</td>
<td>Megan Comstock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Bergdahl</td>
<td>Maury Ullman</td>
<td>Megan Glynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Bernstein</td>
<td>Max Bruning</td>
<td>Megan Goodhue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Burns</td>
<td>Max Bryer-Bass</td>
<td>Megan Grenier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Cole</td>
<td>Max Camarillo</td>
<td>Megan Hattar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Davies</td>
<td>Max Copperman</td>
<td>Megan Hinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Engle</td>
<td>Max Glynn</td>
<td>Megan Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Galvin</td>
<td>Max Houghton</td>
<td>Megan Malhoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Gessel</td>
<td>Max Kauert</td>
<td>Megan Martinelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Gomez</td>
<td>Max Landau</td>
<td>Megan McGuire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Hoffman</td>
<td>Max Moorman</td>
<td>Megan Pereira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Howard</td>
<td>Max Mugnier</td>
<td>Megan Sabal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Israel</td>
<td>Max Salgado</td>
<td>Megan Speciale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Lavin</td>
<td>Maxine Duffield</td>
<td>Megan Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Lewett</td>
<td>Maxwell Hubbard</td>
<td>Megan Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Lewitt</td>
<td>May Roberts</td>
<td>Meganne Downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Marichibar</td>
<td>Maya Dalton</td>
<td>Meggin Hendricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew McCloskey</td>
<td>Maya Dawson</td>
<td>Meghan Alsbeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Milukas</td>
<td>Maya Krolikiewicz</td>
<td>Meghan Dowling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew O'brien</td>
<td>Maya Lord</td>
<td>Meghan Fague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Quinn</td>
<td>Maya Novak-Hertzog</td>
<td>Meghan Morkeski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Russell</td>
<td>Maya Novak-Hertzong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
## Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

**Recipient:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**Letter:** Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meghan Robertello</th>
<th>Melissa Maciel</th>
<th>Merry Lou White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mel Connet</td>
<td>Melissa Mahar</td>
<td>Merry Treanor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melania DeHazes-Carr</td>
<td>Melissa McConville</td>
<td>Mesbah Angel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Arao</td>
<td>Melissa Millgr</td>
<td>Metin Kanikaynar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Dion</td>
<td>Melissa Moe</td>
<td>Mezziah Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Flores</td>
<td>Melissa Patterson</td>
<td>Mia Dieguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Forner</td>
<td>Melissa Snyder</td>
<td>Mia Falco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Hopper</td>
<td>Melissa Spiers</td>
<td>Mla Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Kitchen</td>
<td>Melissa Swick</td>
<td>Michael DiPiero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Krueer</td>
<td>Melissa Vergara</td>
<td>Michael Breeden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Mesiroff</td>
<td>Melissa Weiss</td>
<td>Michael Abowd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Rager</td>
<td>Melissa Whitney</td>
<td>Michael Aragon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Vizzusi</td>
<td>Melissa Woonstenhulme</td>
<td>Michael Avenell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melina Perez</td>
<td>Melissa Yinger</td>
<td>Michael Babich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Cianci</td>
<td>Meliza Mokrani</td>
<td>Michael Baggot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda De Leon</td>
<td>Melannie Strah</td>
<td>Michael Bazarnick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Freeman</td>
<td>Melissa Salem</td>
<td>Michael Beaztt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Hodges</td>
<td>Melodie Bustiche</td>
<td>Michael Benites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Isliker</td>
<td>Melodie Zavala</td>
<td>Michael Benoit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Losik</td>
<td>Melody Culver</td>
<td>Michael Bertoldo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Lundgren</td>
<td>Melody Derenia</td>
<td>Michael Beunier-Browner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Schilperoort</td>
<td>Melody Meyer</td>
<td>Michael Bilgere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Sutter</td>
<td>Melody Record</td>
<td>Michael Bozzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Thompson</td>
<td>Melvin Harvey</td>
<td>Michael Bryant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Vento</td>
<td>Melvin Vaughn</td>
<td>Michael Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Jeffrey</td>
<td>Mercado Manuel</td>
<td>Michael Burroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Holsingue</td>
<td>Mercedes Coffman</td>
<td>Michael Cabak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Begin</td>
<td>Mercedes Hernandez</td>
<td>Michael Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Cline</td>
<td>Mercedes Lewis</td>
<td>Michael Chanin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Dear</td>
<td>Mercy Kendall</td>
<td>Michael Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Edwards</td>
<td>Mercy Olmstead</td>
<td>Michael Craib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Flores</td>
<td>Meredith Freeman</td>
<td>Michael Dahlberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Gerardi</td>
<td>Meredith Hammig</td>
<td>Michael Daly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Godinez</td>
<td>Meredith Torres</td>
<td>Michael Dang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Henck</td>
<td>Meredith Tyler</td>
<td>Michael Dauerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Herzog</td>
<td>Meredith Wall</td>
<td>Michael De Caro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Holloway</td>
<td>Merlin Thomas</td>
<td>Michael Dearmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Lausey</td>
<td>Merrilee Tunik</td>
<td>Michael Decorte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Leib</td>
<td>Merritt Edmunds</td>
<td>Michael Erbe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 Signatures from Santa Cruz County Residents
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michael Eugster</th>
<th>Michael Maher</th>
<th>Michael Shaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Fabiszewski</td>
<td>Michael Mariani</td>
<td>Michael Shen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Faherty</td>
<td>Michael Mason</td>
<td>Michael Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ford</td>
<td>Michael Matthews</td>
<td>Michael Singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Forster</td>
<td>Michael McBride</td>
<td>Michael Sobota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gardner</td>
<td>Michael McKiernan</td>
<td>Michael Sorbet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Giorgianni</td>
<td>Michael McLaughlin</td>
<td>Michael Strand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Glasgow</td>
<td>Michael McSorley</td>
<td>Michael Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Goldman</td>
<td>Michael Meara</td>
<td>Michael Tarbet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gonzer</td>
<td>Michael Meyer</td>
<td>Michael Toland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gorman</td>
<td>Michael Miller</td>
<td>Michael Trapani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Griffin</td>
<td>Michael Millsop</td>
<td>Michael Tyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hall</td>
<td>Michael Milward</td>
<td>Michael Vensel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hamerly</td>
<td>Michael Minuth</td>
<td>Michael Vickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Henderson</td>
<td>Michael Miranda</td>
<td>Michael Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hendricks</td>
<td>Michael Mitchell</td>
<td>Michael Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hoffer</td>
<td>Michael Modest</td>
<td>Michael Zelver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hollister</td>
<td>Michael Mojaver</td>
<td>Michaela Chavez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Johnson</td>
<td>Michael Moore</td>
<td>Michaela Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kanner</td>
<td>Michael Morris-Nix</td>
<td>Michele Beserra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kaufman</td>
<td>Michael Mote</td>
<td>Michele Busenhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kaye</td>
<td>Michael Nedina</td>
<td>Michele Claessens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Keenan</td>
<td>Michael Nemec</td>
<td>Michele D'Amico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kerbyson</td>
<td>Michael Orendurff</td>
<td>Michele Garns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Koplen</td>
<td>Michael Parisi</td>
<td>Michele Goodwin-Hooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kretsch</td>
<td>Michael Pebworth</td>
<td>Michele Hohmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Krueer</td>
<td>Michael Petrov</td>
<td>Michele Manna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Laffoon</td>
<td>Michael Pflueger</td>
<td>Michele McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lamar</td>
<td>Michael Pitt</td>
<td>Michele Peregrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lane</td>
<td>Michael Price</td>
<td>Michele Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lavigne</td>
<td>Michael Roberts</td>
<td>Michele Rae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lesh</td>
<td>Michael Robles</td>
<td>Michele Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lewis</td>
<td>Michael Routh</td>
<td>Michele Roosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Light</td>
<td>Michael Rudolph</td>
<td>Michele Whizin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Linvill</td>
<td>Michael Sampson</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Logan</td>
<td>Michael Schweiterman</td>
<td>Michelle Andre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Logue</td>
<td>Michael Sehrack</td>
<td>Michelle Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Maas</td>
<td>Michael Seniok</td>
<td>Michelle Bergman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Madesko</td>
<td>Michael Severim</td>
<td>Michelle Berryessa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michelle Bradley</th>
<th>Michelle Varrin</th>
<th>Mike Donohue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Burke</td>
<td>Michelle Wallace</td>
<td>Mike Englade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Bush</td>
<td>Michelle Wilczynski</td>
<td>Mike Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Cantor</td>
<td>Michelle Wildey</td>
<td>Mike Everson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Chapman</td>
<td>Michelle Yahn</td>
<td>Mike Fraguglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Close</td>
<td>Michelle Zelena</td>
<td>Mike Grabill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Courtroul</td>
<td>Michelle Zeleny</td>
<td>Mike Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Dennis</td>
<td>Miguel Canizal</td>
<td>Mike Heffernan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Denzler</td>
<td>Miguel Carranco</td>
<td>Mike Hochleutner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Dixon</td>
<td>Miguel Coches</td>
<td>Mike Kane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Dutton</td>
<td>Miguel Felix</td>
<td>Mike Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Easter</td>
<td>Miguel Hernandez</td>
<td>Mike Kelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Elliott</td>
<td>Miguel Ibarra</td>
<td>Mike Laufer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Gilluly</td>
<td>Miguel Lepe</td>
<td>Mike LeClair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Grant</td>
<td>Miguel Lopez</td>
<td>Mike Lelieur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Hernandez</td>
<td>Miguel Sanchez</td>
<td>Mike Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Hodsdon</td>
<td>Miguel Santiago</td>
<td>Mike Lyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Laskey</td>
<td>Miguel Silva</td>
<td>Mike Maceri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle McAllister</td>
<td>Miguel Torres</td>
<td>Mike Maler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Melendez</td>
<td>Miguel Vega</td>
<td>Mike Manzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Michaels</td>
<td>Miguel Verar</td>
<td>Mike Marketello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Miranda</td>
<td>Miguel Zavala</td>
<td>Mike Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Moses</td>
<td>Milk Massby</td>
<td>Mike Mccellan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Mulligan</td>
<td>Mikaela Anderson</td>
<td>Mike Mclay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Navarro</td>
<td>Mikaela Olson</td>
<td>Mike Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Nolan</td>
<td>Mikayla Falk</td>
<td>Mike Montanez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Nussle</td>
<td>Mikayla Howie</td>
<td>Mike Morrish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Pappas</td>
<td>Mike Alperin</td>
<td>Mike Muldoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Phillips</td>
<td>Mike Alvaro</td>
<td>Mike Munson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Pipitone</td>
<td>Mike Bailey</td>
<td>Mike Nittoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Poole</td>
<td>Mike Bancroft</td>
<td>Mike Nolte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Reilly</td>
<td>Mike Barajas</td>
<td>Mike O'boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Rossi</td>
<td>Mike Bonigut</td>
<td>Mike Ontiveros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Rubalcava</td>
<td>Mike Bradley</td>
<td>Mike Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Sapena</td>
<td>Mike Brumett</td>
<td>Mike Parisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Schoick</td>
<td>Mike Caroselli</td>
<td>Mike Pruitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Shippen</td>
<td>Mike Crook</td>
<td>Mike Ransom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Tapiz</td>
<td>Mike Daily</td>
<td>Mike Romano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Tell</td>
<td>Mike Dewitt</td>
<td>Mike Rubendall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mike Sargent</th>
<th>Mitch Temkin</th>
<th>Monique Kremer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Schmidt</td>
<td>Mitchell Bourisk</td>
<td>Monte Atherton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sena</td>
<td>Mitchell Bowles</td>
<td>Monte Meyerdirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Shanks</td>
<td>Mitri Syroni</td>
<td>Montserrat Sanz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Snoddy</td>
<td>Moacyr Vadas</td>
<td>Mordechai Shapiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sparber</td>
<td>Mohsen Boostani</td>
<td>Morgan Bagnall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Thomas</td>
<td>Moira Lanyi</td>
<td>Morgan Ehritt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Weatherford</td>
<td>Moises Ramos</td>
<td>Morgan Gardea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Welles</td>
<td>Mojo Ghassemi</td>
<td>Morgan Matias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Woods</td>
<td>Mollie Jones</td>
<td>Morgan Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikel Parton</td>
<td>Mollie Mae</td>
<td>Morgan Ross-Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan Martin</td>
<td>Molly Uny</td>
<td>Morgan Smidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mile Jennings</td>
<td>Molly Hale</td>
<td>Morgan Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Elam</td>
<td>Molly Henderson</td>
<td>Morgan West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Imwalle</td>
<td>Molly Jaffe</td>
<td>Morris Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Reiter</td>
<td>Molly Lippsett</td>
<td>Moselle Madesko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Stiler</td>
<td>Molly Ressler</td>
<td>Moshe Vilozy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Wadsworth</td>
<td>Molly Rodgers</td>
<td>Muriam Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millicent Frost</td>
<td>Molly Shaw</td>
<td>Muriel Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milo Rodriguez</td>
<td>Molly Shields</td>
<td>Mya Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindi Broughton</td>
<td>Molly Slater</td>
<td>Myea Ackermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindy White</td>
<td>Momen Bassiouni</td>
<td>Mykell Discipulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerva Velasco</td>
<td>Monet Templeton</td>
<td>Mylene Sakamoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming Liou</td>
<td>Monica Amodeo</td>
<td>Myles Routh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miquelle Notmeyer</td>
<td>Monica Bates</td>
<td>Myles Stanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramontes Salvador</td>
<td>Monica Garcia</td>
<td>Myra Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Ganci</td>
<td>Monica Hellberg</td>
<td>Myriam Maldonado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Gensler</td>
<td>Monica Hoberg</td>
<td>Myriam Telus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Gilmore</td>
<td>Monica Houchen</td>
<td>Myrl Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Myhre</td>
<td>Monica Lafleur</td>
<td>N. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Schirmer</td>
<td>Monica Mcguire</td>
<td>Nadene Thorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mireille Cervelli</td>
<td>Monica Mendoza</td>
<td>Nadia Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mireya Reyna</td>
<td>Monica Meyer</td>
<td>Nadia Ruotolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Vilozy</td>
<td>Monica Murphy</td>
<td>Nadine Maguire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirylah Morrow</td>
<td>Monica Ramirez</td>
<td>Nadyne Vargas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misael Barba</td>
<td>Monica Upton</td>
<td>Naina Biswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy Silva</td>
<td>Monika Andrews</td>
<td>Nairi Azaryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty Navarro</td>
<td>Monika Modest</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch Desjardins</td>
<td>Monika Perez</td>
<td>Nana Montgomery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Nana Nasef
Nanaliya Takehana
Nancie Benes
Nancie Van Zanten
Nancy Arreola
Nancy Bennett
Nancy Betsekas
Nancy Brighton
Nancy Brown
Nancy Carr
Nancy Connelly
Nancy Craig
Nancy David
Nancy Deacon
Nancy Delaney
Nancy Diaz
Nancy Fernandez
Nancy Garcia
Nancy Kaneg
Nancy Krusoe
Nancy Lowe
Nancy Martin
Nancy Merritt
Nancy Meyerdirk
Nancy Molina
Nancy Niles
Nancy Paez
Nancy Port-Gaarn
Nancy Rinkardt
Nancy Rinkhardt
Nancy Scarborough
Nancy Schmitt
Nancy Schultz
Nancy Searborough
Nancy Tate
Nancy Torres
Nancy Valek-Corbett
Nancy Whaley
Nancy Yellin

Nancy Zamora
Nanette O’connor
Naomi Bayer
Naomi Dresser
Naomi Epps
Naomi Marquez-
Toulemonde
Naomi Sakoda
Naomi Silva
Naomi Walzer
Naser Suleiman
Nat Brown
Natasha Del Carlo
Natalia Fleming
Natalie Abreo
Natalie Abreu
Natalie Gates
Natalie Hobson
Natalie Kaysen
Natalie Sweeting
Natalie Toy
Natalie Wise
Natalie Yader
Nataliea Filyushin
Natasha Nogueira
Natasha Reiner-Wooten
Nate Tuddenham
Nathalie Chatelain
Nathalie Lauwerier
Nathalie Martin
Nathan Anderson
Nathan Brown
Nathan Calkins
Nathan Ciarleglio
Nathan Escoto
Nathan Forson
Nathan Gurnee
Nathan Henderson
Nathan Henry

Nathan Knight
Nathan Leon
Nathan Marianovsky
Nathan Phillips
Nathan Van Zandt
Nathan Weller
Nathaniel James
Nathaniel Lenfestey
Nathaniel Morotti
Nathaniel Munro
Nathaniel Myers
Neal Fennimore
Neal Woods
Ned Leblond
Neil Cannon
Neil Conner
Neil Hardy
Neil Lyttle
Neil Polehr
Neil Rains
Neil Sprenkel
Neiman Howe
Nelly Vaqueraboggs
Nels Westman
Neno Villamor
Nereida Rodriguez
Nereida Uribe
Nereida Uride
Nester Hernandez
Nestor Hernandez
Neva Stephen
Neville Wallace
Nevin Hongardy
Ngan Tran
Niall Macken
Nichol Manchester
Nicholas Alarcun
Nicholas Baginski
Nicholas Barroso
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicholas Dawson</th>
<th>Nicola Stenton</th>
<th>Ncah Dahl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Debrito</td>
<td>Nicole Beck</td>
<td>Ncah Dillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Elsmore</td>
<td>Nicole Beye</td>
<td>Ncah Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Jarrett</td>
<td>Nicole Bosinger</td>
<td>Ncah Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Koenig</td>
<td>Nicole Bouja</td>
<td>Noah Freedman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Mangrum</td>
<td>Nicole Bowen</td>
<td>Noah Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Mitt</td>
<td>Nicole Chavez</td>
<td>Noah Kipnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Pavlina</td>
<td>Nicole Coleman</td>
<td>Noah Mogor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Redinger</td>
<td>Nicole Ealy</td>
<td>Noah Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Schacher</td>
<td>Nicole Garland</td>
<td>Noah Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Wallace</td>
<td>Nicole Jordan</td>
<td>Noel deGelleke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Ward</td>
<td>Nicole Legassick</td>
<td>Noelle Stanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Wilson</td>
<td>Nicole Lockwood</td>
<td>Noelle Strunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichole Robbins</td>
<td>Nicole Lostrie</td>
<td>Noemi Nunez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Alaga</td>
<td>Nicole Mattacola</td>
<td>Noemi Parra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Allen</td>
<td>Nicole Ottaviano</td>
<td>Noemi Raygoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Antonopoulos</td>
<td>Nicole Reinoldson</td>
<td>Noheini Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Blanchini</td>
<td>Nicole Sandperl</td>
<td>Nola Moosman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Burns</td>
<td>Nicole Sanguinetti</td>
<td>Nolan Hatton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Buscovich</td>
<td>Nicole Tanner</td>
<td>Nomar Sanchez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Cole</td>
<td>Nicole Tarantino</td>
<td>Nomi Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Colligan</td>
<td>Nicole Wimer</td>
<td>Nona Rosso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Gosseen</td>
<td>Nicolette Nasr</td>
<td>Nora Brink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Handley</td>
<td>Nicolle Nelson</td>
<td>Nora Coren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick James</td>
<td>Nicolo Marra-Biggs</td>
<td>Nora Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Judd</td>
<td>Nigel Self</td>
<td>Norbert Borbely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Kambic</td>
<td>Niki Nakada</td>
<td>Noreen Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick LaSorsa</td>
<td>Niklas Johnsson</td>
<td>Norian Valencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Manzi</td>
<td>Nikolai De Malvinsky</td>
<td>Norma Delgaudio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Maridon</td>
<td>Nikolas Greenson</td>
<td>Norma Wolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Mattea</td>
<td>Nikolas Wilhelm</td>
<td>Norman Ghiglieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Milcevski</td>
<td>Nima Sinclair</td>
<td>Norman Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Mucha</td>
<td>Nina Marrman</td>
<td>Norman Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Rodin</td>
<td>Nina Marsh</td>
<td>Nova Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Saporito</td>
<td>Nina McAlexander</td>
<td>Noya Kansky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicki Player</td>
<td>Nina Schlobohm</td>
<td>Npie Hep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickolas Lemas</td>
<td>Noah Best</td>
<td>Nuupure Toulemonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nico Galindo</td>
<td>Noah Brigham</td>
<td>Nuvia Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Sirarides</td>
<td>Noah Brooks</td>
<td>Nydia Jane White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Nyoman Rust
Nyra Ramsey
Ocean Marikos
Odalis Heras Torres
Odessa Cross
Odette Santos
Oksana Chabanenko
Ola Monaghan
Ola Mugnier
Ole Christensen
Olga Hammond
Oliver Kersey
Oliver Pechner
Oliver Ma
Oliver Warren
Oliver Ziff
Olivia Burtt
Olivia Donnelly
Olivia Joyce
Olivia Long
Olivia Maennche
Olivia Osborne
Olivia Rasmussen
Olivia Soto Martinez
Olivier Joly
Olof Siljeholm
Oluywayomi Akinkugbe
Omar Devlin
Omar Guerrerotr
Ona Tigue
Onagh Nichols
Orlando Banos
Orlando Quiroz
Orsolya Salzberg
Oscar Fernandez
Oscar Galdamez Mijango
Oscar Gonzalez
Oscar Guierrez
Oscar Gutierrez
Oscar Monroy
Oscar Paz
Oscar Urquiza
Osman Isvan
Owen Marks
Owen Shimokawa
Pa Lee
Pablo Castro
Pablo Kiger
Pablo Riviere
Paige Curtis
Paige Dixon
Paige McQuillan
Paloma Medina
Pam Nabor
Pam Stevenson
Pamela Anderson
Pamela Barrick
Pamela Buecher
Pamela Comstock
Pamela Del Secco
Pamela Easton
Pamela Flynn
Pamela Hersey
Pamela Matias
Pamela Matuas
Pamela Narcus
Pamela Rivas
Pamela Samuelson
Pamela Secco
Pamela Sweeney
Pamela Waltman
Pamela Way
Panagos Pateras
Pandora Coleman
Paris Lahman
Parisa Jensen
Parrish Correa
Pat Horner
Pa\'i Lynn
Pat McCormack
Pa\'i McGillin
Pat Wright
Pa\'i Pitts
Patrice Beckstrom
Patrice Boyle
Patrice Moran
Patricia Blanchette
Patricia Craig
Patricia Daniels
Patricia Davis
Patricia Dodson
Patricia Duncan
Patricia Eggers
Patricia Green
Patricia Griffin
Patricia Hansen
Patricia Hargadon
Patricia Hayes
Patricia Hogan
Patricia Horton
Patricia Jimenez
Patricia Kaiser
Patricia Koch
Patricia Lancaster
Patricia LeClair
Patricia Lester
Patricia Lezin
Patricia McCarron
Patricia McGlynn
Patricia McGrath
Patricia Medina
Patricia Morris
Patricia Newby
Patricia Nolan
Patricia O'Keefe
Patricia Orozco
Patricia Romo
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patricia Rotolo</th>
<th>Patrick Thomas</th>
<th>Paul Herd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Schork</td>
<td>Patrick true</td>
<td>Paul Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Schwenne</td>
<td>Patrick Turner</td>
<td>Paul Hostetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Steinfurth</td>
<td>Patrick Walker</td>
<td>Paul Iverson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Stepovich</td>
<td>Patrick Ward</td>
<td>Paul Jacobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Stinger</td>
<td>Patti Barnett</td>
<td>Paul Kanieski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Trayer</td>
<td>Patti Waldron</td>
<td>Paul Karz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia York</td>
<td>Patty Becker</td>
<td>Paul Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Barry</td>
<td>Patty Ciesla</td>
<td>Paul Lennon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Bisconti</td>
<td>Patty Garcia</td>
<td>Paul Lessard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Blue</td>
<td>Patty Talbott</td>
<td>Paul Lockwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Buonsante</td>
<td>Patty Winters</td>
<td>Paul McIntosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Carcerano</td>
<td>Paul Allen</td>
<td>Paul McKenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Carstens</td>
<td>Paul Balox</td>
<td>Paul Mcneil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Collins</td>
<td>Paul Bellerjeau</td>
<td>Paul Mecozi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Dale</td>
<td>Paul Binding</td>
<td>Paul Moffino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Darrough</td>
<td>Paul Bobboe</td>
<td>Paul Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Denney</td>
<td>Paul Bouwsma</td>
<td>Paul Niday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Faith</td>
<td>Paul Boyer</td>
<td>Paul Padgett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Fillner</td>
<td>Paul Brindel</td>
<td>Paul Petricevich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Golligher</td>
<td>Paul Brock</td>
<td>Paul Pisarri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Haywood</td>
<td>Paul Brown</td>
<td>Paul Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Hohmann</td>
<td>Paul Burgin</td>
<td>Paul Richeson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Li</td>
<td>Paul Calhoun</td>
<td>Paul Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Jimenez</td>
<td>Paul Candelaria</td>
<td>Paul Schraub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Leamer</td>
<td>Paul Crotwell</td>
<td>Paul Schwartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Lewis</td>
<td>Paul Dandurand</td>
<td>Paul Skiscim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Malo</td>
<td>Paul Dionne</td>
<td>Paul Szlizepanek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Mannion</td>
<td>Paul Donor</td>
<td>Paul Tardif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Mcdermott</td>
<td>Paul Doyon</td>
<td>Paul Torrez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McDonald</td>
<td>Paul Frost</td>
<td>Paul Wagener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McGrath</td>
<td>Paul Gallagher</td>
<td>Paul Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Molanchon</td>
<td>Paul Galli</td>
<td>Paul Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Mrozowski</td>
<td>Paul Gaylon</td>
<td>Paul Willis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick People</td>
<td>Paul Googe</td>
<td>Paul Winiariski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Powers</td>
<td>Paul Grilley</td>
<td>Paula Fries Reuschling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Purcell</td>
<td>Paul Haberman</td>
<td>Paula Gervasoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Silva</td>
<td>Paul Hanneman</td>
<td>Paula Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Slavin</td>
<td>Paul Havlak</td>
<td>Paula Medeiros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Recipient:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**Letter:** Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paula Montesinos</th>
<th>Peter Reitano</th>
<th>Peter Vizzzusi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paula Pinsoneault</td>
<td>Peter Ackerman</td>
<td>Peter Walz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Woods</td>
<td>Peter Bajorek</td>
<td>Peter Wampler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paule Brie</td>
<td>Peter Barnum</td>
<td>Peter Whiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulette Burgin</td>
<td>Peter Bartlett</td>
<td>Peter Wilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulette Hogan</td>
<td>Peter Bauer</td>
<td>Peter Willits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Feyereisen</td>
<td>Peter Belew</td>
<td>Peter Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Naber</td>
<td>Peter Carlson</td>
<td>Petra Probert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Phillips</td>
<td>Peter Cerecedes</td>
<td>Petronella Van Dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavle Jeremic</td>
<td>Peter Chester</td>
<td>Phil Hines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavlovich Linda</td>
<td>Peter Cross</td>
<td>Phil Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paweeana Langan</td>
<td>Peter Davis</td>
<td>Phil Sharfeinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedor Gonzales</td>
<td>Peter Delfino</td>
<td>Phil Stotts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Franco</td>
<td>Peter Doven</td>
<td>Philip Baer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Gonzales</td>
<td>Peter Ellis</td>
<td>Philip Barron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Hernandez</td>
<td>Peter Emanuel</td>
<td>Philip Condon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Barker</td>
<td>Peter Gaechke</td>
<td>Philip Vogel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Curran</td>
<td>Peter Gillett</td>
<td>Philippe Herrou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Ferguson</td>
<td>Peter Golbetz</td>
<td>Philippe Kahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy O'Shea</td>
<td>Peter Goodman</td>
<td>Philips Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Smith</td>
<td>Peter Haworth</td>
<td>Phillip Ayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penelope Sargent</td>
<td>Peter Hester</td>
<td>Phillip Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennie Allen</td>
<td>Peter Hiskes</td>
<td>Phillip Henri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Chesluk</td>
<td>Peter Knego</td>
<td>Phillip Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Ellis</td>
<td>Peter Koht</td>
<td>Phillip Rockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Kelley</td>
<td>Peter Lansdale</td>
<td>Phillip Rupp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Tenorio</td>
<td>Peter Matulich</td>
<td>Phillip Sowden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Vaughn</td>
<td>Peter Meehan</td>
<td>Philips Monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Gjerde</td>
<td>Peter Reiter</td>
<td>Phineas Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Beach</td>
<td>Peter Rigby</td>
<td>Phoebe Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perian Fein</td>
<td>Peter Rothschild</td>
<td>Phoebe Gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perla Hurtado</td>
<td>Peter Sardellitto</td>
<td>Phoenix Pettet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Fox</td>
<td>Peter Scholz</td>
<td>Phyllis Forsyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Olsen</td>
<td>Peter Smee</td>
<td>Phyllis Levin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Christensen</td>
<td>Peter Stanger</td>
<td>Phyllis Menard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Feurtado</td>
<td>Peter Stroot</td>
<td>Pierce Brownstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Hunkel</td>
<td>Peter Szydlowski</td>
<td>Piero Lorenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Kinkead</td>
<td>Peter Townsend</td>
<td>Pierre Boettner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Lew</td>
<td>Peter Truman</td>
<td>Pilar Cox-Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

| Pilar Glucks                  | Rachel Cypher              | Rajan Khokhar              |
| Pilarchrysstyna Allen        | Rachel DiBattista          | Rajiv Sabharwal            |
| Renggli                      | Rachel Frankl              | Rafeigh Parrott            |
| Polly Vaughn                 | Rachel Freeman             | Raíene Henry               |
| Powwa Coomer                 | Rachel Glassberg           | Ralph Berman               |
| Prad Faling                  | Rachel Grad                | Ralph Gomez                |
| Premwattie Sawh              | Rachel Heberly             | Ralph Harel                |
| Presley Heath                | Rachel Hollander           | Ralph Torrisi              |
| Preston Dyson                | Rachel Johnson             | Ramananda Drew             |
| Preston Nelson               | Rachel Kolyer              | Rameena Stubendorff        |
| Price Dean                   | Rachel Mayo                | Rami Alrwais               |
| Price Foulger                | Rachel Morpeth             | Rami Ayyad                 |
| Prima Hernandez              | Rachel Pariseau            | Ramiro Marischal           |
| Prince Lawsha                | Rachel Roessler            | Ramon Aban                 |
| Priscilla Felix              | Rachel Rose                | Ramon Haut                 |
| Priscilla Hannahan           | Rachel Roush               | Ramona Abundis             |
| Priscilla Higgins            | Rachel Sandobal            | Ramona Jacinto             |
| Priscilla Lopez              | Rachel Stoll               | Ramona Porter              |
| Pritisheel Bangh             | Rachel Straw               | Ramona Richard             |
| Priva Tarbet                 | Rachel Sutter              | Ramona Richerd             |
| Puluiyee Tse                 | Rachel Van Cott            | Rana Aziz                  |
| Punit Parmar                 | Rachel Whiting             | Randal Curran              |
| Purea Koenig                 | Rachel Wisotsky            | Randal Kleis               |
| Pveet Gill                   | Rachel Wohlander           | Randall Curran             |
| Quan Nguyen                  | Rachelle Yellin            | Randall Finchum            |
| Quentin Shaeffer             | Rachmat Martin             | Randall Jacobsen           |
| Quinn Chalmers               | Radha Vignola              | Randall Nacamuoli          |
| Quinn Litten                 | Rae Steward                | Randall Venn               |
| R. Buckminster               | Raedawn Bohn               | Randall Wiese              |
| Ra Birhan                    | Raedid Farhat              | Randhi Martinez            |
| Ra Segura                    | Rafael Barreto Blanco      | Randolph Masters           |
| Rachael Brown                | Rafael Diaz                | Randy Abel                 |
| Rachael Cash                 | Rafael Gallardo            | Randy Bynum                |
| Rachael Chapman              | Rafael Monroy              | Randy Garverick            |
| Rachael Henrichsen           | Rafael Osuna               | Randy Grimes               |
| Rachael Sotos                | Rafael Reyes               | Randy Harrell              |
| Rachel Adney                 | Rafael Rochin              | Randy Hart                 |
| Rachel Anderson              | Rafael Torres              | Randy Marty                |
| Rachel Beauregard            | Rain Greenslate            | Randy Polliard             |
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

| Randy Repass       | Rebecca Dutro       | Regis McCann       |
| Raquel Perez       | Rebecca Finn        | Red Anderson       |
| Raquel Talarico    | Rebecca Fresco      | Red Poole          |
| Rare Riley         | Rebecca Hall        | Reja Bolwell       |
| Rashel Advagnn     | Rebecca Holmes      | Reka Levine        |
| Raul Gonzalez      | Rebecca Irelan      | Reina Hernandez    |
| Raul Hernandez     | Rebecca Jot         | Rema Hanna         |
| Raul Robero        | Rebecca King        | Remy Gatinis       |
| Raul Rocha         | Rebecca Knorr       | Renate Silvey      |
| Raul Soto          | Rebecca Lundberg    | Rene Denevan       |
| Ray Apolksis       | Rebecca Miller      | Rene Lopez Enrique |
| Ray Arias          | Rebecca Moon        | Rene Netter        |
| Ray Connelly       | Rebecca Moreno      | Rene Ramirez       |
| Ray Espinoza       | Rebecca Mussetter    | Rene Reineiro      |
| Ray Evert          | Rebecca Nolan       | Rene Sebold        |
| Ray Myers          | Rebecca Peters-Campbell | Renee Cortez  |
| Ray Rauffman       | Rebecca Picker      | Renee Costa        |
| Ray Spinelli       | Rebecca Porter      | Renee DeLisle      |
| Ray Tousseau       | Rebecca Raney       | Renee DeMar        |
| Ray Welsh          | Rebecca Riccabona   | Renee Fossati      |
| Rayette Andrews    | Rebecca Sulay       | Renee Ghisletta    |
| Raymond Garcia     | Rebecca Thielbar    | Renee Kimes        |
| Raymond Thomas     | Rebecca Verlaque    | Renee McCormick    |
| Raymundo Salinas   | Rebecca Whisnant    | Renee Roberts      |
| Raymundo Villalba  | Rebecca Wurster     | Renee Robison      |
| Reb Botelho        | Rebekah Cassar      | Renee Rosky        |
| Rebecca Ann Knorr  | Rebekah Freels      | Renee Rudzinski    |
| Rebecca Borghi     | Rebekah Horvath     | Renee Russo        |
| Rebecca Brokaw     | Rebekah Loy         | Renee Snow         |
| Rebecca Byron Kleis| Redmond Walton      | Renee Tomer        |
| Rebecca Carey      | Reed Dahlmeier      | Renee Waggener     |
| Rebecca Carle      | Reed Duffus         | Renzo Staiano      |
| Rebecca Casas      | Reed Hastings       | Rethel Davis       |
| Rebecca Cole       | Reed Zimpfer        | Reto Stamm         |
| Rebecca Colligan   | Reed Zimpger        | Rewzo Staiano      |
| Rebecca Cope       | Regina Drysdale     | Rex Harris         |
| Rebecca Crane      | Regina Falkner      | Rex Olivieri       |
| Rebecca Dickson    | Regina Judson       | Reynaldo Jaquez    |
| Rebecca Downing    | Regina Martinez      | Reyna Garcia       |
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Reyna Lingemann
Reyna Simon
Reynalda Valdez
Rhianna Mason
Rhiannon Crain
Rhoda Collins
Rhonda Carter
Rhonda Carvalho
Rhonda Harris
Rhonda Howard Vachon
Rhonda McCormack
Rhonda Schlosser
Rhonda Vachon
Rhonda Van Dyk
Ri Kleins
Ricardo Landa
Ricardo Vitranlo
Rich Ignatowicz
Rich Lidia
Rich Mcmillan
Rich Scholten
Rich Suchomel
Rich Taylor
Richael Volheim
Richard Andre
Richard Armendariz
Richard Bedal
Richard Bernier
Richard Bernstein
Richard Bernardien
Richard Burke
Richard Byrd
Richard Caldarella
Richard Chipman
Richard Constantino
Richard Corcoran
Richard Cray
Richard Cueller
Richard Curtin
Richard Gonzales
Richard Gross
Richard Gudino
Richard Hardiman
Richard Hislip
Richard Hornbeck
Richard Huang
Richard Josephson
Richard Kollmar
Richard Latorraca
Richard Liddenbaum
Richard Lippi
Richard Lujan
Richard Magen
Richard Manning
Richard Marks
Richard Marshall
Richard Mccullar
Richard Metz
Richard Murphy
Richard Ogden
Richard Palm
Richard Pasquali
Richard Pender
Richard Perez
Richard Phister
Richard Riley
Richard Roark
Richard Rogers
Richard Rouillard
Richard S
Richard Sanders
Richard Schuppert
Richard Shedden
Richard Siciliano
Richard Siegler
Richard Silveira
Richard Singer
Richard Smith
Richard Spencer
Richard Tessen
Richard Van Auken
Richard Veil
Richard Villa
Richard Walsh
Richard Whitten
Richard Wyrsc
Richardo Vitrano
Rick Bar
Rick Boyle
Rick Donnelly
Rick Flores
Rick Garrett
Rick Harrison
Rick Hawkins
Rick Holmes
Rick Krakowski
Rick Lyons
Rick Magnuson
Rick Melatti
Rick Puckett
Rick Rendick
Rick Rinaldi
Rick Smith
Rick Vento
Rick Weiss
Rick Whitcomb
Rickey Childs
Rickey Ramseur
Rickey Cheung
Rigo Arreola
Rigo Rodriguez
Rigoberto De La Torre
Rikard Kjellberg
Rikki Bell
Rikki Eriksen
Rikki Grober-Eriksen
Riley Brazell
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riley Fischer</th>
<th>Robert Cornejo</th>
<th>Robert McLain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riley Fishcer</td>
<td>Robert Currie</td>
<td>Robert Moreno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley Harn</td>
<td>Robert Deacon</td>
<td>Robert Myrland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rina Weingold</td>
<td>Robert Derenia</td>
<td>Robert Nunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinda Kiesler</td>
<td>Robert DuBois</td>
<td>Robert Overson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risa Locke</td>
<td>Robert Eberle</td>
<td>Robert Packer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishab Malik</td>
<td>Robert Ellenwood</td>
<td>Robert Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Chaffin</td>
<td>Robert Faus</td>
<td>Robert Perhach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Manna</td>
<td>Robert Feist</td>
<td>Robert Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritch Haselden</td>
<td>Robert Feldman</td>
<td>Robert Pitman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riva Canton</td>
<td>Robert Flores</td>
<td>Robert Quinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rman Olivier</td>
<td>Robert Florin</td>
<td>Robert Rathburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Armenti</td>
<td>Robert Foxworth</td>
<td>Robert San Miguel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Branch</td>
<td>Robert Fuller</td>
<td>Robert Smeenk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Crompton</td>
<td>Robert Garner</td>
<td>Robert Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Marani</td>
<td>Robert Giattino</td>
<td>Robert Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Myis</td>
<td>Robert Gibbs</td>
<td>Robert Stephens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Raffaelli</td>
<td>Robert Glynn</td>
<td>Robert Stinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Ruedi</td>
<td>Robert Halbach</td>
<td>Robert Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Sanders</td>
<td>Robert Harris</td>
<td>Robert Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Wels</td>
<td>Robert Harrison</td>
<td>Robert Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Weiss</td>
<td>Robert Henry</td>
<td>Robert Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbie Blackwell</td>
<td>Robert Hitt</td>
<td>Robert Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Adelman</td>
<td>Robert Hogan</td>
<td>Robert Wyland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Alcorn</td>
<td>Robert Jackson</td>
<td>Robert Wynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Baertsch</td>
<td>Robert Jarvis</td>
<td>Robert Xiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Baud</td>
<td>Robert Johnson</td>
<td>Roberta Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Baur</td>
<td>Robert Johnstone</td>
<td>Roberta McGann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Beede</td>
<td>Robert Jones</td>
<td>Roberta Norskog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bicoff</td>
<td>Robert Justice</td>
<td>Roberta Viviani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bischoff</td>
<td>Robert Karz</td>
<td>Roberto Magana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bless</td>
<td>Robert Kawamoto</td>
<td>Roberto Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bohnen</td>
<td>Robert Kincheloe</td>
<td>Roberto Zamora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bowman</td>
<td>Robert Kronisch</td>
<td>Robin Aronson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brown</td>
<td>Robert Lindow</td>
<td>Robin Beecher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Cain</td>
<td>Robert Mann</td>
<td>Robin Berman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Campbell</td>
<td>Robert Martone</td>
<td>Robin Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Carpenter</td>
<td>Robert Matias</td>
<td>Robin Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Clarke</td>
<td>Robert Matthews</td>
<td>Robin Brune</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Robbie Chase
Robin Chase
Robin Cross
Robin Dearinger
Robin Everest
Robin Fillner
Robin Gardner
Robin Holland
Robin McDuff
Robin Morrison
Robin Nacamucri
Robin Phelps
Robin Saravia
Robin Sarles
Robin Stockwell
Robin Williams
Roby Behrens
Robyn Beagle
Robyn Coppedge
Robyn Kleffman
Robyn Ross
Rocco Costanza
Rocco Falcomato
Rochelle Saxton
Rocio Ramirez
Rocio Sullivan
Rock Leum
Rocky Vervatos
Rod Langley
Rod Mendelsohn
Rod Mowbray
Roderick Bruce
Roderick Larsen
Roderick MacLeod
Rodney Gonzalez
Rodney Kelly
Rodney Markle
Rodney Sellers
Rodney Williams
Rodofo Ortiz
Rodolfo Manriquez
Rodrigo Ramirez
Rodrigo Robinson
Roger Acosta
Roger Anderson
Roger Bernstein
Roger Chaffin
Roger Douglass
Roger Dunfield
Roger Bowen
Roger Mckowen
Roger Waddell
Roland Rivera
Roland Sharp
Rolland Hammerness
Rolly Henn
Roman Marin
Roman Randman
Romina WaldBurger
Ron Bailey
Ron Chaney
Ron Elkins
Ron Goodman
Ron Gordon
Ron Gosswiller
Ron Jones
Ron Kinninger
Ron McIntire
Ron Pohlert
Ron Rackley
Ron Record
Ron Sabbatis
Ron Silva
Ron Sinoway
Ron Winitzky
Ronald Bingham
Ronald Bourret
Ronald Cook
Ronald Davis
Ronald Derby
Ronald Rook
Ronald Simons
Ronda Knudsen
Ronda Rice
Ron de la Pena
Ronnie Felix
Ronnie Frazier
Ronnie Garcia
Roy Howland
Roy Walsh
Rosa Sharp
Rosa Tirado
Rosalba callero
Rosalie Bruning
Rosalie Castro
Rosalie Griego
Rosalva Gallo
Rosalyn Gandara
Rosana Lomeli
Rosario Sicaliros
Rose Arellano
Rose Ashford
Rose Beam
Rose Carrera
Rose Filicetti
Rose Lacey
Rose McPherren
Rose White
Roseanne Prevost-Morgan
Rosemarie Cauda
Rosemarie Peoples
Rosemary Chasey
Rosemary Hughes
Rosemary Milich
Rosemary Sutton
Rosendo Limón
Roseno Villalobos
Rosi Rocha
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosie Cerda</th>
<th>Ruth Mehr</th>
<th>Ryan Ramirez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosie Zepeda</td>
<td>Ruth Selvidge</td>
<td>Ryan Sarnataro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossana Bruni</td>
<td>Ryan Allen</td>
<td>Ryan Shapiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouchann Kountz</td>
<td>Ryan Austin</td>
<td>Ryan Sillsbee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana Mehl</td>
<td>Ryan Bailey</td>
<td>Ryan Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxane Stanley</td>
<td>Ryan Barrett</td>
<td>Ryan West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne Arclias</td>
<td>Ryan Brady</td>
<td>Ryan Whitelaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne Baker</td>
<td>Ryan Brown</td>
<td>Ryan Zash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne Rothafel</td>
<td>Ryan Buckholdt</td>
<td>Ryder Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxy Kumagal</td>
<td>Ryan Buell</td>
<td>Ryan Pickett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Horn</td>
<td>Ryan Burgess</td>
<td>Rylee McCullin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Kaplan</td>
<td>Ryan Burr</td>
<td>Rylee Rentschler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Segura</td>
<td>Ryan Cannon-Scott</td>
<td>S. Burk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Fincher</td>
<td>Ryan Colligan</td>
<td>S. Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozalyn Henderson</td>
<td>Ryan Daniele</td>
<td>S. Slaughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozalynn Erickson</td>
<td>Ryan Delanda</td>
<td>S. Suresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruapil Rakshit Patel</td>
<td>Ryan Diller</td>
<td>S. Waiyaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubie Kawamoto</td>
<td>Ryan Downey</td>
<td>Sabina Bukovec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Bakhti</td>
<td>Ryan Edwards</td>
<td>Kendrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Domino</td>
<td>Ryan Evans</td>
<td>Sabra Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Esqueda</td>
<td>Ryan Farris</td>
<td>Sabrina Beyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Nunez</td>
<td>Ryan Ganjomari</td>
<td>Sabrina Bohbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Ramirez</td>
<td>Ryan Garcia</td>
<td>Sabrina Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudolf Gausing</td>
<td>Ryan Glanville</td>
<td>Sacha DeFoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy Gonzales</td>
<td>Ryan Grable</td>
<td>Sachin Khalsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RuiHao Wei</td>
<td>Ryan Hammond</td>
<td>Sadik Chahib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupal Patel</td>
<td>Ryan Hoffman</td>
<td>Sage Leibenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Forbes</td>
<td>Ryan Hoye</td>
<td>Sahar Shawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Harris</td>
<td>Ryan Hughes</td>
<td>Saidah Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Hobbs</td>
<td>Ryan Koehler</td>
<td>Sakari Sanker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Jordan</td>
<td>Ryan Lee</td>
<td>Saket Vora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Robinson</td>
<td>Ryan LeGassick</td>
<td>Sal Mendolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Baldwin</td>
<td>Ryan Legere</td>
<td>Salina Brice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Lake</td>
<td>Ryan McGrath</td>
<td>Sally Buser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Simpkins</td>
<td>Ryan Morper</td>
<td>Sally De La Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Skinder</td>
<td>Ryan Muller</td>
<td>Sally Dix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Woodmansee</td>
<td>Ryan Munnikhuys</td>
<td>Sally Dyrdahl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Diaz</td>
<td>Ryan Nyberg</td>
<td>Sally Gwin-Satterlee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Garland</td>
<td>Ryan Parola</td>
<td>Sally Hicks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sally Hodges</th>
<th>Sami Weiser</th>
<th>Sandra Rettner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sally Johnson-Putica</td>
<td>Samira Hartje</td>
<td>Sandra Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Mitchell</td>
<td>Samuel Adelson</td>
<td>Sandra Rubio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Munro</td>
<td>Samuel Applegate</td>
<td>Sandra Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally O'halloran</td>
<td>Samuel Cushman</td>
<td>Sandra Sottomano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Smith-Weymouth</td>
<td>Samuel Earnshaw</td>
<td>Sandra Vantilburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Vaughn</td>
<td>Samuel Gudino</td>
<td>Sandra Weiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Wilson</td>
<td>Samuel Hipkins</td>
<td>Sandra Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally-Christine Rodgers</td>
<td>Samuel Hite</td>
<td>Sandra Zepeda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Manzo</td>
<td>Samuel Liberatore</td>
<td>Sandrea Roth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Pedroza</td>
<td>Samuel Mandel</td>
<td>Sandrine Georges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Perdoza</td>
<td>Samuel Moore</td>
<td>Sands Palumbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Rubalcava</td>
<td>Samuel Nichols</td>
<td>Sandy Baron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Vazquez</td>
<td>Samuel Randazzo</td>
<td>Sandy Cline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvetoria Larter</td>
<td>Samuel Ross Jones</td>
<td>Sandy Feretto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Denicola</td>
<td>Samuel Selvan</td>
<td>Sandy Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Leon</td>
<td>Samuel Simpson</td>
<td>Sandy Kolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Pederson</td>
<td>Samuel Sutton</td>
<td>Sandy Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Penniman</td>
<td>Samuel Williamson</td>
<td>Sandy Moreto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Roberts</td>
<td>San Juan Perez-Luna</td>
<td>Sandy Novembre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Shields</td>
<td>Sanchez Delsy</td>
<td>Sandy Skees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Solgan</td>
<td>Sandi Moore</td>
<td>Sandy Skezas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Storey</td>
<td>Sandi Rechenmacher</td>
<td>Sanjay Zope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Verar</td>
<td>Sandra Caruba</td>
<td>Sanjin Mehic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Birmingham</td>
<td>Sandra Cohen</td>
<td>Sanne Stockwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Brown</td>
<td>Sandra Cox</td>
<td>Sanra Ritten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Garrison</td>
<td>Sandra Demara</td>
<td>Santhrire Menon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Heredia</td>
<td>Sandra Esparza</td>
<td>Santiago Mendoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Lang</td>
<td>Sandra Frahm</td>
<td>Saoimanu Sope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Limas</td>
<td>Sandra Gogol</td>
<td>Sara Allshouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha McDonald</td>
<td>Sandra Hager</td>
<td>Sara Alvarez Narragon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha McEvoy</td>
<td>Sandra Heinen</td>
<td>Sara Biakanja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Mitchell</td>
<td>Sandra Hernandez</td>
<td>Sara Burkhamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha O'shea</td>
<td>Sandra Kamirez</td>
<td>Sara Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Ramirez</td>
<td>Sandra Kelly</td>
<td>Sara Dietrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Reek</td>
<td>Sandra Lobato</td>
<td>Sara Isenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Schmitz</td>
<td>Sandra Olson</td>
<td>Sara Ledterman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Sommer</td>
<td>Sandra Paredez</td>
<td>Sara Margolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Roberts</td>
<td>Sandra Perez</td>
<td>Sara Marsals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Sarah Melton
Sarah Montalvo
Sarah Rauch
Sarah Ridgeway
Sarah Solovitch
Sarah Stem
Sarah Swenson
Sarah Urzua
Sarah Albright
Sarah Augenstein
Sarah Brady
Sarah Buonsante
Sarah Butler
Sarah Cahalan
Sarah Carvill
Sarah Cheek
Sarah Cohen Domont
Sarah Cowen
Sarah Curry
Sarah DeClue
Sarah DeMeyer-Guyer
Sarah Fraley
Sarah Guidon
Sarah Hannaleck
Sarah Hulick
Sarah Jordan
Sarah Joy Zell
Sarah Kunkel
Sarah Kwasniewski
Sarah Laclergue
Sarah Lanham
Sarah Lasttion
Sarah Leonard
Sarah Magdaleno
Sarah Marra
Sarah Marschall
Sarah McLaughlin
Sarah Mora
Sarah Nie
Sarah Nohrden
Sarah Peck
Sarah Pittiglio
Sarah Powell
Sarah Prescher
Sarah Rapp
Sarah Robinson
Sarah Sanford
Sarah Savasky
Sarah Shinsky
Sarah Steiger
Sarah Walsh
Sarah Welch
Sarahy Argueta
Sarah Alvarado
Sarah Jimenez
Sarah Zayas
Saralee McCormick
Sarina Fulmer
Sasha Wyldes
Saul Alvarado
Saul Zamora
Sava nna Dayton
Savannah Jones
Savannah Rodriguez
Savitri Jones
Schauntel Gomez
Scot Pettit
Scott Andersen
Scott Auerbach
Scott Biggane
Scott Bongiorno
Scott Brandt
Scott Branham
Scott Braymer
Scott Carter
Scott Cervine
Scott Collins
Scott Curwen
Scott Dubois
Scott Edelstein
Scott Edward
Scott Edwards
Scott Farber
Scott Gambrill
Scott Harway
Scott Hillberg
Scott Hovey
Scott Hughes
Scott Joly
Scott Lange
Scott Legget
Scott Lesan
Scott Mack
Scott Mary
Scott Mcinnis
Scott Montgomery
Scott Munro
Scott Neben
Scott Mcinnis
Scott Nebenzahl
Scott Nguyen
Scott Owen
Scott Player
Scott Rader
Scott Roseman
Scott Rowe
Scott Russo
Scott Sage
Scott Silva
Scott St. Denis
Scott Sweetman
Scott Weir
Scott Wilkinson
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Scott Zmiewsky
Sean Andrasik
Sean Basalygo
Sean Bradley
Sean Butler

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
# Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

**Recipient:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
**Letter:** Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sean DeGaetano</th>
<th>Sergio Jurado</th>
<th>Shannon Demma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sean Dowling</td>
<td>Sergio Martinez</td>
<td>Shannon Freed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Estes</td>
<td>Sergio Mercado</td>
<td>Shannon Healer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Fyock</td>
<td>Sergio Rojas</td>
<td>Shannon Innis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Hallett</td>
<td>Sergio Rubio</td>
<td>Shannon Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Hegarty</td>
<td>Sergio Torchio</td>
<td>Shannon Lacey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Joyce</td>
<td>Serina Marichiba</td>
<td>Shannon Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Kagan</td>
<td>Seth Burger</td>
<td>Shanti Wertz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Kane</td>
<td>Seth Heitzenrater</td>
<td>Sharai Simpkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Landry</td>
<td>Seth Reder</td>
<td>Sharareh Khosrowpanah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Mathis</td>
<td>Sevilla Granger</td>
<td>Sharen Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean McAdam</td>
<td>Shade Byron</td>
<td>Shari Laroche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Moriarty</td>
<td>Shae Haney</td>
<td>Shari Levitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Mulvaney</td>
<td>Shahe Moutafian</td>
<td>Shari Nison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean O'Meara</td>
<td>Shahnawaz Hr</td>
<td>Sharon Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Oneill</td>
<td>Shahnaz Moshtael</td>
<td>Sharon Calderon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Petersen</td>
<td>Shain Holden</td>
<td>Sharon Curtaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Reilly</td>
<td>Shakira Meden</td>
<td>Sharon Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Romero</td>
<td>Shakti Wilson</td>
<td>Sharon Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Spencer</td>
<td>Shalamar White</td>
<td>Sharon Hada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Tragni</td>
<td>Shalray George</td>
<td>Sharon Himmelsbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Tuttmann</td>
<td>Shamim Punnilath</td>
<td>Sharon Hoyenga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Watt</td>
<td>Shana Cohen</td>
<td>Sharon Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Wells</td>
<td>Shanda Lucero</td>
<td>Sharon Kluger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Woolery</td>
<td>Shane Bell</td>
<td>Sharon Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeanPaul La Selle</td>
<td>Shane Furtado</td>
<td>Sharon Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seb Frey</td>
<td>Shane Heath</td>
<td>Sharon Pepper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian De Francesco</td>
<td>Shane Kloepfer</td>
<td>Sharon Potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Little</td>
<td>Shane Maloney</td>
<td>Sharon Rea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segah Meer</td>
<td>Shane Siemer</td>
<td>Sharon Reeves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selane Eapinoza</td>
<td>Shane Struthers</td>
<td>Sharon Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selene Vega</td>
<td>Shane Toohey</td>
<td>Sharon Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selesha Webster</td>
<td>Shanee Dinay</td>
<td>Sharon Swenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serafin Ruiz</td>
<td>Shahnia Rocha</td>
<td>Sharron Locatelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serena Federman</td>
<td>Shanna De Diego</td>
<td>Sharyl Maravlov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergey Frolov</td>
<td>Shannen Stark</td>
<td>Shashi Gies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Diaz</td>
<td>Shannon Blake</td>
<td>Shaun Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Hernandez</td>
<td>Shannon Christerson</td>
<td>Shaun Chesnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Ibarra</td>
<td>Shannon Corbin</td>
<td>Shaun Tan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shauna Mora</th>
<th>Sherri Allen</th>
<th>Silva Sam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Anderson</td>
<td>Sherri Betz</td>
<td>Silverio Vasquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Coulson</td>
<td>Sherri Soder</td>
<td>Simon Enix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Dollar</td>
<td>Sherry Ascaer</td>
<td>Simone Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Gallup</td>
<td>Sherry Livingston</td>
<td>Sina Miri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Hyland</td>
<td>Sheryl Coulston</td>
<td>Sira Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Kelly</td>
<td>Sheryl McEwan</td>
<td>Siri Rodoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawna Myton</td>
<td>Sheryl Palmer</td>
<td>Skip Getz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayna Kristen</td>
<td>Sheryl Pinard</td>
<td>Skot Colacicco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayne Barr</td>
<td>Sheryle Pettet</td>
<td>Skylar Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayne Brandberg</td>
<td>Sheyna Holmes</td>
<td>Skylar Rousseau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea Johnson</td>
<td>Shiel Neil</td>
<td>Skylar Spaughe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea Maher</td>
<td>Shika Solomon</td>
<td>Skyler Kerrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea Merritt</td>
<td>Shiloh Wernick</td>
<td>Skyler Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheena Cuccia</td>
<td>Shinshu Roberts</td>
<td>Slawek Tulaczyk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Doran</td>
<td>Shirlene Hayashibara</td>
<td>Slim Heilpern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Ellison</td>
<td>Shirley Henfling</td>
<td>Socorro Alfaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Gamban</td>
<td>Shirley Mallman</td>
<td>Sofia Baugher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Giblin</td>
<td>Shirley Marucci</td>
<td>Sofia Bahnner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Malone</td>
<td>Shirley Ortils</td>
<td>Sofia Beck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila McLaughlin-Mayang</td>
<td>Shirley Taylor</td>
<td>Sofia Coelho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Neil</td>
<td>Shirley Terauds</td>
<td>Sofia Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Vince</td>
<td>Shiva Bol</td>
<td>Sofia Graziosi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Williams</td>
<td>Shona McDougall</td>
<td>Sofia Spadosfora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby Frame</td>
<td>Shuuni Houghtaling</td>
<td>Sol Posada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby Rogers</td>
<td>Siamak Tasharofi</td>
<td>Soleil Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Beek</td>
<td>Sibson Simon</td>
<td>Somia King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Kadota</td>
<td>Sibyl Cryer</td>
<td>Sondi Carcello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Stamp</td>
<td>Sibyll Olson</td>
<td>Sondra Cohelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelli Ervin</td>
<td>Sidney Eubanks</td>
<td>Sonia Beatham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Cruddas</td>
<td>Sidney Irving</td>
<td>Sonia Malandon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Escobar</td>
<td>Sidney Nicol</td>
<td>Sonja Ghanetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Nadelman-Douglas</td>
<td>Sierra Darton</td>
<td>Sorja Gustafssen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Ritchie</td>
<td>Sierra Leahy</td>
<td>Sorja Tyesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Sonnenberg</td>
<td>Sierra Nasr</td>
<td>Sorora Sanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheon Maki</td>
<td>Sieta Bel</td>
<td>Sonya Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheree Azeyedo</td>
<td>Sigfrid Garman</td>
<td>Sonya Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Macaya</td>
<td>Sigrid Lonnberg</td>
<td>Sonya Rodriguez-Reyna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherie Benoit</td>
<td>Silka Jewell</td>
<td>Sophia Almendras</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Sophia Catanese
Sophia Ciotti
Sophia Galarosa
Sophia Jaime
Sophia Larman
Sophia Ly
Sophia Weigand
Sophie O'Meara
Soren Bjorn
Spencer Hays
Spencer Takata
Spencer Thompson
Spring Farr
Spring Smith
Srina Lynne
Stacey Basile
Stacey Carroll
Stacey Clima
Stacey Crippen
Stacey Palau
Stacie Clary
Stacy Figueroa
Stacy Frank
Stacy Markell
Stacy Niemen
Stacy Pinkham
Stan Hughes
Stan Poplin
Stan Wolken
Stanley Lundgren
Stanley Voyles
Stanley Wilson
Starr Cellona
Stacie Brightman
Stefan Abreo
Stefani Jones
Stefanie Bourcier
Stefanie Sherman
Stella Winston
Stephani Lewis
Stephanie Barnes Castro
Stephanie Baron
Stephanie Barraza
Stephanie Brown
Stephanie Bush
Stephanie Carlson
Stephanie Diaz
Stephanie Gelman
Stephanie Golino
Stephanie Gomez
Stephanie Harris
Stephanie Kelly
Stephanie Kerwin
Stephanie Layton
Stephanie Le Fever
Stephanie Ortega
Stephanie Rapisardo
Stephanie Russell
Stephanie Sallum
Stephanie Sanders
Stephanie Shaffer
Stephanie Siddens
Stephanie Solorzano
Stephanie Stenner
Stephanie Straus
Stephanie Taylor
Stephanie Head
Stephen Anderson
Stephen Banks
Stephen Bender
Stephen Cupery
Stephen Daddario
Stephen Gagnon
Stephen Hager
Stephen Hauskins
Stephen Kociol
Stephen Kolesar
Stephen Lee
Stephen Maraldo
Stephen Matteson
Stephen Meyer
Stephen Nielsen
Stephen O'Clair
Stephen Pascuni
Stephen Peck
Stephen Phillips
Stephen Rowe
Stephen Shoemaker
Stephen Thomas
Stephen Vahle
Stephen Weldon
Stephen Williams
Stephon Schreiber
Steve Alberi
Steve Anderson
Steve Barber
Steve Beltramo
Steve Bock
Steve Boyd
Steve Clark
Steve Davenport
Steve Douglas
Steve Duke
Steve Dunlap
Steve Elpers
Steve Guintero
Steve Hambright
Steve Henderson
Steve Hermosillo
Steve Hernandez
Steve Hilleary
Steve Ilse
Steve Johnson
Steve Kringen
Steve Lake
Steve Lima
Steve Mandel
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## Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steve Matarazzo</th>
<th>Steven Plummer</th>
<th>Summer Zuber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve McGinty</td>
<td>Steven Robins</td>
<td>Sumra Sohail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Miles</td>
<td>Steven Sobotor</td>
<td>Sunjay Mohan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Mills</td>
<td>Steven Travis</td>
<td>Sunny Cardona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Munoz</td>
<td>Steven Venturini</td>
<td>Sunny Hellesoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Murillo</td>
<td>Steven Vermouth</td>
<td>Sunny Rudolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Pereira</td>
<td>Steven Yetter</td>
<td>Susan Andre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Shapiro</td>
<td>Stewart Vaughan</td>
<td>Susan Archibald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Strah</td>
<td>Sthefany Plata</td>
<td>Susan Beatteaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Taty</td>
<td>Stijn Cattaert</td>
<td>Susan Beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Tietz</td>
<td>Struthers Sharor</td>
<td>Susan Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Wait</td>
<td>Stuart Kellerymyer</td>
<td>Susan Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Walters</td>
<td>Stuart Only</td>
<td>Susan Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Watkins</td>
<td>Stuart Rodriguez</td>
<td>Susan Cartwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Webber</td>
<td>Susan Salinger</td>
<td>Susan Cellarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve West</td>
<td>Sudeshna Ghosh</td>
<td>Susan Churchill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Westen</td>
<td>Sue Brenner</td>
<td>Susan Condit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Western</td>
<td>Sue Calcagno</td>
<td>Susan Corey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Yatson</td>
<td>Sue Cross</td>
<td>Susan Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Arkley</td>
<td>Sue Dormanen</td>
<td>Susan Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Bignell</td>
<td>Sue Healey</td>
<td>Susan Cuneo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Bueno</td>
<td>Sue Holt</td>
<td>Susan Daugherty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Gabay</td>
<td>Sue Jamieson</td>
<td>Susan Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Garrett</td>
<td>Sue Loshkajian</td>
<td>Susan DeQuattro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Gibbs</td>
<td>Sue Martin</td>
<td>Susan Dykhuizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Gillanders</td>
<td>Sue Neary</td>
<td>Susan Emerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Grassi</td>
<td>Sue Renner</td>
<td>Susan Erlendson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Greenburg</td>
<td>Sue Rose</td>
<td>Susan Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Haddock</td>
<td>Sue Seely</td>
<td>Susan Ezequelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Hinkel</td>
<td>Sue Stauffer</td>
<td>Susan Farish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Kayser</td>
<td>Sue Uchiyama</td>
<td>Susan Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Krol</td>
<td>Sue Walton</td>
<td>Susan Giddings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Lange</td>
<td>Sue Yuanovich</td>
<td>Susan Giner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Lloyd</td>
<td>Sue-Jean Sung</td>
<td>Susan Griffiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Mcmanus</td>
<td>Sukhmeet Singh</td>
<td>Susan Gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Mendivil</td>
<td>Summer Judice</td>
<td>Susan Haid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Navichogue</td>
<td>Summer Sutherland</td>
<td>Susan Harden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Oliver</td>
<td>Summer Torrez</td>
<td>Susan Holmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Olson</td>
<td>Summer Vanslager</td>
<td>Susan Hurley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Susan Irby
Susan Jaeger
Susan Jarvis
Susan Keil
Susan Kelly
Susan Kincaid
Susan Kohen
Susan Land
Susan Lawson
Susan Lynch
Susan Mahler
Susan Mancusi-Ungaro
Susan Mason
Susan Miller-Chakib
Susan Moen Penprase
Susan Mooke-Rodriguez
Susan Murphy
Susan Norton
Susan Palsma
Susan Peoples
Susan Perchesky
Susan Pierce
Susan Plumez
Susan Reddington
Susan Rines
Susan Roberts
Susan Rolen
Susan Russell
Susan Schaaf
Susan Schwartz
Susan Smith
Susan Stanford
Susan Strnad
Susan Tannehill
Susan Thomas
Susan Waters
Susan Westman
Susan Wheeler
Susan Rocha

Susana Valencia
Susie Cronk
Susie Deutsch
Susie Kusler
Susy Adams
Suwat Chaimungkla
Suzan Sequoia
Suzanne Chonette
Suzanne Davis
Suzanne De Clerq
Suzanne Haley
Suzanne Helfman
Suzanne Jensen
Suzanne Johnson
Suzanne Mace
Suzanne Mapes
Suzanne Marin
Suzanne Morrow
Suzanne Nelsen
Suzanne Patten
Suzanne Rains
Suzanne Roth
Suzanne Samson
Suzanne Sterns
Suzanne Tuescher
Suzi Mahler
Suzi Morgan
Suzie Russin
Suzy Stevens
Sven Wetmore
Sydney Claire Weiser
Sydney Ferris
Sydney Gladu
Sydney Rastatter
Sydney Reuben
Sylvia Hermosillo
Sylvia Patience
Sylvia Skefich
T. Davies

T. Thompson
Tai Li Harrill
Tai Miller
Tai Stone
Takuya Jorgensen
Tali Cohn
Tama Klosmski
Tamar Dolwig
Tamara Carver
Tamara Cook
Tamara Donnelly
Tamara Dow
Tamara Henry
Tamara Morse
Tamara Myers
Tamara Norris
Tamara Riedel
Tamara Sheinkman-Lewis
Tamara Swain
Tamara Tahara
Tamera Martin
Tamera Thomas
Tami Corum
Tami Snook
Tammie Van Sant
Tammy Bush
Tammy Fox
Tammy Hamer
Tammy McBride
Tammy Rogers
Tammy Sager
Tammy Tremaine
Tamra Ancona
Tamra Schmidt
Tamra Scott-Hunt
Tangi Chapman
Tania McAdams
Tania Pannabecker
Tanner Spence

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Tanner Stinchfield
Tannie Low
Tanya Barnicoat
Tanya Bennett
Tanya Phillips
Tanya Poulis
Tara Forrest
Tara Larson
Tara Parcella
Tara Slager
Tarah Locke
Tarek Chakib
Taren Loftis
Tariq Al-Najjar
Taryn Marse
Taryn Yorba
Tascha Haughton
Tate Woniya
Tatiana Gottwald
Tatiana Lima
Tauna Grinager
Tawnya Gilbert
Taylor Dutrow
Taylor Fife
Taylor Finn
Taylor Frame
Taylor Friend
Taylor Kihoi
Taylor Lambert
Taylor Lane
Taylor O'Meara
Taylor Venciil
Taylor Williams
Ted Burke
Ted Carl
Ted Donnelly
Ted Egner
Ted Holladay
Ted Lorek
Ted Provost
Ted Shank
Ted Woods
Tegan James
Tennessee O’hanlon
Tenolian Bell
Teomah Buelna
Tere Fickel
Terence Courreault
Teresa Anaya
Teresa Black
Teresa Godoy
Teresa Lenz
Teresa Leviicki
Teresa Macaluso
Teresa Maguire
Teresa Martinez-Rod
Teresa McCaffrey
Teresa Mogavero
Teresa Olson
Teresa Quintero
Teresa Schneider
Teresa Simpson
Teri Ruegg
Teri Taylor
Terra Mar
Terra Villa Gawboy
Terrence Cohelan
Terrence Willett
Terri Daniels
Terri Foster
Terri Levine
Terri Lodge
Terri Mayall
Terri Ryan
Terri Schmidt
Terri Steinmann
Terri Thames
Terri Tiedeman
Terrie And Larry Duimstra
Terrie Sima
Terry Walters
Terry Bacon
Terry Ballantyne
Terry Brown
Terry Campion
Terry Gripton
Terry Healey
Terry Hershner
Terry Hutmacher
Terry Kirkana
Terry Laucher
Terry Lauchner
Terry Record
Terry Stockwell
Terry Turner
Terry Way
Terry Welsh
Terry Wood
Tessha Craft
Tess Church
Tess Horn
Tessa Cados
Tessa Ramsay
Teyara Hardy
Thaleia Williams
Thania Sanders
Thelma Velazquez
Theodore Cerboneschi
Theodore Jonson
Theresa Biggam
Theresa Helsing
Theresa Mantz
Theresa Neil
Theresa Sullivan
Therese Johannesson
Therese Valdez
Theron Forester

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomas Albrecht</th>
<th>Tiana Hale</th>
<th>Tim Robins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Armstrong</td>
<td>Tico Andrea</td>
<td>Tim Roessler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Beggs</td>
<td>Tiffanie Aguilera</td>
<td>Tim Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bohn</td>
<td>Tiffany Burns</td>
<td>Tim Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bonura</td>
<td>Tiffany Cesarin</td>
<td>Tim Youmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Boser</td>
<td>Tiffany Lindsay</td>
<td>Tim Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Brookins</td>
<td>Tiffany Meyers</td>
<td>Timmi Pereira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Brooks</td>
<td>Tiffany Munoz</td>
<td>Timote Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Burke</td>
<td>Tiffany Smith</td>
<td>Timothy Dinsmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Carr</td>
<td>Tiffany Theden</td>
<td>Timothy Eells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Castillo</td>
<td>Tiffany Werdmuller</td>
<td>Timothy Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Christ</td>
<td>Tiffen Shirey</td>
<td>Timothy Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Davis</td>
<td>Tighe Melville</td>
<td>Timothy Moran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dorst</td>
<td>Tiki Levy</td>
<td>Timothy Oneil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Harrison</td>
<td>Tilly Falsetti</td>
<td>Timothy Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hennessey</td>
<td>Tim Aron</td>
<td>Tin Root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hennessey</td>
<td>Tim Barroca</td>
<td>Tina Bamford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Herzog</td>
<td>Tim Bennett</td>
<td>Tina Mallek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hines</td>
<td>Tim Bone</td>
<td>Tina Ratliff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hood</td>
<td>Tim Brattan</td>
<td>Tina Seifert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Horn</td>
<td>Tim Cadell</td>
<td>Tina Siepe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Huddleston</td>
<td>Tim Carson</td>
<td>Tina Somers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jacobs</td>
<td>Tim Castro</td>
<td>Tira Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jones</td>
<td>Tim Clayman</td>
<td>Titian Roveva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Keaton</td>
<td>Tim Donovan</td>
<td>TJ Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Knight</td>
<td>Tim Epperson</td>
<td>Tobi Stonich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Levi</td>
<td>Tim Erwin</td>
<td>Tobias Aguirre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Mason</td>
<td>Tim Farley</td>
<td>Toby Corey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Matthews</td>
<td>Tim Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>Toby Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Moreno</td>
<td>Tim Hartnett</td>
<td>Toby Loeffler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Robb</td>
<td>Tim Johnson</td>
<td>Toby Lybrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Schwab</td>
<td>Tim Kenworthy</td>
<td>Toby Mathews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Spaulding</td>
<td>Tim Korinth</td>
<td>Toby Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Stelling</td>
<td>Tim Liebenthal</td>
<td>Toby Saiccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tonnrs</td>
<td>Tim Maurantonio</td>
<td>Toby Thiermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Turner</td>
<td>Tim McGarvey</td>
<td>Tod Likins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wolf</td>
<td>Tim McNulty</td>
<td>Tod Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wolff</td>
<td>Tim Oliver</td>
<td>Tod Butka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wunderer</td>
<td>Tim Rice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Todd Caplan</th>
<th>Tom Hoppe</th>
<th>Tonia Kalafut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todd Dagman</td>
<td>Tom Kibwell</td>
<td>Tonja Scofield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Duffee</td>
<td>Tom King</td>
<td>Tony Calcagno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Fernandez</td>
<td>Tom Kittleson</td>
<td>Tony Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Goudberg</td>
<td>Tom Livingston</td>
<td>Tony Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Graham</td>
<td>Tom Lynch</td>
<td>Tony Franco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Guild</td>
<td>Tom Maciel</td>
<td>Tony Graziano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Habelt</td>
<td>Tom Martin</td>
<td>Tony Mendoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Hicks</td>
<td>Tom Masotto</td>
<td>Tony Milazzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Kent</td>
<td>Tom Medeiros</td>
<td>Tony Morosco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Kramer</td>
<td>Tom Moreno</td>
<td>Tony Muchamuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Lepinski</td>
<td>Tom Moulding</td>
<td>Tony Pemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Liberty</td>
<td>Tom Nelson</td>
<td>Tony Shifert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Losik</td>
<td>Tom Parker</td>
<td>Tonya Fleck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Mayer</td>
<td>Tom Powers</td>
<td>Tori Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd McFarren</td>
<td>Tom Radich</td>
<td>Torvald Tempestas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Moulton</td>
<td>Tom Ritchie</td>
<td>Tony Delfavero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Nysether</td>
<td>Tom Rucker</td>
<td>Towhee Huxley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Phillips</td>
<td>Tom Thacher</td>
<td>Trace Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Prindle</td>
<td>Tom Thompson</td>
<td>Tracey Appleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Skelton</td>
<td>Tom Thompson</td>
<td>Tracey Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Vierra</td>
<td>Tom Watson</td>
<td>Tracey Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Alexander</td>
<td>Tom Wihelms</td>
<td>Tracey Rader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Baker</td>
<td>Tom Wihelms</td>
<td>Tracey Weiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Barber</td>
<td>Tomas Salvage</td>
<td>Traci Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Bargetto</td>
<td>Tomatsky Louis</td>
<td>Traci Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Birney</td>
<td>Tommie Garrett</td>
<td>Traci Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brady</td>
<td>Tommy Dembski</td>
<td>Tracy Elser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brandow</td>
<td>Tona Drewes</td>
<td>Tracy Leavenworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Bruce</td>
<td>Tonee Picard</td>
<td>Tracy Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Clements</td>
<td>Toni Adams</td>
<td>Tracy Morse Zertuche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Evans</td>
<td>Toni Bianco</td>
<td>Tracy Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Fieweger</td>
<td>Toni Breese</td>
<td>Tracy Phariss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hald</td>
<td>Toni Crossen</td>
<td>Tracy Unti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Halderman</td>
<td>Toni Miras</td>
<td>Tracy Van Staalduinen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hartnett</td>
<td>Toni Ottare</td>
<td>Travis Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hesselbein</td>
<td>Tonia Brandt</td>
<td>Travis Guiley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hicks</td>
<td>Tonia Hagan</td>
<td>Travis Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonia Heath</td>
<td>Travis Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travis Lofland</th>
<th>Tyler Fox</th>
<th>Vanessa Ambriz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trenton Minear</td>
<td>Tyler Mccaul</td>
<td>Vanessa Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevir Jones</td>
<td>Tyler McGlashan</td>
<td>Vanessa Beall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Acheson</td>
<td>Tyler Newell</td>
<td>Vanessa Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Bradford</td>
<td>Tyler Orr</td>
<td>Vanessa Gonzales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Bridge</td>
<td>Tyler Quinn</td>
<td>Vanessa Killpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Davis</td>
<td>Tyler Schirmer</td>
<td>Vanessa Platt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Heath</td>
<td>Tyler Smith</td>
<td>Vanessa Vazquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Lindemann</td>
<td>Tyler Speas</td>
<td>Vanessa Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Noml</td>
<td>Tyler Strum</td>
<td>Vanessa Wenzstrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor O'neil</td>
<td>Tyrion Jones</td>
<td>Vanya Erickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Page</td>
<td>Tyrone Bush</td>
<td>Velia Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Paque</td>
<td>Tyson Evans</td>
<td>Vanessa Coffaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Rico</td>
<td>Uffe Marenlund</td>
<td>Venus Stafford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Storey</td>
<td>Ulrika Friesen</td>
<td>Verena Elias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treb Drake</td>
<td>Ulrike Kummerow</td>
<td>Vern Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treb Highton</td>
<td>Ulrike Wagner</td>
<td>Verne Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treb Whitley</td>
<td>Uriel Espinoza</td>
<td>Veronica Cantolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Cross</td>
<td>Ursula Ehrhart</td>
<td>Veronica Castro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Dalton</td>
<td>Vadi Molman</td>
<td>Veronica Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Kelly</td>
<td>Vajreshwari Jernberg</td>
<td>Veronica Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Larson</td>
<td>Val Andromacha-Atha</td>
<td>Veronica Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Proctor</td>
<td>Val Otazu</td>
<td>Veronica Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trina McCoy</td>
<td>Valentin Orozco</td>
<td>Veronica Guerrero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Hull</td>
<td>Valentin Paredez</td>
<td>Veronica Hoover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Reiter</td>
<td>Valeria Roman</td>
<td>Veronica Larenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Foley</td>
<td>Valerie Carr</td>
<td>Veronica Manuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Hucklebridge</td>
<td>Valerie Diaz</td>
<td>Veronica Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Lizarra</td>
<td>Valerie Gomez</td>
<td>Veronica O'Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristan Grell</td>
<td>Valerie Kockx</td>
<td>Veronica Pulido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristant McHugh</td>
<td>Valerie Leal</td>
<td>Veronica Rivas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Hicks</td>
<td>Valerie Martin</td>
<td>Veronica Shearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Rossi</td>
<td>Valerie Messer</td>
<td>Veronica Vargas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryntje Young</td>
<td>Valerie Phipps</td>
<td>Veronica Zaleha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turi Andrade</td>
<td>Valerie Pitts</td>
<td>Vicenta Cabrera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Ayers-Nusbaum</td>
<td>Valerie Siemer</td>
<td>Vicente Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Bunn</td>
<td>Valerie Auger</td>
<td>Vick Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Corder</td>
<td>Vance Webb</td>
<td>Vicki Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Cronin</td>
<td>Vanessa Smith</td>
<td>Vicki Ivancovich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Vicki Malandra
Vicki Orendurff
Vicki Powers
Vicki Vasconcellos
Vicki Voll
Vickie Garcia
Vickie Meyer
Vickie Winkler
Vicky Tran
Vicky Weddington
Vicky White
Victor Carrillo
Victor Gaona
Victor Garcia
Victor Guzman
Victor Hoagland
Victor iii
Victor Khan
Victor Martinez
Victor Mendoza
Victor Poiesz
Victor Yanez
Victoria Berckefeldt
Victoria Cano
Victoria Chartier
Victoria Covell
Victoria Cull
Victoria Dixon
Victoria Erickson
Victoria Gairaud-Hinkley
Victoria Gilbert
Victoria Grimm
Victoria Icaza
Victoria Nam
Victoria Nobles
Victoria Railjoy
Victoria Rue
Victoria Shuts
Victoria Todd
Victoria Vierra
Victoria Yuen-Ruan
Viebeke Orsini
Virginia Sigala
Viktoria Gleason
Vilma Jordan
Vincent Corrarubias
Vincent Rossi
Violeta Castillo Zamarripa
Violette Peoples
Vireinia Hedrick
Virgicio De La Cruz
Virgil Robinson
Virginia Delaney
Virginia Hughes
Virginia Marti
Virginia Saunders
Virginia Signala
Virginia Taylor
Vittorina Howell
Vivan Vadakan
Vivian Larkins
Vivian Moutafian
Vivian Simon
Vivian St Shepard
Vivian Taing
Viviana Cornejo
Viviana Magdeleno
Viviana Marin
Viviana Munoz
Viviana Renteria
Viviana Xilonzochilt
Vladzimir Sviatchanva
W. Frederick Sampson
Waldo De Paz
Walt Allen
Walter Haynes
Walter Schillinger
Walter Stauss
Wanda Jackson
Wanda Molari
Wangk Kho
Warren Klausner
Warren Rudder
Warwick Boulton
Wayd La Pearle
Wayne Hayashibara
Wayne Kiba
Wayne Ledgister
Wayne Martin
Wayne Thompson
Wayne Wright
Wendi Gurnee
Wendi Lefebre
Wendi Ballen
Wendy Bowers-Gachesa
Wendy Bussiere
Wendy Butler
Wendy Canales
Wendy Cumming
Wendy Day
Wendy Gauquier
Wendy Iriberry
Wendy Johnson
Wendy King
Wendy Rae Johnson
Wendy Shea
Wendy Sickels
Wendy Smith
Wendy Traber
Wes Allinger
Wes Leith
Whitman Peace
Whitney Brandt-Hiatt
Whitney Geddes
Whitney Heier
Whitney Mitchell
Wiktoria Zaleska
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Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition

Recipient:  Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter:  Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Willem Banks
Wilfredo Montejo
Will Bachar
Will Beckett
Will Cassilby
Will Hahn
Will Lorand
Will Mayall
Will Menchine
Will Moody
Will Ryan
Will Tomlinson
William Hopkins
William Aldis
William Roberts
Willem McRobie
William Allen-Dupraw
William Anderson
William Arnold
William Babcock
William Cole
William Comfort
William Conklin
William Cooper
William Coulter
William Crawford
William Curtis
William Des Jardins
William Farlee
William Frohn
William Gibson
William Gorson
William Hancock
William Hess
William Hoberg
William Huffman
William Juncosa
William Kinsella
William Lippert
William McBride
William Nowicki
William Ow
William Philipps
William Rosenoff
William Rubel
William Rupel
William Rutherford
William Sears
William Serratelli
William Souza
William Spendlove
William Tyler
William Walker
William Winkler
William Wishon
William Zang
William Barker
Wilma Burchell
Wink Saville
Winona Suyenobu
Winton Woods
Wolfgang Langhans
Wouterina Swets
Wynn Jacobson-Galan
Xavier Ballard
Xavier Ortiz
Ximena Ospina
Xiomara Nimmer
Xochild Rivera
Xochilt Chavez
Xochilt Homeli
Yadira Santos
Yagmur Ilgen
Yajaira Rubio
Yande Cervantes
Yarira Landaverry
Yasemin Golan
Ye Thomas
Yenesia Curiel
Yenesia Gutierrez
Yladan Strbac
Yoana Martinez
Yoel Tapanes
Yo'anda Gutierrez
Yo'anda Kane
Yo'anda McFarren
Yo'olonda Lovejoy
Yonat Michaelov
Yu Chen
Yuliana Izavravas
Yuvitz Sosa
Yvette Garcia
Yvette Herrera
Yvette Saville
Yvonne Escobar
Yvonne Reynolds
Yvonne Smith
Yvonne Villanueva
Yvonne Williams
Z. Haas
Zac Creager
Zac Garfield
Zac S
Zach Bandfield
Zach Langton
Zach Meschi
Zach Morton
Zach Newberry
Zachary Kawagoe
Zachary Morae
Zachary Nissen
Zachary Savedra
Zack Hill
Zack King
Zack Mitchell
Zack Reed
Zackary Boyd
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Recipient: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Letter: Help build a world-class Greenway (trail-only) in Santa Cruz County by removing train tracks.

Zaena Sherrell
Zaira Covarrubias
Zane Brattan
Zane Brown
Zanne Jeffs
Zarbab Ali
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10,191 SIGNATURES FROM SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RESIDENTS
From: Manu Koenig  
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2018 6:08 PM  
To: john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Patrick Mulhearn <BDS023@co.santa-cruz.ca.us>; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Bertrand, Jacques <jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us>; rlj12@comcast.net; Cynthia Chase <cchase@cityofsantacruz.com>; tim_gubbins@dot.ca.gov; ebotorff167@yahoo.com; Ryan Coonerty <ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Sandy Brown <sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com>; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; openup@cats.ucsc.edu  
Cc: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>; Guy Preston <gpreston@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Scenario "R"ealistic and Corridor Principles  

Dear Commissioners,

Please find attached Santa Cruz County Greenway's proposed Scenario "R"ealistic for the Unified Corridors Study as well as a set of principles for the Coastal Corridor that we hope will serve as common ground for our community.

I look forward to providing comment at your Dec. 6th meeting.

Sincerely,
Manu

--

Manu Koenig, Executive Director  
849 Almar Ave, STE 247, Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
(831) 234-3922 | www.sccgreenway.org
Members of the Santa Cruz County community are proposing a realistic, effective and affordable set of projects from the Unified Corridors Study called Scenario R. Scenario R provides congestion relief and public transit options on Hwy 1, Soquel/Freedom and the Coastal Corridor for $423M less capital ($1,154M vs $731M) and about half the annual operating expense ($30M vs. $16M). Using Measure D, Self-Help funds and conservative assumptions on federal and state grants, Scenario R can be implemented sooner, more flexibly and realistically with the resources under the RTC’s control or reasonably available.

### Scenario “R”ealistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTC Staff Preferred</th>
<th>Scenario “R”ealistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 1 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses on shoulders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV) &amp; increased transit frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary lanes to extend merging distance IN ADDITION TO MEASURE D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metering of on-ramps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional lanes on bridge over San Lorenzo River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission St intersection improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soquel Avenue/Drive and Freedom Blvd</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT lite (fast boarding, transit signal priority and queue jumps)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased frequency of transit with express service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffered/protected bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection improvements for auto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection improvements for bikes/ pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail Right of Way</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike and pedestrian trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local rail transit with interregional connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus rapid transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight service on rail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Only Watsonville
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW PUBLIC INVESTMENT - CAPITAL</th>
<th>RTC Staff Preferred</th>
<th>Scenario &quot;R”ealistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Estimate-Capital</td>
<td>Funding Potential-Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses on shoulders - (end point varies depending on aux lanes included)</td>
<td>$7,900</td>
<td>$7,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV) &amp; increased transit (incl. ramp metering and interchange reconstruction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary lanes to extend merging distance</td>
<td>$97,800</td>
<td>$13,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metering of on-ramps w/o HOV (including intersection/ramp improvements)</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$74,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional lanes on bridge over San Lorenzo River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission St intersection improvements</td>
<td>$10,300</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal- SR 1</td>
<td>$229,000</td>
<td>$105,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel Avenue/Drive and Freedom Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus rapid transit lite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased frequency of transit with express service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffered/protected bike lanes</td>
<td>$19,700</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection improvements for bikes/ pedestrains/auto</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal- Soquel/Freedom</td>
<td>$50,500</td>
<td>$42,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike and pedestrian trail</td>
<td>$283,000</td>
<td>$197,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of Capitola Trestle</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local rail transit with interregional connections</td>
<td>$339,800</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric train</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus transit connections to rail</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus rapid transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight service on rail</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Rail Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$874,500</td>
<td>$306,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO TOTAL- (2018 dollars)</td>
<td>$1,154,000</td>
<td>$455,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The funding potential from Scenario B is used for both the Staff Preferred Scenario and Scenario "R”ealistic.
2. Funding potential of $13,400 is applied to the additional auxiliary lanes for Staff's preferred scenario in order to balance total Funding Potential of $455,000,000 based on RTP, State and Federal sources.

3. The Funding Potential of $10,200,000 from Scenario B is used for both Scenarios shown.

4. Funding potential for BRT lite ranges from $18,100,000 in Scenario A to $37,000,000 in Scenario C.

5. The RTC Staff Preferred Scenario includes intersection improvements for bikes and pedestrians but NOT for autos in Table 52 (UCS p150, Nov 2018). However, capital costs for these projects are represented as a single line item in Table 39 (UCS, p105, Nov 2018). The combined price is used in absence of another figure.

6. Cost estimate from Alta Planning + Design's "Proposed Modifications to the UCS Analysis Methods" is used. The Funding Potential includes Measure D and some additional State or Federal funds to balance total Funding Potential at $455,000,000. The cost of constructing a trail with BRT on corridor is considerably lower because it assumes a combined roadway for bus, bikes and other wheeled vehicles and a narrower trail for pedestrian access alongside.

7. A cost of $20 million was estimated in the attachment "Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation", Dec. 3, 2015 RTC meeting, attachment 3-B.

8. From the UCS, the cost for an electrified rail system that utilizes electrical multiple unit vehicles is estimated to cost a total of $549.5 million.

9. Approximate cost to repair the entire corridor for freight use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW PUBLIC INVESTMENT - CAPITAL</th>
<th>RTC Staff Preferred</th>
<th>Scenario “R”ealistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Estimate-O&amp;M</td>
<td>Funding Potential-O&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 1 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses on shoulders - (end point varies depending on aux lanes included)</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV) &amp; increased transit (incl. Ramp metering and interchange reconstruction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary lanes to extend merging distance</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metering of on-ramps w/o HOV (including intersection/ramp improvements)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional lanes on bridge over San Lorenzo River</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission St intersection improvements</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal- SR 1</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soquel Avenue/Drive and Freedom Blvd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus rapid transit lite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased frequency of transit with express service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffered/protected bike lanes</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection improvements for bikes/ pedestrians/auto</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal- Soquel/Freedom</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail Right of Way</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike and pedestrian trail</td>
<td>$606</td>
<td>$606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local rail transit with interregional connections(^1)</td>
<td>$11,800</td>
<td>$8,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus transit connections to rail</td>
<td>$12,100</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus rapid transit</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight service on rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Rail Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$24,506</td>
<td>$12,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Project Area Transportation System Management and Demand Management</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO TOTAL- (2018 dollars)</td>
<td>$30,276</td>
<td>$18,399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) For RTC Staff Preferred Scenario with rail transit, costs are for electric units. Funding potential for rail transit is assumed to be at parity with bus transit.
From: Bud Colligan  
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2018 5:05 PM  
To: Mike Rotkin <openup@cats.ucsc.edu>; John Leopold <john.leopold@santacruzcounty.us>; Bruce McPherson <Bruce.McPherson@santacruzcounty.us>; Patrick Mulhearn <Patrick.Mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us>; Randy Johnson <rlj12@comcast.net>; ed bottorff <ebottorff167@yahoo.com>; Cynthia Chase <cchase@cityofsantacruz.com>; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; Greg Caput <greg.caput@santacruzcounty.us>; Andy.Schiffrin@santacruzcounty.us; Ryan Coonerty <ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>; Bertrand, Jacques <jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us>; Sandy Brown <sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com>  
Cc: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Community Groups Support METRO's Alternatives Analysis  

Dear Commissioners,

Please find attached a press release put out by the following community groups regarding support for METRO's proposed Alternatives Analysis of the Coastal Corridor.

Santa Cruz County Business Council  
Santa Cruz New Tech Meetup  
Campaign for Sustainable Transportaiton  
Santa Cruz County Greenway  
Santa Cruz Works
Dear Commissioners,

Please find attached a press release put out by the following community groups regarding support for METRO’s proposed Alternatives Analysis of the Coastal Corridor.

Santa Cruz County Business Council
Santa Cruz New Tech Meetup
Campaign for Sustainable Transportaiton
Santa Cruz County Greenway
Santa Cruz Works
Community Groups Support METRO’s Request for an Alternatives Analysis of the Rail Corridor

December 4, 2018

Community groups, including Santa Cruz County Business Council, Campaign for Sustainable Transportation, Santa Cruz Works, Santa Cruz New Tech Meetup and Santa Cruz County Greenway announced today they are supporting METRO’s request for a detailed Alternatives Analysis of the two public transit options for the rail corridor in Santa Cruz County: rail & trail and electric bus & trail. The Alternatives Analysis was requested by METRO and approved unanimously by its Board of Directors on November 16, 2018. The Alternatives Analysis would also fully comply with the requirements of Measure D to analyze the “best use” of the corridor. The request is timely as the RTC could vote as early as January 17th, 2019 on a plan that would re-establish rail freight for 10 years north of Watsonville and eliminate the option of running electric buses on the corridor.

The Alternatives Analysis proposed by METRO would determine the most appropriate mode of public transit for the Rail Corridor and include:

- Ridership forecasts
- Operating and capital costs, including “value engineering”
- Funding sources for capital improvements
- Funding sources for operating expenses

METRO’s staff report explains why the Alternatives Analysis is needed: “The mode selection in this corridor should not be based on a choice between steel and rubber wheels but rather on the service profile (alignment, frequency, daily span of service) that most effectively meets the travel patterns and mobility needs in Santa Cruz County.”

The recently completed Unified Corridors Study (UCS) provides a foundation for the Alternatives Analysis but it is not sufficient by itself. According to METRO staff, “The [UCS’s] Scenario-based analysis does not provide enough mode/corridor specific comparable data, and information is insufficient to determine the most appropriate public transit mode to pursue in the rail corridor.”

Moreover, METRO’S staff expressed concern that passenger rail could jeopardize the bus system’s already lean budget. “All of these services and facilities could draw from the same limited funding sources. A review of the UCS suggests that some funding sources currently used for METRO operations and capital needs are being assumed as possible sources for UCS projects.”

“The Business Council represents over 80 of the major employers in Santa Cruz County,” said Robert Singleton, Executive Director. “The Council’s board issued a statement last week emphasizing incremental approaches to improve transportation in the county using already approved Measure D funds. METRO’s proposed Alternatives Analysis will provide the detailed information needed to make the right transportation decisions in the corridor.”

“METRO’s proposed Alternatives Analysis makes good policy sense,” said Doug Erickson, President of Santa Cruz New Tech Meetup. “Before locking our county into one strategy, it is essential to
understand ridership forecasts, operating and capital costs, and funding sources to be able to build and operate each alternative. This work has not been done and needs to be done before a strategic direction and set investment decisions is made.”

“Greenway is interested in clean, affordable, and flexible transit options for the corridor,” said Manu Koenig, Executive Director of Santa Cruz County Greenway, “METRO already carries 5.2 million passengers every year so there may be huge benefits in expanding its service on the Coastal Corridor.”

“Campaign for Sustainable Transportation (CFST) advocates that our transportation dollars prioritize transit and active transportation,” said Rick Longinotti, Chair of the CFST. “If we want to offer a practical alternative to auto dependency, then we need to make public transit affordable, safe and convenient. We need the best information we can get before making large investment decisions.”

“Santa Cruz Works fully supports METRO's proposal to evaluate in detail all transportation alternatives for our coastal corridor,” said Keri Waters, President, Santa Cruz Works. “Our emerging economic hubs in downtown Santa Cruz and Westside Santa Cruz need better transportation links with each other, as well as to the neighborhoods of the workers that are commuting here from Watsonville and points between. The current plans don't adequately consider the rate at which our communities are adopting personal short-range transportation options like bike share and scooters, and the infrastructure needs that can and must be met for that segment.”

**Contact Info: Community Groups Supporting METRO’s Alternatives Analysis**

Santa Cruz County Business Council  
Robert Singleton, Executive Director, Robert.singleton@sccbusinesscouncil.com

Santa Cruz New Tech Meet-up  
Doug Erickson, President, dougwerickson@gmail.com

Santa Cruz County Greenway  
Manu Koenig, Executive Director, manu.koenig@sccgreenway.org

Campaign for Sustainable Transportation  
Rick Longinotti, Chairman, longinotti@baymoon.com

Santa Cruz Works  
Keri Waters, President, keri@buoy.ai
Community Groups Support METRO’s Request for an Alternatives Analysis of the Rail Corridor

December 4, 2018

Community groups, including Santa Cruz County Business Council, Campaign for Sustainable Transportation, Santa Cruz Works, Santa Cruz New Tech Meetup and Santa Cruz County Greenway announced today they are supporting METRO’s request for a detailed Alternatives Analysis of the two public transit options for the rail corridor in Santa Cruz County: rail & trail and electric bus & trail. The Alternatives Analysis was requested by METRO and approved unanimously by its Board of Directors on November 16, 2018. The Alternatives Analysis would also fully comply with the requirements of Measure D to analyze the “best use” of the corridor. The request is timely as the RTC could vote as early as January 17th, 2019 on a plan that would re-establish rail freight for 10 years north of Watsonville and eliminate the option of running electric buses on the corridor.

The Alternatives Analysis proposed by METRO would determine the most appropriate mode of public transit for the Rail Corridor and include:

- Ridership forecasts
- Operating and capital costs, including “value engineering”
- Funding sources for capital improvements
- Funding sources for operating expenses

METRO’s staff report explains why the Alternatives Analysis is needed: “The mode selection in this corridor should not be based on a choice between steel and rubber wheels but rather on the service profile (alignment, frequency, daily span of service) that most effectively meets the travel patterns and mobility needs in Santa Cruz County.”

The recently completed Unified Corridors Study (UCS) provides a foundation for the Alternatives Analysis but it is not sufficient by itself. According to METRO staff, “The [UCS’s] Scenario-based analysis does not provide enough mode/corridor specific comparable data, and information is insufficient to determine the most appropriate public transit mode to pursue in the rail corridor.”

Moreover, METRO’S staff expressed concern that passenger rail could jeopardize the bus system’s already lean budget. “All of these services and facilities could draw from the same limited funding sources. A review of the UCS suggests that some funding sources currently used for METRO operations and capital needs are being assumed as possible sources for UCS projects.”

“The Business Council represents over 80 of the major employers in Santa Cruz County,” said Robert Singleton, Executive Director. “The Council’s board issued a statement last week emphasizing incremental approaches to improve transportation in the county using already approved Measure D funds. METRO’S proposed Alternatives Analysis will provide the detailed information needed to make the right transportation decisions in the corridor.”

“METRO’s proposed Alternatives Analysis makes good policy sense,” said Doug Erickson, President of Santa Cruz New Tech Meetup. “Before locking our county into one strategy, it is essential to
understand ridership forecasts, operating and capital costs, and funding sources to be able to build and operate each alternative. This work has not been done and needs to be done before a strategic direction and set investment decisions is made.”

“Greenway is interested in clean, affordable, and flexible transit options for the corridor,” said Manu Koenig, Executive Director of Santa Cruz County Greenway, “METRO already carries 5.2 million passengers every year so there may be huge benefits in expanding its service on the Coastal Corridor.”

“Campaign for Sustainable Transportation (CFST) advocates that our transportation dollars prioritize transit and active transportation,” said Rick Longinotti, Chair of the CFST. “If we want to offer a practical alternative to auto dependency, then we need to make public transit affordable, safe and convenient. We need the best information we can get before making large investment decisions.”

“Santa Cruz Works fully supports METRO's proposal to evaluate in detail all transportation alternatives for our coastal corridor,” said Keri Waters, President, Santa Cruz Works. “Our emerging economic hubs in downtown Santa Cruz and Westside Santa Cruz need better transportation links with each other, as well as to the neighborhoods of the workers that are commuting here from Watsonville and points between. The current plans don't adequately consider the rate at which our communities are adopting personal short-range transportation options like bike share and scooters, and the infrastructure needs that can and must be met for that segment.”

**Contact Info: Community Groups Supporting METRO’s Alternatives Analysis**

Santa Cruz County Business Council  
Robert Singleton, Executive Director, Robert.singleton@sccbusinesscouncil.com

Santa Cruz New Tech Meet-up  
Doug Erickson, President, dougwerickson@gmail.com

Santa Cruz County Greenway  
Manu Koenig, Executive Director, manu.koenig@sccgreenway.org

Campaign for Sustainable Transportation  
Rick Longinotti, Chairman, longinotti@baymoon.com

Santa Cruz Works  
Keri Waters, President, keri@buoy.ai
From: Brian Peoples
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2018 4:26 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Cc: rlj12@comcast.net; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us; jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; jimmy.dutra@cityofwatsonville.org; cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; openup@cats.ucsc.edu; John Leopold <John.Leopold@santacruzcounty.us>; Zach Friend <BDS022@co.santa-cruz.ca.us>; 'Patrick Mulhearn' <Patrick.Mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us>; budd <bud@colligans.com>; Manu Koenig <manu.koenig@sccgreenway.org>; Will Mayall <will@mayall.com>; Carey Pico <carey.pico@yahoo.com>; joex <joexmart@comcast.net>; Miles Reiter <Miles.Reiter@driscolls.com>; Robert Stephens <awranch@aol.com>; Robert Quinn <rquinn@pacbell.net>; ryan <ryan@pacificappraisers.com>; Ryan Sarnataro <ryan@calcentral.com>; Rodoni Farms <rodonifarms@aol.com>; brodoni@aol.com; Grace Blakeslee <gbblakeslee@sccrtc.org>; Cory Caletti <ccaletti@sccrtc.org>; Ginger Dykaar <gdykaar@sccrtc.org>; Guy Preston <gpreston@sccrtc.org>; Luis Mendez <lmendez@sccrtc.org>; Sarah Christensen <schristensen@sccrtc.org>

Subject: Trail Now response to Item #23 on RTC Agenda (12/6/18)

RTC,

For item #23 on the RTC Agenda (12/6/18), please include the following statement.

We believe the Unified Corridor Study (UCS) has achieved some goals, however, based on gaps and shortcomings identified by Caltrans, Metro and local community groups, we suggest the following:

1. With the completion of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for Highway 1 Tier I and II, Caltrans and California Transportation Commission (CTC) recognize this as the definitive information source for long term plans for Santa Cruz County. We recommend RTC publicly confirm long-term plans for Highway 1 Tier I upgrades (HOV/BRT lanes, metering lights, widening to Larkin Valley Road) and proceed with request to CTC for Self-Help County and SB1 Funding.
2. RTC commitment to preserve the historic timber trestles, i.e., Seascape, Hidden Beach, Capitola, along the Coastal Corridor.

3. Perform Alternatives Analysis to determine the most appropriate mode of public mass transit for the Coastal Corridor. In addition to the suggested Metro criteria, we ask that the analysis include an assessment of a “trail designed for transportation” that allows for market-based mass transit that is governed by vehicle size (no wider than 6 feet) and safe operating speeds. Mass transit is not necessarily “public transit”.

4. Agreement that the old railroad tracks from Natural Bridges to Davenport are no longer required and RTC Staff can work directly with the local Farmers and Property-owners on a collaborative win-win solution to build a world-class rail-trail along the North Coast by 2020.

5. Explore License Agreement as outlined in Trail Now January, 2018 proposal to begin using the Coastal Corridor today as an interim trail for alternative transportation while property ownership rights are adjudicated.

Best regards,

Brian Peoples

Executive Director

Trail Now
From: Brian Peoples
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2018 6:41 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Support TrailNow / Farmer's North Coast Rail Trail Plan

RTC,

One of the key goals of the Unified Corridor Study (UCS) was to provide guidance for the North Coast Rail Trail to meet the Federal Grant deadline of 2020. Now that Metro and other key organizations are against the results of the UCS and requesting that more studies for the rail corridor be performed, we are concerned that this could delay moving forward with the North Coast Rail Trail and jeopardize Federal Grant funds.

With an estimated cost of over $15M to refurbish the railroad tracks for excursion trains to Davenport, we believe it can be concluded that our community will not make this type of investment. We believe the results of the UCS can provide enough guidance that the old railroad tracks from Wilder Ranch to Davenport are no longer required. Making this determination will allow RTC staff to begin working directly with the Farmers and Property-owners on a collaborative win-win solution to build a world-class rail-trail along the North Coast. The North Coast Rail Trail EIR report shows that our plan has the least environmental impact and can meet the 2020 deadline to use the Federal Grant funds.

We ask that you please support the recommendation that the old railroad tracks from Wilder Ranch to Davenport are no longer required and RTC Staff can proceed with developing the Farmers' Alternative Rail Trail plan along the North Coast.

Best regards,

Brian Peoples
Hi Grace,

To follow-up with our conversations, we believe we can support a non-trail-only plan along the Coastal Corridor, but it can not be rail.

We have drafted a statement we are willing to socialize with you prior to releasing. We have other important organization(s) co-authoring.

In the parking lot, we went further about possible next steps to using the Coastal Corridor soon, specifically getting the Coastal Corridor from Buena Vista Road (Milepost 7) to Davenport as an interim trail. We are willing to submit a proposal for a License Agreement to manage property as a railroad and provide needed investments. Our proposal would eliminate the need to railbank the property, provide capital funding to perform maintenance on the property, ensure security of corridor and allow Metro/RTC to pilot e-buses along the corridor. It would allow RTC to further investigate property boundaries and take the appropriate action to secure the deed. We would maintain railroad operations throughout the duration of the License Agreement that comply with all federal and state regulations for such operations.

We would like to discuss both our public statement on "non-trail-only" and a potential License Agreement for the corridor prior to anymore RTC planning for UCS recommendation.

Is there a time we can meet?

We want to be able to have "official" discussions that we can expect would be presented to the Board. Maybe after Preston arrives?

Are you all interested?

Best regards,

Brian Peoples

Executive Director
INTRODUCTION

“The objective of the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) is to identify multimodal transportation investments that provide the most effective use of Highway 1, Soquel Ave/Soquel Dr/Freedom Blvd, and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line to serve the community’s transportation needs.”¹ The UCS considered bus transit, rail transit, auto, bike/ped and rail freight modes. It also considered automated vehicles/connected vehicles even though those modes are still emerging. Despite this multi-modal approach, the study completely ignores a mode that has been operating in public service since 1975. This mode is called automated transit networks (ATN – an umbrella term for personal and group rapid transit - PRT & GRT). ATN suppliers such as Vectus, Ultra, Modutram and 2getthere have had ATN systems in continuous public service since 1999². ATN systems have completed over 200 million injury-free passenger miles.

The purpose of this paper is to document why the UCS should add ATN to the modes considered. This is accomplished by addressing each of the performance measures used in the UCS in turn, with emphasis being placed on comparison with Scenario B, understood to be the likely preferred scenario.

¹ SCCRTC’s Unified Corridor Investment Study, Step 2 Analysis Results, Draft, September 2018, by Kimley Horn
² Video clip of ATN systems in operation: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8IM5299tXcw&
AUTOMATED TRANSIT NETWORKS

DEFINITION AND DESCRIPTION

Automated transit networks (ATN) is an umbrella term for two concepts that are now merging into one. These are personal rapid transit (PRT) and group rapid transit (GRT). PRT was conceived to use small (2 – 6 seated passengers) driverless vehicles carrying individuals or parties travelling together nonstop from origin to destination and not sharing rides with strangers. GRT uses large driverless vehicles (up to 20 or even 30 seated and/or standing passengers) which often wait before departing to encourage ride sharing and stop at intermediate stations if necessary. Modern PRT systems generally have 4 to 6 seats, encourage ride sharing and may make an intermediate stop or two. Other terms for these systems include Podcars (commonly used in Sweden) and Pod Taxis (commonly used in India). This study refers to these systems as PRT, GRT or ATN as appropriate.

ATN systems provide a very high level of service and passengers have no need to know routes, schedules or transfer points. All they need to know is the name of their destination station.

Table 1 on the following page provides a comparison of PRT with cars and conventional transit.

ATN systems proven in public service have capacities ranging from 2,000 to 10,000 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd) and maximum speeds ranging from 25 to 43 miles per hour. Higher capacities and speeds up to 20,000 pphpd and 60 mph are under development now that the American Society of Civil Engineers has agreed to adapt their Automated People Mover Standards to better apply to ATN systems. The maximum speed assumed in this study is 40 mph while the maximum capacity assumed is 5,000 pphpd.
### TABLE 1. COMPARISON BETWEEN TRANSIT, CAR AND PRT
(Source: PRT Consulting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>PRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Level</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trip Time</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Depends on traffic</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost/Passenger</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Capital Cost/Passenger</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Potential and Cost Savings</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Demand 24/7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seated Travel</td>
<td>Yes, with limits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Stop Travel</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short waiting time</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Less than 1 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliant</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and Secure</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Friendly</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow &amp; Ice</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Walking</td>
<td>Not Often</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Friendly</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficient</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually Appealing</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates inside buildings</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** Poor ✗ Acceptable ✓ Good ✅
The Ultra PRT System

The Ultra system is rubber-tired, battery-powered, and runs on an open guideway. The front wheels are steerable, and the vehicle keeps itself on the guideway without any physical lateral guidance (using lasers), simplifying switching, which is accomplished by steering. This system has been in operation at London’s Heathrow International Airport since April 2011. The commitment to using off-the-shelf technology, wherever possible, coupled with a rigorous testing and development program, has allowed the Ultra system to be the first modern PRT system to win a commercial contract.

Heathrow Airport has expressed its satisfaction with the system by including significant expansion in its budget. However, it is understood that construction of a new runway may obliterate the existing system and alter the plans for expansion.

The Ultra vehicle was designed for four adults, plus luggage. However, Heathrow has opted to replace the bucket seats with bench seats, allowing the vehicle to carry a family of six. Commuter versions of this vehicle are anticipated to include two jump seats allowing six adults to be accommodated.

Open guideway PRT, such as that used by Ultra and 2getthere, tends to be more economical, but the rubber/guideway interface can be problematic during inclement weather conditions. Ultra has plans to address this issue, by using a glass fiber reinforced plastic grating as the riding surface. Preliminary testing by PRT Consulting in the winters of 2006 and 2007 has shown this solution to be very successful in mitigating the effects of Colorado snowfall.

Ultra PRT Ltd. is under new ownership that is aggressively marketing the system in Asia. They are reducing costs by implementing vehicle manufacture in India and other means. They are also developing a next-generation control system to allow higher speeds and shorter headways intended to increase capacity while reducing costs.
The 2getthere GRT System

2getthere, a Dutch company, has been operating an automated GRT-like shuttle bus system, in cooperation with Frog Navigation Systems in Rotterdam, Holland, since 1999. They are delivering their second GRT system using third-generation vehicles in Dubai in the United Arab Emirates. This system will have 25 vehicles and a capacity up to 5,000 pphpd. A third system is being delivered to Brussels Airport. The vehicles are capable of speeds up to 37 mph. Operation in mixed traffic is possible with top speeds up to about 30 mph.

The 2getthere PRT System

2getthere’s true PRT system was the first of its kind when it went into operation in Masdar City in the United Arab Emirates in November 2010.

2getthere’s PRT system is of the open guideway type, with somewhat similar attributes to those of the Ultra system.

The Vectus PRT System

Vectus is a subsidiary of POSCO, one of the world’s largest steel manufacturers. Despite being a British company owned and operated by Koreans, Vectus chose to establish a full-size test track, with an offline station, in Sweden to prove operability in winter weather conditions and to meet the rigorous Swedish safety requirements. They have now accomplished both goals and moved on to implement a system in South Korea.

The Vectus system is of the captive-bogey type, where the undercarriage, or bogey, is not steerable, but has wheels which run along vertical side elements, thus, keeping the vehicle on the guideway. Switching is accomplished by movable wheels mounted on the vehicle. The test track vehicles were propelled (and braked) by linear induction motors mounted in the guideway. Mounting the motors in the guideway reduces the weight of the vehicles but increases the cost of the guideway. This is advantageous for high-capacity systems, but expensive for low-capacity systems. Their first application in Suncheon Bay, South Korea, uses...
conventional rotary motors which obtain wayside (third rail) power. Propulsion batteries are not required, allowing the vehicles to be lighter in weight.

The Vectus Vehicle is designed to carry four or six seated adults, plus their luggage. In an urban transportation mode, the vehicle can also accommodate up to six standees.

**The Modutram ATN System**

While not yet in public service, the Modutram system has been included here because of the extensiveness of its test track and demonstration program. A public project is understood to be imminent.

Modutram, is being developed as a university effort with considerable funding from the Mexican government. This system is comprised of rubber-tired vehicles operating on a steel track. The vehicles have electric motors that are battery-powered.

The Modutram system has been designed specifically for the Mexican climate and is not initially intended to be capable of operating satisfactorily in snow and ice conditions. Development has progressed fairly smoothly from the initial design through a small test track to a larger test track with two stations and, more recently, a demonstration system that carries passengers in six-passenger vehicles.

Modutram appears well suited for urban operations. The system is designed for speeds up to 40 mph with minimum headways of 3 to 4 seconds. Vehicles can be physically coupled together to increase capacity.

**SOLUTIONS NOT YET PROVEN IN PUBLIC SERVICE**

Numerous ATN systems are in various stages of development ranging from being mere concepts to having engineering design completed and prototype systems in various stages of development. Some of the better-known names include JPods, Metrino, Futran (Milotek), PRT International, skyTran, Swift ATN and Transit X. Taxi 2000 recently closed its doors after decades of being unable to fund a full-scale test track demonstrating full functionality, the same hurdle that is holding many of the previously-mentioned systems from emerging onto the market.

Some of these emerging suppliers make aggressive claims regarding the costs and capabilities of their systems. These claims have typically not been proven in practice and have therefore been ignored in this study. Should high speeds and capacities become viable at very low costs, this will further enhance the feasibility of the solutions discussed here.

More information on ATN can be found here: [www.prtconsulting.com](http://www.prtconsulting.com) and here: [www.advancedtransit.org](http://www.advancedtransit.org)
CONCEPTUAL ATN LAYOUT

A conceptual layout (Figures 7 and 8) has been developed for purposes of comparison with the Scenario B rail project. Like the rail project, it extends along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way from the Westside of Santa Cruz to Pajaro Station near Watsonville. Unlike the rail project, portions of the alignment (mostly those through developed areas) are one-way with return one-way guideways located in the adjacent communities, mostly along the Soquel Avenue/Drive BRT routes. These return guideways are elevated to facilitate retrofitting into existing road rights-of-way. Portions of the alignment within the rail right-of-way are also elevated to avoid at-grade crossings with other traffic (a key factor contributing to ATN safety and reliability).

Note that the routing and station locations shown are in no way intended to be final. The southern portion of the route could serve Freedom Blvd. (equivalent to BRT Lite in the UCS) or Highway 1. It could do so as a two-way line or it could be in the form of a one-way loop. In the latter case it would provide service/stations along two of the three routes (the rail corridor, Freedom Blvd. and Highway 1). It would also be possible to extend the system to UCSC and/or other destinations. If a goal is to improve circulation within Santa Cruz (for example), more guideway could be added, including additional north-south connectors with new stations between the loops shown.

ATN has almost infinite capability to be scaled up or down. It would be possible to start with a simple two-station demonstration shuttle system and to scale up from there in phases. As new routes and stations are added, the new stations will be accessible from the old with no transfers being necessary. The portion of the system from Santa Cruz to Aptos is likely to be very viable as a stand-alone system that could cover its own operating costs and most, if not all, of its capital costs through fare-box revenue.
### TABLE 2. CONCEPTUAL ATN LAYOUT CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Grade Track Length (miles)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Grade Stations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Track Length (miles)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Stations</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed (mph)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Time Santa Cruz to Watsonville (mins)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ability of ATN to achieve a 39-mph average speed with a 40-mph maximum speed derives from the fact that all stations are offline, requiring no slowing of through vehicles. Note that slowing for horizontal alignment characteristics (tight curves – of which there are few) has been accounted for.

A single at-grade ATN track only requires about seven feet of right-of-way. The ATN may thus be able to co-exist with the existing rail line allowing for freight operations. However, the assumption has been made here that the rail track will be removed, and those costs have been accounted for.
CONCEPTUAL ATN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS – 2035 FORECASTS

This section provides a conceptual analysis of the ATN alternative with particular reference to passenger rail and bus rapid transit as envisioned for Scenario B (understood to presently be preferred by some community groups).

SAFETY

Automated guideway transit is held to a far higher standard of safety (American Society of Civil Engineers Automated People Movers Standards) than any other mode of surface transportation. ATN operates on exclusive guideways separated from pedestrians and traffic. There are no crossings, only merges and diverges. The results speak for themselves – over 200 million injury-free passenger miles. Couple this with the fact that ATN’s higher level of service attracts more passengers than any other transit mode and it is clear that ATN will significantly increase safety over any other solution.

RELIABILITY AND EFFICIENCY

ATN systems for which data is publicly available (Heathrow Airport and Masdar City) are operating at availabilities more than 99.5%. This is five times more reliable than transit level of service A (97.5%).

Peak Period Mean Auto Travel Time

While an analysis of the impacts of ATN on auto travel time has not been undertaken, the significantly higher mode share with ATN (see below) will result in fewer autos on the road than with other transit modes and thus should have a greater positive impact on congestion and travel speeds.

Peak Period Mean Transit Travel Time

Referring to UCS Table 17, the ATN average travel time of 30 minutes between Downtown Watsonville and Downtown Santa Cruz is better than the average AM and PM peak period auto times of 52 and 60 minutes respectively. Referring to UCS Table 35, Scenario B, it is also better than the best bus time of 53.6 minutes and the passenger rail time of 41.0 minutes and considerably better than the worst bus time of 83.7 minutes.

Travel Time Reliability

ATN systems are designed to avoid traffic jams. Overcrowding results in people waiting a bit longer in stations which encourages ridesharing and thus boosts capacity at the time it is most needed. Trip times are always the same between any two stations with the small exception that some passengers may have a small detour or an intermediate stop or two if they have agreed to rideshare. Even these passengers will be able to count on very little daily variability in trip and waiting times.

Mode Share

The mode share for ATN has been based on the transit mode share for Scenario B adjusted to account for changes in waiting and travel times as well as revenue miles. The transit mode share for Scenario B includes 7,396 rail boardings per day (10/16/18 UCS FAQ) and an unstated number of bus boardings per
day. Based on boardings reported by the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, Route 91X, the Santa Cruz/Watsonville Express has 704 daily boardings and Route 71, Santa Cruz to Watsonville has 1,920 daily boardings.

The following discussion explains how bus daily ridership and ATN daily and peak period ridership were estimated for Scenario B from this information.

The analysis was based on work done by Liu\(^3\) and uses a Logit Model to estimate changes in mode share based on modal preferences and changes in trip times. Mode preference is the extra time a person would spend to use their preferred mode. For example, people have been shown to be willing to take a 25-minute longer trip by car rather than catch a bus. Public stated-preference surveys by PRT Consulting have shown ATN mode preference over bus to be higher than auto but, to be conservative, it has been assumed to be the average of auto (25 minutes) and rail (10 minutes). Transit wait times have been assumed to be the square root of peak headway as per UCS Table 11. Since the number of bus stops varies, the first and last mile times for all systems have both been assumed to be five minutes. The BRT times have been averaged into one time. The average fare per trip was assumed to be the same for all modes ($5.50 per trip) and was therefore not a factor.

The Logit Model can predict the increase or decrease in ridership of a given mode based on the known ridership and any changes in service level (headways, first- and last-mile times and travel times). With the addition of modal preference values, it can be used to predict the ridership if one mode is replaced with another.

First, the Logit Model was used to estimate the BRT boardings in Scenario B. To do this, the model calculated the number of BRT boardings that would result if passenger rail, which produced 7,396 boardings, was paralleled with BRT service running a mile or so away through roughly similar neighborhoods. The characteristics of the rail and BRT service used in the model are shown in Table 3. The result was 1,479 BRT trips. This seemed low relative to the existing boardings and the BRT boardings were increased by 30% to 1,920 (the same as Route 71) to be conservative.

Next, the model was run in the same manner using the factors in Table 3 to predict the number of ATN boardings that would result if the rail system was replaced by an ATN system (22,800) and, secondly, if the BRT system was replaced with an ATN system (28,100). These results total 50,900 ATN boardings.

Table 3 shows the assumptions for each mode and the resulting ATN trips.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Headway</th>
<th>Wait Time</th>
<th>First + Last Mile</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Mode Preference</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Rail</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT (estimated average)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>50,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Liu, R et al (1997), “Assessment of Intermodal Transfer Penalties Using Stated Preference Data”, Transportation Research Record 1607 pp 74-80
To test the accuracy of the Logit Model, it was used (in a previous project) to predict the bus ridership on the Red Route in Clemson, South Carolina, based on the actual automobile ridership and the differences in trip characteristics between the auto and bus trips. The model was run twice with slightly different factors each time. It predicted an average bus ridership of 3,459 which was 4% higher than the actual bus ridership of 3,239.

To compare the Logit Model to the model used in the UCS, it was used to predict the ridership on BRT in the rail corridor based on the rail ridership and the difference between the rail and BRT characteristics. The characteristics used are shown in Table 4 below. The first/last mile times used reflect the fact that the BRT has twice the number of stations as the passenger rail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Headway</th>
<th>Wait Time</th>
<th>First + Last Mile</th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Mode Preference</th>
<th>Boardings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B Rail</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C BRT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3,698 predicted BRT trips are 251 (6%) less than the 3,949 predicted by the UCS (10/16/18 FAQ).

The results in Table 3 above are consistent with those of other investigators around the world as illustrated in Figure 9, which is based on studies undertaken in the named cities using a variety of methodologies.

Part of the reason the ATN system does so well is that it covers both the rail and the Soquel BRT routes and would undoubtedly also pick up traffic from the local bus routes (a factor not accounted for above). This is largely because, unlike BRT, ATN combines high average speeds with numerous stations. Note that savings in local bus operating costs have not been accounted for here.

The 50,900 daily ATN boardings result in about 3,000 ATN pphpd in the peak hour (assuming 10% of trips are in the peak hour and a 60/40 directional split), which is less than the previously-selected maximum line capacity for this project of 5,000. The projected ATN boardings are not out of line with the 13,900 average daily boardings reported in 2010 for the Morgantown PRT system which only has five stations.

To estimate countywide mode share, it was anticipated that bus ridership for UCSC and Highway 17 will exceed the current level of at least 11,000 daily trips, for a countywide total of at least 61,900 daily.

---

4 PRT Facilities Master Plan, West Virginia University, by Gannett Fleming, Lea+Elliott, Olszak, June 2010
5 Santa Cruz Metro, Comprehensive Operational Analysis, January 2016
transit trips. Therefore, assuming a total of 947,700 daily trips for all modes (10/16/18 UCS FAQ) the countywide transit mode share with ATN is likely 6.53% or better, exceeding the anticipated result for Scenario B.

Despite the comparisons and justifications, some will doubt the ability of high-quality transit with reliable express, on-demand service, numerous stations and short waiting times to attract riders. The ATN boardings have therefore been reduced 25% in the following analyses. This results in a daily ATN ridership of 38,800.

ECONOMIC VITALITY

Public Investment

The UCS revenue analysis appears to ignore fare-box revenues. This analysis assumes fare-box revenues at the average rate of $5.50 per boarding. In addition, to obtain a true comparison of the total cost of each system, the operating costs and fare-box revenues are estimated over a life of 30 years, assuming the 2035 ridership represents the average ridership. The daily boardings have been multiplied by 300 to determine annual boardings. The daily boardings are for weekday ridership and the 300 multiplier is used in place of 365 to account for lowerridership on weekends and holidays.

TABLE 5. TOTAL COST COMPARISON (SCENARIO B)
(All figures in thousands of year 2018 dollars, except subsidy per ride in 2018 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Capital Cost ($000)</th>
<th>O&amp;M Costs Over 30 Years ($000)</th>
<th>Fare-Box Revenue Over 30 Years ($000)</th>
<th>Total Net Cost Over 30 Years ($000)</th>
<th>Subsidy Per Ride ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soquel/Freedom BRT + bus-on-shoulder (1,920 daily boardings)</td>
<td>$44,863</td>
<td>$534,000</td>
<td>-$95,040</td>
<td>$483,823</td>
<td>$28.00?6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail (7,396 daily boardings)</td>
<td>$339,800</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>-$366,100</td>
<td>$393,700</td>
<td>$5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B Total</td>
<td>$384,663</td>
<td>$954,000</td>
<td>-$446,142</td>
<td>$877,521</td>
<td>$10.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATN (38,800 daily boardings)</td>
<td>$1,403,500</td>
<td>$1,158,000</td>
<td>-$1,920,600</td>
<td>$640,900</td>
<td>$1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though table 5 shows that the ATN solution is considerably more expensive, it attracts far more passengers and thus has higher fare-box revenues. The ATN system more than covers its own operating costs through fare-box revenues (almost unheard of for US transit systems). In order to also cover the capital costs over 30 years (neglecting interest), the subsidy per ride for ATN is only $1.84. Even if the ATN ridership estimate is halved, the capital costs would be reduced (since fewer vehicles are needed). The operating cost would be approximately halved, and the required a subsidy would be $5.42 per ride.

6 Ridership based on Table 3 assumptions. The UCS estimated BRT ridership is unknown.
about half of Santa Cruz Metro’s current subsidy (for operating costs only) for intercity routes. On the other hand, as ATN ridership increases, the required subsidy decreases.

Note that it has proven impossible to ascertain the extent, if any, of BRT costs not included in the UCS Study. The study seems to imply that the costs shown are additional to existing service, which will continue, but does not provide the cost of the continuing service. Also, it is unclear whether the projected fare-box revenue has been deducted from the annual O&M costs in the study or not (Table 4 assumes not).

An analysis of the potential amount of funding from known federal, state, and local revenue sources for ATN is not included here. Even though the ATN solution has the potential to fund itself (should the contingency allowances not be required), it is eligible for FTA funding in competition with other fixed-guideway modes as evidenced by the continuing federal grants being awarded to the Morgantown PRT System.

It is likely that an ATN system can be acquired under a design/build/finance/operate/maintain/transfer procurement model requiring little to no upfront funding. The supplier team would finance the project and receive payments over time in return for ensuring the system is available for public use meeting predetermined criteria. Technical and business failure risks would be protected by performance and payment bonds ensuring all debts will be paid and the system will be removed if it fails to work.

**Visitor Tax Revenues and Other Economic Impacts**

While no analysis is included here, the increased transit use, shorter trip times and reduced congestion should result in increased visitor tax revenues and positive economic impacts.

**Costs Associated with Collisions**

Motor vehicle collisions and associated costs should reduce approximately in proportion to the increase in transit mode share.

**ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH**

**Automobile Vehicle Miles Traveled**

If we assume the average transit trip length is 5.9 miles (UCS Page 119), we find that ATN increases the daily transit person trip miles by approximately 245,000. Assuming an average automobile occupancy of 1.29 (UCS Table16) and disregarding any induced automobile travel demand, this would reduce daily automobile vehicle miles traveled by approximately 190,000. This is about twice the anticipated VMT reduction for Scenario B.

**Environmentally Sensitive Areas**

While no analysis has been undertaken, ATN has a smaller footprint (seven feet wide for one-way track at grade) than any other transit mode. In addition, the lightweight vehicles produce almost no noise, vibrations, emissions or electro-magnetic interference. Accommodating a trail next to the ATN system...
will be relatively easy compared to train or bus, especially since the ATN guideway can be elevated the entire way or just in tight situations.

**Greenhouse Gas and Criteria Pollutants**

ATN vehicles themselves do not emit greenhouse gases, and in general ATN systems consume about one third of the energy per passenger mile of other transit systems. ATN guideways are well-suited to support solar panels (costs not considered here) which may be sufficient to meet the needs for motive power. Even if the system lacks solar panels, it would likely be powered with carbon-free electricity from Monterey Bay Community Power. Battery-powered vehicles could facilitate energy storage. Reduction in automobile vehicle miles traveled and congestion should have significant positive impacts on emissions.

**EQUITABLE ACCESS**

**Transit Vehicle Miles Traveled**

Unlike most other transit modes, ATN vehicles do not have to travel to the end of the line or even the end of a scheduled route before turning around. Furthermore, they do not need to move to provide availability when there is no demand. This means there is less relatively empty vehicle movement. It also makes it more complicated to determine vehicle miles traveled without a detailed station-to-station trip demand matrix. Nonetheless, the ATN vehicle miles traveled have been estimated at 43.8 million miles per year. This is 6.5 times higher than the 6.65 million shown in UCS Figure 41.

**Household Transportation Cost**

Since “How much a household spends on transportation depends primarily on the number of automobiles in the household” (UCS Page 130), it is clear that the increased transit mode share with ATN will do more to reduce household transportation costs than any other alternative.

The community may wish to implement a tiered fare structure to encourage ride sharing and give passengers more control over their transit spending. For example:

- Tier one passengers pay per vehicle. They get a vehicle dedicated to them and their party (one to six). They wait less than a minute and travel nonstop to their destination.
- Tier two passengers pay per ride. They must be willing to wait up to (say) five minutes for others to arrive who are on the same route and can share the ride. They may have to make an intermediate stop or two.
- Tier three passengers pay a very low fare per ride and must be willing to wait longer (up to 20 or 30 minutes) for their ride.

This fairly unique ability to match the level of service to the fare paid promotes equitable access and mobility for all. An animation of an ATN station configured to accommodate this type of operation may be viewed here: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dXyBJ_nyh4M&](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dXyBJ_nyh4M&)
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SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

ATN systems are commercially available from a number of suppliers. They have been in continuous public service since 1975 (1999 for commercially-available systems). This conceptual study has found a six-passenger ATN system to be superior to the UCS Scenario B combination of passenger rail and BRT. It is believed that consideration of a 24-passenger GRT system would probably also find superior results.

This analysis has not been undertaken to the same depth as the UCS analysis. However, the level of accuracy is adequate to demonstrate that ATN will be a far superior solution that is worthy of further consideration. The operating characteristics have been proven in public service. The costs have been derived by experienced suppliers from projects that have been implemented. Even if the ridership estimate is halved, the ATN system will still cover its operating costs with fare-box revenues and it will only require a subsidy of $5.42 per ride to also cover its capital costs. This is far lower than any other alternative.

The thirteen key criteria in the UCS study have each been addressed. ATN has been found to be superior to Scenario B for each criterion. There appears to be no credible argument to exclude ATN from consideration.
APENDIX A – PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND COST ESTIMATES

The ATN project description and cost estimates are provided below. This project has been evaluated at a conceptual level and a contingency of 50% has been used. Costs are based mostly on fixed bid prices in South Carolina in 2016 adjusted to reflect this project’s size and location.

“Annual Operations and Maintenance” includes costs for new ATN service, vehicle operations and maintenance as well as facility maintenance. Maintenance costs include replacement of worn parts up to and including vehicle replacement as necessary.

### Project Table A-1: ATN System

| Limits                        | Natural Bridges Drive in Santa Cruz to Pajaro Station near Watsonville. The route from Aptos to Cabrillo Highway near Watsonville consists of two-way track along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way, mostly at-grade. The remainder of the route is mostly elevated and consists of one-way track along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way forming interconnected loops with one-way track along Mission Street, Lincoln Street, Soquel Avenue/Drive, 17th Avenue, Capitola Road, Clares Street and Wharf Road in Santa Cruz and along Salinas Road, Porter Drive, Main Street, Freedom Boulevard, South Green Valley Road and Ohlone Parkway in Watsonville. See Figures 7 and 8 for maps of the layout showing proposed station locations. It should be noted that the guideway routing and station locations shown are conceptual. They are intended for use in this conceptual analysis only. Determining preferred routing and locations requires extensive public input. |
| Description                   | On-demand passenger service provided by driverless small (six-passenger) vehicles traveling along exclusive guideways and serving offline stations. Guideways and stations may be elevated or at-grade. This analysis is based on six-passenger battery-powered vehicles such as offered by Ultra or Modutram (and possibly 2getthere if they can accommodate six passengers). |
| Scope                         | Connect 57 stations with 58.3 miles of one-way track. Provide 20 hours of service 365 days a year with an average wait time less than three minutes at any station and average speeds exceeding 35 mph. |

### CAPITAL COSTS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track Removal</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideway &amp; Control System</td>
<td>$609,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations/Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>$114,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles (480)</td>
<td>$50,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs (30%)</td>
<td>$234,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (50%)</td>
<td>$389,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Costs</td>
<td>$1,403,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual O&amp;M Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATN service 20 hours a day for 365 days a year</td>
<td>$25,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (50%)</td>
<td>$12,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual O&amp;M Costs</td>
<td>$38,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Chairman Leopold and Commissioners,

Thank you for all the time and resources you have invested in identifying the right transportation choices for our community. Greenway has also spent a large amount of hours examining the UCS. We request that your carefully consider the following due to the complexity of the study’s data and the fact that whatever is decided will impact the lives of all county residents for years to come:

1. Allow the RTC’s new Executive Director, Guy Preston, to have an adequate amount of time to evaluate the UCS findings and make his recommendations.
2. Do an objective Alternatives Analysis of the options on the rail corridor which includes input from METRO (see METRO memo pages 223 - 231: https://www.scmtd.com/images/department/board/current/111618BODAgendaPOST.pdf) and fully complies with Measure D’s language of studying “transportation uses of the corridor through an open and transparent public process.”
3. Authentically seek community consensus to ensure fair and equitable outcomes.

As a justification for delaying any further action on the UCS, we have taken the liberty to outline some of the main issues with the study for your review.

A close look at the benefits of each Scenario shows they are nearly identical and within the study’s margin of error, thus making them essentially useless for comparison purposes.

When Greenway examined all the benefits, including; total collisions, mean auto speed, person trips, economic vitality, tax revenue, cost associated with collisions, vehicle miles traveled, criteria pollutants, CO2 emissions, household transportation costs, and equity considerations, the benefits do not vary much from Scenario to Scenario. In fact, there isn’t much difference from the Baseline or No Build Scenarios.

The RTC staff’s “preferred scenario” is recommending we spend 76% of capital on projects in the rail corridor which will not benefit Watsonville residents for 20 years.

South County will bear the brunt of the cost to maintain these projects via a regressive sales tax, which is already close to the statutory limit (and requires approval of 2/3s of all county residents). In fact, the UCS shows only 3,698 roundtrip passenger train riders per day countywide and the previous Rail Transit Feasibility Study showed only 300 of those coming from Watsonville. In addition, in the area in which South County residents have the most pain--Hwy 1--the UCS predicts there will be NO change in average...
mean auto speed from now until 2035. So the RTC staff is recommending no improvement for South County residents in their daily struggle to go north in the morning and south in the afternoon.

The “preferred scenario” recommendation is even more perplexing when you look at the cost per user over the next 30 years.

Greenway has calculated the cost per user of the four different modalities included in the study; passenger train, Hwy 1 HOV lane, Trail Only, and METRO. The analysis looks at a 30 year period since this is a reasonable timeframe for an investment of this type and the time period of a needed sales tax to fund the operating expenses of a train. All the data comes from the UCS except for METRO, where we are using publicly available capital, operating expense and ridership data.

The calculations show that a train user is 16 times more expensive than an incremental user of an HOV lane, 16 to 34 times more expensive than a trail user, and 1.6 times more expensive than a METRO user. The use of “battery electric trains,” even if available in the next twenty years, will not change this calculation significantly since ridership forecasts are so low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Capital Cost &amp; Opex Over 30 Yrs</th>
<th>Users/30 Years</th>
<th>Cost/User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Train</td>
<td>$1,321M</td>
<td>81M</td>
<td>$16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 HOV</td>
<td>$615M</td>
<td>548M</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Only</td>
<td>$116M - $240M</td>
<td>246M</td>
<td>$0.47 - $0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>$1,533M</td>
<td>156M</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All capital and opex data is taken from the UCS, all METRO data, is taken from published METRO sources (see Appendix below for further detail)

The RTC is proposing locking up the corridor for 10 years North of milepost 7 to preserve the tracks for a passenger train in 20 years if ever. At the same time, it is providing no relief to Hwy 1 commuters.

South County commuters will bear the greatest harm to their health and well being.

No change in commuter time will inevitably lead to increased stress and poor health caused by sitting in hours of traffic. CO2 emissions don’t change dramatically in the four scenarios, so more emphasis should be paid to short and medium-term health, personal time loss and real business costs to those stuck in traffic. Not to mention the lost opportunity for a healthy lifestyle provided for by the use of a Greenway for safe, active transportation and an affordable means of exercise and important community building that could have a profound impact on South County residents.
Let’s create a vision for an Optimal Use Scenario (OUS) that benefits all including South County residents!

There is broad consensus on most of the individual projects delineated in the UCS. These include those that provide real transportation value the county can afford, can implement in a reasonable timeframe and positively impact South County residents. Why not implement an Optimal Use Scenario that includes:

- Freight operations serving Watsonville businesses
- Bus on Shoulder on Hwy 1
- Additional Auxiliary Lanes from Rio Del Mar to Freedom Blvd.
- Ramp Metering
- Mission Street Intersection Improvements
- Soquel and Freedom Intersection Improvements
- Protected Bike Lanes throughout the county
- Bus Rapid Transit on Soquel/Freedom
- Trail Only on the Rail Corridor

The above projects would result in TWO north/south public transit options with optimized traffic flow, one on Hwy 1 and one on Soquel/Freedom. These projects are affordable and nearer-term public transit options for Watsonville residents, who will come to learn that they will pay a disproportionate share of the cost of any sales tax to fund a train, with few of them able to leave their cars at home due to the high cost of train fares, inconvenient schedules, first mile/last mile connections, and need for flexibility.

All of the projects listed above cost about $450M, and together with Measure D funds and state/federal grants, we have a realistic chance of implementing them ALL in the next 10 years and maintaining them thereafter.

Bring the community together by making the right choices for our transportation future.

Thus far, the Capitola voters have been the only Santa Cruz County residents able to express their opinion about the use of the corridor by way of Measure L. Greenway believes that ALL Santa Cruz County residents deserve the right to express their preference at the ballot box on these important transportation choices.

“Do residents of Santa Cruz County want to spend $1.3 billion over the next 30 years, inclusive of an additional ¾% sales tax to fund passenger rail between Santa Cruz and Watsonville?”

This is the question that Greenway will seek to answer moving forward. Please join us in ensuring that ALL residents are considered in the transportation decisions our community faces, and that your decisions have real impact in our lives in the next 10 years!
Appendix

Passenger Train
An electric train has a capital cost of $550M, and $13.2M per year in operating costs or $396M over 30 years. Additional buses for transit connections have a capital cost of $11.7M, and annual operating costs of $12.1M or $363M over 30 years. So total cost of ownership for a train and additional buses is $550M + $396M + $11.7M + $363M = $1.321 billion over 30 years. (Table B-10 and Table 39)

According to the UCS, a train on the rail corridor has estimated ridership of 7,396 people per day, or 2.7M per year. Over 30 years total ridership would be 81M. (Table E-2)

Highway 1 HOV Lane
An HOV lane on Hwy 1 has a capital cost of $453M, and $5.4M annual operating and maintenance expense times 30 years = $162M. So total cost of ownership for an HOV lane for 30 years is $453M + $162M = $615M. (Table B-2)

Hwy 1 accommodates about 100,000 cars per day in each direction, most with single drivers, so to be conservative, let’s say Hwy 1 currently delivers to their destinations about 100,000 persons per day or 36M per year. One additional lane has the capacity to deliver about 18M persons per year, or 548M people over 30 years.

Trail Only
We strongly dispute the UCS cost estimate for Trail Only of $222M and have provided documentation from Alta Planning and Design with an estimate of $98M. To be fair, let’s use these two numbers as the range for the capital cost and add the $606K annual operating expense, which totals $18M for 30 years. So total cost of ownership over 30 years is $98M + $18M = $116M up to $222M + 18M = $240M. (Table B-13 and Alta memo 10.18.18)

Per the UCS, Trail Only can accommodate about 22,518 people per day, which translates to 8.2M annually or 246M over 30 years. (Table E-1)

METRO
The capital budget of METRO in FY18 for revenue producing buses was $9.4M or $282M in capital over 30 years. The FY18 operating budget is $46.7M per year less approximately $5M for ParaCruz = $41.7M, or $1,251M over 30 years. METRO has ridership of about 5.2M people per year. Over 30 years, METRO carries 156M passengers at an operating cost of $1,251M + capital cost of $282M = $1,533M total cost of ownership.
INPUT FROM THE PUBLIC
November 14, 2019 - January 9, 2019
The SCCRTC received the following email sent by the individuals listed below:

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 9, 2019 11:57 AM  
**To:** john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
**Subject:** UCS lacks environmental and economic analysis

Dear Commissioner Leopold,

Please vote NO on RTC Staff's "Preferred Scenario" this January 17th, 2019.

A vote for RTC Staff's "Preferred Scenario" would betray the trust of voters and violate Measure D because the Unified Corridors Study has so far failed to provide "environmental and economic analysis...through an open, transparent public process" (Measure D, Voter Approved Expenditure Plan, 2016).

The UCS must develop an optimal scenario based on a complete analysis that takes into consideration the majority of public opinion as represented by 10,000 petition signatures and the passage of Measure L.

Thank you,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 9, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stan Poplin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Sorrentino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Plumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genny Haid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Susaimuthu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Moffat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbi Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutti Hacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Milukas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From:** Tim Aron  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 9, 2019 11:39 AM  
**To:** Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
**Subject:** Rail Petition

Hello,

Last year I signed a petition the Santa Cruz County Greenway Petition. I believe I was misled by the petition and would like to have my name, Timothy Aron, removed from the petition. While I support a trail on the transit corridor, I am not opposed to complementary uses such as rail system. Please let me know if you require additional information to have my name removed from the petition.

Thank,
Tim

**From:** Jamie Aron  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 9, 2019 9:38 AM  
**To:** Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
**Subject:** Retract my signature please
To Whom This May Concern,

I’m writing to retract my signature from the petition that was anti-rail in Santa Cruz County. I’m in support of a bike/ped trail in addition to the rail that would connect North and South Counties.

I signed the petition while I was walking along East Cliff and a nice young man was asking for signatures and he told me his whole sob story about moving to Santa Cruz for love but that didn’t work out and this was his job now, getting paid to collect signatures. I signed it more out of pity for the young man than for the cause which I found out recently was anti-rail and not inclusive of rail, bike and ped.

Thank you.

Kindly,
Jamie Aron

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 8, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gabriella Rapport-Esquirel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erfan Soltanmohammadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela Salazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock Gudeman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
• Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
• Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 7, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Fairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Rohde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karyn Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskia Newberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Negroni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: LD Freitas  
Sent: Sunday, January 6, 2019 1:29 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: rail busses

Hi:

I’ve attached an article about rail busses being built by Toyota in Japan. These vehicles can operate on roads and railway. They have a capacity of twenty-five passengers. I think this is a no-brainer for the branch rail line between Pajaro Junction and Swift Street on the Westside and Downtown Santa Cruz. Upgrade of tracks to class 2 between La selva and Santa Cruz, class 3 from Pajaro to La Selva.

LD Freitas  
Aptos, Ca.

• https://www.wired.com/2008/05/half-bus-half-t/  

IT'S A BUS. IT'S A TRAIN. IT'S BOTH!

• 05.27.08 | 11:58 AM  
By: Alexander Lew

What do you get when you cross a bus with a train? A dual-mode vehicle that has the versatility of a bus, the speed of light rail and fuel economy vastly better than either.
Toyota and its truck-making subsidiary Hino Motors have signed on with Japan Rail Hokkaido to develop the vehicles, which carry 25 people and reportedly burn one-fourth the amount of diesel fuel required by conventional buses. Japan Rail started testing them about 18 months ago, and bringing Toyota aboard could speed up development and commercialization of what may be the mass transit vehicle of the future.

Dual-mode vehicles have four rubber tires for road use and four steel wheels for the rails, and it takes less than 15 seconds to go from road to rail and back again. It drives just like a bus on the road, and a hydraulic system raises the tires and lowers the steel wheels as the driver guides the vehicle onto the tracks.

Japan Rail provides rail service for the island of Hokkaido, and about one-third of its lines carry less than 500 people. It developed the dual-mode vehicles as a means of cutting costs on those lines without reducing service. The vehicles use a Toyota microbus body and axles built by Hino. The two companies will help Japan Rail refine the technology and increase passenger capacity with an eye toward commercial production.

"Our contribution is expected to be another step toward more practical use of the dual mode vehicle," company spokesman Kenichiro Baba told AFP. Combing the versatility of a bus with the speed of a train has allowed Japan Rail to tailor routes and services to the communities it serves. Rather than scuttling service on under-utilized lines, Japan Rail has simply switched to smaller vehicles.

Combing the versatility of a bus with the speed of a train has allowed Japan Rail to tailor routes and services to the communities it serves. Rather than scuttling service on under-utilized lines, Japan Rail has simply switched to smaller vehicles.

Dual-mode vehicles would be a great addition to America's mass transit infrastructure. It would make rail transit feasible in those areas that don't have the population density to support a lot of stations, and make mass transit a more viable option for exurbs. Riders could simply hop on at a bus stop in their neighborhood, then ride the rails to their destination.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6I1GBcAlm-8

From: Pureheart Steinbruner  
Sent: Saturday, January 5, 2019 1:56 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Rail Line

I hope Roaring Camp or Progressive will be running excursions up to Davenport this spring and summer while waiting to get the whole line underway. A "galloping goose" type trolley can also be plying the streets of Santa Cruz at all times.

Where will the parking for the Aptos station be now that the 'projects' there will be taking all the spaces?

Our grandparents had something like eleven trains/day passing through...what is do darn hard
| From: Gail Jack  
| Sent: Friday, January 4, 2019 4:08 PM  
| To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
| Subject: No Highway Expansion |

Dear Commissioners,

You've made a seriously misguided decision in voting to extend Highway 1 widening down to Aptos. "If you build it, they will come." And with that increase comes more pollutants when we should be decreasing them.

Very, very disappointed in this group of supposedly forward-thinking individuals.

Let's put our dollars into transit and active transportation where they can improve our mobility in a way that is environmentally sustainable and socially equitable.

Thank you,

Gail Jack

| From: Phil and Pam Stearns  
| Sent: Thursday, January 3, 2019 7:47 AM  
| To: paulinesales120@gmail.com; info@sccrtc.org; +gpreston@sccrtc.org; +john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; +ebottorff167@yahoo.com; +zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; +ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us; +greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; +bruce.mcpPherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; +jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; +sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; +rlj12@comcast.net; +trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; +cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; +aschiff@Gmail.com; +virginia.johnson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; +patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us; +openup@ucsc.edu  
| Subject: RE: [SCCAN] Transit not highway expansion |

Dear Commissioners,

Thank goodness for transit experts such as Jarrett Walker. His talk to you last summer was illuminating. He confirmed what most observers can easily see - that we have an inadequate transit system for an area of our size and demography.

In this time of Climate Crisis we implore you to use your power to guide transit development away from individual auto capacity. Do your job! We have so little time to right our wrongs.

Sincerely,  
Phil and Pam Stearns  
Santa Cruz
The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

The citizens council will deliver its deliberations at a public forum interactive event to which you are warming invited;

Cruzo (Cedar St) 6:30 - 9:30 pm, Saturday January 12, 2019;

https://www.eventbrite.com/e/santa-cruz-county-citizenscouncil-public-event-tickets-53850138213

Please note, we are planning to livestream this event for those who cannot attend in person.
HOW WE CONVENED THE CITIZENS COUNCIL:
The copy below went out to 80 randomly selected citizens, taken from the voter rolls from Watsonville, Aptos, Capitola, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, Felton, Ben Lomond, Boulder Creek. This email (and/or phone call followed an initial snail mail invitation letter;)

FOLLOW-UP EMAIL ADDRESSED TO THE 80 RANDOM CITIZENS WHO RECEIVED INITIAL SNAIL MAIL:

[We are] following up on our invitation to join a group of citizens to address a confounding local civic issue. By meeting with a group of randomly selected citizens, your deliberations will serve to inform the broader community.

We know this might sound abstract but if you're interested in this kind of democratic exercise, we'd love the chance to talk with you about what this is.

It's a first for Santa Cruz County. We've pasted couple links below that give you more of a sense of its potential impact and efficacy.

If you choose not to respond at all, this will be the last communication you will receive from us.

Best,
Corrina McFarlane

REFERENCES:
Here's a video of this process being used in Austria (in the state of Vorarlberg where they have an 'Office of Future Related Issues' (!)!! Two staff members from that office trained originally with (our) WA state USA-based Jim Rough):
https://vimeo.com/135618811

And here's an article in Axiom News (generative journalism) on Wisdom Councils in Europe (work originating from Jim Rough).

Center for Wise Democracy is a WA-based 501(c)3. Jim Rough is the co-founder with a long history of helping Communities establish this participatory democracy model. His book is called Society's Breakthrough; Releasing Essential Wisdom and Virtue in All of the People [2002].

We are convening the inaugural Center for Wise Democracy #WeThePeople Santa Cruz citizens council on a local hot button issue;

On January 11th & 12th, we are convening a 11 person citizens council which will meet for two long sessions Friday eve and all day Saturday, and present their findings in a special Community Conversation for the public.
Fourteen of us (so far) have gone through a local 'Dynamic Facilitation' training seminar with Jim Rough but we do not yet have mastery. Jim Rough is coming down (again), this time to guide us through our first citizens council process on a local hot button issue.

Center for Wise Democracy LOCAL NON PROFIT partner:

**It's Our Home**  501(c)3

302 Emeline Ave,

SC, CA 95060

Web address ~ [https://itsourhome.org](https://itsourhome.org)

EIN #: 26-2872625

Contact: Corrina McFarlane

About the public event (into which the Citizens Council will deliver their story/deliberations):

!!![Center for Wise Democracy](https://itsourhome.org)!!!

**Santa Cruz County citizens council #WeThePeople Process ~ 'A Dynamic Facilitation'**
First up: _Once Upon a Rail Corridor..._

January 11 & 12 is a small citizen council process, which will feed into Saturday evening public event;

"A Community Conversation phenomenon"

**At Cruzio (Cedar St) 6:30 - 9:30 pm, Saturday January 12, 2019**

It's an opportunity both to see what we're doing with Center for Wise Democracy toward generating a more participatory democracy in our County, and to learn what this first Santa Cruz County #WeThePeople citizens council concluded from their 2-day intensive on this ~rail corridor~ hot button issue, and for all of us to then speak to that.
World Cafe-style..

Note that the citizens council is a symbolic representation of #WeThePeople comprised of between 8-16 randomly selected citizens drawn from North/South County voter rolls. Having delivered their conclusions, the council disbands; the work of the council is done (subsequent issues convene a new random selection).

About the Organizers (a 501(c)3 partnership:

Santa Cruz-based IT'S OUR HOME 501(c)3 ~ MISSION
We are committed to empowering ordinary people to learn, organize, and participate in creating a cleaner, safer, socially just and sustainable community. We work locally to unify and build bridges of understanding and support, increasing the collective impact upon multiple issues, from environmental sustainability to social justice. We provide key resources for citizens to explore and engage in the important local issues and the groups that are focusing on solutions.

Executive Director: Angela Blessing

CENTER FOR WISE DEMOCRACY 501(c)3
[Port Townsend, WA] brings 'Dynamic Facilitation'

Dynamic Facilitation evokes "choice-creating," a special quality of thinking where people use all their capacities to achieve breakthroughs on impossible-seeming issues. Choice-creating is akin to what often happens naturally in a crisis, where everyone drops their old ways of thinking and comes together to achieve the impossible. Dynamic Facilitation can be used with individuals, groups, organizations and, through this council process, very large systems of people.

Executive Director: Jim Rough

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY #WeThePeople Coordinator: Corrina McFarlane
direct line:  831 345 1476

Our first "Santa Cruz County Citizens Council" [Wisdom Council];

Eighty letters were mailed on Winter Solstice/Dec 21st to randomly selected citizens throughout the County. The letter explains that we will follow up with a phone call and also invites all recipients to go online to read the long version of the letter we sent, and check out the links. From these eighty we should glean eleven to serve on the SCC 'citizens council'.

You can see what they accessed here:
https://www.eventbrite.com/e/santa-cruz-county-16-person-citizenscouncil-tickets-53989098848
This private event page went live in readiness for the 80 randomly selected citizens to receive their snail mail letter. .

The letter to randomly selected citizens went out as a one-pager, double-sided, English/Spanish.

Pasted below are both versions here.
December 19th, 2018

Dear .............,

Remember the phrase “We the People”? Here’s your chance for that to mean you. You’ve been selected from the Santa Cruz County Voter Registrar to form a Citizens Council for 24 hrs on the topic of the Santa Cruz Branch Line “Rail Corridor.”

The Citizens Council will develop creative, win/win solutions. You may be well versed in the subject or you may know nothing about it. Either way your input will be invaluable as a representative of the community. A facilitator will guide the process. The Council will share their findings with the community at a public workshop immediately following.

The Council will convene at Cruzio, City of Santa Cruz on:

- **Friday evening, 1/11/19 from 6:30pm - 9:30pm (Cruzio classroom)**
- **Saturday, 1/12/19 from 9:30am - 5:00pm (Resource Center for Nonviolence)**
- followed by a public workshop **Saturday evening from 6:30pm - 9:30pm (back at Cruzio)**

Saturday food will be provided for citizens council *(lunch & dinner)*. Where transport would be appreciated we will do our best to arrange pick-up/drop-off / rideshares.

We will reach out to you by phone to answer any and all questions! You are also welcome to RSVP at: [www.citizenscouncil.org/scc](http://www.citizenscouncil.org/scc) (more detailed version of this letter there).

We hope you will join us in this exciting exercise to **revitalize democracy**.

Sincerely,

Corrina McFarlane,
Coordinator

Citizens Council | [citizenscouncil.org](http://citizenscouncil.org)
In partnership with *It’s Our Home* 501(c)3
based on the model by *Center for Wise Democracy*
19 de diciembre de 2018

Estimado ............,

¿Recuerda la frase “Nosotros, el pueblo”? Esta es su oportunidad para que eso signifique usted. Ha sido seleccionado del Registro de Votantes del Condado de Santa Cruz para formar un Consejo de Ciudadanos por 24 horas sobre el tema del Corredor Ferroviario de la Línea de Sucursal de Santa Cruz.

”El Consejo de Ciudadanos desarrollará creativas, soluciones y llega a un consenso sobre el tema. Usted puede estar bien versado en el tema o puede no saber nada al respecto. De cualquier manera, su participación será invaluable como representante de la comunidad. Un facilitador guiará el proceso. El Consejo compartirá sus conclusiones con la comunidad en un taller público inmediatamente después.

El Consejo se reunirá en la ciudad de Santa Cruz el
• viernes, 1/11/19 de 6:30 pm a 9:30 pm
• sábado, 12/01/19 de 9:30 am a 5:00 pm incluyendo un taller público de 6:30 pm a 9:30 pm

El sábado tendremos comida (almuerzo y cena). Si se necesita transporte, haremos todo lo posible para organizar lo de ida y vuelta.

Nos comunicaremos con usted por teléfono para responder a todas sus preguntas. También puede confirmar su asistencia en: www.citizenscouncil.org/scc (versión más detallada de esta carta allí). Esperamos que se unan con nosotros en este emocionante ejercicio para revitalizar la democracia.

Atentamente,

Corrina McFarlane,
Coordinadora

Consejo de Ciudadanos | citizenscouncil.org
En asociación con It’s Our Home 501 (c) 3
basado en el modelo de Center for Wise Democracy
From: THEODORA KERRY  
Sent: Wednesday, January 2, 2019 6:00 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org; gpreston@sccrtc.org; john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;  
ebottorff167@yahoo.com; zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us;  
greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us;  
sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; rlj12@comcast.net; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org;  
cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; aschiffr@gmail.com; virginia.johnson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;  
patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us  
Subject: Transit not highway expansion  

Dear Commissioners,  
As a full time bus passenger/pedestrian, I’m begging you to please put transit  
and active transportation investments ahead of projects that increase auto capacity. The latter  
increase traffic, greenhouse gases, and fail to reduce travel time beyond the short term. I’m especially  
disturbed that the bus service between Santa Cruz and Watsonville (lines 71 and 69) shuts down by  
9pm, which all but eliminates the possibility of night time pursuits along that corridor. Also, line 4 into  
the Harvey West Area offers no weekend service, even though that area contains The Tannery Arts  
and Housing Complex where hundreds live and work, and many more hundreds visit. I’ve had to give  
up visiting many friends and businesses due to the limited routes served throughout the county. Not  
sure who’s making the final decisions, but i’m pretty sure they all drive their own cars.  

Thank you for considering my input in your decision making!!  

Theodora Kerry, 40 year county resident

From: Nick Danty  
Sent: Wednesday, January 2, 2019 3:14 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org; +gpreston@sccrtc.org; +john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;  
+ebottorff167@yahoo.com; +zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; +ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us;  
+greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; +bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;  
+jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; +sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; +rlj12@comcast.net;  
+trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; +cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; +aschiffr@gmail.com;  
+virginia.johnson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; +patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us; +openup@ucsc.edu  
Subject: Transit not highway expansion  

Dear Commissioners,  
Please put transit and active transportation investments ahead of projects that increase auto  
capacity. The latter increase traffic, greenhouse gases, and fail to reduce travel time beyond the short  
term. Induced demand is a real thing, and within 5 years of widening Highway 1 we will see more  
traffic and congestion than existed before. I urge you to fight this proposal.  

With all the progressive politics in our county, I am continually baffled by the lack of public transit  
services. Forget electric vehicles, rideshare, and scooters - what we need is a more robust bus fleet  
that has a competitive advantage over the automobile. This is a low tech solution that has the  
potential to benefit everyone...including motorists! I don’t own a car, but am lucky to live in  
downtown Santa Cruz where the majority of my daily needs are within walking or biking distance.  
However, for errands or visits to friends and activities that require longer travel distances, I am
basically out of luck. This means I am forced to purchase items or services in San Jose where I work, or continue my corporate slavery to Amazon. This takes money away from local businesses that I would otherwise support if they were served by frequent bus routes. Plus, I would like to keep my sales tax dollars in the county I live in...not over the hill or in Jeff Bezos’s pocket.

Please challenge the status quo and do more to further the discussion of public transit and complete streets in our county. If L.A and San Jose can do it, so can we. Don't let this beautiful region further succumb to the auto-oriented development of the 20th century.

Thank you for your continued efforts to improve sustainable transportation in Santa Cruz County.

Best,

Nick Danty
Transportation Planner and Santa Cruz Resident

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

January 2, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randy Probst</th>
<th>Raoul Ortiz</th>
<th>Dan Stevenson</th>
<th>Mark Gordon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Liu</td>
<td>Karen Edwards van Muijen</td>
<td>Morgan Adams</td>
<td>Zackary Boyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viviana Rentena</td>
<td>Mona Shams</td>
<td>Estyn Cannan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Stong</td>
<td>Mary St.Clair</td>
<td>Carol Christenson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Meier</td>
<td>Leticia Quintano</td>
<td>Mary Odegaard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Curt Simmons
Sent: Wednesday, January 2, 2019 8:40 AM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening
Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.

Thank you,

Curt Simmons

From: Stanley Sokolow  
Sent: Tuesday, January 1, 2019 1:39 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Input for the UCS scenario decision on Jan 17, 2019

Dear RTC:

Please accept the attached letter as public input to your agenda item on the scenario decision.

Thank you,

Stanley Sokolow
Stanley M. Sokolow

January 1, 2019

TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

VIA EMAIL

RE: Input for the UCS scenario decision at the January 17, 2019, upcoming meeting

Dear Commissioners:

At your last meeting, the executive director clarified that your upcoming decision to select a UCS scenario does not bind the Commission to the type of transit on the railroad corridor at this time. Further studies will be done to examine the alternatives in more detail. However, advocates for the train have been arguing that a train provides superior ride quality over a BRT bus and that this difference would be a big influence on ridership. Therefore, I submit the following evidence for your consideration. Pay close attention to the last example I give, that of the Adelaide (Australia) rapid bus system called the O-Bahn because I believe it’s the closest model of ride quality that we could build here on our railroad corridor alongside the trail. The Cambridge example shows that they have a bike path directly adjacent to the busway. The Eugene (Oregon) example shows how buses can run opposite directions on a single lane by using signaling to give the okay for a bus to enter the shared segment after waiting for the oncoming bus to pass.

As posted on Facebook at The Campaign for Sustainable Transportation on Jan 1 2019:

RIDE QUALITY OF TRAIN VS BRT AS SEEN ON VIDEO.

[Posted by Stanley Sokolow. Opinions are his own and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Campaign for Sustainable Transportation.]

The Unified Corridor Investment Study says that a train on the rail corridor would cost more to build and operate than a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system there. People argue that the ride quality of a train would be worth the extra investment and operating expense, even though the train would not go directly to the established transit centers in Watsonville, Capitola, and Santa Cruz. What actually is the difference in ride quality, assuming the BRT bus is equipped with interior amenities similar to the train? Here are some videos of actual rides on train and BRT systems.

First, the SunLINK Streetcar in Tucson, AZ, which is an electric train powered by overhead wires. It is a 3-car train running on tracks embedded in streets in an urban environment, not an express service with few stops as our train would be.  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6syS5DELPAI
Second, a Stadler FLIRT electric train designed for inter-city routes like our Amtrak trains. This video shows the maiden voyage of the new train in Norway. Since it’s an intercity train, it is outfitted for longer trips, so it has an on-board toilet which our commuter train probably would not. Stadler has recently announced a new model of the FLIRT which is powered by batteries instead of overhead wires as this example shows.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6CttqWKz8KM

Third, the EmX BRT line in Eugene, Oregon, which has articulated New Flyer diesel hybrid buses designed for BRT with low floors and doors on left and right, bike racks inside at the rear door. It runs mostly on streets in lanes reserved for bus-only. A portion of the route runs on new concrete lanes which were intended to operate like the Adelaide O-Bahn that you’ll see further below, but the guide wheels are not used now. New Flyer has recently announced that its battery-powered articulated bus has passed federal certification, so it would be available by the time our RTC is ready to purchase BRT buses.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JW3wRfBbGJ0

Notice that a portion of the EmX BRT runs buses both directions on a single track by using signals to control when the bus can enter the shared segment. Watch this happen in this video. Notice that the bus we're on waits for the arriving bus to clear out of the lane. Then the bus signal overhead, which is No-Go even though the general traffic lanes have a green light, changes to Go when it's clear to enter the shared section. That could be done on our single-track right-of-way with passing occurring at stations on the route. Here's the video which jumps in at that moment.
https://youtu.be/JW3wRfBbGJ0?t=133

Fourth, the Cambridge guided bus in Cambridgeshire, UK, runs part of the time on an exclusive busway similar to the O-Bahn and part through the city on bus-only lanes in mixed traffic. The buses are guided by small side wheels attached to the front steering so they stay by themselves within the busway. In city streets they run like a regular bus. The travel time could be reduced if the traffic signals gave priority to the buses so they don’t stop for cross traffic, which is a feature that our BRT is supposed to have.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mTJVQ13sFaU

Finally, the Adelaide O-Bahn which runs on a busway that was built specifically to solve geologic problems on the route. It has concrete tracks sitting on concrete sleepers (like railroad ties) which rest on concrete posts to get down to solid subsoil support. The engineers and builder were careful to make the pre-cast tracks smooth and vertically aligned so there are minimal bumps. It's somewhat like a concrete railroad with rubber wheels on concrete rails. It also is guided by guide wheels so the driver can take hands off the wheel in the guided sections. At the stations, it transitions to conventional paving. Part of the route runs in a tunnel.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jJKpgDukL84

Our BRT on the railroad corridor would run nearly all the route on an exclusive busway, as Adelaide's does, with street running to get to the existing bus transit centers, so if built well, it could have ride quality similar to Adelaide’s.
The RTC’s revised UCS study estimated that building the train service would cost $324.7 million. The BRT service would cost $265 million. Operating and maintaining (O&M) the train and the increased bus trips between the train and existing transit centers would cost $9.7 million/year in new public money. O&M of the BRT would cost $400 thousand/year in new money. The train would run every 30 minutes; the BRT every 15 minutes. The BRT would go directly to existing bus transit centers; the train can’t. It would make fewer stops than a streetcar or conventional bus route does.

Is the difference in ride quality worth the additional $9.3 million per year to operate and maintain the train compared with the BRT?

Sincerely,

Stanley Sokolow
The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

December 31, 2018

Emma Nelson
Neil Moak
Doug Abrams
Gabriel Arzovni
Roger Knacke
Clay Ramsay
Elenaor Mendoza
Noah Kipnes
Emily Brodsky
Jean Kratzer
Emma Christie
Travis Beck
Josh Brandt
Rachel Schwehr
Robert Cooper
Christina Haslam
Sarah C. Beck
Page Brownton
Matthew Hall
Jim Mulherin
David Foster
Ellen Vaughan
Kathleene McDillean
Rohan Mahy

From: DeAnna Lopez
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2018 12:35 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org; gpreston@sccrtc.org; john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bmcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; rlj12@comcast.net; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; aschiff@gmail.com; virginia.johnson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us; openup@ucsc.edu
Subject: Transit not highway expansion

Dear Commissioners,
Please put transit and active transportation investments ahead of projects that increase auto capacity. The latter increase traffic, greenhouse gases, and fail to reduce travel time beyond the short term.

Thank you,

From: Cathy
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2018 10:37 AM
To: Regional Transport.Commission <info@sccrtc.org>; gpreston@sccrtc.org; john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us;
Dear Commissioners,

Please put transit and active transportation investments ahead of projects that increase auto capacity. The latter increase traffic, greenhouse gases, and fail to reduce travel time beyond the short term.

I am asking you to put the completed analysis of alternatives before your decision on the mode of transit for the corridor between Santa Cruz & Watsonville.

Please do not let the well-funded special interests of a few outweigh the needs & best interests of the majority in our county.

Thank you for your time and serious consideration,

Cathy Gamble
Aptos, CA

From: Sheila Carrillo
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2018 9:38 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org; gpreston@sccrtc.org; john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; rlj12@comcast.net; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; aschiffr@gmail.com; virginia.johnson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us; openup@ucsc.edu
Subject: Transit not highway expansion

Dear Commissioners,

Please put transit and active transportation investments ahead of projects that increase auto capacity. The latter increase traffic, greenhouse gases, and fail to reduce travel time beyond the short term. We need make decision that take responsibility as a community for the welfare of the planet. We need to do everything in our power to decrease auto use and also encourage electric vehicles.

Thank you,
Sheila Carrillo
50 year resident of Santa Cruz County

From: Tony Fleig
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2018 9:31 AM
To: +aschiffr@gmail.com; +bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; +cchase@cityofsantacruz.com;
+ebottorff167@yahoo.com; +gpreston@sccrtc.org; +greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;
+jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; +john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; +openup@ucsc.edu;
+patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us; +rlj12@comcast.net; +ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us;
+sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; +trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; +virginia.johnson@co.santa-
cruz.ca.us; +zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Transit not highway expansion

Dear Commissioners, Please put transit and active transportation investments ahead of projects that increase auto capacity. The latter increase traffic, greenhouse gases, and fail to reduce travel time beyond the short term. Thank you,

From: Marlene Majewska
Sent: Monday, December 31, 2018 9:18 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org; gpreston@sccrtc.org; john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;
ebottorff167@yahoo.com; zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us;
greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us;
sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; rlj12@comcast.net; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org;
cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; aschiffr@gmail.com; virginia.johnson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;
patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us; openup@ucsc.edu
Subject: Transit not highway expansion

Dear Commissioners,
Please put transit and active transportation investments ahead of projects that increase auto capacity. The latter increase traffic, greenhouse gases, and fail to reduce travel time beyond the short term.

Thank you,

From: Rae Schwaderer
Sent: Sunday, December 30, 2018 9:15 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening
Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity. A bus-on-shoulder lane could be built for less money and better results. Please, listen to the people of Santa Cruz County and the transportation professionals --not the big money!

Thank you,
Rae Schwaderer
Aptos

From: Elissa Wagner
Sent: Sunday, December 30, 2018 6:25 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening

Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.

METRO is asking the RTC to fund an alternatives analysis that will include examining bus-on-shoulder on Hwy 1 and buses on the rail corridor. I hope you do indeed fund that study.

Highway widening won’t reduce congestion, it increases greenhouse gases, and it prevents us from spending money where we need it---on transit and active transportation. Please be bold and escape from the individual-auto/highway-widening mold. It is futile and outdated.

Thank you,
Elissa Wagner
Aptos 95003

From: Juliet Goldstein
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2018 6:41 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: comments on proposed rail line

I live in Aptos as I like country living. Am against the rail- line for a number of reasons. Where are people going to park their cars in order to ride the train? we do not want large parking lots in Aptos.
Noise pollution
Who wants to go for a nice walk or bike ride next to a train going by?

thank you for noting my comments
J.Goldstein

From: GARY PLOMP
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2018 11:59 AM
To: SCCRTC - UCS <ucs@sccrtc.org>
Cc: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: RE: Rail with Trail "B"

To whom it may concern:

I wish to respectfully ask that you expediently vote for Scenario "B" Rail with Trail in January. Many people including I, feel that in the interest of future transportation in Santa Cruz County, this is the best use for the historic Santa Cruz Branch rail line.

Please keep in mind that the anti-rail groups have **misinformed the public, paid petitioners to gather "10,000" signatures, and have used deceptive tactics** to further their cause to remove the rails.

I also request that you do not delay or postpone the vote for Phase 2 in the rail plan.

Thank you for your attention to my letter.

Sincerely;

Gary V. Plomp
Rail Advocate

From: Johanna Lighthill
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 5:07 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org; Santa Cruz County RTC <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Re: UCS comments

A correction to my previous letter: Re; equitable access, should read “preferred has 1.62 fewer transit miles per year **than B**.” Sorry for my error.

On Dec 28, 2018, at 5:00 PM, jjmmlight wrote:
Dear RTC Staff,

Thank you for considering my comments regarding the UCS.

The Preferred scenario should not be referred to as a modification to Scenario B. It is closer to Scenario E. This is very misleading:
Preferred is B with 4 changes: +AUX, -BRT lite and express, + Freight.
Preferred is E with two changes: +BOS and -HOV. In fact, beyond 2035, preferred is identical to E, yet there is not reference to this.
I urge you to clarify.

With regard to Table 3. Performance Measures Results for Preferred Scenario:

Safety
Collisions figure is 865, which is identical to that of Scenario B, yet, with the addition of AUX lanes, collision numbers should increase. Please adjust accordingly.

Reliability and Efficiency
Peak Period Travel Time Reliability = “More reliable.” Can you quantify that? And can you accurately estimate reliability of passenger rail service, when freight service has priority and ability to adjust scheduling?

Economic Vitality
The level of public funding is excessive compared to the benefits provided by preferred scenario. Cost reductions associated with collisions should be adjusted to reflect adjusted total collisions (above).

Environment and Health
Automobile VMT, Greenhouse gas emissions, and criteria pollutants totals are all equal to those of Scenario C. Please clarify.

Equitable Access
Transit VMT total for preferred is 5.03. This is the lowest of all scenarios. In fact, preferred has 1.62 million fewer transit miles per year. Please do not compare to B with regard to transit benefits.

With regard to public input: performance measures rated “most important” by the public:

At the October 15th meeting in Live Oak: Travel time reliability, Greenhouse gas emissions, Benefits to transportation disadvantaged, Transit travel time and Collisions.

At the October 16th meeting in Watsonville: Mode share, Benefits to transportation disadvantaged, Greenhouse gas emissions and Transit Travel Time.
I would recommend more opportunity for public input after these inconsistencies are explained.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Johanna Lighthill

From: Manu Koenig
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 4:59 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org; ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: UCS conclusions based on faulty economic analysis

Dear RTC Staff,

There is reason to believe the UCS has serious shortcomings. The economic analysis is incomplete if not completely lacking. This has lead to a poorly performing draft Preferred Scenario.

For example, while the UCS provides costs and benefits for each scenario in its Performance Dashboard, each scenario’s costs are not considered against their respective benefits to create a cost-benefit analysis. Without a true cost-benefit analysis, the Study provides an incomplete and misleading picture. For example, Scenario B seems to outperform the other scenarios when the benefit of savings from reduced collisions is considered. Scenario B produces seventy-eight million dollars ($78,000,000) of annual savings compared to Scenario A which only produces fifty-two million dollars ($52,000,000) of annual savings. However, when the benefits of each scenario are divided by their respective annual cost for operations & maintenance ($25,000,000 for Scenario A and $48,000,000 for Scenario B) a different picture emerges: Scenario A performs best producing $2.08 of savings for every $1.00 of cost whereas Scenario B only produces $1.63 per dollar spent. The Study’s focus on benefits alone, without adequately weighing them against costs, resulted in an incomplete and inaccurate representation of the potential scenarios.

The preferred scenario should not be based on Scenario B. You should create an optimal scenario. A true economic analysis is required before you propose a preferred scenario.

I am more than happy to explain and work with you. Please contact me if you would like additional info, charts, explanation, etc.

Sincerely yours,

Manu
From: Julie Montgomery
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 4:45 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org; info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Selection of UCS Scenario

Dear Commissioners,

I strongly support adoption of any UCS scenario which includes an option to use the rail corridor for rail transit. Scenario B is the best solution for our county since both the bike trail and rail will be accommodated in the corridor.

Santa Cruz county is facing challenges for both affordable housing and transportation. Proposed increases to UCSC enrollment and any prospect of attracting new business or jobs will require that both these issues are addressed. Good public transit alternatives expand options for affordable housing by connecting regions with lower housing costs to employers, entertainment, and school. Construction of both bike and rail infrastructure on the rail corridor, together with improved safe bike routes on existing roads, has the potential to fundamentally change how we get around the county. Bike from your home to catch a train or to bike on the trail, then bike from the trail or train to your destination. Enable tourists to leave their cars at their hotel, or even at home, and be able to access points of interest from Davenport to Manresa and beyond.

Building for both bike and public transit is the best use of this precious resource. Keeping the tracks in place preserves the existing easements and keeps the right of way intact. Planning for rail transit is the fastest way to provide real transit options to get from Aptos to the westside of Santa Cruz.

I have resided in Santa Cruz county for almost 28 years. I have seen the traffic congestion on 1 and 17 keep increasing despite the many improvements that have been made to both those highways. We need a real option to driving. As a regular patron of the Hwy 17 Express, I am skeptical that Bus Rapid Transit using the shoulder of Hwy 1 will significantly improve transit times from Watsonville. Buses are great, but will always be impacted by traffic on all our roadways. A train and trail together can provide a real option for students, workers, and tourists to move around the county without needing to use a car.

Thank you for your time and for considering my point of view.

Regards,

Julia Montgomery
Dear Commissioners,

As a longtime Santa Cruz County resident, I am so excited with the options that rail brings to our county. The RTC’s and County’s years of diligent research has backed the conclusion that rail transit integrated with existing and future transportation modes will provide the greatest return on investment for the greatest number of county residents among the different design concepts on the rail corridor.

The results of the UCIS provide the data needed to move forward with a yes vote on a package that includes rail transit.

Scenario B investments provide:
- Lower greenhouse gas emissions,
- Fewer collisions,
- Greatest transit mode share,
- Greatest bike mode share,
- Highest scores across multiple economic criteria.

The rail corridor is an invaluable transportation asset and the rail line is already in place, permitted and operational, upgrades to this line are by far a more feasible project than demolition of it and replacement with bus lanes.

I support Scenario B because, having lived in and having been a homeowner in South County, I know that developing the rail system that makes the full trip to Watsonville will be a huge social and economic bonus to our entire County. Additionally, it also makes strategic sense to align our transportation network with the overall California plan, including the expansion in Monterey County. It is wonderful that we will be able to take advantage of some of the $144 Billion in funds provided through 2040 by the Caltrans State Rail Plan to expand the rail network, which includes our branch line. Finally, it is increasingly important that we develop truly sustainable transportation options in our County. As shown by recent UN and government studies on global climate change, our time for transforming the way we live and get around is running out. It’s important we not delay this important infrastructure that will allow us to get around as efficiently and economically as possible.

I fully support a vote to move forward with investments including rail and trail on the branch line.

Thanks,
Julie Pascal
Dear Commissioners,

As a life-long Santa Cruz County resident, I am so excited with the options that rail brings to our county. The RTC’s and County’s years of diligent research has backed the conclusion that rail transit integrated with existing and future transportation modes will provide the greatest return on investment for the greatest number of county residents among the different design concepts on the rail corridor.

The results of the UCIS provide the data needed to move forward with a yes vote on a package that includes rail transit.

Scenario B investments provide:
- Lower greenhouse gas emissions,
- Fewer collisions,
- Greatest transit mode share,
- Greatest bike mode share,
- Highest scores across multiple economic criteria.

The rail corridor is an invaluable transportation asset and the rail line is already in place, permitted and operational, upgrades to this line are by far a more feasible project than demolition of it and replacement with bus lanes.

I support Scenario B because, having lived in and as a homeowner in South County, I know that developing the rail system that makes the full trip to Watsonville will be a huge social and economic bonus to our entire County. Additionally, it also makes strategic sense to align our transportation network with the overall California plan, including the expansion in Monterey County. It is wonderful that we will be able to take advantage of some of the $144 Billion in funds provided through 2040 by the Caltrans State Rail Plan to expand the rail network, which includes our branch line. Finally, it is increasingly important that we develop truly sustainable transportation options in our County. As shown by recent UN and government studies on global climate change, our time for transforming the way we live and get around is running out. It’s important we not delay this important infrastructure that will allow us to get around as efficiently and economically as possible.

I fully support a vote to move forward with investments including rail and trail on the branch line.

Thanks,
Justin Cortez
From: Christine Weir  
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 3:23 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Cc: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: support for "Scenario B"

Dear staff and commissioners,

I am writing the RTC to encourage you to support “Scenario B” for the Rail Right of Way. I am strongly in favor of preserving the tracks for future transit use, while building an adjacent bike/walking trail as soon as possible. I believe that preserving this right-of-way for rail-based public transit is vital to our future. On a global scale, it means that Santa Cruz will be doing its part to combat climate change – trains are more efficient and safe than automobiles and trucks. And on a local scale, a train would be the best option we have to move people about the county in a safe, convenient, and timely manner. We have the right-of-way and state funding is available for train development. We don’t want to lose either the right-of-way easements (by removing the tracks), or the opportunity that is growing to fund rail based transit projects.

The rail corridor is a precious resource for our county. There are those that argue that it should be limited to being only a wide bike path. That would be an incredible waste. This valuable transit corridor should be accessible and useful to ALL of our citizens.

Thank you,

Christine Weir  
Santa Cruz, CA

From: kaki rusmore  
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 3:00 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Scenario B

Dear RTC Staff,

I know you are in the final stages of making recommendations to the RTC board about which scenario to choose. Having read most of the report, I strongly support Scenario B or the slight revisions suggested by the consultants. As described in the report, adopting train travel on the rail corridor will:

- provide access to jobs, education and recreation throughout the county
- support greater economic and social equity than vehicle transportation
- help reduce climate impacts (less GHC than cars/buses, less gas and vehicle miles)
- provide more safety, speed of transit times, and comfort than other options
provide a greater boost to the local economy than other options

I understand you are under great pressure to recommend a bike-only or bus option, but neither of these would provide the benefits described above. I hope thoughtful, analytical minds will prevail and allow Santa Cruz County to live up to its name of being a green, compassionate, forward-thinking place.

I also am very clear, from having observed the bike-only petition gatherers at work, that the people signing those petitions were not told they what they were signing. The information offered was that the petition was to support bike access to the corridor, not to eliminate train travel. Please take this into account as you see those petitions arrive.

Warmly,
Kaki Rusmore
Aptos

---

From: Sally Arnold  
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 3:00 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org; Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Comments to RTC Staff & Commissioners re Scenario Choice for ROW

Dear Commissioners & Staff,

Thank you for all the work you have done comparing various options for our rail corridor.

I am writing to urge you to recommend and approve Scenario B for our rail corridor. It allows us to use our wonderful public resource soonest. Because of the complex easement issues, unless you want to spend lots of time and lots of money in litigation, you must vote to preserve and use the tracks. You must keep those tracks or, at best our public transportation options are seriously delayed, and at worst they are killed.

And there are several ways we can make B even better:

The proposed Mission Street “improvements” are largely car centric. But we know that when we reduce the emphasis on cars and improve the walkability of a street

- it increases nearby property values
- people spend more money in the area stimulating the local economy
- it’s safer for everyone
- It is less expensive for the city to maintain

Clearly it would be financially wise for the RTC to plan any Mission St improvements to increase pedestrian and bike access, not to speed up car traffic in those 2 miles.
Additionally, I suggest that you remove all improvements to Highway 1 as part of the recommended scenario. We all know that improving flow on the highway just encourages people to drive (induced travel) which then increases greenhouse gas emissions and does nothing in the long run to relieve congestion. What a waste of our tax dollars!

Another improvement to Scenario B would be to increase the freight service to be available on the whole line, not just the Watsonville area. I realize there may be less freight business in North County, but if there are some businesses that prefer to receive or send product by rail, that is better for the environment and for safety than trucking, so let’s keep the possibility open.

Lastly, delays can be costly. I know some people want you to delay your decision about the tracks until all the legal questions about the easements are answered or until all the possible transit vehicles have been studied. I think that is a mistake. It’s time to pick a general direction and work out the details later. Every day we delay is a day that people are forced into private auto use, further degrading our environment.

Please make your decision soon. We’ve been planning and discussing how to best use the rail corridor for about 20 years. It’s time to act.

Thank you,

Sally Arnold
Santa Cruz Resident

From: Sandra Owusu
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 1:48 PM
To: ucs@scrtc.org; info@scrtc.org
Subject: Support for UCS vote and Scenario B from Santa Cruz County Resident

Dear Commissioners,

As a resident of the beautiful Santa Cruz County, I am very excited by the options that rail brings to our county. The RTC’s and County’s years of diligent research supports the conclusion that rail transit integrated with existing and future transportation modes will provide the greatest return on investment for the greatest number of county residents among the different design concepts on the rail corridor.

The results of the UCIS provide the data needed to move forward with a yes vote on a package that includes rail transit.

Scenario B investments provide:

- Lower greenhouse gas emissions,
- Fewer collisions,
- Greatest transit mode share,
• Greatest bike mode share,
• Highest scores across multiple economic criteria.

The rail corridor is an invaluable transportation asset, and upgrades to an already existing, permitted and operational rail line, makes for a more feasible project than its demolition and replacement with bus lanes.

As a Santa Cruz County resident, and knowing the huge economic contributions of agriculture from Watsonville, I fully support Scenario B. I know that developing the rail system that makes the full trip to Watsonville will be a huge social and economic bonus to our entire County.

Strategically, it is sensible to align our transportation network with the overall California plan, including the expansion in Monterey County. Additionally, we will be able to take advantage of the $144 Billion in funds provided through 2040 by the Caltrans State Rail Plan to expand the rail network, which includes our branch line.

Finally, we cannot overemphasize the importance of developing truly sustainable transportation options in our County. Research by both the UN and government on global climate change hammers on the necessity of making huge changes in our daily lives in the now to help contribute to combating climate change. A rail line is an important infrastructure that will allow us to get around in a most environmentally friendly, sustainable, efficiently and as economically as possible.

I fully support a vote to move forward with investments including rail and trail on the branch line.

Thank you,
Sandra Acheampong Owusu (Segal), Ph.D
Research Scientist (Forest Molecular Genetics)

From: Brett Garrett
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 1:02 PM
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Comprehensive Alternatives Analysis - include ATN/PRT

Dear RTC staff and commissioners,

I agree with Santa Cruz Metro that a Comprehensive Alternatives Analysis should be conducted to help determine the best mode of transit for the rail corridor, over and above the basic alternatives study that would be done by default as part of the CEQA process. I would further extend Metro’s recommendation by insisting the analysis must include alternative transit and emerging technologies such as ATN/PRT, that is, Automated Transit Networks and Personal Rapid Transit in particular.

I have previously shared a study from PRT Consulting that predicts that an ATN/PRT system using long-established technology (such as Ultra, 2getthere, or Modutram) could exceed five times the ridership of the "Scenario B" passenger rail, while further improving safety and reducing energy usage and carbon emissions. PRT/ATN technology will dramatically improve in the next few years. Santa
Cruz County is currently (and should strive to remain) in a great position to take advantage of any of the following developments:

**Elon Musk and the Boring Company** have demonstrated a mile-long tunnel near Los Angeles, at a cost of only $10 million. Although we don’t know all of the details, it appears to me that (in addition to transporting private vehicles) this system will be fully capable of serving as a high-speed, high-capacity ATN mass transit system.

**Transit X** has produced a system [proposal for Santa Cruz County](https://example.com) that is said to be privately funded at no expense to taxpayers. It remains to be seen whether Transit X is capable of delivering what they promise, but they expect to demonstrate a prototype system very soon.

Other companies that appear to be on the cusp of being able to deliver an excellent transportation system without taxpayer expense include [skyTran](https://skytran.com) (building a prototype in Israel), [JPods](https://j pods.com) (expecting to build in Shaxian, China), and [Futran](https://futran.com) (building a prototype in South Africa). Note that Futran has a local connection, namely Ron Swenson whose family has successfully built numerous buildings and solar power projects in Santa Cruz County.

It is vitally important for our UCS decision to "leave the door open" for emerging transit technology. I urge you to fully embrace and extend the Comprehensive Alternatives Analysis that has been requested by Santa Cruz Metro.

Sincerely,
Brett Garrett

---

From: *dana jameson*  
Date: Fri, Dec 28, 2018, 12:53 PM  
Subject: Alternatives to highway widening  
To: <ucs@sccrt.org>

Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.

Highway lanes fill up and congestion is never relieved for long. It’s a rule called induced demand. If you make it easier for people to do something they do it more. Building more lanes on SR 1 will simply encourage more auto trips on the corridor bringing congestion with it.

We need to provide people with fast alternative routes and modes of transportation that don’t involve cars. No matter what we do, congestion during peak times on SR 1 will remain and spending our way out of the problem with auxiliary and HOV lanes is far too costly an answer for our small county.

Commissioners, I urge you to divert spending of our valuable tax dollars toward solutions that will provide alternatives to hardworking people like me who are unhappy sitting on a congested Highway.
Bus on shoulder without auxiliary lanes is a far cheaper and more cost-effective alternative.

Thank you,
Dara Jameson
Mom and long time resident, Live Oak

From: Bruce Sawhill
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 12:22 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Jan. 17 vote- Yes on Scenario B

Dear RTC Commissioners:

I am writing to urge you to vote on the preferred scenario of the current four being considered in the UCIS study on Jan 17. We have had enough delay already, and further delay will serve no constructive purpose. We need transportation solutions ASAP, and these things take a long time because they’re complex and expensive.

I also urge you to vote ‘yes’ on Scenario B because it is important to have transit on the rail corridor and I believe that is going to turn out to be the cheapest and easiest way to get significant transit capacity to where people need it in our County. Furthermore, I believe that modern electric rail (battery or fuel cell powered) will turn out to be the most effective solution in terms of efficiency, reliability, safety, and amortized per-trip cost. I understand that the detailed specifics of a transit solution (like rail or bus or other) remain to be studied, and, even though I’m impatient, I understand the importance of due diligence.

Seven days before you meet, the first segment of the eagerly awaited “rail trail” will start construction on the San Lorenzo Bridge. Please select Scenario B so we can move ahead with planning transit and trail together and avoid costly and problematic replanning and “re-dos” that could occur with planning them as independent projects.

Currently only a very small sliver of the population bikes or uses transit and it is heavily concentrated around UCSC. I believe that with a coordinated effort (managed by Metro) we could turn that into a Thanksgiving-sized slice of the pie, but it will require many modes working together in a coordinated way—rail, bus, bikes, walking, transportation network companies, etc. It will also require transportation improvements on the other corridors studied by the UCIS. This is a pathway to a more livable and equitable future.

Thanks for your attention,

Bruce Sawhill, PhD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Dianne</th>
<th>Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 11:33 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To: <a href="mailto:ucs@sccrtc.org">ucs@sccrtc.org</a>; <a href="mailto:info@sccrtc.org">info@sccrtc.org</a></td>
<td>Subject: Electric transit for our future!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly support preserving the rail corridor for future electric transit and building the trail as soon as possible. With population growing in the county, few options for expanded roadways, and the dire need for reducing carbon emissions, electric transit is the only sensible decision.

Choose Scenario B without delay!

Dianne Dryer  
Santa Cruz County resident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Brian Heath</th>
<th>Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 10:31 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To: UCS <a href="mailto:UCS@sccrtc.org">UCS@sccrtc.org</a></td>
<td>Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity. A bus-on-the shoulder-lane for parts of Highway 1 in Santa Cruz needs to be fully researched and considered.

Brian Heath PhD

Thank you,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: David Lieby</th>
<th>Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 10:31 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To: <a href="mailto:ucs@sccrtc.org">ucs@sccrtc.org</a></td>
<td>Subject: Unified Corridor Study (UCS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Commissioners,

I have been following the UCS for a long time. I have attended meetings and watched it develop. The commission has been very diligent in the pursuit of the best way to move forward. I fear, though, more delays. Looking at the way construction costs are rising, and the amount of money involved, it seems to me that every delay requested by groups who want to have just one more question answered probably will add several hundreds of thousands of dollars a month to the cost of the project.

Please move forward and get the corridor built.
Thanks,
David Lieby

From: Anna Kammer
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 10:07 AM
To: SCCRTC - UCS <ucs@sccrtc.org>; Trina Coffman <trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org>; Greg Caput <greg.caput@santacruzcounty.us>; Tony Gregorio <tony.gregorio@santacruzcounty.us>
Subject: Please Adopt UCS Scenario B

Dear Chair Leopold and RTC Commissioners,

As Watsonville residents, we urge you to adopt Scenario B from the Unified Corridor Study. With the addition of freight service on the rail corridor, and protected, rather than buffered, bike lanes along the Soquel/Freedom corridor the options in this Scenario would serve the transportation needs of the greatest number of County residents. South County folks, representing one-third of the County population, especially need safe, reliable alternatives to car travel on Highway 1.

By prioritizing funding and improving the rail line, we also open our connection to the main north/south line on the Statewide Rail Network. As we go into the future, this transportation option will become crucial to the economic development of Santa Cruz County. Santa Cruz County prides itself on being a leader in looking toward a greener and cleaner future for our residents. Scenario B offers transportation choices that reduce not only VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled), but this plan goes a long way toward reducing our greenhouse gasses by focusing on transit and active transportation over highway widening.

Scenario B offers the most transportation options for all County residents. Please consider the needs of the Santa Cruz County community as a whole, equally balancing the needs of North and South County residents. Keep the long-term vision of multiple transit options in mind as you look to building future transportation alternatives in Santa Cruz County.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Anna Kammer and Dan Fallorina

The SCCRTC received the following email sent by the individuals listed below:

Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018
To: ucs@sccrtc.org; info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Support for UCS vote & Scenario B from Life Long County Resident and Homeowner

Dear Commissioners,
As a life-long Santa Cruz County resident, I am so excited with the options that rail brings to our county. The RTC’s and County’s years of diligent research has backed the conclusion that rail transit integrated with existing and future transportation modes will provide the greatest return on investment for the greatest number of county residents among the different design concepts on the rail corridor.

The results of the UCIS provide the data needed to move forward with a yes vote on a package that includes rail transit.

Scenario B investments provide:
• Lower greenhouse gas emissions,
• Fewer collisions,
• Greatest transit mode share,
• Greatest bike mode share,
• Highest scores across multiple economic criteria.

The rail corridor is an invaluable transportation asset and the rail line is already in place, permitted and operational, upgrades to this line are by far a more feasible project than demolition of it and replacement with bus lanes.

I support Scenario B because, having lived in and as a homeowner in South County, I know that developing the rail system that makes the full trip to Watsonville will be a huge social and economic bonus to our entire County. Additionally, it also makes strategic sense to align our transportation network with the overall California plan, including the expansion in Monterey County. It is wonderful that we will be able to take advantage of some of the $144 Billion in funds provided through 2040 by the Caltrans State Rail Plan to expand the rail network, which includes our branch line. Finally, it is increasingly important that we develop truly sustainable transportation options in our County. As shown by recent UN and government studies on global climate change, our time for transforming the way we live and get around is running out. It’s important we not delay this important infrastructure that will allow us to get around as efficiently and economically as possible.

I fully support a vote to move forward with investments including rail and trail on the branch line.

Thanks,

December 28, 2018

Faina Segal
Coleman Segal

From: Susan Dahlgren
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 8:49 AM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening
Dear Commissioners,

Please don’t put money toward widening Hwy 1 or building auxiliary lanes. As pointed out by UC Davis researcher Susan Handy, these measures don’t reduce traffic. Instead, put money towards a Bus on the Shoulder solution and other alternatives, such as the rail/trail.

Thank you,

Sincerely,
Susan Dahlgren

---

From: Val Cole  
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 5:57 AM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Scenario B

Dear Commissioners,

I am excited to see our community move forward with Scenario B. The benefits, as I see them

- Rail Trail ASAP — we have waited long enough for this. Let’s get moving!
- Lower greenhouse gas emissions,
- Fewer collisions,
- Greatest transit mode share
- Greatest bike mode share
- Highest scores across multiple economic criteria.

While some in the community have made rail a controversial issue, I believe preserving the corridor for future use is smart for our community. It’s more equitable than widening Highway 1 for our neighbors in South County, rail is a far greener mode of transit than the automobile, and preserving the corridor gives our community transit options for the future.

Please don’t delay your vote so that we can get our community moving!

Thank you for your service,

Val Cole

---

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,
• We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
• We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
• Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
• Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

---

From: Felipe Hernandez  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 10:21 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org; info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Let’s Move Scenario B Forward

Dear Commissioners,

It’s time to move forward with rail transit, consistent with the 2012 original purchase of the rail line and years of study that tell us with increasing certainly that rail transit integrated with existing and future transportation modes will provide the greatest return on investment for the greatest number of county residents among the different design concepts on the rail corridor.

The results of the UCIS provide the data needed to move forward with a yes vote on a package that includes rail transit.
Scenario B investments provide:
• Lower greenhouse gas emissions,
• Fewer collisions,
• Greatest transit mode share,
• Greatest bike mode share,
• Highest scores across multiple economic criteria.

The rail corridor is an invaluable transportation asset and the rail line is already in place, permitted and operational, upgrades to this line are by far a more feasible project than demolition of it and replacement with bus lanes.

Equity is best served by developing the rail system that makes the full trip to Watsonville, the bus plans for the corridor end at State Park Drive.
Monterey County is expanding their rail network with a Salinas to Gilroy extension, featuring a station at Pajaro connecting to our rail line.
The Caltrans State Rail Plan includes $144 Billion through 2040 to expand the rail network, and includes our branch line in their vision for the network.

Please do not delay this vote a second time. Vote to move forward with investments including rail and trail on the branch line.

Assure Metro supporters that bus alternatives will be studied, take Trail Only off the table, and begin the important process of developing transportation solutions that fit our needs and the needs of future residents and visitors.

Sincerely,

Felipe Hernandez

From: Craig Chatterton
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 11:04 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Cc: tim_gubbins@dot.ca.gov; jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; rlj12@comcast.net; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bmcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; openup@cats.ucsc.edu; David.reid@santacruzcounty.ca.us; patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us; aschiff@ucsc.edu; aschiff@gmail.com
Subject: RTC UCS final report recommendations

To: RTC staff

Please include the following additional information in the final UCS report. This information will help the commission and the public better understand the trade-offs involved in the UCS study and preferred scenario:

1) Please clarify whether the plans and budget assume work will be done during the day or at night. Night work would result in less disruption during high traffic periods, however, it would likely increase costs. If the current costs assume daytime work, please specify the additional cost if work is done primarily at night to reduce disruption.

2) Please clarify how long each of the projects is expected to take and how the work is likely to impact current traffic flows. It might be helpful to compare the Hwy 1 work to benchmarks like the ongoing, multi-year impact on Hwy 17, since residents have a feel for that.
3) Please clarify the preferred staging/sequencing of the projects. For example, select a draft project sequence and calculate year-by-year impacts on the budget, speeds, transit times, traffic flows, etc. The current study lacks this detail, which makes it impossible to properly evaluate.

4) Please include the cost and feasibility of an early metering pilot using portable units on one or more segments on Hwy 1, and measure traffic flows and driver acceptance. Positive or negative results could significantly affect longer term planning/implementation.

5) Please explain why the population growth is projected at 10%, but traffic increase on Hwy 1 is projected at 38%. The models may be correct, but I think this deserves some validation and explanation.

6) Please include a discussion on potential project risks and their impacts - e.g. cost overruns, estimation errors, rail corridor ownership/easement rights, etc. One useful way to do this is to include a pre-mortem on the 2035 preferred and beyond scenarios. Imagine we are in 2025/2035 and the program has failed miserably. Everyone is pointing fingers and trying to deflect blame for bad decisions and failed implementation. Careers are in jeopardy and the local economy is suffering. The public is outraged. What are the likely causes for this failure, and how could they be mitigated?

Craig Chatterton
Resident, 2nd District

From: Kurt Rosenberger
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 10:33 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: UCS Preferred Scenario

Dear Commissioners
I was ecstatic in 2012 when I heard that the RTC had purchased the rail right of way from the railroad. I work in the Wrigley Building, and used to watch the cars of cement and aggregate pass by three times a week, and wished that the line could be used for other purposes. Living in Capitola, I was hopeful that someday soon I would be able to ride light rail to work and not have to sit in a parking lot on Highway 1 or weave through other peoples neighborhoods to and from work. Six years later we have not made enough progress towards that goal - the trail only community has hijacked the usage of this invaluable resource for far too long. It is time to move forward with passenger rail, and put to rest any notion of using the right of way for only a bike path.

I personally wouldn't care if it were a train or a bus on the ROW, but there are so many reasons why rail is the best use, not the least of which is that it is already built and ready to use with minimal
upgrades. I don't have to list all the other benefits of rail over other technologies, as I'm quite sure you are aware of them, but being an oceanographer, the environmental benefits are sufficient.

I grew up in a suburb of Boston, where the extension of a subway line was blocked by my town for fear of bringing in the 'wrong element', which in my mind, is criminal. For me, this is as much about equity as it is about the environmental benefits. The people of south county deserve better transit options, and our businesses in Santa Cruz rely on employees who can't necessarily afford to live in town, and they need a reliable way to get to work.

Please do not delay a vote on the preferred Scenario, continue with Scenario B, and let's get this done!

Thank you for your hard work.

Sincerely

Kurt Rosenberger

From: Steven Schieffer  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 10:20 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Rail with Trail

I urge you commissioners to look at our counties future in regards to our precious resource, our existing rail corridor. The rail with trail option in my opinion is not only the best option, it is the most logical option. I see a time coming where people will not want to drive their expensive vehicles to get around. The solution is our rails and a trail. Nobody wants to be stuck in gridlock. The rail corridor is a great alternative for folks like me. I strongly urge you to do right by the citizens of our county and move toward making our rail with trail become reality. Once in place, this option will become wildly popular. Please do not allow a few wealthy individuals dictate our future. This is the future of travel. Embrace it please.

From: Terry Jelcick  
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 6:36 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Cc: Info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Santa Cruz rail corridor.

Please do what is necessary to prepare the rail for coaches that will provide transportation options for the elderly and handicapped, such as myself, as well as preparing an adjacent pathway to be utilized by the more agile in our coastal community who can walk distances, ride bicycles and skateboards.
We need both. We have the tracks which needs an upgrade and we can use a path as an alternative to bikes on surface streets.

Thanks,

Terry Jelcick
Soquel, CA 95073

From: J Mella
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 8:11 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org; info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail and trail

Dear Commissioners,

It's time to move forward with rail transit, consistent with the 2012 original purchase of the rail line and years of study that tell us with increasing certainly that rail transit integrated with existing and future transportation modes will provide the greatest return on investment for the greatest number of county residents among the different design concepts on the rail corridor.

The results of the UCIS provide the data needed to move forward with a yes vote on a package that includes rail transit.

Scenario B investments provide:
- Lower greenhouse gas emissions,
- Fewer collisions,
- Greatest transit mode share,
- Greatest bike mode share,
- Highest scores across multiple economic criteria.

The rail corridor is an invaluable transportation asset and the rail line is already in place, permitted and operational, upgrades to this line are by far a more feasible project than demolition of it and replacement with bus lanes.

Equity is best served by developing the rail system that makes the full trip to Watsonville, the bus plans for the corridor end at State Park Drive.
Monterey County is expanding their rail network with a Salinas to Gilroy extension, featuring a station at Pajaro connecting to our rail line.

The Caltrans State Rail Plan includes $144 Billion through 2040 to expand the rail network, and includes our branch line in their vision for the network.
Please do not delay this vote a second time.
Vote to move forward with investments including rail and trail on the branch line.

Assure Metro supporters that bus alternatives will be studied, take Trail Only off the table, and begin the important process of developing transportation solutions that fit our needs and the needs of future residents and visitors.

Sincerely,

Jaakko Mella
Resident of Aptos

From: Tom A.
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 6:30 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org; info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail Transit

Dear Commissioners,

I am taking the time to write to you today to ask that you move forward with rail transit, consistent with the 2012 original purchase of the rail line and years of study that tell us with increasing certainly that rail transit integrated with existing and future transportation modes will provide the greatest return on investment for the greatest number of county residents among the different design concepts on the rail corridor.

There are some groups that wish to have a trail only and development of the widening of Hwy 1 in lieu of including the rail line. This rail corridor is a precious resource for the county with the capability to serve multiple communities with a safe, environmentally responsible mode of transportation all the way down to South county. The rail line is already in place, permitted and operational. Upgrades are more than feasible and in my mind far more desirable than tearing the rails out with the associated costs and no assurance that rail banking will ever bring them back.

Equity is best served by developing the rail system that makes the full trip to Watsonville, the bus plans for the corridor end at State Park Drive.
Monterey County is expanding their rail network with a Salinas to Gilroy extension, featuring a station at Pajaro connecting to our rail line. Imagine being able to get on a train in Santa Cruz and being able to ultimately connect with existing lines to our east.

I would also like to add that although a lot of people want to widen Hwy 1, it would be an expensive long term project taking many years while this plan could be implemented fairly quickly. Coupled with the fact that widening would only be a short term solution, proven almost everywhere it has been done, with HOV lanes being a unreasonable alternative in this environment. Most people driving Hwy
1 during commute hours are single occupant vehicles and expecting that people will carpool is a pipe dream. I already know many people, including current employees, that would gladly ride a comfortable train during commutes versus 45 minute to 1 hour commutes from Watsonville to Santa Cruz. I am aware of this because I do it every single day.

Please do not delay this vote a second time.
Vote to move forward with investments including rail and trail on the branch line.

Assure Metro supporters that bus alternatives will be studied, take Trail Only off the table, and begin the important process of developing transportation solutions that fit our needs and the needs of future residents and visitors.

Best Regards
Tom Abbott
Aptos

From: david van brink
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 5:21 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org; info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Final UCS Revision, and Please Move Forward with Preferred Plan

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you, as always, for your hard work. Nothing makes all of us happy, in fact, we the citizens will always be kind of disappointed. (Well, not me, I'm a great fan of whatever works out.) Thank you for your efforts.

Please support the Transportation Commission's Staff Recommendation regarding the rail corridor usage. The process has been years in the making, delayed sufficiently for comprehensive understanding, critique, and analysis.

I will suggest that some context be added to the decision, which could help allay some late concerns:

a) The Rail Corridor will NOT be rail banked at this time
b) It is anticipated that the Santa Cruz Metro would manage any new transit services
c) Although at present, it appears that rail service offers the highest and most forward-looking value for transit within the corridor, there will be alternatives analysis to consider dedicated bus lanes before implementation as well.

Thank you for considering this brief note. Exciting times await.

Warmly,
// David Van Brink, Santa Cruz Resident for 31 years.
Dear RTC Commissioners,

There have been many changes to our transportation methods in Santa Cruz County since my family first came here 7 generations ago. I applaud your determination to identify the best possible use for our Rail Corridor as an adjunct to our current thoroughfares to ease our growing transportation needs.

The UCS scenario B shows that it will be the safest, least disruptive, most equitable for all of our citizens. As a retired utility engineer & estimator, the possibility of using our existing corridor for rail transit and adjacent trail will obviously save millions (if not billions) of dollars by not requiring purchase of new real estate to widen our highway with multiple new lanes and wider overpasses. It will save our communities from having properties taken by eminent domain for highway widening. It will not cause massive traffic disruption as highway widening will. We will also retain our easements that are not “fee simple” along the corridor by keeping rail service.

Many homeowners who live adjacent to the Rail Corridor are pushing the RTC to use the corridor for Trail only, but the rail corridor is one of our county’s transportation corridors, and the cost to everyone NOT to use for rail service is an unfair burden.

At this point, I hope that you will take a Trail Only option out of contention for our Unified Corridor. I urge you move forward with real transportation methods that will work for all of us, and will support our future transportation needs. I believe that both Rail and Trail on the corridor, plus upgrades and expansion of our Metro system are the solutions. Please pass a resolution that will support keeping our rails, developing rail transit, building a trail, and upgrade our Metro system. Please do not delay.

Thank you,
Catherine Marino
Santa Cruz, CA

Dear Commissioners,

Barry Scott
Thursday, December 27, 2018 9:20 AM
To: SCCRTC - UCS <ucs@sccrtc.org>; Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Vote for Scenario B/Preferred Scenario Rail and Trail, without further delay
It's time to move forward with rail transit, consistent with the 2012 original purchase of the rail line and years of study.

The results of the UCIS provide the data needed to move forward with a yes vote on a package that includes rail transit.

Scenario B:
- Lower greenhouse gas emissions,
- Fewer collisions,
- Greatest transit mode share,
- Greatest bike mode share,
- Highest scores across multiple economic criteria.

The rail corridor is an invaluable transportation asset and the rail line is already in place, permitted and operational, upgrades to this line are by far a more feasible project than demolition of it and replacement with bus lanes.

Equity is best served by developing the rail system that makes the full trip to Watsonville, the bus plans for the corridor end at State Park Drive.
Monterey County is expanding their rail network with a Salinas to Gilroy extension, featuring a station at Pajaro connecting to our rail line.
The Caltrans State Rail Plan includes $144 Billion through 2040 to expand the rail network, and our county will be contributing to that fund.

Please do not delay this vote a second time.

Assure Metro that alternatives will be studied, take Trail Only off the table, and begin the important process of developing transportation solutions that fit our needs and the needs of future residents and visitors.

Many thanks,
Barry Scott

From: Susan Cavalieri
Sent: Thursday, December 27, 2018 7:37 AM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening

Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our transportation dollars on public transit and active transportation improvements, not on the construction of auxiliary lanes on Highway 1. Induced travel on the wider highway will only result in more congestion and more greenhouse gas emissions. Instead of moving ahead with
construction of auxiliary lanes, the RTC must study the bus-on-shoulder alternative requested by METRO.

As I'm sure you are aware, the recent IPCC report has indicated that humanity has only about a decade to drastically reduce emissions to avoid catastrophic climate chaos. In addition, the "Fourth California Climate Change Assessment" documents the dire effects of "business as usual" carbon emissions on our central coast. It is imperative for the survival of our county that vehicle emissions be cut. Funding for public transit and active transportation projects instead of auxiliary lanes on Highway 1 is an important step.

Thank you,
Susan Cavalieri

From: Susie
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 10:22 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org; info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Best choice for Santa Cruz County is Scenario B - Rail and Trail

Dear Regional Transportation Commission

I have lived in Santa Cruz County for over 40 years. I’m a professional real estate agent and I love living in our beautiful county. My children and grandchildren were born and reared here. For these reasons Scenario B is the best option. Scenario B allows getting around Santa Cruz County easier (especially north to south).

The trail with rail Scenario B - is the best for: improving safety, increasing public transit use and reducing vehicle miles traveled. The trail with rail - Scenario B - is better at reducing collisions, increasing transit use, and reducing vehicle miles traveled than the trail without rail - scenario A. Scenario B: there’s a 50% increase in transit use over the trail only. Scenario B: it’s cheaper to build than the trail only scenario A - $831 million vs. $899 million.

Please don’t delay another month, week or day.
Sincerely,

Susie Stelle, Broker Associate

From: Nancy Maynard
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 8:49 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening

Dear Commissioners,
Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.

Thank you,
Nancy Maynard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Devi Tong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 7:58 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: <a href="mailto:ucs@sccrtc.org">ucs@sccrtc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Commissioners,

Mass transit will get more cars off the roads.
Building auto capacity will put more and more cars on the roads.
I urge you to put transportation dollars into Bus-on-Shoulder, not into highway widening for more cars.

Thank you,
Devi Tong RN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Cathy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 5:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: <a href="mailto:ucs@sccrtc.org">ucs@sccrtc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: Consider Alternatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear RTC Members,

Please, seriously consider alternative plans rather than widening Highway 1. They'll serve us far better in the long run since widening highways has never solved traffic or transportation problems in CA.

Thank you for your time & consideration,

Cathy Gamble
Aptos, CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Susan Cook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 4:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: UCS <a href="mailto:UCS@sccrtc.org">UCS@sccrtc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: Highway One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give more attention to the bus lane on the shoulder idea. I don't hate trains but the projected expense is incredible for that option; and I suspect that the Greenway folks have their own private.
motives for their point of view, so in my mind the bus option is the logical way to go for reducing traffic. In Santa Cruz County we need to make busses the cool way to travel, and flying by on a shoulder lane is a good place to start. There should be a season for free bus passes to get people out of their cars for a trial run. There need to be LOTS of busses, not fewer, and there need to be busses that go from Watsonville all the way to various end points over the hill, with free wi-fi. PLEASE RETHINK!

Susan Cook, Santa Cruz

From: Victor Aguiar  
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 12:33 PM  
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: No Highway Expansion

Dear Commissioners,

Please delete highway expansion projects from your preferred investment scenarios. To begin with, research from around the world shows that expanding highway capacity is not effective in reducing congestion beyond the short term. But it does increase vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Beyond that, let’s just consider humanity’s challenge. We know that our carbon-intensive infrastructure and economy need prompt and extensive retooling if there is to be any hope of staving off its devastating impacts. The evidence is irrefutable. Equally irrefutable, the personal automobile, as a transportation model, is a chief contributor of emissions, and is utterly unsustainable. In this model, everyone of age owns one or more vehicles, using them for all transportation needs.

More than half of the energy used in the life-cycle of a car is consumed, not in driving the car, but in making and disposing of it. Hybrids and electrics are valuable, efficient technologies, but they currently serve more to legitimate this unsustainable model. If humanity sets out to propagate this model throughout the developing world (as seems intended), then humanity will further institutionalize it and perpetuate its inherent destructive force. We should avoid investing our resources in expanding the infrastructure for it here.

Investing in maintaining existing roads and infrastructure, mass transit, cycling amenities, community vehicle sharing, creative land use planning, renewable energy, and other sustainable transportation options will serve us better. Time has come to invest in good models. We in Santa Cruz County are known as pioneers in sustainability. Taking measures to move beyond the personal automobile will help keep us on that path.

Thank you,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Russell Brutsché | RTC Commissioners,  
Please consider bus-on-shoulder and other mass-transit option rather than freeway widening for more autos, which doesn’t seem to work out when tried in other communities.  
Thank you,  
Russell Brutsché |
| Audrey Kim  | Dear Commissioners,  
Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.  
In particular, I urge you to consider the "bus on shoulder" option on Hwy 1. Until we can make public transportation more attractive (or at least AS attractive) as individual car travel, we will be stuck with congestion and carbon emission problems.  
Thank you,  
Audrey Kim |
| Tom Fordham | Dear Commissioners,  
Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.  
Thank you,  
Tom Fordham |
From: Nicolette Czarrunchick  
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 10:21 AM  
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening

Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.

Highway widening won't reduce congestion; it increases greenhouse gases, and it prevents us from spending money where we need it---on transit and active transportation.

I support the Bus-on-Shoulder proposal/solution to Southbound Highway 1 gridlock, and recommend it for the Watsonville-SC Northbound lane as well.

Thank you.  Sincerely,

Nicolette Czarrunchick  
Santa Cruz resident

From: Coleen Douglas  
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 10:05 AM  
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening

Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.

I especially encourage the bus-on-shoulder alternative on Highway 1. This would give an incentive to bus-riders who will not have to fight the highway 1 congestion, and reach their destinations much sooner than in a car. This kind of benefit is the only way people will get out of their cars in order to use the bus. Otherwise, there's no incentive to use a bus stuck in the same traffic as everyone else.

Since the Unified Corridors study did not include the bus-on-shoulder alternative, the RTC cannot compare it to other alternatives. I know the southbound bus-on-shoulder was studied and is so much cheaper than highway widening. The northbound alternative must be included as well. Please fund the alternatives study requested by the METRO, to make an informed decision.

Thank you,
Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.

Highway lanes fill up and congestion is never relieved for long. It’s a rule called induced demand. If you make it easier for people to do something they do it more. Building more lanes on SR 1 will simply encourage more auto trips on the corridor bringing congestion with it.

We need to provide people with fast alternative routes and modes of transportation that don’t involve cars. No matter what we do, congestion during peak times on SR 1 will remain and spending our way out of the problem with auxiliary and HOV lanes is far too costly an answer for our small county.

Commissioners, I urge you to divert spending of our valuable tax dollars toward solutions that will provide alternatives to hardworking people like me who are unhappy sitting on a congested Highway. Bus on shoulder without auxiliary lanes is afar cheaper and more cost effective alternative.

Thank you,
Gray Jameson
College student, Live Oak

From: Lisa Segnitz
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 8:56 AM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening

Dear Commissioners,

Please strongly consider the bus-on-shoulder solution to traffic issues. I support spending our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, rather than only temporarily effective attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.

Thank you,
Lisa

From: John Hall
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 8:37 AM
To: SCCRTC - UCS <ucs@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening

Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.

Specifically, the bus-only-on-shoulder approach seems worthy of very serious consideration. More bus transportation would reduce car usage in a highly cost-effective way. It could be implemented in both directions or in one-only.

Thank you for your consideration,

John Hall

From: fred geiger
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 8:04 AM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening

Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity. The rail trail, Bus on shoulder and PRT feeders to the bus system are the most reasonable ways to spend our transport dollars!

Thank you,
Fred J Geiger

From: Martha Keeler
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 7:52 AM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Alternatives to Highway Widening

Dear Commissioners,

Please spend our limited transportation dollars on transit and active transportation improvements, not futile attempts to relieve auto congestion by building more auto capacity.
Thank you,
Martha Keeler

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

December 26, 2018

Laura Batcha
Viviane Bias
Tom Beggs
Dan Brumbaugh
Heather Harlan
Spencer Gordon
Keelan Senkier
Joyce Gutstein
Carly Bate
Sophia Galarosa
Lee Spencer Jr.
Citizen
Brian A.
Nicole Rimedo
Dennis Grady
Morgan Baker
Audrey Kim
Jalset Hides
Judith Grijalua
Robin Davis
Nicolas Lossly
Scott Taylor
Stephanie Harris
Antoinette M. Norton
Kelly Stall
Zac Garfield
Sarah Rodriguez

From: Becky Steinbruner
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2018 8:36 AM
To: George Dondero <gdondero@sccrtc.org>; Ginger Dykaar <gdykaar@sccrtc.org>; Sarah Christensen <schristensen@sccrtc.org>; Yesenia Parra <yparra@sccrtc.org>
Cc: Becky Steinbruner
Subject: Please Conduct Northbound and Southbound Highway One Bus-On-Shoulder Lane Alternative Cost/Benefit Analysis (Letter for the Public Record)

Dear Regional Transportation Commissioners and Staff,

I am respectfully asking that the Commission fund and direct a cost/benefit analysis of bus-on-shoulder lanes for both Northbound and Southbound Highway 1 corridors. A 2018 Santa Cruz Metro & Monterey-Salinas Transit feasibility study indicates such an alternative for commuters could be done without widening Highway One.
If the calculations performed for the feasibility study’s Southbound bus-on-shoulder lane are correct, the Regional Transportation Commission could direct $12 million for such an improvement and offer a more rapid option for Metro riders on the 91X. A similar Northbound option would enable commuters to take the 91X in either direction of their commute, with reduced time spent on the road being a real incentive to take Metro’s public transportation.

Right now, taking the bus is not attractive because it is not faster than driving in commute hour congestion, and is less convenient.

Please do further cost/benefit analysis of the Metro bus-on-shoulder lane alternative and include both Northbound and Southbound opportunities for commuters to encourage public transportation. Having a bus-on-shoulder lane in both directions would also improve emergency responder times during heavily-congested commute hours and would definitely add to public benefit of such a transit network improvement project.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

From: Victoria McCharen
Sent: Tuesday, December 25, 2018 9:59 AM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Please Choose Scenario B

Listed below are some of the reason you should support Scenario B. Thank you.
Victoria McCharen, Aptos

- Listed here are some of the reason you should support Scenario B.
- climate change (trains emit less GHG than cars or buses per person/mile)
- reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled, saving 9,000 gallons of gasoline every day, saving residents $12M / year in gasoline expense over a trail-only scenario
- economic equity (people can access jobs, bring customers to local businesses, better transit will encourage car-free life and could allow 2-car families to get rid of one car)
- social equity (especially for Watsonville commuters)
- convenience (fastest public transit travel times across county)
- tourism (bring people to and around our county without their cars)
- quality of life (escapes traffic congestion, nothing beats the smooth, quiet ride of modern rail travel, plus the recreational options on trail)
- safety (Scenario B will result in more than 100 fewer collisions and save us more than $25M every year, you could walk and bike car-free on the trail)
- Or just write a brief story of how you would use trail+transit on the rail line instead of driving for certain trips
Dear Commissioners,

I am fully supportive of Option B as a direction to proceed with regional transportation in Santa Cruz County. By this, I mean the original Option B in the original menu of options. Not the one that includes highway widening. My one recommendation is that the recommendation on trains be made less specific, that it be widened to include electric train options, especially options for battery driven trains that do not need elevated power cables. I feel certain that these trains will be a realistic option by the time our county is ready to pay for and build the train system. I understand that including this option will make the cost estimates of Measure B less specific, I think that is fine in this stage of our planning process.

I do not think we need further study of Bus Rapid Transit or other options to the rail line, at least not at this time. At the moment I think we are trying to find the right mix between public and private regional transportation. I think Option B is the right mix. If, down the line, a train is found to be unfeasible and there is interest in Bus Rapid Transit, that would be an appropriate time to consider it.

As California continues to take leadership in reigning in climate change, I think widening the highway will become less and less feasible.
As California continues to expand its rail network, I think it will be more and more useful for our county to have a rail connection to the larger system. I also think that a train and trail will complement each other nicely and will increase the use of both facilities.

Thanks you for your consideration. I am happy to talk further with any of staff or Commissioners if you think that would be valuable.

Micah Posner
Campaign for Sensible Transportation Member
Founder of Friends of the Rail Trail
Past Director of People Power/ Bike Santa Cruz County
Past City Councilmember for Santa Cruz/ alternate to the SCCRTC
Dear Regional Transportation Commission,

We have traveled all around the world and have discovered beautiful bike/walking trails in many areas. Along these trails they even put in different exercise options for people to enjoy. There are also dog parks along the way and other fun things for the public to utilize. We need this in our community also. It will be such a great asset for us to enjoy and the generations to come!

I am in favor of Scenario B it is the best choice for Santa Cruz County. It will be so nice to walk, ride a bike or take light rail to our destinations. Please move forward, without any further delays, to finish the trail and then expedite the rail because every day we delay keeps our children, families, neighbors and visitors on streets and the possibility of being struck by a car or truck.

Future generations deserve a quality-of-life of escaping traffic congestion, cleaner air quality.

Future generations of Santa Cruz County Residents deserve more options of commuting to their jobs throughout the county; keep rail and trail options.

Sincerely,

Jim & Doann Wilder
Aptos Resident

From: James F. Long
Sent: Sunday, December 23, 2018 10:18 AM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Build the Rail and Trail, PLEASE!

Hello Commission members,

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

As stated above in the subject line, please build the Rail and Trail with the Preferred Scenario. We need to do it for the health of the county.

I have some thoughts on the Coastal Rail & Trail project.

Santa Cruz, a city and county, where people talk about equality for everyone, diversity, 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 really interested in a bicycle riding path... period. They’ll make the argument that the tracks are unsightly, that they’re taking up space, 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. The notion they put out that all these people will suddenly start riding bicycles or start walking along the pathway is not true either. Doctors will say this too 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.

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 one years old. It’s not uncommon for me to walk 8-10 miles on a Saturday or Sunday, and 5 miles on some week days. I consider myself lucky that I can get out and walk. Some folks cannot.

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.

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 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.
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.

My late mother used to live in Scotts Valley. From time to time my brother would drive my mother around the area or take a drive down to Monterey. I would drive down to Scotts Valley from Santa Rosa and drive mother around. She was at that time still able to drive her car. She was 85.
A few years prior to my mother moving to the east coast (2005) my sister and her two kids came out and the 5 of us rode the Steam Train at Roaring Camp. That train was a great connection and even better memory for us.

Natural Disasters
There is a great need for our rail corridor open for emergency purposes.

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? Get patients to a hospital? 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 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 drive up to Hayward. 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.

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

Capitola Village
Customers can come to this area year round. I’m sure the business owners would love this. The parking area across from the old Capitola depot could house a transit platform. We don’t need much structure. For reference look up the train stops for Denver RTD to and from Denver Airport.

Aptos Village. New townhouses being built right next to the old Bay View Hotel just north of the existing tracks.
Not much in the way of shopping there but a half 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.

(I happen to work for SF BART in Hayward as a Transit Vehicle Mechanic).
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.

SMART up in the North Bay. How great that is in operation now.
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.
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 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. There are sections on the road where there is no sidewalk.

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.
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.
Up in Santa Rosa along the Joe Rodota Trail (former Right of Way for Sebastopol & Petaluma Railway) the homeless have taken over that trail path for their encampments. Earlier this year I believe it was a cyclist was pulled off his bike as he pedaled through that area and was beaten.

The Trail Now folks have painted this picture of our railroad track sections in a crummy part of a town versus this nice green pathway where there’s all these healthy looking people out biking, walking, etc. I have walked the railroad tracks in sections from the Wye over by Depot Park in Santa Cruz all the way to Aptos. Not too many people doing the same.
As I stated in the beginning only a few people will be able to take advantage of a green path bike trail 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.

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. Frequency travel could be based on supply and demand. The weekends 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 that want to enjoy. 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.

I understand that what’s going on now with the Coastal Trail is for that- a trail. I’m all for a trail. I’m also for our existing rail corridor that needs to stay in place.

Sincerely,

James F. Long
Capitola

Rail with Trail References

(1) March 24, 2016 Santa Cruz Sentinel  
http://www.santacruzsentinel.com/article/NE/20160324/NEWS/160329811

(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: Thomas Fredericks  
Sent: Saturday, December 22, 2018 3:24 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Rail trail  

I am writing from Felton as a senior citizen and frequent user of the bus including jump bike when feasible. I really appreciate the benefit of public transportation and of a coordinated, countywide, multimodal transportation system. I urge you to keep the rails in the rail corridor In order to keep all options open. Sincerely, Tom Fredericks

From: Dean Silvers  
Sent: Saturday, December 22, 2018 12:12 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Cc: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Please adopt "Scenario B" for the rail trail

Hello RTC & All,  

As avid bicyclers, walkers, and lovers of public transit, we are asking you to adopt "Scenario B" for the rail trail. From 1979-’86 we used to live in Watsonville and wished that there had been train service as an alternative to clogging the freeway. We did take the bus some times, but it could stuck in the same traffic, and therefore was not as fast or relaxing as would be a train ride. We know that lots of folks there today would love to get to Santa Cruz and other spots by train, vs. sitting in the traffic, which is only getting worse.  

In 1986 we bought our home on Myrtle Street in Santa Cruz--specifically because it is so close to the train tracks and the old depot. We’ve been waiting ever since for train service to be restored. We still do lots of my errands on bike or foot, but when it’s dark or rainy, we would really appreciate an alternative to using our car, which has a carbon footprint and also wastes our time when stuck in traffic.  

Many of our friends have also wished that there was another way to get around the county,, as would lots of tourists. In our travels to many spots in the world (most of which have smaller economies and population that our county), we always use the excellent trains (and other forms of public transit) because it’s cheaper, easier, saner, and better for the environment.  

“Rail banking” is not only an absurd idea, it would also lead to losing the railroad’s current right of way, resulting in costly litigation AND the loss of the path for the so-called “greenway.” The voters of this county have already approved the railroad, so let’s get moving on it! **Vote to preserve those tracks for future rail transit.**

Thank you,  
Dean A. Silvers  
Ira E. Schwartz
From: Tina Andreatta  
Sent: Saturday, December 22, 2018 10:44 AM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Cc: RTC <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Scenario B ~ keep the rail and the trail  

Dear Regional Transportation Commission,  

I live close to the rail and I am excited because Scenario B is the best choice for Santa Cruz County. I am excited with having a choice of riding my bike or taking light rail. Please quickly move forward, without any further delays, to finish the trail and then expedite the rail because every day we delay keeps our children, families, neighbors and visitors on streets and the possibility of being struck by a car or truck.  

Future generations deserve the option of keeping the rail.  
Future generations deserve a quality-of-life of escaping traffic congestion, cleaner air quality.  
Future generations of Santa Cruz County Residents deserve more options of commuting to their jobs throughout the county; keep rail and trail options.  

Please don’t forget our elderly that are fearful of riding bikes and want rail service. Please don’t forget Watsonville residents that strongly support a rail option. Please don’t forget our disabled community; 19% of Americans are disabled; don’t turn away from their special needs because they strongly support a rail option.  

Sincerely,  
Tina Andreatta

From: Trician Comings  
Sent: Saturday, December 22, 2018 8:57 AM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Cc: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Support for UCS Scenario B  

Dear Regional Transportation Commissioners,  

There are SO many good reasons to adopt Scenario B over other options.  

For me, I am excited to hear about the 2018 California Rail Plan and the prospect of Santa Cruz being connected to other destinations without using polluting cars, trucks and buses which impact Climate Change.
Trains would also be great for tourism and for commuters who want to avoid the ever-increasing traffic congestion on Highway One.

As a bicyclist, I will look forward to using the trail for a great car-free way to get around our County.

Please do get moving on the Rail Trail!

Sincerely,
Trician Comings

---

From: Molly Ording
Sent: Saturday, December 22, 2018 3:55 AM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Our support for Scenario B

Good Day from Ireland RTC Members!

I am especially reminded of those fore-thinking Irish transportation planners who created this amazing and well used train and transit system in and out of Dublin SO many years ago! Dublin has changed so much, just in our last 28 years of regular visits (our son and family live here), but one thing that has not changed is the widespread and ever-growing use of the trains that run in and out of Dublin, taking workers to and from their jobs, delivering children (including my grandchildren) to school, providing a way for seniors and those who do not drive to access the city center or other far ranging attractions, parks, etc. The primary distances and uses the trains travel are not so much different than our rail trail will provide at some stage...15-40 miles in and out. They are clean, comfortable, quiet and their narrow roads, amazingly even with all the growth and changes in and around the city, are surprisingly un-clogged! Busses travel in bus lanes only and everyone seems to be able to move around relatively quickly, safely and comfortably. Much foresight on the part of the Irish!

May we be so foresighted!!! May we make conservation of our time and finite natural resources, social & economic equity and convenience and safety our long term visions. Do not be short sighted!

We strongly urge you to not limit our future transportation, economic, equity and recreational options! Please support Scenario B! We will be watching and ever so grateful, along with so many future generations, for your long term visions!

Most sincerely,

Molly & Mickey Ording
The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December 21, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Biddick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando Romero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Lewin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryanna Downey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Rocha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Richter, Eric
Sent: Friday, December 21, 2018 6:17 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Cc: INFO@SCCRTC.ORG
Subject: Please choose Scenario B

Honorable members of the SCCRTC,

As a near 40-year resident of communities throughout SC County, I urge you to adopt Scenario B from the Unified Corridor Study, because:

- We must boldly address climate change with both short and long-term solutions (trains emit less GHG than cars or buses per person/mile)
- We must reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled to improve both the environment and quality of life
- We must commit to greater economic and social equity through safe, efficient and accessible transport for all
• We must continue to encourage tourism while managing its impact on our community and resources
• We must aspire to enhance our quality of life (reducing traffic congestion, saving time, and providing greater recreational opportunities for everyone)
• We must prioritize public safety (Scenario B estimates a decrease of roughly 100 collisions and saves us more than $25M every year)

I am a multimodal transit user who will enthusiastically and regularly use the Rail Corridor for both recreational activity and transit to reduce my reliance on automobiles, and this will also greatly increase the chances of getting my spouse to join me since she will not cycle on streets currently.

With thanks for your service, and hope for the future,

-e

Eric Richter

From: Zav
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 5:22 PM
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>
Subject: No Highway Expansion

Dear Commissioners,

Please delete highway expansion projects from your preferred investment scenarios. Research from around the world shows that expanding highway capacity is not effective in reducing congestion beyond the short term. But it does increase vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions.

As the cost of housing in Santa Cruz continues to rise, more and more renters with jobs in the city must move farther afield to afford a place to live. This displacement may be a large part of the traffic demand on Highway 1 and will only get worse as the housing crisis continues. Mass transit will do a better job providing safe, clean, equitable, comfortable transportation for these displaced people than if they are forced to buy fuel-inefficient used cars and commute individually from cheaper-rent Watsonville and other areas of the Pajaro Valley.

Let’s put our dollars into transit and active transportation where they can improve our mobility in a way that is environmentally sustainable and socially equitable.

Thank you,

Zav Hershfield
organizer with Students United with Renters
From: annieajb
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 12:35 PM
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>
Subject: No Highway Expansion

Dear Commissioners,

Please delete highway expansion projects from your preferred investment scenarios. Research from around the world shows that expanding highway capacity is not effective in reducing congestion beyond the short term. But it does increase vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Let's put our dollars into transit and active transportation where they can improve our mobility in a way that is environmentally sustainable and socially equitable.

Please put more consideration into expanding greenways and building a train (utilizing already existing tracks). This is the way for green cities and for all cities in the future.

Thank you,

Annie

From: Len Beyea
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 12:29 PM
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>
Subject: No Highway Expansion

Dear Commissioners,

You have been presented some investment scenarios that include highway expansion. My own experience of the ineffectiveness of increased lanes - multiple episodes growing up in and revisiting Los Angeles, and the addition of Highway 85 freeway during my 13 years commuting to Silicon Valley - has been corroborated by research from around the world showing that expanding highway capacity is not effective in reducing congestion beyond the short term. But it does increase vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions. Please delete highway expansion projects from your preferred investment scenarios.

Let's put our dollars into transit and active transportation where they can improve our mobility in a way that is environmentally sustainable and socially equitable. And please let's begin to create a framework for a long-term sustainable solution to our transportation challenges that comprehensively addresses how we provide mobility for the next century.

There are multiple solutions available, and they need to be integrated and comprehensive to have a significant impact. While the funding may not be available today, we need to plan for true long-term
needs, including connections into and out of Santa Cruz County and interconnections to and from major transit corridors. Cost of roadway maintenance and effect of induced demand should be included in evaluating options.

Thank you,
Len Beyea
Santa Cruz

From: DEBORAH BENHAM
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 11:58 AM
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>
Cc:
Subject: No Highway 1 Expansion

Dear Commissioners,

Please delete highway lane expansion from the preferred scenarios. Research shows that expanding highway capacity is not effective in reducing congestion beyond the short term. It does increase vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Some quotes from familiar people, active in the transportation arena:

"Induced demand ...the simple biological principle that if you make a desirable thing easier, the organism will do it more... If we remove from driving the appalling waste of time ...then people will do it more."

- Jarrett Walker, Author of Human Transit [at a talk sponsored by the RTC]

"Adding capacity to roadways fails to alleviate congestion for long because it actually increases vehicle miles traveled."

- Susan Handy, Director of the National Center for Sustainable Transportation [at UC Davis]

Let’s put our dollars into transit and active transportation where they can improve our mobility in a way that is environmentally sustainable and socially equitable.

Thank you, Debbie
Scotts Valley, CA 95066
Dear Commissioners,

I support 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, Brad Mills

These pictures will prove that these bald eagles are nesting next to the railroad tracks. There is also many other birds and animals that would be chased out of their habitat. I have many more photos of how the RR tracks are in the air above a washed out ravine right by the eagles nest. These are the only bald eagles in Santa Cruz county.
Dear Commissioners,

I ask that you take a position against highway widening. As a transportation commissioner, I am guessing you are aware of 2 essential facts: 1) we are in a civilization-threatening battle for our lives with climate change; and 2) automotive travel accounts for half of the greenhouse gas emissions in our County.

Add to this the ever-stronger evidence that widening highways increases VMT, and the existence of alternatives, and there is no way to take an ethical position in support of widening our highway.

I am with the Campaign for Sensible Transportation in saying: Let's put our dollars into transit and active transportation where they can improve our mobility in a way that is environmentally sustainable and socially equitable.

Thank you,
--
Michael Levy
Santa Cruz, CA USA

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Before a penny of money goes to the freeway widening project, I would like to see SCCRTC throw it's support to Monterey County's plans to extend CalTrain or the Capitol Corridor to Salinas, and get that passenger rail service started as quickly as planned, and in so doing, suggest to that commission that that train service start simultaneously with a stop at Pajaro Junction, something that is supposed to come two years later in time, (2021?) so that for two years trains will leave and arrive at Salinas without stops at the proposed Castroville and Pajaro stops. Perhaps some of our county's money could go to getting a Pajaro stop built, but the plans to spend some $20 million for a parking lot, lights, and ticket booths seem way too much anyway. The San Martin Caltrain station on the Old 101, Monterey Road, is a simple parking lot with a ticket booth, overhead lighting, and not much else, and could not have had such a high cost, but Monterey plans on making these stops somewhat fancy for no good reason, with artistic pieces added to project. Waste of money!
I believe much of the traffic, mornings and evenings, on Highway One, is due to people living in north Monterey County using the road to get to their jobs, whether here in this county, or in Santa Clara County. Those who have jobs in Santa Clara County would benefit from passenger rail, with the stop at Pajaro Junction. They are now clogging up Highway One along with local traffic, or South County traffic doing the same: driving to jobs in Santa Cruz or over the hill. Obviously, a light rail system on the branch rail line could take some cars off the freeway, but more importantly, I think it would be worthwhile to see how the extended passenger rail service to Salinas affects traffic before planning on widening the freeway. I would think by 2023 that question could be answered. If there is a significant drop in traffic, why widen the freeway? If there are more significant attempts at getting young college-age people to carpool to Cabrillo, perhaps the traffic problems would decrease.

It seems some also like to bike to work, and those numbers could rise. But finally, it's a well-known fact that people prefer to use inter-city and longer-haul passenger rail systems to busses. Repairing the tracks for a light rail system should be a priority. Better yet, using rail-busses initially, before electrification, could be a way to use the rail with minimum repair, and have those same rail-busses leave the track and use parallel roads along some portions of the branch line, particularly in those neighborhoods that have homes, apartments, or mobile homes very near to the line. I would imagine, in time, that converting to a modern electrical system, much as the light-rail in Santa Clara Valley, could happen, but using rail-busses in the meantime could mean having a rail and trail, passenger rail service on much of the track, and exempting those neighborhoods with close proximity to the tracks to having a rail vehicle pass by their abodes so closely. So, a rail bus could leave the track at Clubhouse and use Sumner on its way to an Aptos Village stop, getting back on the track very near the Rio Del Mar Blvd. crossing where the row of homes on Sumner end, or Portola could be used instead of the track between 17th Ave. and 41st. Perhaps a rail-bus system is the answer, and not a very expensive electrified light rail system: it would not cost hundreds of millions of dollars to upgrade the tracks to the next level, Class 2, from Class 1, in Mid-County and Santa Cruz, and between Pajaro Junction and Watsonville, but tens of millions instead, though I believe the rail line should be upgraded to Class 3 for the stretch between Watsonville and La Selva Beach, as there would be, at most, one stop along that stretch, at the KOA Camp; the cost of an upgrade to Class 3 on that segment of would still be much cheaper than widening a freeway by adding one lane for a few miles. Rail busses could be hybrids in design, running on electricity and propane, or completely electric. Already there are systems of light rail cars in use, being self-propelled electrically, without a "third rail."

Please take my considerations seriously.

LD Freitas,
Aptos, Ca.
From: Johanna Lighthill  
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 8:15 AM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Rail Trail  

Hello,  
I hope you can help me. My neighbors and I have heard different things. I’m trying to get an understanding about the trail route. I hear it will be diverted onto streets in some areas. Can you please confirm this? If so, can you tell me where, and will the diversions be temporary or permanent?  

Thank you for your consideration.  

Johanna Lighthill  

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:  

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC  

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,  
- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.  
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.  
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.  
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.  

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.
From: Sarah Rabkin  
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 9:05 AM  
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: No Highway Expansion

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to urge you to delete highway expansion projects from your preferred investment scenarios.

Research from around the world shows that expanding highway capacity is not effective in reducing congestion beyond the short term. But it does increase vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions.

If our community is to thrive in the coming decades, we must invest NOW in transit and active transportation to improve our mobility in environmentally sustainable and socially equitable ways.

Research shows that highway expansion is simply not the answer.

Thank you,
Sarah Rabkin

The SCCRTC received the following email sent by the individuals listed below:

Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Subject: No Highway Expansion

Dear Commissioners,

Please delete highway expansion projects from your preferred investment scenarios. Research from around the world shows that expanding highway capacity is not effective in reducing congestion beyond the short term. But it does increase vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Let's put our dollars into transit and active transportation where they can improve our mobility in a way that is environmentally sustainable and socially equitable.

Thank you,

December 20, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kathleen Tyger Wright</th>
<th>Dean Lyons</th>
<th>Nancy Maynard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray Jameson</td>
<td>Curt Simmons</td>
<td>Bob Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Lachman</td>
<td>Alec Webster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Commissioners,

Please delete highway expansion projects from your preferred investment scenarios. Research from around the world shows that expanding highway capacity is not effective in reducing congestion beyond the short term. But it does increase vehicle miles traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Let's put our dollars into transit and active transportation where they can improve our mobility in a way that is environmentally sustainable and socially equitable.

We have to ban all pollution vehicles now unless absolutely an emergency. We have to give people bikes and bike riding support. We have to get electric buses. We have to demand if they can't travel green they have to tell police why then get a referral from the police to contact a green transportation office that helps them get green transportation. We have to take direct action. Pollution is death. Murder is wrong.

Thank you,

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.
December 19, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzi Merriam</td>
<td>Victor Martinez</td>
<td>Tim Borrego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Evans</td>
<td>Melissa Jullig</td>
<td>Maya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Wright</td>
<td>Karen Oakley</td>
<td>Cheryl Horton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wright</td>
<td>Barry Fiore</td>
<td>Ron Sinewny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Crowe</td>
<td>Frank Herst</td>
<td>Randy Adrion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry S.</td>
<td>Jim Rolens</td>
<td>Jamie Keil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Scofins</td>
<td>Martha McGimmins</td>
<td>Rose Marie Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Feeney</td>
<td>Nicki Braxley</td>
<td>Robert Adecman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From:** Elizabeth Lipton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 19, 2018 2:02 PM  
**To:** Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
**Subject:** rail trail petition

It appears that there is no such thing as a gratious loser in Santa Cruz County. A small, very vocal and very well funded organization, SCC Greenway is dead set on forcing their vision for trail only onto the majority of SC county voters, who approved Measure D. Measure D had wide support throughout the county. Gutting the rail part of the transportation plan would be tantamount to stealing the votes from the majority to promote a minorities desire to exclude rail county wide as a viable and, for most of us, welcome alternative to Hwy 1.

**From:** Robert Elledge  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 19, 2018 12:09 PM  
**To:** Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
**Subject:** Rail with Trail

In today’s Sentinel article about Greenway, Watsonville resident Silvia Morales laments the 3 hours per day it takes to drive her kids to PCS school on the Santa Cruz west side and implies that a bike trail would alleviate the situation. Google Maps shows the distance from Watsonville to PCS as 24 miles with a bike taking 2 hours and 23 minutes each way. So approximately 5 hours round trip.

Certainly a committed child might occasionally do this. But in the winter rains it would be nice for her children to get on a light rail that would literally drop them across the street from the school in about 40 minutes. They could even do some homework on the trip.

I agree with Silvia that a bike trail will be nice, but without the train option the building of the trail will be further delayed by the need to repay $11 million to the state and numerous lawsuits for compensation by land owners next to the rail line.

**From:** Della Davis  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 19, 2018 8:16 AM  
**To:** Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
**Subject:** No Rail on Trail
The projections by Progressive do not justify the millions of dollars Santa Cruz will commit to spending to bring the railroad tracks up to Class 1. That kind of diesel or diesel hybrid engine is from another era. They are not efficient people movers. New technology offers many solutions. But the best, most beneficial use of the trail would be for active transportation. This would benefit our communities, our local businesses and environment. Please, keep the freight lines in Watsonville, where they may be needed, but get rid of this antiquated concept and embrace a fully paved trail. I certainly do not want to bike next to a huge diesel pulled train full of nobody.

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

December 18, 2018

Richard McDavid  Lucy Stafford  Peter Bechmann  Wendy Coats
Kay Wood  Oliver Whitcroft  Marie Moore  Thomara Fernando
Burt Levitsky  Chris Miroyan  Todd Carpanter  Gave Mobito
Debbie Bulger  Sisi Xue  Gail Magid  Jose Antonino
Jim Rolens  Genevieve A.A.  Roseanne Magid  David Shackleton
Richard Stover  James Stewart  Kris Woolf  Carolyn Butera
David Benhen  Michael McGehee  Amanda Ramirez  Shane Hacsle
Tina Andreatia  Jessica Mitzen

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December 17, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lninnen Hannaleck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Hannaleck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Sadoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreu Trombatore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Reahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Stewart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Adam Hall  
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2018 3:51 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Scenario B

Dear Metro Commissioners,

Time and again, the acquisition of a right of way has proven to be the most difficult, expensive, and time-consuming part of building a railroad. We've seen the inability to procure a right of way prevent many projects from moving forward, potentially kill California High Speed Rail, and cost the taxpayers millions where new rail is constructed. Santa Cruz has the ability to sidestep this entire issue. There is a perfectly good, usable right of way that is already yours. To remove the tracks would be to squander what is an amazing resource that does not often appear.

No, the project isn't perfect. Many people have opposed it on the grounds that it may not decrease much, but the railroad will stem the increase, which is in and of itself highly valuable. Santa Cruz is a growing county, with more and more cars being added all the time. If a railroad keeps 2035 congestion at 2018 levels, that's a major accomplishment. A railroad is also an opportunity. With a strong backbone of existing passenger service, acquisition of new rights of way for extended services becomes easier. Santa Cruz needs this. Right now, traffic bottlenecks are massive. To get in and out of the area, there is Highway 1, Highway 17, and nothing else. Congestion will be apocalyptic unless more alternatives are implemented. With the Gilroy-Salinas rail extension that this railroad can connect into, a vital outside connection can be established.

I do have a couple suggestions. Diesel trains take a lot of fuel to run, and over time costs add up. Electrification may be more expensive upfront, but it is a substantial cost saver in the long run. Electric trains are also quieter, more comfortable, and faster to accelerate, meaning they are more
attractive to ride and able to complete trips faster. Do not go with a less desirable method of propulsion for short term gains. Learn from Caltrain, don't repeat that long, drawn out process once you decide you do want to electrify, and implement electric rail from the very beginning. Also, do not widen any highways. It has been proven, over and over again, that it just does not work. Stop wasting money on failed autocentric planning, and spend it on electric rail infrastructure.

Recreational trails are a good thing, and if both rail and trail can be accommodated at once, do so. Scenario B seems the best option.

Thank you,

Adam Hall

The SCCRTC received the following email sent by the individuals listed below:

Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2018
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Please Support Scenario "R"ealistic

Dear Commissioners,

Please join me in supporting a realistic, effective and affordable set of projects from the Unified Corridors Study called Scenario R. Scenario R provides congestion relief and public transit options on Hwy 1, Soquel/Freedom and the Coastal Corridor for $423M less capital ($1,154M vs $731M) and about half the annual operating expense ($30M vs. $16M). Using Measure D, Self-Help funds and conservative assumptions on federal and state grants, Scenario R can be implemented sooner, more flexibly and realistically with the resources under the RTC’s control or reasonably available.

Thank you,

December 13, 2018
Beverly Grova

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
• Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

December 12, 2018
Sally Suzanna Young
Sarah C. Clark

From: Peter Goodman
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2018 5:43 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Please Support Scenario "R"ealistic

Dear Commissioners,

I love this idea. It will get us going a lot quicker and less cost than a train. Please consider this solution. Mini-bus goes north in the morning on the coastal corridor, south on the freeway. Reverse in the evening. No busses on the weekend. Good compromise and don’t need a wall or to have the path go off the corridor to the street.

Please join me in supporting a realistic, effective and affordable set of projects from the Unified Corridors Study called Scenario R. Scenario R provides congestion relief and public transit options on Hwy 1, Soquel/Freedom and the Coastal Corridor for $423M less capital ($1,154M vs $731M) and about half the annual operating expense ($30M vs. $16M). Using Measure D, Self-Help funds and conservative assumptions on federal and state grants, Scenario R can be implemented sooner, more flexibly and realistically with the resources under the RTC’s control or reasonably available.

Thank you,
Peter Goodman

The SCCRTC received the following email sent by the individuals listed below:

Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2018
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Please Support Scenario "R"ealistic

Dear Commissioners,

Please join me in supporting a realistic, effective and affordable set of projects from the Unified Corridors Study called Scenario R. Scenario R provides congestion relief and public transit options on Hwy 1, Soquel/Freedom and the Coastal Corridor for $423M less capital ($1,154M vs $731M) and about half the annual operating expense ($30M vs. $16M). Using Measure D, Self-Help funds and conservative assumptions on federal and state grants, Scenario R can be implemented
sooner, more flexibly and realistically with the resources under the RTC’s control or reasonably available.

Thank you,

December 12, 2018

B. Stanger
Don Willet
Tanya Bennett

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS & RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

December 11, 2018

Mike & Sue Sampon
Raleigh Young

From: Keith Otto
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>
Subject: SCC RTC - Significance Of Jan 17 2019 Vote - Phase II?

SCC RTC -

Hello!

What is the significance of the Jan 17 2019 vote by the Commission on the RTC staff 'Preferred Scenario' (modified Scenario B)?

And one additional specific question: If a 'yes' vote carries, does that mean that the rail contract then enters in to Phase II?
Thank you.

Regards,
Keith

The SCCRTC received the following email sent by the individuals listed below:

Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 8:54 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Please Support Scenario "R"ealistic

Dear Commissioners,

Please join me in supporting a realistic, effective and affordable set of projects from the Unified Corridors Study called Scenario R. Scenario R provides congestion relief and public transit options on Hwy 1, Soquel/Freedom and the Coastal Corridor for $423M less capital ($1,154M vs $731M) and about half the annual operating expense ($30M vs. $16M). Using Measure D, Self-Help funds and conservative assumptions on federal and state grants, Scenario R can be implemented sooner, more flexibly and realistically with the resources under the RTC’s control or reasonably available.

Thank you,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December 11, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Tiedeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Montalvo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Rupp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Johanna Lighthill
Sent: Sunday, December 09, 2018 3:41 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>; UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>
Subject: MBSST

Hello,
The UCS table A-14 (Scope) describes rerouting the trail onto Nova, etc. in Capitola. The MBSST “opportunities and constraints” pages show the trail diverted in Seacliff (onto Poplar) and in Rio Del
Mar (onto Sumner twice), yet there’s no mention of these. Does this mean these diversions are not planned, and trail will remain next to the rail line, or were they just excluded from description? Thank you for your feedback.

Johanna Lighthill

From: Nadene Thorne
Sent: Sunday, December 09, 2018 10:50 AM
To: Ryan Coonerty <ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>; Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Posted on Westside Nextdoor

Commissioners:

How about considering an expert weighing in before making expensive decisions?

Nadene Thorne

Still trying to comprehend the RTC's Rail with Trail numbers..

A friend of mine just notified me that he is reading a fascinating book about prospect theory and decision making by Daniel Kahneman — winner of the Nobel Prize in economics for his work in this area. Kahneman discusses “The Planning Fallacy” which describes forecasts that are unrealistically close to best-case scenarios and could be improved by consulting the statistics of similar cases. It’s telling he chose a study of rails to articulate his point and includes the following passage: “A 2005 study studied examined rail projects undertaken worldwide between 1969 and 1998. In more than 90% of the cases, the number of passengers projected to use the system was overestimated. Even though these passenger shortfalls were widely publicized, forecasts did not improve over those thirty years; on average, planners overestimated how many people would use the new rail projects by 106%, and the average cost overrun was 45%. As more evidence accumulated, the experts did not become more reliant on it.” A quick review of the RTC Rail with Trail plan looks like it is a best case scenario. If this is the case, we should reduce the estimated ridership by 106% and increase the cost by 45%. Trust the RTC and their consultants, or a Nobel Prize winner?

From: Stanley Sokolow
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2018 6:05 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>; George Dondero <gdondero@sccrtc.org>; Guy Preston <gpreston@sccrtc.org>; Ginger Dykaar <gdykaar@sccrtc.org>
Cc: sensibletransportation@googlegroups.com; Alex Clifford <aclifford@scmtd.com>; Barrow Emerson <bemerson@scmtd.com>; Jacques Bertrand <jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us>
Subject: Ownership of the railroad corridor parcels with clouded title

TO: George Dondero and Guy Preston, Executive Directors; Ginger Dykaar, Sr. Transportation Planner; and members of the Regional Transportation Commission
FOR consideration now and inclusion in the public comment file on the Unified Corridors Study.

In public comment at today's meeting (Dec. 6, 2018) of the RTC, I expressed my concern that the UCS report says that titles to 20 to 50 parcels of the railroad corridor are still clouded with uncertainty and that 10% of the other 120 parcels are easements which could be lost if railroad operation is abandoned. I said that I was baffled why the RTC has not tried to quiet the title to these parcels by legal actions. I admit that I and the public may not be aware of legal strategies that the RTC has received in closed session from qualified counsel. Perhaps you have dealt with the risk of "removing the rails" from those parcels by decided to remain silent and defend the RTC's rights if an owner of these parcels challenges those rights at some time in the future. However, I feel that you should consider the following information.

I preface this by stating that I am not an attorney, never have attended law school classes, but I can find and read precedent-setting legal case decisions. To be clear, I'm not threatening any legal action. Far from it. Rather, I'm concerned that the RTC makes a rational decision on the best use of the rail corridor knowing the risks and possible mitigations.

As RTC staff have explained, some of the right of way is owned in easement, not fee simple. If those easements were for railroad purposes only, and the RTC removes the railroad infrastructure without following the procedure for railbanking, then it could be held liable for damages by the owners of the underlying land. Under railbanking, if approved by the government agencies, the RTC would be immune from claims that the rails were replaced with a trail or busway. Setting that aside, there still may be a legal basis for defending against such claims if they ever arise.

California law recognizes "adverse possession" and "prescriptive easement" as ways to acquire either fee simple title or an easement without the consent of the land owner. A case in the First District Court of Appeal arising in Humboldt County is instructive. Connolly v. Trabue A131984 (4/10/12) (Petition for review or depublication was denied by Supreme Court.) Here's one place where it can be found: https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/2012/a131984.html.

In that case, Connolly (for reasons not relevant here) fenced off a portion of neighbor Trabue's land and used it continuously for 15 years for his cattle. When Trabue wanted Connolly to cease the use of the land which Trabue thought he owned, Connolly asserted that he made an agreement with the prior owner for such use and that the fenced portion of Trabue's land had become Connolly's by prescriptive easement. Connolly filed suit seeking to have the court declare that he had acquired an easement according California law. The trial court denied Connolly, but the appellate court overturned and declared that Connolly had acquired the easement because of the failure of the land owner Trabue (or predecessor owner) to object within 5 years after the use began and because the use met the statutory requirements. The court said that Connolly was not required to file any legal
action to declare the prescriptive easement or to claim title by adverse possession. Title transfers the moment that the statutory requirements were met.

This quote from an attorney explains:
To establish a prescriptive easement, a claimant must prove use of the property, for the statutory period of five years, which has been: (1) open and notorious; (2) continuous and uninterrupted; (3) hostile to the true owner; and (4) under a claim of right. (Main Street Plaza v. Cartwright & Main (2011) 194 Cal.App.4th 1044, 1054.) Generally, the claimant has the burden of proof of proving each of the elements necessary to establish that the easement has been created by prescription. (Code Civ. Proc. § 321.) Whether the easement satisfies the above requirements is considered a question of fact. (Warsaw v. Chicago Metallic Ceilings, Inc. (1984) 35 Cal.3d 564, 571.) Accordingly, a claimant is usually entitled to a jury trial on these factual issues. (Arciero Ranches v. Meza (1993) 17 Cal.App.4th 114, 125-126.)

In addition to the above requirements, the claimant also must show that their prescriptive easement is not exclusive. What this means is that a claimant generally cannot establish a prescriptive easement for a physical encroachment. (See Mehdizadeh v. Mincer (1996) 46 Cal.App.4th 1296)

A prescriptive easement allows use of the land but not ownership of it. However, adverse possession can create actual ownership (fee simple). A trespasser is entitled to legal ownership of property if his occupation of the property is hostile, actual, open and notorious, exclusive and continuous for a period of years set by state statute (5 years in California). Moreover, when the trespassing is done by the public, a public right to use property can be created. It is often called an "implied dedication" instead of a prescriptive easement. These terms and criteria are explained in this paper by Caltrans: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/row/landsurveys/Study_material/California-Adverse-Possession.pdf

Since the RTC continues to report that removal of the railroad could result in loss of use of the parcels whose title documents can't be found, some members of the Commission and public seem to think that the railroad use is unavoidable if we want to maintain a continuous right-of-way for the trail and/or transit. From my reading of the above information, it seems that you can put that fear to rest. The RTC has owned and used the railroad right-of-way for more than the minimum 5 years, so a prescriptive easement has been established. Perhaps actual fee simple title has been obtained by adverse possession.

For the parcels with known easements that expressly are for railroad purposes only, removal of the railroad could be trouble if the railroad use is abandoned without or before railbanking, leading to costly settlement with the land owners or in the worst case an action to acquire the parcel or easement by eminent domain with just compensation to the owner. How much might that compensation be?
The notorious case in King County, Washington, which I cited in a prior email on today's agenda item #23, said: "The average payout per homeowner along Lake Washington is an eye-watering $415,000. The payouts range from $10,000 to more than $1 million, just to change a rail bed to a trail bed."

An appraiser could estimate the fair market value of the RTC's 12 easements (10% of 120 parcels) which could require compensation to the owner if the tracks are removed. If King County's example is applied, the cost could be $120,000 to $12 million for all 12 easements. Add to that the cost of legal action for eminent domain if the owners refuse to settle.

This cost estimate has not been included in the capital costs listed in the scenarios. It should be. The risk if the train is removed is not that we may not have a continuous right of way, but rather that it will cost extra to plug the holes.

I urge you to get a legal opinion on these title risks, put a price tag on the likely cost range for those easements, disclose it in the capital cost spreadsheets, and then move forward with the detailed study to decide upon the best form of transit on the rail corridor (passenger train vs. BRT vs. anything else), as requested by the Metro Board.

Sincerely,

Stanley M. Sokolow

From: Michael Schmidt  
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2018 10:13 AM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>; Michael Schmidt  
Subject: Rail to Trail Project - Input for the UCS

Commissioners of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission.

Between 1999 and 2004 I was the CEO of the Santa Cruz Area Chamber of Commerce. During that time many of us were working on the purchase of the rail line with the dream of having a coastal trail running the length of the county.

I am pleased the RTC purchased the line and are now in the decision phase of the project. Thought I love the idea of rail running on this line in the cold light of 21st century thinking I can no longer support rail for this project. I believe "Bus Rapid Transit" is a much smarter, less costly and more flexible solution to meeting our transportation needs alone the corridor. Let rail bank the tracks and in the future rail service may be a more viable alternative, but not now.

I add my voice to those saying let's have a safe bike and pedestrian trail with bus rapid transit.
Thank you for the opportunity to express my feelings.

Take care,

Mike Schmidt

From: Mike Schmidt
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2018 9:05 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Support Metro's Alternatives Analysis, Don't Vote Till It's Done!

Dear RTC,

Our METRO system moves 5.2 million people every year. Please conduct the Alternatives Analysis requested by METRO to understand how bus service could be improved and expanded onto the Coastal Corridor. This level of analysis is required by Measure D. Do not vote on a transportation scenario until this Alternatives Analysis is complete!

Thank You

December 5, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Steve Barber</th>
<th>Gary Sultana</th>
<th>Emily Clark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

From: Anderson Shepard
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2018 3:09 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: UCS and Metro

Dear Chairman Leopold and RTC,

We are making great progress on the UCS, but Metro raises a great point that further analysis of usership, funding, and the other specific breakdowns between bus vs rail transit is needed. Please heed their request for such an analysis and hold-off on voting on any of the UCS scenarios until this Alternatives Analysis is complete.

Thank You,

Anderson Shepard
Live Oak
From: Robert Stephens  
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2018 2:48 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Slow Down on the UCIS

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing you to ask that you don’t proceed with approving Scenario B of the UCIS and start the trigger to sign a 10 year contract with Progressive Rail.

First and foremost, this is a very important issue for our community that will have very long-term effects on our community. The commission needs to spend some time figuring this out. It is much more important to get this right than rush to some conclusion. Due to the recent elections there will be new players who will need to get up to speed on this issue.

There is absolutely no reason to rush this, as it will take about close to a year to fix the blowout on the rail line north of Watsonville. So there will be no trains north of Watsonville for a while. Why is there a rush to sign up Progressive Rail? Not only will a contract with Progressive, give up local control of the corridor for ten years, it will do nothing for traffic relief and It will only close out valuable options.

MERTO has asked for an Alternative Analysis, which seems like a very good idea. Make this happen and learn for the results. Also there are some very basic questions about Prop 116 funds that should be answered first.

It also seems very prudent to give the new RTC ED some time to weight in on this issue, as he will have to live with it and implement it.

I don’t need to tell you that the UCIS has not brought our community together, it has divided it even more. So please spend a little time and see if there is some common ground and room for compromise on this issue. It might take time and work, but it will really pay off in the long run.

Sincerely,

Robert Stephens  
Aptos

From: Dean Morrow  
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2018 1:27 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Support Metro's Alternatives Analysis, don't vote till it's done

Dear RTC Staff and Board,
Our METRO system moves 5.2 million people every year. Please conduct the Alternatives Analysis requested by METRO to understand how bus service could be improved and expanded onto the Coastal Corridor. This level of analysis is required by Measure D. I urge your Board to NOT vote on a transportation scenario until this Alternatives Analysis is complete.

Thank You,

Dean Morrow
Capitola
From: Stanley Sokolow  
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2018 10:35 AM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Cc: sensibletransportation@googlegroups.com  
Subject: Unified Corridors study's omission of bus improvements on Soquel Ave/Dr.

Commissioners,

You should watch this short video which was published yesterday about Boston's pilot project to test and demonstrate a simple way to enhance their bus service along major streets.

[Boston Area Bus Pilots Move Region Closer to BRT](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oDDPbbw_cag)

They temporarily have placed time-of-day no-parking signs to allow only buses and right-turns to use the rightmost lane during commute hours. You could implement a similar test along Soquel Ave/Drive to let buses bypass the congested traffic. It need not be permanent nor expensive until the changes are tested, measured for performance, and approved for permanence.

I urge you to make a pilot project to test this partial BRT-lite improvement.

Sincerely,

Stanley Sokolow

From: Carey Pico  
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2018 9:52 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Cc: Ginger Dykaar <gdykaar@sccrtc.org>; Grace Blakeslee <gblakeslee@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: right-of-way is easements

On p.23-3 of the RTC agenda Dykaar and Blakelee address the issue of potential consequences if the rail corridor is not used for rail passenger service. They state a number of parcels exist lacking historical record as to ascertain whether or not a rail easement ever existed that would have reverted to fee-simple ownership under the 1982 California Marketable Record Title Act if the easement was not renewed. Adding to the mix, they mention the lack of identifiable property lines in some parcels.

The implication of their address is that the RTC would potentially lose railroad easements in these parcels if the tracks were ever removed. With trail being in the background of the discussion, railbanking was mentioned as well with the suggestion railbanking (i.e. trail-only) could lead to future legal issues for the County.

Lacking in their discussion is a) unidentified property easement titled properties are already at risk for private ownership claim, **regardless of rail service or not**, b) building a trail **with or without** accompanying rail service carries the same risk of easement loss. This is because trails are not, in general, critical to railroad operations and fall outside the easement grants (see US Supreme Court cases addressing utilities such as telephone wires versus non-utility uses such as loading docks), and c)
railbanking protects the RTC/County from any damages related to citizen demands for compensation for the "taking of property" because the rail easement would be under Federal stewardship. While the authors of p.23-3 allude lawsuits and that the landowners of the easement lands won compensation for unlawful taking of land, they failed to mention the local municipalities who controlled the rail corridors/easements were not harmed.

What I want to make clear, building the MBSST as planned would violate the railroad easements on record. With the large number of parcels lacking proper easement title, it is highly probable a landowner will challenge ownership and use, especially with the issue being discussed publicly. This is potential problem that should not be ignored.

From a straight risk analysis point of view, railbanking is the least risk-averse strategy if a trail is ever to be built.

Carey Pico, attorney-at-large
From: Shinshu Roberts  
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2018 9:36 AM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Support Metro's Alternatives Analysis, Don't Vote Till It's Done!

Dear RTC,

Please stop blocking the desires of many Santa Cruz residents to do rail banking. I am appending this paragraph to the statement below. Capitola's Measure L is a clear indication that you are going in the wrong direction. At the very least the rail corridor should be brought to a community vote and not be a decision made by a few people.

Our METRO system moves 5.2 million people every year. Please conduct the Alternatives Analysis requested by METRO to understand how bus service could be improved and expanded onto the Coastal Corridor. This level of analysis is required by Measure D. Do not vote on a transportation scenario until this Alternatives Analysis is complete!

Thank You, Lani Roberts, Capitola, CA

The SCCRTC received the following email sent by the individuals listed below:

Subject: Support Metro's Alternatives Analysis, Don't Vote Till It's Done!

Dear RTC,

Our METRO system moves 5.2 million people every year. Please conduct the Alternatives Analysis requested by METRO to understand how bus service could be improved and expanded onto the Coastal Corridor. This level of analysis is required by Measure D. Do not vote on a transportation scenario until this Alternatives Analysis is complete!

Thank You

December 4, 2018
Christy Tall Christopher Lucas
Bill Gray DeAnna Lopez
Janet Perry Scott Roseman
Phillip Rupp
Enda Brennan
Nadeau Thorne
Michael Hollister
K.C.
Dear RTC,

Please accept the attached letter as public comment on item #23 about the Unified Corridors update.

Stanley M. Sokolow
The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS AND RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study

December 3, 2018
Annie Boheler

From: Mountain andSurf
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2018 9:43 PM
To: john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bruce.mcperson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; openup@cats.ucsc.edu; tim_gubbins@dot.ca.gov; Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: No Rail Trail, No Longterm Train Contracts Until Comprehensive Plan. Prioritize Active Transport - Trail Only, Trail Now

Today I received the Ecology Action newsletter urging me to “Support the Westside Rail Trail Phase II Development on December 6th™, but the details contained within the newsletter have encouraged me to do exactly the opposite.

The Ecology Action newsletter begins with a discussion of Segment 7 – what was initially thought to be one of the more straightforward sections of the corridor to begin constructing rail/trail – however, bids for this particular section are way over initial estimates, have strained relations with local businesses, and by Ecology Action’s own admission will require “expensive retaining walls and the removal of trees that will displace native habitat”.

Ecology Action’s newsletter goes on to celebrate that plans are in the works to expand the pedestrian crossing of the San Lorenzo River Trestle, picturing the current 4ft wide path juxtaposed with the neighboring but long idle train tracks. I do not disagree that this area is a particular bottleneck and a wider path is desirable, but it seems foolhardy and needlessly expensive to modify a portion of the river crossing when the whole trestle could be put to better use supporting active pedestrian transit.

Our rail corridor represents a tremendous opportunity. I am frustrated that significant time and expense have been dedicated to prioritizing a train system that won’t improve traffic congestion but will be extremely expensive. Capitola’s passage of Measure L, the RTC’s hiring of a new executive director,
and the findings of the Rail Trail Feasibility Study and Unified Corridor Investment Study suggest that the time is right to reconsider the train. While I eagerly await a world-class pedestrian trail, I do not support construction of any piece of a path until a comprehensive plan is established.

Sincerely,
Ryan Hoffman, RN, MBA
Live Oak, Santa Cruz

From: Schwartz Susan
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2018 5:19 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Build the trail now - forget the rail

It just can’t be any simpler. Santa Cruz needs a bicycle and walking corridor that passes through our various neighborhoods and is safe. The issues with adding a train to the picture put plans for the trail off indefinitely. Build the trail now. So so many people want it!

Sincerely,
Susan Schwartz

From: Family Gmail
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2018 8:36 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Stop the rail trail

Please stop the rail trail, make it trail only. For the health of our community and allow safe access for children to schools. Please vote no on the rail trail, make it trail only!

Thanks,
Brett

From: David Kunis
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2018 7:30 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Rail Corridor

Stop this nonsense with a commuter train because it's a stupid idea, lacks public support and you aren't going to believe the outrage directed your way if it ever does come to pass. Trains will be required to blast their horns at every unprotected crossing and the many people impacted will be calling for your resignation or worse. Public funding will be harder and harder to get and taxpayers will revolt. Give it up!!!

David Kunis
From: Kathy Helmer  
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2018 12:48 AM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Cc: Bruce McPherson <bruce.mcpherson@santacruzcounty.us>; Johnson, Gine <Gine.Johnson@santacruzcounty.us>  
Subject: Comments on UCS for Commissioners' Consideration

Below are my comments pertaining to Highway 1 ramp metering/auxiliary lane timelines

Ramp Metering and Auxiliary Lane timelines

A comprehensive ramp metering system is long overdue on the Highway 1 Corridor. For example, traffic volumes and speeds on the two SB 41st Avenue on-ramps often exceed mainline Highway 1 volumes and speeds during afternoon peak periods. Slowing and increasing gaps in the flow of on-ramp traffic and maximizing ramp storage capacity is one of the most cost effective ways to begin reducing mainline congestion. For that reason, I do not support the scenario on page 154 stating that ramp metering should be added after 2035 when auxiliary lanes are completed to San Andreas Road. I recommend amending the preferred scenario to:

- The first phase of a Highway 1 ramp metering system should be installed along with interchange modifications and ramp widening at Morrissey Blvd., Soquel Drive, 41st Av. and Bay/Porter interchanges during the next 6 to 8 years in conjunction with the Phase 1 Auxiliary Lane projects. The second phase of the Highway 1 ramp metering system should be installed in conjunction with auxiliary lane projects to San Andreas Road.

The Transportation Commission should adopt the following policy positions:

- Installation and operation of ramp metering systems are of regional importance and maximum benefit to Highway 1 will occur if each City and county support their installation as a system. Local street and traffic signal improvements and increased ramp storage must be an integral part of any ramp metering system.
- Current interchange designs should be redesigned as needed to maximize traffic flows and safety on both the mainline and local streets for all users.
- Ramp meters should be activated as mainline traffic conditions warrant and not be seen as only operational during "traditional" peak congestion periods.

My comments are based upon review of the draft study, my observations and my experience of 32 years serving as head of municipal transportation in the Cities of Santa Cruz and San Jose and one of the founding members of the Safe on 17 Task Force formed after the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake.

James Helmer, P.E., T.E.
From: Mike Pisano  
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2018 5:46 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Subject: UCS

Hello UCS,

I agree with the New Preferred Scenario with adding;

BRT lite (faster boarding, transit signal priority and queue jumps), and Increased frequency of transit with express services. Less emphasis on ramp metering, but more emphasis on auxiliary lanes.

Also add & expand bike share & scooter share to the County.

Thank you  
Michael Pisano

---

From: Mike Pisano  
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2018 3:23 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Subject: UCS

Hi UCS study,

I reside in Live Oak.

Please include frontage roads on Hwy 1 & Hwy 17 to allow those locales ease of access to their local areas with not hopping on the highway.  
One example;  
Connect Auto Plaza Drive to Bay Ave.

We also need a safe pedestrian & bike path between Santa Cruz & Scotts Valley.  
From;  
Ocean St Extension - along the edge of Henry Cowell.  
Graham Hill Road  
Glen Canyon Road

If Brookwood Drive could add a two-way bike lane.

Thank you  
Michael Pisano
From: Bill Gray  
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2018 8:21 AM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Please support the North Coast Plan, and...

Stop the rail folly, NOW.

Bill Gray  
Capitola

From: Brian Peoples  
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2018 6:41 AM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Support TrailNow / Farmer’s North Coast Rail Trail Plan

RTC,

One of the key goals of the Unified Corridor Study (UCS) was to provide guidance for the North Coast Rail Trail to meet the Federal Grant deadline of 2020. Now that Metro and other key organizations are against the results of the UCS and requesting that more studies for the rail corridor be performed, we are concerned that this could delay moving forward with the North Coast Rail Trail and jeopardize Federal Grant funds.

With an estimated cost of over $15M to refurbish the railroad tracks for excursion trains to Davenport, we believe it can be concluded that our community will not make this type of investment. We believe the results of the UCS can provide enough guidance that the old railroad tracks from Wilder Ranch to Davenport are no longer required. Making this determination will allow RTC staff to begin working directly with the Farmers and Property-owners on a collaborative win-win solution to build a world-class rail-trail along the North Coast. The North Coast Rail Trail EIR report shows that our plan has the least environmental impact and can meet the 2020 deadline to use the Federal Grant funds.

We ask that you please support the recommendation that the old railroad tracks from Wilder Ranch to Davenport are no longer required and RTC Staff can proceed with developing the Farmers’ Alternative Rail Trail plan along the North Coast.

Best regards,

Brian Peoples  
Executive Director  
Trail Now
Hi SCCRTC board,

I am a resident of Live Oak.

I highly recommend Scenario B on the rail trail study.
I highly recommend a full METRO ITS, and AVL with route information on solar powered visual & voice
signage notifications systems at several key points (such as Ocean & Water, and all Transit Stations).

Common Acronyms:
ITS=Intelligent Transportation Systems - AVL=Automated Vehicle Locator
AVA=Automated Vehicle Announcement - APC=Automatic Passenger Counters

Our County voted overwhelmingly for Measure D & again has shown support with the defeat of
Measure 6. Our METRO has done a tremendous job in cutting $6 million dollars from its budget to give
us a just adequate local mass transit system. We need options in our County. I have joined a few other
locals to be car-less by choice since March of this year – I can tell you sustainable transportation in this
County is very difficult. We need Options like a rail with trail, bike share, scooter share, carpools, and
vanpools access. More walkable areas – bring back the five & dime stores with pharmacies, a diner/cafe
(with milkshakes), grocery & retail. I hope that the recent Bird Scooter dropping In Santa Cruz has not
discouraged our County from Scooter share. It is my opinion that this is what sustainable transportation
looks like for the first & last mile solutions.

For example;
I took the METRO 66 to Capitola Mall, after work, from Pacific Station to gain some good value from
Sears (before the notice of Sears closing). I finished shopping waiting for a return 66 back to Santa Cruz
and hopped off at Coles BBQ for a rib dinner. Then had to wait in the cold for an hour for the next 66
going to the Mall then to return to Soquel Ave to transfer to the 71 to go home in Live Oak. Please have
more transportation options in Live Oak.

My ex-wife worked at, as temporary help, at West Marine in Watsonville during a transition for them,
and the closest bus stop arrived at 5pm. The next bus was at 6pm (she was able to get a ride to
Watsonville, but not back home). I had the brilliant idea to use Uber to get her to the Watsonville Metro
Station to catch whatever bus was going back to Santa Cruz. I would then either wait at 41st & Soquel to
pick her up or at the bus stop at Soquel & Thurber. This quickly became better for me to be dropped off
at Pasatiempo to catch the 35A into Scotts Valley, and for her to continue to Watsonville for when we
shared our one car. Please have more transportation options in the Watsonville Square Area.

Rideshare;
I have tried Zimride a UC Santa Cruz TAPS supported rideshare program. I have been on the Zimride site
for over four years now and have failed to find adequate, timely rideshare. Enterprise Car Rental
Company had recently purchase Zimride & Rideshare vanpool. I did reach out to & met with Rideshare,
but I have not successfully gained a ride to work & back. I have tried WazeCarpool with only three rides
in the last seven months. I have tried scoop & duet to no avail. I can use some of the ride share apps, but the convenience is lost either I have to get up an hour early or work with my supervisor to come in later (my supervisor is very supportive of my endeavor). My time is just a valuable as anyone else’s, and if it is too much an inconvenience for me - I might as well buy a car. I currently use either Uber or Lyft to get to work in a timely manner at $16 to $20 a trip and take the METRO home with a UCSC staff buss pass ($16 a month).

We have a free Lyft rides back and forth to Campus, but only students can use this for commute purposes. I found out recently that TAPS has not gathered enough data to justify other options between campus, downtown and the UC Scotts Valley Center. We have been at the Enterprise Technology Center (ETC) in Scotts Valley since January of 2017. UCSC TAPS only supports Zimride as an alternative to a TAPS vanpool as affiliates feel safer with other affiliates (less the non-affiliated Lyft free rides for staff & students).

Maybe help UberPool & LyftPool with accessibility in our county, and other viable less expensive ride share options?

FYI:
It is about 25 minutes back and forth from Campus to Scotts Valley on Lyft (this does not include wait times).
Uber & Lyft are smartphone app based ride hailing services.
UberPool, Lyftpool, Wazecarpool, Scoop & Duet are smartphone app based car-pool options – you have to walk to a convenient pick-up spot (up to ten minutes – another reason for scooter share).
Wazecarpool, Scoop & Duet are encouraged by Cruz511 ($4 a trip).

Kaiser Changing Service
I just learned from my Kaiser Doctor that Kaiser is ending therapy for adults at the Santa Cruz Kaiser location, but they are expanding Watsonville & Scotts Valley locations (Santa Cruz Kaiser will still have child therapy).

How will those in need of service & campus students get to Watsonville & Scotts Valley Kaiser in a timely manner?

Can the SCCRTC, the METRO, Kaiser, Cabrillo, the Enterprise Technology Center (ETC) & U.C. TAPS work together to find an equitable transportation solution?
Maybe there is grant money available from Kaiser?
Maybe ETC can move from free Lyft service to a shuttle service or help enhanced METRO service to ETC & Kaiser?
Maybe METRO can loop from Santa Cruz to Scotts Valley stopping at the ETC & Kaiser (both ways on Scotts Valley Drive)?
Maybe METRO can go from half-hour intervals to 20 minutes intervals on Metro routes 35/35A?

Safety
I have been pretty amenable to going car-less, but as of late, safety has been on my mind. Our Highways are designed to trickle people in, but it also trickles people out. As for safety, this is very disadvantageous. We need to have three lanes on at least Hwy1 to safely help get people out of our County in an emergency. We also need to attain some evacuation help for those that are car-less.
Please note for future thoughts:
I wonder if autonomous vehicles would help get people out, or would those companies that own the autonomous vehicles keep them out of harm’s way & have them not enter evacuation areas? Will future autonomous vehicles insurance companies allow their property to help evacuate car-less citizens?

Our County needs more options.

Thank you for your time and consideration

From: GARY PLOMP
Sent: Thursday, November 29, 2018 9:42 AM
To: Undisclosed recipients:
Subject: RE: Repair of the Santa Cruz Branchline

To all:

The storms of 2017, damaged and undermined the Santa Cruz Branch rail line just North of Watsonville at Mile Post 5 rendering it unusable. The Army Corps of Engineers are not scheduled to repair it until late next year. Of course, the anti-rail groups in North Santa Cruz County have impeded this process too. This is ridiculous!

I respectfully ask that you Lobby or contact the CTC (California Transportation Commission) and your Local, State and Federal representatives to fast track (no pun) the repairs of this important transportation entity. Thank you for your attention.

Gary V. Plomp
Rail Advocate

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS AND RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study

November 28, 2018
Francis Nimmo Golden Love
From: Kirill Petrov  
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 12:15 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: I support Greenway

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,

Kirill Petrov

From: Craig Chatterton  
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2018 11:44 AM  
To: tim_gubbins@dot.ca.gov; jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us; sbrown@cityofsantacruz.com; rlj12@comcast.net; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; zach.friend@santacruzcounty.us; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; openup@cats.ucsc.edu; David.reid@santacruzcounty.ca.us; patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us; aschifr@ucsc.edu; Ginger Dykaar <gdykaar@sccrtc.org>; Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: draft Unified Corridor Investment Study Document

To: RTC commission and UCS team members,

As a resident of the 2nd district in Santa Cruz County, I have significant concerns about the draft Unified Corridor Investment Study document (UCS). Like many residents, my life is significantly impacted by the transportation issues and decisions facing the county. Attached are some comments on the draft UCS.

Thank you for time and consideration.

Craig Chatterton  
Resident, 2nd District
From: Robert Esposito  
Sent: Saturday, November 24, 2018 9:18 AM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: UCS  

Dear RTC members,

I am sure much time has been spent discussing the engineering feat of the UCS. As a licensed contractor in the building industry for over 20yrs, I feel the expense doesn’t justify the current planned options. Typically 2 tracks are required for safe and efficient commuter rail service. The corridor currently seems only wide enough for single (1) tracking which usually is only used for branch lines. How can you have a commuter rail service with only one track?

Sincerely,

Robert Esposito  
Resident of Rio Del Mar

From: John Speyer  
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2018 1:09 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Comments on Unified Corridor Investment Study  

Dear SCCRTC:

As a resident of Watsonville for more than 20 years, I urge you to support Preferred Scenario B, which include Rail + Trail route between south & north county.

Destroying the rail line would be disastrous for our county, eliminating one of the best options for North-South commutes. Don’t listen to the Greenway folks: most county residents will not be commuting north & south on bikes! The rail offers an excellent option to move folks, assuming the price is not out of the range of service/hospitality/factory workers.

It’s been proven time and again that widening lanes will NOT help solve the problem in the long run, as HWY 1 will simply turn into a rush hour parking lot after a few years of its widening. Drivers need to be encouraged to carpool or take alternative forms of transportation.

Final thought: how about encouraging private or public smaller vehicles - mini-vans that hold a dozen or so, and run every 15 min or less - to get folks to and from work at the train hubs, “the last mile” scenario. This would be essential for getting folks from Watsonville to Pajaro train station, and from the Santa Cruz station to the industrial Westside & River St/Hwy 9 areas.

Sincerely,

John Speyer  
Watsonville CA
From: margherita zavatta  
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 4:48 PM  
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Public Comment

I urge Commissioners to support the Preferred Scenario (B) of the Unified Investment Corridor Study. Using the rail corridor for both rail and trail is definitely the best option when considering public safety, reducing carbon emissions, improving social equity, increasing use of public transit and benefiting the local economy.

Thanks,  
Margherita Zavatta

From: Bob F  
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 12:07 PM  
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Improving Quality of Life in Santa Cruz County by easing HWY1 traffic during Commute Times

Apparently the RTC is still undecided between the "Rail-Trail" and "Trail-only". I feel the very distant "promise" of one mixed with all the realities of the other, may be best and to offer it now! With the RTC delaying a decision, I’d like to encourage a “Bus-Trail Corridor” alternative that allows a very viable means for transporting people safely and comfortably across Santa Cruz County that can essentially be guaranteed to be a fraction of the time that it now takes during commute times. This should appeal to those who can only dream of one day taking a safe passenger train. It also should appeal to those who want the opportunity to freely travel along this corridor via a variety of human-powered means.

I just sent the following to the newspapers, please support this alternative that I feel will most likely further improve Quality of Life in Santa Cruz County.

Bob Fifield  
Aptos, Ca. 95003

From: Dianne  
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 11:34 AM  
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Keep the Rail!

Regional Transportation Commission:

I urge Commissioners to support the Preferred Scenario (B) of the Unified Investment Corridor Study. Using the rail corridor for both rail and trail is definitely the best option when considering public safety, reducing carbon emissions, improving social equity, increasing use of public transit and benefiting the local economy.
Public safety - fewer traffic collisions, injuries and deaths.

Significant reduction in VMT (vehicle miles traveled) - critical for reducing carbon emissions and traffic congestion.

Economic benefits - the increase in visitor related tax revenue will be as much as 60% higher than the other scenarios.

Funding availability - Santa Cruz County voters overwhelmingly approved Measure D, which includes ongoing funding for the rail and trail. Most importantly, the recently adopted California State Rail Plan specifically allocates $1.5 billion for the Central Coast to “Implement Regional Rail Connecting Monterey and Santa Cruz to the Statewide Rail Network”.

Equitable - Rail with trail will serve many modes of travel for many differing abilities.

Keep the rail and build the trail - Scenario B is the best option to address the climate crisis, provide equitable transportation access for everyone, improve local economic vitality and develop a truly sustainable transportation system that will serve Santa Cruz County now and well into the future.

Dianne Dryer
Santa Cruz County resident

From: Martha Macambridge
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 9:11 AM
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Keep the rail and build the trail

I urge Commissioners to support the Preferred Scenario (B) of the Unified Investment Corridor Study. Using the rail corridor for both rail and trail is definitely the best option when considering public safety, reducing carbon emissions, improving social equity, increasing use of public transit and benefiting the local economy.

Public safety - fewer traffic collisions, injuries and deaths.

Significant reduction in VMT (vehicle miles traveled) - critical for reducing carbon emissions and traffic congestion.

Economic benefits - the increase in visitor related tax revenue will be as much as 60% higher than the other scenarios.

Funding availability - Santa Cruz County voters overwhelmingly approved Measure D, which includes ongoing funding for the rail and trail. Most importantly, the recently adopted California State Rail Plan specifically allocates $1.5 billion for the Central Coast to “Implement Regional Rail Connecting Monterey and Santa Cruz to the Statewide Rail Network”.

Equitable - Rail with trail will serve many modes of travel for many differing abilities.
Keep the rail and build the trail - Scenario B is the best option to address the climate crisis, provide equitable transportation access for everyone, improve local economic vitality and develop a truly sustainable transportation system that will serve Santa Cruz County now and well into the future.

Thank you,

Martha Macambridge

From: Nadene Thorne
Sent: Sunday, November 18, 2018 8:22 PM
To: Ryan Coonerty <ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>
Cc: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Way Forward in Light of the UC Study

Commissioner Coonerty,

As your district constituent, I was highly disappointed by your vote in June to approve the Progressive Rail contract. Most of the commissioners who voted for it with you expressed the same justification: “We HAVE to do something for the businesses in Watsonville who depend on freight.”

My question to you, and to these other commissioners, is why you didn’t direct the RTC staff to write and negotiate a contract that would have done only what we all agreed was immediately needed: provide rail service for Watsonville businesses and to the south, rather than a 10-year contract (potentially) committing the county to make substantial – and expensive – repairs to the rail line whose value we are far from a consensus on. None of the commissioners, to my knowledge, has answered that question.

Now we have the results of the highly touted UCI Study, one that, for all its advertised community input and presumed foundation on verified fact, nevertheless seems to offer a mishmash of partial proposals, and further postpones substantive solutions until 2035! It appears as though the commission staff would rather study the transportation problems, rather than actually recommend doing anything about them any time soon.

Doesn’t it make sense at this critical juncture, before further obligating the county to whatever uncertainty is proposed in Progressive Rail’s contract, to at least step back and consider the implications of some of the significant circumstances that have changed since the UCI Study was authorized:

1) The Measure L vote in Capitola,

2) The Progressive Rail contract,

3) The sudden and perhaps unexpected popularity of e-bikes in Santa Cruz as a viable transportation option rather than as simply recreation,
4) The inability to date of the City of Santa Cruz to fund the astonishingly expensive Segment 7 phases of even a narrow trail aside the railroad tracks,

5) The substantial number of community speakers and letter writers who have lobbied you all to pursue bus and trail only (as opposed to the ambiguous dot-and-vote system of several of the presentations), and to oppose the Progressive Rail contract as written,

6) The less-than-enthusiastic local responses to the north coast EIR proposal and presentations,

7) The comments and recommendations of several transportation speakers which you, the RTC, sponsored,

8) And there are probably innumerable other changes to the transportation landscape which only you all may be aware, and through which you commissioners must negotiate.

In short, accepting the staff recommendation of Scenario B will undermine the explicit goals the study: to ascertain transportation solutions which offer economy, meet environmental goals, and enhance social equity. The study itself makes it clear that no rail option will be equitable, or will effectively reduce traffic on Highway 1, or will be affordable for the long term, or achievable in the near term.

Before simply rubber-stamping this flawed scenario recommendation of the RTC staff, who, it should be noted, were not elected as representatives of us citizens but rather function only at the behest of you commissioners, I would hope that you would use this opportunity to re-evaluate “the plan of record” in light of the present and near future and create a scenario that genuinely offers viable and affordable transportation improvements for both north and south county residents.

I would be happy to meet with you to discuss these options further.

Nadene Thorne

---

From: Joel Isaacson  
Sent: Sunday, November 18, 2018 6:50 PM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Rail trail

Keep the rails for the future. Build the trail now.

Joel Isaacson

---

From: Nancy  
Sent: Sunday, November 18, 2018 10:15 AM  
To: ucs@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Rail + Trails
I urge Commissioners to support the Preferred Scenario (B) of the Unified Investment Corridor Study. Using the rail corridor for both rail and trail is definitely the best option when considering public safety, reducing carbon emissions, improving social equity, increasing use of public transit and benefiting the local economy.

Some of the reasons cited in the recent Unified Corridor Study:

- Public safety - fewer traffic collisions, injuries and deaths.

- Economic benefits - the increase in visitor related tax revenue will be as much as 60% higher than the other scenarios.

- Funding availability - Santa Cruz County voters overwhelmingly approved Measure D, which includes ongoing funding for the rail and trail. Most importantly, the recently adopted California State Rail Plan specifically allocates $1.5 billion for the Central Coast to “Implement Regional Rail Connecting Monterey and Santa Cruz to the Statewide Rail Network”.

- Equitable - Rail with trail will serve many modes of travel for many differing abilities.

- Climate - Significant reduction in VMT (vehicle miles traveled) - critical for reducing carbon emissions

- Traffic - Significant reduction in traffic

Keep the rail and build the trail - Scenario B is the best option to address the climate crisis, provide equitable transportation access for everyone, improve local economic vitality and develop a truly sustainable transportation system that will serve Santa Cruz County now and well into the future.

Thank you,
Nancy Willard
Aptos resident

From: Chuck Johnson
Sent: Sunday, November 18, 2018 8:37 AM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Save the rails for the future of transport

From: Eva Brunner
Sent: Saturday, November 17, 2018 10:52 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail Trail

Commissioners -

Keep the rail and build the trail - Scenario B is the best option to address the climate crisis, provide equitable transportation access for everyone, improve local economic vitality and develop a
truly sustainable transportation system that will serve Santa Cruz County now and well into the future.

Eva Brunner

From: Tom Rath  
Sent: Saturday, November 17, 2018 1:51 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: RAIL TRAIL CORRIDOR

I live in Capitola and have been a member of the national Rails To Trails Conservancy since 2005. I receive their quarterly magazine and am amazed at how much has been accomplished nationwide in either converting rails to trails or establishing trails alongside rails. It dismays me to see that we are stuck with advancing our rail/trail with opposition primarily from Trail Now and Greenway. I am a firm proponent of rails WITH trails for our corridor.

I only get the weekend subscription to the SC Sentinel and every week there is a letter to the editor on this topic either pro or con. I have subscribed to emails from Trail Now to read about their positions as well. I have read your studies provided by consultants and completed your surveys when asked upon to do so. I am a voter and checked elections results this morning because they are still counting mail in ballots. Measure L here in Capitola now trailing by 127 votes.

I think a lot of negativity regarding rail comes from prior years when Union Pacific ran the rock train from Aromas to CEMEX once or twice per week. It was extremely heavy, loud, spewed lots of diesel exhaust, not energy efficient and basically obnoxious. I don't think the trains to Christmas Town helped improve the image of rail much for some of the same reasons. It amazes me that we ran that heavy rock train over all of our 100 plus year old bridges without incident but now cannot run "light" rail passenger service over those same bridges. This reeks of litigation issues even with scheduled structural inspections and retrofits if deemed necessary.

I have researched Siemens in Sacramento and they have some really modernized, low floor, light weight, low emissions and quiet light rail vehicles. Although they do have many electric only applications they also have Tier 4 diesel/electric and brand new hydrogen/electric power options for their engines. Tier 4 is the lowest emissions level for diesel powered vehicles in use currently. They provide their various products now on a world wide basis and are considered a leader in the industry.

I believe I read where SMART in Marin/Sonoma offered free demo rides for a limited period of time. This offered proponents, opponents, stakeholders and general public an opportunity to experience the service prior to full implementation. Some of our stakeholders have gone up to ride SMART to experience for themselves light rail transit. I think a similar demo here having the RTC, Progressive the local cities and the County develop a proposal for submission to Siemens for this purpose. Many of our County residents are basing their opinion either pro or con without ever having experienced what a light rail service could provide. A former coworker of mine who lives just South of Watsonville and works at the main County building on Ocean told me his morning commute is now 1.5 hours minimum and his evening commute is now 2 hours notwithstanding any traffic incidents. He would love to drive in to Watsonville, hop on a light rail, ride to the Boardwalk area and then take a SC Metro shuttle up Pacific and over to Ocean.
Next phase of widening HWY 1 from Soquel Ave to 41st Ave not to begin until 2021. That's no more than one mile. HWY 1 commute traffic now spilling onto surface streets in attempt to evade the congestion. Tourism is our number one industry and agriculture is number two. We have an opportunity to increase our eco tourism economy by providing light rail service. Imagine many of the tourists entering our County from the East, the North and the South, parking their cars, hopping on light rail with a day pass and enjoying our County's many attractions without having to navigate the traffic. Rails To Trails Conservancy has reported that many businesses within 1/2 mile of the rail/trail corridors report a 20% to 25% increase in sales revenues. I just don't see many other options for us to consider bound in with the ocean on one side and the mountains on the other. I wish to thank you sincerely for your efforts on behalf of the residents of Santa Cruz County!!

---

From: GARY PLOMP  
Sent: Saturday, November 17, 2018 7:17 AM  
To: UCS <UCS@sccrtc.org>  
Cc: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: RE: Support for "B"

To whom it may concern:

I once again write this letter to voice my support for Measure "B" in regard to Rail with Trail.

It is paramount that the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line be preserved for future use! It is a historic transportation asset that will factor big time into the future of transit in Santa Cruz County in the years ahead.

Keep in mind, other than the Greyhound bus, there is NO DECENT INTERCITY connections in or out of Santa Cruz County at this time. Also, the Santa Cruz Branch rail line will not only provide a link to future Amtrak service at Watsonville Junction in Pajaro but providing a needed transportation option for COMMUTERS as well.

Hopefully, freight service will be increased in the Santa Cruz and North County area in the future and preserving the rail line is essential for the economy of the county.

In addition the trail aspect will appease those who desire a walking and bike path as well. It is a win-win for all.

Thank you for your attention.  
Gary V. Plomp  
Rail Advocate
From: Dan
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2018 7:51 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Viable traffic solutions

We are retired and walk the area near Newbrighten elementary. If we are serious about traffic solutions we should talk a hard look at returning to school bus program. It would be far more effective in removing surface and highway traffic in the area. Also by studies estimates 3500 daily commuters would use new rail most of which would most likely be taken from existing bus passengers. By the way that is almost the same number I came up with several years ago when this all came up. I based it on existing public bus ridership. But to my point 3500 daily compared to 100,000 on highway is only 3.5% think about that number and the money that will have to be spend and continued to be spent to subsidize 3500 riders on 60 trains daily. Lastly freight on rail in our area is a fantasy. Maybe a few decades ago but not in today’s world. Perhaps from Watsonville or Salinas eastward but not our area. Good to hear that meeting has been rescheduled . Thank you for all your efforts.

The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

SAFER STREETS AND RELIEF FROM TRAFFIC

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study

November 15, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monica Alvarez</th>
<th>Nayerli Ortiz</th>
<th>Anna Castillo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yahir Alvarez</td>
<td>Freddy Garcia</td>
<td>Fidelina Mendoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noe Fernandez-Duarte</td>
<td>Ivan Salvador</td>
<td>Sarah Aquilina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Perez</td>
<td>Edgar Rocha</td>
<td>Monica Gracizo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domonique R.</td>
<td>Miguel H.</td>
<td>Leon Pacheco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca Castameda</td>
<td>Carolyn Candia</td>
<td>Rolando Munoz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Hernandez</td>
<td>Shane Soarez</td>
<td>Ariana Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Mores</td>
<td>Abram Rincon</td>
<td>Richard Walsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SCCRTC received the following letter sent by the individuals listed below:

CALLES MÁS SEGURAS Y ALIVIO DE TRÁFICO

Estimada Agencia Regional de Transportación de Santa Cruz:

• Necesitamos tránsito público rápido y confinable y calles más seguras para ciclistas y peatones.
• Necesitamos alternativas para aliviar la congestión del tráfico en el autopista.
• Favor de utilizar la vía de tren para servicios de pasajero confinable para trabajadores, estudiantes y todo el público.
• Favor de hacer nuestras calles más seguras para bicicletas y peatones.

Yo vivo en el condado de Santa Cruz y apoyo las mejoras en el Escenario B del Estudio “Unified Corridor Investment Study”.

November 15, 2018

Mark Poza  Gabino E. Torres S.  Carlos Plasceria  Lexio Valeria
Daniel Oviedo  Adriana Cruz  Eduardo Jiménez
Jeremi  Gerardo Cruz  Mariah
Angel Barrientos  Romero Roberto  Guadalupe Grande
Jorge Hernandez  Maria Pocel  Yaneli
Adriana Zacarias  Joaquin Lane  Rodrigo Hernandez
Ian M.  Ana Martinez  Xitlali Suarez
Eric B.  Joel Garcia  Alejandro Martinez

From: kaki rusmore
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 10:47 PM
To: ucs@sccrtc.org
Subject: Unified Corridor Study

Dear RTC staff,
I have reviewed information on the UCS and want to encourage you to recommend keeping the rails for future possible use, while developing the trail alongside them now: scenario B.

This option helps move our county towards sustainable transportation, supports healthy lifestyles, and offers a long-term affordable solution to north-south transportation. We need to move away from supporting cars as our main form of transportation. We need to take action towards an equitable, affordable solution to our transportation challenges. This option will help that happen.

I also want to take this opportunity to comment on Measure L in Capitola. I do not think you can take its passing as a measure of support for abandoning the rail option. The Yes on L publicity was extremely misleading, talking about "saving the trestle", providing bike paths (as though that is not already in the plans) and never mentioned the way it would inhibit the development of rail transit. I walked neighborhoods for No on L with my daughter who lives there, and at least 90% of the people we talked
to had no idea that L would make it more difficult to develop rail transit. They thought getting rid of the tracks and effectively eliminating the possibility of developing modern rail transit in the future was a very bad idea. As you are probably aware, L passed by only 90 votes. I am sure that if Capitola voters all had clear information about the implications of L on future rail transit, it would have been defeated by a wide margin.

Thank you for your hard work on this contentious issue. I hope that Santa Cruz Co. takes this opportunity to stand behind its rhetoric of loving the natural environment and caring about other human beings and puts a plan in place that demonstrates both those values.

Warmly,
Catherine Rusmore

From: T & G Schuttish
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 4:57 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Safer streets and relief from traffic

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

- We need fast reliable public transit and safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians.
- We need alternatives to being stuck in highway traffic congestion.
- Please use the rail line for dependable passenger train service for workers, students and everyone.
- Please make our streets safer for bikes and pedestrians.

I live in Santa Cruz County and I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study. Please decide quickly, we are ready for the Rail & Trail.

From: Robert Stephens
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 10:20 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: My Comments for the Commissioners

Dear RTC Commissioners:

It looks like the majority of voters in Capitola are not interested in a train in their community and prefer a safe useable trail. Watsonville wants to widen the freeway like north county has done (look how nice the fish hook works after the improvements were made), San Lorenzo Valley and Scotts Valley residents will never use a train or want to pay for one, no one working in ag in Watsonville will ever use a train(but they will pay for it), METRO is concerned about their funding being cannibalized by the train, and Jump bikes are moving a lot of people at no cost to tax payers. All the while the RTC staff is
recommending: “stay the course”: don’t widen the freeway, keep the rusty rails, and are causing the trail to not be built anytime soon due to and extremely high cost (look at segment 7.1 costs).

The UCIS is nothing but an exercise in “continue with the plan” from the RTC staff. There is now a big push to wrap this up by the end of the year. What is the rush? Is this good government, or more a political push? There will not be any trains going past Watsonville for six months or more. The RTC has a new ED, who should have time to weigh in on all this, as he will have to deal with this in the end. You are also facing a CEQA lawsuit that is not resolved. Let’s see if the UCIS can stand up to a peer review. You will also have some new commissioners, who will want to weight in on this issue. I am sure the staff will tell you a lot of reasons for a rush to get this done, but they are all just set up by staff to “push this through”. You and I all know this.

Let’s spend a little time and effort to get this right, as it is very important to our community. Use some common sense and don’t rush into this and make another mistake. Remember the last rail operator the staff recommended, how much did that improve traffic in our community or help anything.

Rail banking leaves all doors open: rail, wheeled vehicles, trail and any combination of the above (yes it can be iron clad to allow for future trains), while going with Progressive closes the door for ten years, except for spending a lot of money on a trail and losing local control of the corridor.

Stop, listen to your community and try and make transportation improvements we can afford and implement in a timely fashion that works for everyone.

Sincerely,

Robert Stephens
Aptos

From: Keresha J Durham
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 11:56 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Support for Scenario B

Dear Chair Leopold and Commissioners,

After close review of the Unified Corridor Investment Study, myself and many local environmental and transportation activists feel that Scenario B best meets our local environmental and social equity goals.

As you may know the October 8, 2018 report issued by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) stated that time to act to limit global warming to 1.5°C is “rapidly closing.” Due to this fact, we urge you to make a decision by your December 6 meeting.

Scenario B is the best for our regional environment for the following reasons:
1) has the fewest vehicle miles traveled (VMT) of any option.
2) emits the lowest level of pollutants of any option.
3) has the greatest CO2e emission reductions.
4) is the most equitable choice. It is responsive to needs of all people as it serves the highest number of County transit users.
5) includes a rail option which according to national Sierra Club Transportation Policy, is “most effective in stimulating compact development patterns, increasing public transit patronage and reducing motor vehicle use.” (policy from September 2018)
6) results in the highest mode share for bicycle use.
7) has the second lowest mode share for driving alone.
8) results in the highest mode share for transit use.

Scenario B is not perfect; special attention must be paid to the avoidance and mitigation of environmental impacts during the design phase of transportation projects. It can do a better job of implementing modern transportation design that protects the environment, sensitive habitat and wildlife, by including:
- Continued use of the rail line for transport of goods by freight must be included. Every freight rail car removes three to four trucks from the highway improving safety for road users and reducing greenhouse gases.
- Mission Street intersection improvements must be designed for increased safety for bicyclists and pedestrians, not just to improve automobile traffic flow.
- We urge future upgrade of public transit modes to all electric as soon as possible. This conversion coupled with the County’s participation in Monterey Bay Community Power will further reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Transportation is the highest source of CO2 emissions in the United States. As the national Sierra Club Transportation Policy states, transportation strategies must “protect natural systems and open space, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and promote environmental and economic justice and access for all, including low-income communities and those most impacted by pollution.” Also national Sierra Club policy opposes the building or widening of limited access highways and states that HOV lanes should come from converting existing highway lanes rather than constructing new lanes.

Please move forward with Scenario B and providing transit options for our County!

Keresha J Durham
Environmentalist, former Chair of the City of Santa Cruz Transportation Commission
37 year resident of Santa Cruz, lifetime member of the Sierra Club

From: Bill Rutherford
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 10:47 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>
Subject: Rail

I just can’t believe you will move forward with rail. The cost benefit ratio is glaringly ridiculous. This project is a boondoggle. Stop it! You are moving on this way too fast. There is no crisis that will be fixed by going forward with commuter rail now. Your ideas and plans today will be obsolete before they can be implemented. Please wake up before its too late. Since I have not had the chance to have my opinion counted in at the poles, this is my NO vote on a rail option at this time.
Dear Mr. Dondero,

I'm attaching the report from a study of the potential of Automated Transportation Networks in Santa Cruz (ATNs, aka PRT). This study was commissioned by Santa Cruz PRT Inc. member Brett Garrett with a supplemental stipend FROM Santa Cruz PRT Inc., and is intended to support and inform the Unified Corridor Investment Study.

The consultant performing this study is Peter Muller from PRT Consulting, Inc. (http://prtconsulting.com/) This is the same consultant who performed the recently published study for the Greenville-Pickens Area Transportation Study (GPATS) Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) process.*

In my opinion, Santa Cruz RTC is fortunate to have this consultant draw upon his recent work experience and prepare this study for Santa Cruz.

I am attaching the PDF file of the Santa Cruz study for your use and for any distribution you may wish to make.

I'm writing to make a specific request. That is, we would like to present this study to the Commission with the hope that there would be a motion from a Commission member to accept the study. Our thinking is that this could happen at the meeting 2 weeks from now.

You will notice that I have cc'd Commissioner Sandy Brown so that she will be informed of my request.

I'd also like to comment at this time that we think ATN/PRT should be considered within the broad category of "Rail Transit" since there are a wide variety of rail possibilities in size of vehicle and other specifications.

Best Regards,

Ed Porter

*GPATS is the MPO, for the Greenville, South Carolina Urbanized Area. Here is a link to that working group:

http://www.gpats.org/about-gpats/gpats-101
From: Janie Soito  
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 9:49 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Support Profession staff recommendation of Scenario B

I’m a Watsonville native and am writing to let you know that I support the professional staff’s recommendation for Scenario B with modifications. My biggest concern now is that quick action is needed to approve the plan and start moving forward with more trail construction and starting excursion service as soon as possible. I’m tired of the delay tactics of those who think they can circumvent the process. Now is the time to put the washout repairs on a fast track so that the rail line can be put back into use. With the rail line north of Watsonville out of service since February 2017, it gives some groups the false impression that the rail line is surplus and not needed. Watsonville needs the rail line for rail transit to jobs and recreation on the north side of the county. Santa Cruz needs that rail line for access to Pájaro and the rail transit opportunities that are coming. A trail only plan is insulting to the people of Watsonville. Seize the moment and let’s get the rail rolling!

Sincerely,  
Janie Soito

From: Dan Denevan  
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 5:57 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: ucs study

How did the UCS study arrive at their train ridership estimate of 7400 per day? The SMART train ridership is closer to 2000 per day for a population 3 times as large as Santa Cruz. Denton,TX and Beaverton, OR are both larger than Santa Cruz and have ridership under 2000 per day. It appears the UCS estimates are off by a factor of ten.

From: Carey Pico  
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 2:46 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>; Patrick Mulhearn <patrick.mulhearn@santacruzcounty.us>; Andy Schiffrin <andy.schiffrin@co.santa-cruz.ca.us>; Ed Bottorff <ebottorff167@yahoo.com>; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Gine Johnson <gine.johnson@santacruzcounty.us>; trina.coffman@cityofwatsonville.org; Jacques Bertrand <jbertrand@ci.capitola.ca.us>; Supervisor: Ryan Coonerty <ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us>; Randy Johnson <rlj12@comcast.net>; Cynthia Chase <cchase@cityofsantacruz.com>; Michael Rotkin <openup@ucsc.edu>  
Subject: Costs to taxpayers for UCIS topics - HOV: $0.38/trip; Train: $9.76/trip; BRT: $3.73; (Metro: $5.34)

Please note the operating costs of programs stated in the UCIS: These are the "county cost"/trip (i.e., operating cost - fares).

Cost per Trip (based on UCIS numbers except METRO)
METRO: $5.34/trip (average fare of $1.52/trip, total cost: $6.86/trip) - included for comparison
Train:  $9.76/trip (accounts for $2.50 fare/trip, total cost is $12.26/trip)
HOV:   $0.38/trip (using Caltrans flow/speed data suggesting ~30% of trips are affected by congestion)
Trail:  $0.07/trip
BRT+Lite: $3.73/trip (note: this value seems too low; calculated as $24.3M/(Scen.C users-baseline))

From: Tom Fredericks  
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 2:24 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: In Support of Rail Corridor

My name is Tom Fredericks. I live in Felton and I will be attending the RTC Meeting November 15 in Watsonville. I support keeping the rails for future transit. I use Metro (including the 91X to Watsonville) and Jump Bike and hope I can include rail in my mix of transportation options in the years ahead.

From: Molly Ording  
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 12:13 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission <info@sccrtc.org>  
Subject: Our Support for the RTC's "Preferred Scenario!"

Good Day Very Valued and Appreciated RTC Members!

I wish to state my husband’s and my long time support for all of your research and work and dedication of time and talents! We are long time Capitola residents and have been interested in your studies for quite some time!

We unequivocally support your selection of Scenario B, with agreed upon modifications. We feel this is a regional issue and we all need to take a regional approach that will benefit the most in our area as a whole. I might add that the “social equity” portion of the plan has long been of importance to me, as well as the future development of some sort of transportation mode along the rail corridor and an adjacent walking and bike trail! Being retired, we try to stay off Hwy 1 whenever possible...for so many reasons... time, pollution, frustration, etc. etc!

Thanks to each of you, most sincerely, for your very hard and long work and study of the many options! We will look forward to hearing the results of your meeting and very much look forward to some tangible improvements for all of us throughout our coastal region!

Most sincerely,

Molly & Mickey Ording