

# DAVENPORT / NORTH COAST ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 251, Davenport, CA 95017 [nqbock@icloud.com](mailto:nqbock@icloud.com)

Katie Webb, Chair  
John Barnes  
Noel Bock  
Don Croll  
Mike Eaton  
Colin Hannon  
Nicole Miller  
Rosanna Petralia  
Rachael Spencer

15 May 2026

Mr. Max Friedman, Project Manager  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
[mfriedman@scrtc.org](mailto:mfriedman@scrtc.org)  
[info@scrtc.org](mailto:info@scrtc.org)

**Re: Draft North Coast Transportation Demand Management Plan (Draft TDM Plan)**

Dear Mr. Friedman,

The Davenport North Coast Association (DNCA) respectfully submits this comment letter in response to the recently released Draft North Coast Transportation Demand Management Plan May 2026. Public safety and traffic management along the Highway 1 corridor between the City of Santa Cruz and San Mateo County has been a key focus of the DNCA for many years and we are very excited the RTC is focusing on these urgent issues. We congratulate the RTC for putting together a thorough and thoughtful plan that provides TDM measures to help mitigate the growing traffic along the corridor at peak times along with a phased approach to implementation.

The DNCA is an elected and representative community council made up of local citizens who travel Highway 1 daily during all seasons and traffic conditions. We believe we can offer observations that will help the Draft TDM Plan address the smooth operation of the corridor for everyone. On June 19 of last year, we sent you a preliminary letter outlining concerns we hoped the Draft TDM Plan would address. Now that plan has been released, this letter identifies a couple of key general concerns along with a short list of more detailed comments for your consideration.

## **General Comments**

We believe the TDM Draft Plan could be clearer in outlining upfront strategies that reduce (and eliminate in the long-term) informal and unsafe parking on the shoulders of Highway 1. The plan includes a menu of proposals all of which are helpful. But the vague language regarding shoulder parking restrictions does not provide a clear goal for future planning and will not help encourage visitors to get out of their cars and use alternate modes. (see 4.2.5 and 5.2.4 comments) We support the formalization of informal parking off Highway 1 combined with turn pockets, such as at Four Mile Beach, however, please incorporate clearer language restricting shoulder parking. A clearer stance about how the suite of TDM measures would be implemented to support each other without creating greater pinch points than already exist should be clearly articulated.

As a next step, DNCA encourages the RTC to undertake a pricing study that would provide information on how pricing of parking options on the coast vs. use of alternative modes, including the "excursion train," would further the objectives of the TDM plan.

In our June 19, 2025, letter we recommended the following:

- Locate collector lots at north and south ends of the TDM area to reduce traffic on Highway 1. For those who want to bike the coast and/or visit recreational sites, these lots could serve as weekend pilot locations: CEMEX, UCSC Westside Research Building, Pacific Collegiate School and/or Toadal Fitness parking areas. These all have easy access to the Rail Trail. For those who would use a shuttle or micro-transit, consider CEMEX and the underutilized CVS lot on Mission. (see 2.3.1.3 comment)
- We believe the TDM Draft Plan should include regular collection of data and include language to adapt, or reorder, “Short, Medium, and Long-Term” projects, programs and services as necessary.

## **Detailed Comments**

### **Section 1.3.1**

Please include the Coast Dairies State Park (sub-unit of Wilder Ranch State Park) and County facilities in this section on current and future visitation. The State Park lands/beaches on the oceanside of Highway 1 are the main attractions that draw the greatest number of visitors and Highway 1 traffic issues.

**Page 7** (please consider adding the bolded language)

Ensure there is local input to planning **and regular monitoring to adapt to changing circumstances.**

**Figure 5** (and other figures)

Please delete “Wilder Beach” as that beach is closed to the public.

### **Page 22**

Please update language regarding closure hours to reflect the very recent changes supported by the Supervisor’s office. Please also identify the current confusion created by inconsistencies of closure across various locations. This may not seem to be a TDM issue, but the confusion for visitors caused by conflicting hours of closure does not help traffic management. The inconsistency between the hours of the Rail Trail and the State Park beaches it serves is the most glaring example.

In relation to the sentence about visitors parking along Highway 1, please include Panther/Yellowbank and Shark Fin.

### **Figure 8**

For Davenport Beach, please include the number of spaces for the formalized parking that RTC will be constructing this summer.

Davenport Landing Beach parking number is often well over 100 on weekends and holidays. Also please check parking number for Four-Mile and add highway shoulder parking for Three-Mile.

Is “Davenport Crack” a commonly known term?

### **Section 2.3.1.3**

Consider a program of Bike Share (or other bike rental) on weekends near the Rail Trail to encourage people to leave their cars. These could be located at underutilized weekend parking at: UCSC Research Building (near tennis courts); or Pacific Collegiate School; or Toadal Fitness. We suggest that B Cycle and RTC develop a marketing program for visitors that includes location of bike share stations (adjacent to parking) and enables pre-reservation of bikes. Include this information in Visit Santa Cruz marketing, etc. Perhaps there could be a “North Coast Bus to Bike to Beach” program using the Hwy 17 bus, or others. This links to the objectives of Section 4.2.3.

### **Page 41 Scenic Pullouts**

The area between Scotts Creek and Waddell seems like an ideal area for designated scenic pullouts. Uses and management for this section of the North Coast seem under-defined in this study. Beach access is limited but it is a very scenic waypoint for visitors and there are 2-3 areas that are long enough to accommodate a scenic pullout. Please consider adding some additional language and direction for this area.

### **Section 4.2.3 Traveler Information and Outreach**

This is one of the most important and cheapest ways to inform visitors in a coordinated fashion. DNCA urges RTC to prioritize this as a way to communicate a lot of useful real-time information to the public. It also helps identify the area as a "Recreational District."

#### **Page 43**

DNCA supports the consideration of micro-transit as a responsive way to get people out of their cars. This seems like a very interesting way of piloting alternate modes of visitation.

The Study does not mention either use of Uber/Lyft or the future use of autonomous vehicles (Waymo, etc.) and how they might affect transportation, traffic, and parking demand patterns. Please consider adding a short section on those modes. In terms of traffic safety, for visitors who may spend a day or evening at the beach drinking, etc. these modes offer a safe way to transit Highway 1. In the future, is it possible that additional large parking areas may not be necessary and that only drop-off/pick-up need be accommodated? How would that affect traffic patterns?

#### **Section 4.2.5 Parking Enforcement**

Please add enforcement of daytime parking restrictions at informal overflow areas and on the shoulders of Highway 1 at Shark Fin, Panther to encourage use of alternate modes.

Please improve parking conditions along Davenport Landing Road between Highway 1 and the beach where emergency vehicles often cannot access the beach due to congestion and illegal parking. The original plan approved by the Coastal Commission encouraged parallel parking along the one-way section of the road north of the beach.

#### **Figure 12**

Please add names of crossing locations to the map (similar to the graphic on page 51), without these it is impossible to decipher what is proposed. Some crossings may encourage parking on inland shoulder of Highway 1 that counters the intent of trying to stop informal parking on Highway 1 shoulders. Showing which are associated with a bus stop and which are for peds only would be helpful.

#### **Pages 59-61**

We believe enforcement should be included in each "Short, Medium, and Long-Range" list of implementation measures. An enforcement presence is critical at each phase of implementation and should be articulated in the TDM Draft Plan to make sure all the other measures are actively and successfully used by visitors.

We recommend RTC undertake a pricing study as described for Section 5.2.5 as both a short and medium term measure.

Under LT-5, we understand the attractiveness of rail excursion like Roaring Camp Big Trees Railroad as a goal, but it is important to recognize it is unlikely to contribute to solving traffic demand or the safety challenges identified in the Draft TDM Plan or RHSP. The DNCA met with a private rail operator several years ago and the business model was neither attractive nor sustainable and could only survive with a significant ongoing subsidy. The Antonelli trestle and its use for rail or rail and trail is a large cost factor that would need to be resolved. An excursion train should not be considered as a candidate for public subsidy if it competes with funding of priority TDM projects. It is hard to imagine the fares would be low enough or travel times sufficiently fast for the rail option to function as a beach shuttle. (see 5.2.5 comment)

#### **Section 5.2.4**

We support an ultimate goal of "restricting" all informal and unsafe shoulder parking along the Highway 1, which may need to be phased. The use of terms like "limiting or discouraging" shoulder parking does not provide clear direction as part of an alternate mode strategy. (see General Comment and 4.2.5 comment)

#### **Section 5.2.5**

We support a paid parking program (see 4.2.5 comment) to encourage car-sharing and transit use and to establish a funding stream for O&M. The objective should be a corridor-wide fee (paid by app or at fee stations).

Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment on this much needed planning effort. We truly appreciate RTC's efforts to improve conditions on the North Coast and look forward to our continued collaboration. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding these comments.

Sincerely,



Katie Webb, Chair

cc: Justin Cummings, Supervisor Santa Cruz County District 3/ SCCRTC Commissioner  
Sarah Christensen, Executive Director Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Scott Eades, Director Caltrans District 5  
Paul Guirguis, Caltrans Regional Planning Liaison for Santa Cruz County  
Grace Blakeslee, SCCRTC Senior Transportation Planner  
Brianna Goodman, SCCRTC Transportation Planner  
Sandy Brown, County District 3 Staff  
Andy Schiffrin, County District 3 Staff  
Trina K. Barton, County District 3 Staff  
Chris Spohrer, Supervisor State Parks Santa Cruz District  
Zachary Ormsby, BLM Central Coast Field Manager  
Rainey Graeven, CA Coastal Commission Central Coast District Supervisor  
DNCA Board Members

# FRIENDS OF THE NORTH COAST

Website <https://friendsofthenorthcoast.weebly.com/>

Email address: [friendsofthenorthcoast@gmail.com](mailto:friendsofthenorthcoast@gmail.com)

May 15, 2026

Mr. Max Friedman, Project Manager  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
[mfriedman@scrtc.org](mailto:mfriedman@scrtc.org)  
[info@scrtc.org](mailto:info@scrtc.org)

**Re: Draft North Coast Transportation Demand Management Plan (Draft TDM Plan)**

Dear Mr. Friedman,

The Friends of the North Coast (FONC) thanks you for the opportunity to comment in response to the recently released Draft North Coast Transportation Demand Management Plan May 2026. Friends of the North Coast is a non-profit public benefit corporation based in Santa Cruz, California. Until incorporating in 2020, FONC was an association protecting the North Coast for over 30 years, specifically its biotic species and habitat; including, but not limited to coastal, natural, scenic, cultural, archeological, and paleontological resources. We much appreciate the Regional Transportation Commission's attention to the need for this Plan.

## **Comment Points**

Friends of the North Coast has reviewed the Davenport North Coast Association (DNCA) May 15, 2026 Comment Letter on the North Coast Traffic Demand Management Plan). **FONC supports DNCA's Comment Letter** and recommends it to you. **FONC has the following additional points of emphasis or clarification we request you to consider.**

**First**, we have a point of emphasis regarding DNCA's General Comment that TDM Draft Plan could be clearer in outlining upfront strategies that reduce (and eliminate in the long-term) informal and unsafe parking on the shoulders of Highway 1. The dangers of parking on the shoulders of Highway 1 are exacerbated due to the Highway's use by visitors unfamiliar with where they are going and focused on the scenery along with use by logging trucks and agricultural produce trucks which have historically relied on the Highway. Add to this the

reduction in parking spaces at some locations as informal parking areas are redeveloped to safer standards.

One important example is the **Panther Beach/RTC Rail Trail Access and imminent C-CD Trailhead**. Indeed, the Federal Highway Administration as applicant for a Federal Coastal Act Consistency Concurrence from the Coastal Commission acknowledged that: “Formalizing parking at ... Panther/Yellowbank would *reduce the number parking spaces from 160 to 48.*”

One way to address the major reduction in parking spaces would be to construct the C-CD Trailhead Parking Lot directly across Highway 1 from the new Panther Beach Rail Trail Parking Lot which we understand to be the intended plan of action under a 3/17/2026 non-binding Letter of Intent/Understanding between BLM and Trust for Public Land. This should reduce the safety conflict of the lack of enough parking capacity for the Rail Trail at Panther Beach resulting in the inevitable spillover parking onto the shoulders of Highway One (both sides). In fact, this shoulder parking is the only current plan for overflow parking by the Federal Highway Administration as set forth in its Federal Consistency Determination:

At these times [of high parking demand], the parking locations reach capacity and visitors use the gravel shoulders along Highway 1 for informal and overflow parking. See, NCRT Coastal Consistency Determination p.20.

This, in turn, results in the safety hazard of pedestrians whose vehicles are parked on the inland shoulder crossing Highway One to get to Panther Beach. FONC submits that this **does not meet the [Coastal Act] statutory requirement of providing access “consistent with public safety needs”** as can be seen in the below photo of parking along the Highway One shoulder taken at the informal Panther Beach Parking Lot in 2023.



**Second**, the draft TDM bases its analysis and recommendations on inadequate information and evidence due to reliance on single observation cited to characterize visitation, a Monday in March without information collected on one Monday in March (with no description of weather or waves which are primary attractants to the coast), The aggregation of Cell Data is credited for evidence of visitation patterns while the Draft TDM acknowledges that cell service needs to be remedied due to patchy coverage.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,  
Friends of the North Coast

***Jonathan Wittwer***

Jonathan Wittwer, President

cc: Justin Cummings, Supervisor Santa Cruz County District 3/ SCCRTC Commissioner  
Sarah Christensen, Executive Director Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation  
Commission  
Scott Eades, Director Caltrans District 5  
Paul Guirguis, Caltrans Regional Planning Liaison for Santa Cruz County  
Grace Blakeslee, SCCRTC Senior Transportation Planner  
Brianna Goodman, SCCRTC Transportation Planner  
Sandy Brown, County District 3 Staff  
Andy Schiffrin, County District 3 Staff  
Trina K. Barton, County District 3 Staff  
Chris Spohrer, Supervisor State Parks Santa Cruz District  
Zachary Ormsby, BLM Central Coast Field Manager  
Rainey Graeven, CA Coastal Commission Central Coast District Supervisor  
DNCA Board Members  
RBDA Board Members  
FONC Board and Advisory Committee members

May 15, 2026

Rick Hyman comments on North Coast Transportation Demand Management Plan Public Draft

*\*Revise in **2.2.1 Vehicle Travel:***

There are no on-street pedestrian or bicycle facilities on Highway 1, ~~but bicyclists are permitted to bike on the shoulder.~~

*Bicyclists can legally ride on the roadway; for safety reasons most ride on the shoulder but they are not confined to the shoulder as this statement implies.*

*\*Add to **2.2.3 Transit:***

All METRO buses are equipped with front-mounted racks with space for three standard size bikes.

Use of the bike racks is free to fare paying customers, on a first-come, first-serve basis. One bike per customer.

You can load your bike at any posted bus stop. To make loading easier, you can ask the operator to “kneel” (lower) the bus for your convenience.

Folding bikes are allowed on the bus if space is available. Bikes must be folded and stored out of the aisle and always controlled by the owner.

Standard size bikes are allowed on Routes 40. Up to two bikes can be accommodated inside these buses if the bus is not already at full seated capacity. Bikes must be stored in the accessible seating area and secured with straps obtained from the Operator.

METRO used to publicize offering courtesy stops where safe to do so and especially at night.

*All of the above are from METRO website, except the last. I don't know if they don't want to publicize offering courtesy stops or if they stopped offering them.*

*\*Add to **3.1.2 Milestone 2 Feedback Themes** fourth bullet, **5.1.1 General Implementation Considerations** or another appropriate section:*

Respect scenic beauty and natural setting.

While each individual recommended amenity serves a laudable purpose, if the full extent of providing all in all of the potential locations was realized, the overall character and resultant attractiveness of the North Coast could deteriorate. Thus, the interrelationships of subsequent additions to the landscape need consideration. Some principles to follow include: using natural materials as much as possible, avoiding placements that can adversely impact scenic views, prioritizing virtual information sharing over extensive onsite displays, concentrating physical improvements in already developed areas, and the like. Regarding the latter, consideration should be given to establishing visitor centers on Highway 1 in Half Moon Bay and west Santa Cruz City for travelers to obtain the information that they may desire and make their transportation choices before traversing the North Coast.

*\*Revise 4.2.2 Well-Planned Vehicle Access TDM PROJECTS, PROGRAMS, AND SERVICES UNDER THIS STRATEGY: first bullet:*

**Speed, Passing and Turn Lane Study Studies:** Conduct traffic studies to evaluate operational improvements such as lowered speed limits, turn lanes near key access points and passing lanes along Highway 1.

*As noted in the feedback portions of the report, vehicular speeding is a safety concern, but there are no recommendations to address speeding. Lower speeds can make bicycling safer. Especially where access to and along Highway One is increased such as at parking areas and trail connections, reduced speed limits should be considered. Caltrans should be encouraged to conduct periodic speed studies.*

*\*Revise 4.2.2 Well-Planned Vehicle Access TDM PROJECTS, PROGRAMS, AND SERVICES UNDER THIS STRATEGY: third bullet:*

**Shared Use Shoulders and Bicycle Separation:** Maintain and Enhance shoulder access along Highway 1 for bicyclists by maintaining smooth shoulder paving to the very pavement edge, keeping the shoulder as debris-free as possible, widening the shoulder where narrow and feasible, applying wider (e.g., 6 inch) shoulder stripes or buffers where room, retaining at a minimum Caltrans commitment to only install rumble strips where there is at least a 5-foot shoulder width and they are placed on or inward of the shoulder stripe and identify locations where greater separation from traffic (e.g., buffered or physically separated lanes) may be feasible.

*Physically separated bike lanes would be costly and experience has shown some physical separations may be dangerous to cyclists or motorists and may not last long. Rumble strips are*

*especially dangerous to cyclists who ride into them. If someone wants to ride on a separate route, the rail trail will be available.*

*\*Add to 4.2.4 Convenient Transit Services TDM PROJECTS, PROGRAMS, AND SERVICES UNDER THIS STRATEGY:*

Continue and possibly expand METRO bike rack and bikes allowed in buses programs.

Maintain METRO courtesy stop availability.

*\*Add to the map in Highway 1 Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossings:*

a crossing at Shaffer Road to access Moore Creek Preserve.

*The only parking for the Preserve is on the south side of Highway One, so hikers who come by car need to cross the road at Shaffer to access the Preserve. If they come by bus and want to get back into Santa Cruz, they would also need to cross the highway.*

*\*Add to **5.1.1 General Implementation Considerations** last bullet **Monitor** or elsewhere:*

Conduct a survey of rail trail users some time after it is officially open to gather feedback on any problems and needed amenities.

*To help specify several of the recommended project details, it would be prudent to wait until the rail trail is being used and survey users. This could help in determining, for example, locations for bike racks and trail connections.*

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
PHONE: (831) 427-4863  
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

**May 26, 2026****Sent Electronically**

Max Friedman, Transportation Planner  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1101 Pacific Avenue, Suite 250  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
[mfriedman@scrtc.org](mailto:mfriedman@scrtc.org)

**Subject: Draft North Coast Transportation Demand Management Plan**

Dear Mr. Friedman:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft North Coast Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM Plan) for Santa Cruz County. Overall, we commend the TDM Plan's objectives, which include: providing flexible transportation options that support diverse groups; preserving the natural environment for future generations by managing the amount of driving on the North Coast; ensuring local input in the planning process; making the North Coast more accessible to more people (including non-drivers); improving parking management to reduce conflicts; and improving access, safety, and navigation to and along the North Coast. In many ways, the TDM Plan satisfies and fulfills many core California Coastal Act and Santa Cruz County Local Coastal Program (LCP) goals and requirements related to coastal access and recreation, expanded multi-modal transportation, improved safety for automobile and non-automobile users, economic vitality and health, as well as efforts to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMTs) and greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs). Further, the TDM Plan builds upon recent and ongoing work, including notably, the Rural Highways Safety Plan (RHSP) and the North Coast Interagency Working Group's Facilities Management Plan (FMP). Collectively, these efforts seek to enhance transportation and access for all users, and we support the complementary planning efforts and the significant investments being made to manage, protect, and enhance the North Coast. The purpose of this letter is to inform you of draft TDM Plan elements we fully support (along with what we hope is helpful guidance regarding refinements to make such elements even stronger), as well as to inform you of elements for which we have serious concerns, most notably regarding paid parking and parking reservation systems.

As noted in the draft TDM Plan, the North Coast of Santa Cruz County is home to extensive land held in public and/or non-profit ownership (State Parks, County Parks, the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County, Regional Transportation Commission, Bureau of Land Management, etc.) with substantial existing, planned, or under-construction public access routes, features, and amenities. With growing recreational opportunities and spaces comes an increased demand for public access, and thus, implementing

## **SCCRTC Draft Transportation Demand Management Plan**

meaningful demand management strategies along Highway 1 on the North Coast to sustainably serve these facilities and the community is integral to the ongoing vitality, preservation, and success of these lands.

With that in mind, we would like to offer the following comments for your consideration. Our comments primarily seek to convey our support for many of the concepts and strategies identified in the draft TDM Plan and offer some suggestions and questions for consideration in the final plan and future implementation. However, we also want to be transparent that there are components of the draft TDM Plan that raise significant Coastal Act and LCP consistency questions which Commission staff may not be able to support should they move forward in the future.

We would like to express our support for the following aspects of the TDM, many of which are common-sense improvements that are expected to improve public recreational access conditions and manage transportation demand responsibly. These include:

- Closing gaps in the existing North Coast trail network to improve trail connectivity, including the California Coastal Trail network and planned segments of the planned North Coast Rail Trail.
- Improving pedestrian crossings along Highway 1 at key public access locations, improving ADA accessibility and parking at both formal and informal parking areas, and expanding and upgrading bicycle parking.
- Providing clear and easily identifiable wayfinding and navigation tools, such as legible access signage and intuitive routes.
- Providing reliable comfort stations at key public access destinations, including rest areas, seating, shade structures, restrooms, and trash receptacles.
- Improving safety along Highway 1, including speed limit reductions, new turn lanes at key access points, new passing lanes, new scenic pull-outs to reduce conflicts between slower-moving visitors and commuters, and dedicated/separated bicycle lanes.
- Formalizing parking lots at popular visitor destinations, such as Four Mile Beach and Shark Fine Cove, so long as the overall number of available parking spaces is not significantly reduced without adequate alternative access provided.
- Providing real-time traveler information and parking availability and wayfinding plans.
- And, if done mindfully, providing visitor hubs with self-guided informational kiosks, physical maps and brochures, and areas that allow visitors to park once and access multiple key destinations. Such visitor hubs should be strategically placed at formal parking areas and avoided in less developed areas to retain the rugged character of the North Coast.

## **SCCRTC Draft Transportation Demand Management Plan**

We would also like to offer the following suggestions and questions for improving the TDM Plan:

- We believe it is implied that many of the strategies identified in the draft TDM Plan are intended to work synergistically to enhance safety and improve access and recreation; however, this connection may not be readily apparent to the casual reader. Accordingly, we suggest building upon the narrative to better explain how these strategies will work together to achieve multiple goals. For example, adding bikeshare opportunities and restrooms may very well enhance the efficacy of the 'Park Once' model, which is expected to reduce the number of times vehicles pull on and off the highway, which should then in turn reduce the number of conflicts between various multi-modal users, etc. The same type of analysis can be done for wayfinding signage, real-time parking information, etc.
- We also recommend the final TDM Plan better draw the connection between related and ongoing North Coast planning efforts including the RHSP and the FMP by identifying areas of commonality and providing more clarity on the mechanisms/stakeholders responsible for implementing various strategies and the anticipated timelines to better aid in public participation and understanding.
- We specifically recommend prioritizing formalized parking at Four Mile Beach and Shark Fin Cove in the near term to alleviate safety and congestion concerns as these are incredibly popular beaches with known safety issues. Formalized parking along with formalized ingress/egress (and restroom and trash facilities) would likely serve multiple TDM, RHSP, and North Coast Interagency Working Group goals related to reducing user conflicts and increasing safety.
- Does the RTC have data on the number and percentage of users going to multiple destinations over the span of one trip to the North Coast and which locations are most commonly paired together? If so, it may be helpful to include this information in the final TDM Plan to help evaluate and inform potential and priority "Park Once" destinations.
- What was the extent of community outreach for the draft TDM Plan and was outreach conducted in multiple formats (e.g., in-person, QR codes on the North Coast with links to an online survey, etc.)? Did outreach extend to South Santa Cruz County, the City of Santa Cruz, the Bay Area, San Mateo County, and the greater Silicon Valley? If not, we recommend another round of outreach to ensure that this reaches a broader audience including many individuals and groups likely to be affected by the TDM Plan and future implementation.
- To the extent there are examples of successful shuttle services in other locations, it would be helpful to share those examples and any parallels/differences between those programs and the locations they operate in versus the North Coast.
- We note that the Cotoni-Coast Dairies National Monument trails are not included in Figure 5. We recommend updating the figure to include those trails, as well as other figures in the draft TDM Plan to reflect that the northern portion of Cotoni-Coast Dairies is now open to the public.

## **SCCRTC Draft Transportation Demand Management Plan**

- Please clarify whether any studies have been conducted to date and/or are planned to help inform the efficacy, type/level of service, pricing, etc. related to expanding transport services (i.e., weekend shuttles, new bus trips and stations, etc.). If studies are planned in the future, we welcome the opportunity to weigh in to help inform methodologies, assumptions, etc.
- For the reasons explained further below, we recommend deprioritizing paid parking at this time and choosing an alternative priority project.

And in terms of the aspects of the draft TDM Plan that raise Coastal Act/LCP consistency concerns and questions, particularly related to public recreational access, these include:

- **Paid Parking on the North Coast (Priority Project 5).** Both the Coastal Act and the County's LCP require that public recreational access be maximized, that recreational opportunities are provided for all people, and that existing lower cost visitor and recreational facilities are protected, encouraged, and where feasible, provided (see, for example, Coastal Act Sections 30210 and 30213 and LCP Land Use Plan (LUP) Goal AM-4.0, Objective AM-4.1, Policies AM-4.1.4, AM-4.1.7, and AM-4.1.8, and Implementation Strategy AM-4.1e). Requiring parking fees for these coastal access points runs counter to the Coastal Act's direction to maximize access and preserve existing access by making such access opportunities less affordable, especially to visitors of more limited means. Commission staff cannot support requiring parking fees, and we recommend that the RTC consider an alternative for Priority Project 5 in lieu of paid parking.
- **Parking Reservation System.** For reasons similar to the above, a reservation system may have the effect of adding additional barriers to accessing the North Coast, particularly for those without compatible technology or those visiting Santa Cruz County for only a short period of time. On the other hand, providing real-time parking information for formal parking lots (e.g., available number of spaces, estimated length of stay per vehicle, turnover information, etc.) may assist visitors in planning their trip and determining whether to visit the North Coast, and is a measure supported by Commission staff in lieu of a reservation system.
- **Parking Enforcement and Formalizing Parking.** Many informal parking areas along the North Coast have long served as the main mechanism for vehicular access, and driving remains the primary way in which the public accesses this stretch of the California coast. Enforcing parking restrictions at informal parking areas may potentially be problematic as more parking is formalized (for example, at Panther/Yellowbank and Davenport Beaches) by effectively reducing the overall number of available parking spaces. As such, Commission staff urges the RTC to thoughtfully balance the available number of parking spaces when considering parking enforcement and when formalizing parking lots to ensure there is no net loss in overall access, and to generally prioritize parking enhancement over more punitive measures.

In conclusion, we commend the RTC for undertaking this planning effort. Commission staff believes that many aspects of the draft TDM Plan will greatly improve the current

## SCCRTC Draft Transportation Demand Management Plan

access experience on the North Coast for locals and visitors alike. We hope that these comments will strengthen the TDM Plan. We continue to appreciate the excellent coordination between Coastal Commission and RTC staff, and we are available for questions or discussion should RTC need any additional clarification on these comments. We look forward to working with you on these important transportation demand management strategies in the near future.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:  
*Nolan Clark*

77591515633A40D...

Nolan Clark

Coastal Planner

Central Coast District

Cc: Grace Blakeslee, RTC Senior Transportation Planner  
Brianna Goodman, RTC Transportation Planner  
Robert Tidmore, Santa Cruz County Parks Principal Planner  
Steve Wiesner, Santa Cruz County CDID Assistant Director  
Jocelyn Drake, Santa Cruz County CDID Assistant Director  
Claire Gallogly, City of Santa Cruz Transportation Planner  
Geramaldi Geramaldi, Caltrans Environmental Coordinator  
Jonathan Wittwer, Friends of the North Coast President  
Katie Webb, Davenport North Coast Association Chair  
Linda Hitchcock, California State Parks Senior Park and Recreation Specialist  
Sky Murphy, BLM Planning and Environmental Coordinator  
Justin Cummings, Santa Cruz County Third District Supervisor