

From: Kevin Maguire <kmaguire831@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 7:12 PM
To: Regional Transportation Commission; City Council
Cc: Concerned Citizens Of Capitola
Subject: [PDF] Current Capitola Municipal code 8.72 violations - for the Record - Immediate Pause Requested on Capitola Rail Trail Realignment – Measure L, CEQA, EIR, and Environmental Concerns
Attachments: RTC-Capitola staff, others 12.24 Meeting (1).pdf

Capitola City Staff and the Rail Trail Project Team violated CMC 8.72, and clearly states these are along the Park Avenue right-of-way. The Agenda report from the Public Works Department: Park Avenue Traffic Calming Improvements with Coastal Rail Trail Options Page 567-568 from the [2/13/25 Agenda](#)

567 / 720



87%



Coastal Rail Trail Alignment Options

As stated above, during the same time period that the City has been preparing its Traffic Calming Project, the County of Santa Cruz and RTC have been developing the Coastal Rail Trail. Segments 10 and 11 of the Rail Trail, as approved by the Board of Supervisors in April 2024, included a trail alignment that was on the coastal side of the existing tracks between Monterey Avenue and Coronado Street, within the rail right-of-way. This alignment is consistent with the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Master Plan from 2013. The County and RTC presented this design to the Capitola City Council on October 26, 2023. Due to existing topography and right-of-way constraints, constructing the trail on the coastal side of the tracks between Monterey Avenue and Grove Lane requires the construction of significant infrastructural components, including approximately 1,500 feet of retaining walls up to 16 feet high and a 240 foot long viaduct across Escalona Gulch. Similarly, constructing the trail on the coastal side of the rail between Grove Lane and Coronado Street also requires significant infrastructure, including approximately 950 feet of retaining walls up to 8 feet high, and a 330 foot long viaduct on steep slopes above the New Brighton State Beach parking lot.

Because of the extensive infrastructure required by the original design, the County and RTC are proposing to revise the Coastal Rail Trail Segment 11 alignment between Monterey Avenue and Coronado Street (approximately 0.7 miles) to the Park Avenue right-of-way, in the City of Capitola. The County and RTC are also proposing to coordinate the realigned segment of the trail with Capitola's Park Avenue Traffic Calming Project. Shifting the Coastal Rail Trail alignment to the Park Avenue right-of-way will enhance bicycle and pedestrian safety while improving connectivity between neighborhoods, the Coastal Rail Trail, and Capitola Village. This alignment serves as a cost reduction strategy identified in

567

Item 9 C.

the value engineering analysis. Finally, the Park Avenue Coastal Rail Trail alignment is designed to avoid possible conflicts with potential future transportation uses in the rail corridor.

Since the approved designs were developed in 2022-2023, additional information has emerged that should be considered as part of the trail and rail corridor's development.

1. Updated cost estimates for the Coastal Rail Trail Segments 10 & 11 showed significant increases

As a result of this new information, the County and RTC have recommended shifting Coastal Rail Trail Segment 11 from between Monterey Avenue and Coronado Street (approximately 0.7 miles) to the Park Avenue right-of-way. City staff supports this recommendation.

The proposed realignment would include a new 12-foot-wide Class I multi-use path adjacent to Park Avenue on the coastal side of the roadway and includes a minimum 3-foot buffer between the vehicular travel lane and trail. The design includes improvements from Capitola's Park Avenue Traffic Calming Project, such as narrowed travel lanes and speed feedback signs. The Coastal Rail Trail project will also add crosswalks with push-button activated rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFB), similar to the newly installed crosswalk at Cabrillo Street, that would connect the trail to the surrounding neighborhood at McCormick Avenue, Washburn Avenue, and the 600 Park Avenue driveway. Intersection lighting will also be upgraded at new crosswalks and trail lighting could also be installed.

In coordination with Capitola staff, the Rail Trail Project team developed two Coastal Rail Trail alignment options along the Park Avenue right-of-way. Option A (Attachment 4) extends the Park Avenue footprint further towards the coast to add the Coastal Rail Trail on the coast side of Park Avenue in order to preserve the existing on-street Class II bike lane on the inland (inbound) side of Park Avenue. Option B (Attachment 5) shifts the Park Avenue roadway alignment inland in order to maximize the use of the existing Park Avenue right-of-way for development of the Coastal Rail Trail and eliminates the Class II bike lane on the inland (inbound) side. Option B is expected to reduce environmental impacts when comparing the two Park Avenue alignments and will reduce project costs. With Option B, cyclists traveling towards Capitola Village would utilize the Class 1 multi-use path on the coast side of Park Avenue instead of the existing Class II bike lane on the inland side of Park Avenue. This would require local bicycle traffic from the Cliffwood Heights neighborhood to cross Park Avenue to access a bike path. Option A would maintain the existing Class II bike lane on the inland side of Park Avenue and allow local users direct access to a bike path for westbound trips without crossing Park Avenue.

Under either option, the existing on-street Class II bike lane on the coastal (eastbound) side of Park Avenue will be eliminated to accommodate the Class I trail. Similarly, from Grove Lane to Coronado

568

Subject: Immediate Pause Requested on Capitola Rail Trail Realignment – Measure L, CEQA, EIR, and Environmental Concerns

To: [RTC Project Team], [Santa Cruz County Public Works], [City of Capitola Officials]

Cc: [Relevant legal counsel, environmental consultants, community representatives]

Dear RTC and County Project Leaders,

I am writing to formally request that the Capitola Rail Trail realignment project (Segments 10 and 11) be paused until further environmental, legal, and procedural concerns are addressed. After reviewing the December, 2024 RTC staff meeting transcript and project updates, it is evident that several critical issues—particularly related to Measure L, CMC 8.72 CEQA compliance, biological impacts, and long-term risk—remain unresolved.

1. Violation of Measure L and CMC 8.72 (Protection of Open Space and Community Vote Requirements)

This project appears to threaten protected open space and sensitive areas, triggering Measure L and Capitola Municipal Code 8.72. Yet, there is no reference to a public vote or community process to approve these significant impacts.

Additionally, the realignment's proximity to mobile homes and the proposal to acquire land or pursue eminent domain to build retaining walls raises red flags. As acknowledged in the meeting:

“Would you guys consider allowing us to shift both the relocated track and the trail... to prevent the need for [temporary construction easements]... given the possibility for a contested acquisition...” (p. 271)

These actions conflict with Measure L’s intent to safeguard residential communities and public spaces from excessive encroachment without broad consent.

2. Monarch Habitat and EIR Inadequacies

The realignment passes through ecologically sensitive zones, including a known monarch butterfly roost at Escalona Gulch. Despite this, the team is treating significant impacts and design changes as eligible for a mere EIR addendum:

“I don’t know if we have tree surveys for that area... I think if it’s handled by an EIR addendum, we can probably accommodate that...” (p. 267)

This downplays CEQA’s requirement to analyze significant new or more severe environmental effects in a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR. Adding retaining walls, modifying alignments, and removing vegetation near critical roosting zones demand formal biological and cumulative impact studies.

3. Critical Windbreak and Tree Removal Risks

The Rodeo Gulch area and adjacent segments serve as vital windbreaks and habitat corridors. Yet, these are subject to realignment or retaining wall construction without adequate study:

“I don’t know if we have that information to make an informed decision.” (p. 267)
“We’re definitely gonna revisit this... moving it has an impact.” (p. 269)

This approach violates CEQA’s requirement for disclosure and mitigation of significant biological impacts, especially where trees support monarch habitat or buffer residential zones.

4. Conflicts with CEQA, Eminent Domain and Construction Risks

The project hinges on right-of-way acquisition and encroachment removal—yet admits high uncertainty about the legal, engineering, and cost feasibility of retaining wall designs:

“How tall are these walls?”
“Like 3–4 feet, I would imagine...” (p. 275)
“There’s usually a drain like a back drain that’s required... some additional work behind the wall as well.” (p. 276)

Pursuing eminent domain or altering alignment designs without confirmed geotechnical feasibility and community outreach is premature and risky.

5. Lack of Alternatives Review

The team discussed off-corridor alternatives (e.g., Brommer, Milton, or Nova alignments), but they are not being carried forward into the final schematic:

“I think it's very likely the RTC is going to want to see an alternative alignment option outside of the right of way...” (p. 280)

CEQA requires that feasible alternatives be studied if they could avoid or lessen significant impacts. Proceeding without this review may result in legal challenge or delay.

Immediate Actions Requested

1. **Pause final design and permitting** until:
 - A supplemental or revised EIR is completed.
 - Updated monarch habitat, tree, and wetland surveys are published.
 - Measure L and CMC 8.72 compliance is confirmed.
 2. **Release** design-specific tree removal, grading, and biological impact maps for public review.
 3. **Provide clear, public justification** for not pursuing alternate routes outside the current right-of-way, particularly in Segment 11.
-

This is a deeply sensitive and high-stakes project. The community deserves a transparent, law-abiding process that protects its natural and residential assets. We urge you to take these concerns seriously and avoid irreversible missteps.

Sincerely,
Kevin Maguire

Capitola

Transcript

December 20, 2024, 5:03PM

□ **Robert Tidmore** started transcription

RT **Robert Tidmore** 0:07

Alright, well, I think everyone understands the the purpose of the meeting today. Essentially, what we're hoping to get out of this meeting is a collective understanding and agreement on the direction that the project's gonna move forward with going into final schematic design and then eventually psns we've we've had a lot of moving parts over the last nine months or. So and we've resolved some and and many of them. And that this is a sort of a final effort. To resolve any remaining things and make sure we have agreement. On on everything before RM really jumps back into the design and starts moving things around so we don't waste any effort and we can move forward in our in a very efficient manner and and try to to finish PS and E in right of way really as quickly. As possible, we'll get into the schedule and and some key upcoming dates in a few slides, but that's that's really the goal today. Any questions or comments? Before we jump in anything unclear from what I sent out the last couple days. Did everyone get a chance to look at the blue beam? Hopefully you had. You had a chance to. Note any comments to yourself? I didn't see any any questions or comments in the blue beam itself, so hopefully everyone has at least had a look at it and noting things down to themselves so they can discuss and I just got a text that grace is joining now. So should see her in just a minute. And I think I think we all know each other. So I'm gonna skip introductions because we have a lot to cover in this two hours, and I figure we've all met, at least at least one time. And I'll share my screen. We'll go through the presentation while we're waiting on grace. So thank you to Matt Starkey. I stole his format of his presentation. We had a similar meeting for segments 8:00 and 9:00. I think it was last Friday. About this and I just like the way he sort of went through and organized everything. So I borrowed. Very heavily from what he did. So I want to spend. We have a lot more to cover in terms of design direction for the two segments.

It's longer and there's a lot more to to to cover, so I really want to try to spend the majority of our time focused on going through the blue beam session and and going through the design and making sure we're all on the same page.

But I thought it be worth spending just a few minutes at the beginning talking about where we've been some of the key decisions we've made and and why we're sort of in the in the place we are.

And for those of you who attended the 8-9 meeting last week, this will be very similar.

But there are a number of people on the call who haven't.

So I I felt like it was worth going through and then I wanted to leave a few minutes at the end to sort of go through any outstanding decisions and make sure we're all.

Uh, there's clarity for for the project moving forward.

So just a quick recap of key dates.

Almost a year ago I got a.

Here we go.

Someone let her in.

Thank you.

GB

Grace Blakeslee 3:08

Sorry, I was a little late.

Sorry about that.

RT

Robert Tidmore 3:09

Grace. No problem. That's OK.

We're just going through a similar recap of what we did for 8-9. So in February 23 room completed the refined schematic design and then the all the various agencies and the Coastal Commission finished commenting on that in May of 23.

So we've been sort of pencils down since that point in time.

Separate started in December of 2023. In April of this year, we completed the sequel review and filed our notice of determination for the EIR that was also around the time that the the cost overruns were really widely publicized.

And we started to dig into those and then in May of 2024, as a result, you know, we began the value analysis, value engineering exercise at the RTC funded and and led in June of 2024, we got the the information that the rail clear.

Is for the passenger rail project needed to increase in some cases to 12 feet which started this. Conflict resolution exercise.

Where where we've really been in the last six months trying to figure out how do you fit both the passenger rail and the rail trail on the corridor.

And then in August, we we had sort of a A an analysis of the VA and VE effort that the RTC team put together by the trail design team.

And then had a series of meetings in August to go through and get direction from the group

on on which strategies would be we would be proceeding with.

And so now we're in this last phase of the Zephyrt conflict coordination.

And I'm really hopeful that that process ends here this month and that we're we're, you know, clear in 2025 to move forward.

And then a recap on the value engineering. So again, in early 2024 when the cost issues sort of came to light, a number of us sat down really from RTC City and county, brainstorming ways to save costs.

We even looked at going so far as to rail back the corridor, which would allow us to remove the fencing and signals and explored ways to have relocate the tracks. In April of 2024, bringing to the RTC and the county saying that they would.

You know, relocate the tracks on their dime.

And the savings that we calculated at the time for that work would be roughly 7 to \$8 million that that amount is less if we have to build walls to support the tracks and we'll talk about that in a couple slides. And then the the VAVE study.

Identified roughly \$4 million in savings and that 4 million was corroborated by the design team.

The savings identified by the VE team were considerably higher.

But when our our design team went through and looked at some of the constraints and in a more in depth analysis of the cost savings.

The number was reduced significantly and this primarily comes from changing the wall types to either less expensive options or changing the wall type so we can reduce the number of walls where in some cases we had two walls in in one area and then replacing by ducts with. Retained fill or changing the structure to precast concrete.

And then finally, more recently we looked at the Monterey to Coronado.

I'll say it's a combination of the Vave suggestion as well as reducing conflicts with separate.

And the VE study estimated savings of about \$13 million for that effort.

But I would say that's on the high end and we should expect less.

The zipper coordination side, we have made a couple decisions and I'll just summarize those for each of the the two segments.

So in segment 10, in general, we've agreed that we're gonna build a 12 foot wide trail against the inland edge of the right of way as we know, due to the zephyrt clearances, it's not possible to eliminate all conflicts and Zephyr is going to rebuild and or address.

Those conflicts where needed when that project is built.

One thing I do want to talk about when we get to the bluebium session is.

The right of way impacts and risks with this approach, particularly as we get adjacent to the mobile home parks, understanding that that's already been a contentious issue just with the clearance of encroachments, we also decided that we're gonna relocate lights to the outside edge of the right of.

Way where they would be in conflict with separate so we don't have to rebuild them in the future and then at the Rodeo Gulch bridge, there's been discussions on e-mail and in the last

week's stage gate meeting that the design team needs to verify that there are.

No structural impacts to the existing.

Rail structures from the trail bridges.

In segment 11, one thing I want to talk about today, which I we didn't or I didn't know it before, was that there's a 2 foot clearance conflict along Cliff Dr. moderated Coronado.

We've already discussed that because of the need for a passing siding in this area, we're going to push the trail out to the Park Ave. right of way.

From Coronado to New Brighton Bridge, there's an unknown conflict with Sepert and Riley.

I'm hoping you can speak to that a little bit today.

No, we didn't get an exhibit from from hgr at the New Brighton Bridge. Again, verifying there's no impact to the existing rail structure. And then from New Brighton Bridge to the Oak Trail, there's a 2 foot clearance conflict in that area. And then Marvista State Park again UN.

Conflict with separate. So we'll we'll go through those in more detail, but just wanted to give a high level overview.

And really quickly, since we talked about this again last week, but for for new folks, the RTC and the and camp are going to enter into an MOU which will state that roaring camp will be relocating the tracks on their own dime.

However, there is a need for.

The trail design team to evaluate the need for structures to support the tracks we already have that in the design right now, but the the direction we got in last week's stage gate was that the RRM team would go back and really take a second look at.

The need for walls and try to reduce them where possible.

You know where regrading where we can and then the project will provide the construction stacking of the proposed track center line.

That's a that's sort of a a given.

We know that that's gonna happen.

And then the the next three.

Pieces that have an asterisk with them. We're still trying to figure out the sequence and exactly how that's gonna play out, but the the thought now is that the project will design and construct the retaining walls.

That are needed to support the track, the relocated track and that we will design and construct the rail and road intersections and that then roaring camp will relocate the track to meet the freight standards. And again the sequencing will figure out at 65% to that.

So here's a here's a draft roject schedule.

Draft is emphasized, have not had a chance to work with the room team to understand, you know, their timelines for these various pieces, particularly for the psne part.

I pulled these from our our schedule that we worked through in Paed.

So they're, I would say they're within the ballpark, but a lot of details still need to be figured out.

I would say that the key thing to focus on is this this deadline here April 2027.

This is if we're not going to request an extension. This is when we have to have materials due to CTC both for the completion of the PS and E and right away.

And that sets us up for a construction allocation in June of 2027.

So our critical path really is getting to a place in the final design that 65% or we can start appraisals because right of ways you can see is is really the longest critical path needed to get to a construction so.

We are here in early or late 2024.

We're working through the PS and E contract approval with RRM right now. We expect to go to the board on March 11th with the PS and E contract amendment.

RM again based on the the previous schedule, I'm thinking we'll need about 3 months to do final schematic design.

They'll have to be reviews in there, and then another three months to do 65% design and then the the the remaining portion of the PSNE package will take around 10 months.

And again, the the really the 65% design sets us up for both getting permits from the Coastal Commission and starting the appraisal process.

I'm hoping that after the final schematic design, we'll have a pretty good sense of what our right of way needs are so that we can go out and hire an appraiser and and get that process going. And that really as soon as that 65% design package.

Is done.

We can hit the ground and start doing appraisals.

Obviously, we would all love to have right of way, be uncontested and not have to go into eminent domain. And if that's the case, I think we can save.

A fair amount of time, but we sort of need to plan for that and then utility relocations and coordination will happen.

While we're going through final design.

I see some questions. Riley. Gear first.

RG

Riley Gerbrandt 12:14

Have you vetted the the time period for eminent domain?

If you if we needed to go that route.

RT

Robert Tidmore 12:19

Yeah. Yeah, sort of.

I talked to Kimberly from our real property team and she said, you know, that's sort of a best case scenario.

It's basically you do appraisals, then you need six months of negotiations before you can go to a resolution of necessity. And then it's about 6 months from Iran to an order of possession.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 12:43
So if that schedule slips, then what would we do?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 12:48
We would request an extension for both completion of well completion of right of way and then construction allocation.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 12:55
OK.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 12:56
Yeah.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 12:56
I have a feeling that you probably would have a better chance of.
That being a successful request for that type of a situation.
But that's pretty aggressive timeline for a potential MND domain.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 13:14
Yeah, that's good feedback. Thank you, grace.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 13:18
My question actually was also related to node domain. Not sure if this is a dumb question, but for like the places where you might need easements for tiebacks for walls does does that like something that can happen under eminent domain?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 13:32
I assume so.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 13:34
I don't.
I just.
I just don't know 'cause not familiar with that. Usually I think of it as actually like a like acquiring property and fee.
But anyway, just curious because I feel like that's where some of the challenges there's gonna be on the county side. RTC has two property issues that we're working through.
Not sure if we'll go with definite domain. It doesn't have to follow the same timeline related to this project, but I feel like the county's gonna have more of.
The construction easements and the easements for tieback.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 14:01
Yeah.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 14:03
So thinking about the process for that just 'cause I'm not very familiar and then I thought the funds were use it or lose it if you didn't request an allocation by June 30th.
2027 it sounds like you have.
Your information is different.
I was just wondering if you could just briefly communicate what kind of extensions are allowable. I've been really using the June 30th as a drop dead.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 14:27
Yeah, I can.
I will confirm that with Caltrans, but if you follow the timely use guidelines then we can extend. We have basically another 12 months extension we can extend past that and actually I would say I can I can corroborate that with Caltrans because.
Evelyn, from District 5 local assistance sent the city of a very sort of two two scenarios. One if they followed no extension timeline and then a second one if they used all their possible extensions and that had construction starting in like 20-30.
So there there's a lot of potential there for getting extensions and they had the same construction allocation date.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 15:03
That's really great information.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 15:05
Obviously, we don't go that way, but if we need to, we can, yeah.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 15:08
'Cause cost will go up, but I didn't know that applied to ATP, so that's really good information for me. And the reason I'm thinking about it right now is that we just sent out the notices to the mobile homes again, that they're trespassing and we have a we.
Planning on getting a court order in June end of June 2025, based on the required 2027 deadline and one of our negotiating pieces will be schedule for encroachment removal.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 15:23
Mm hmm.
OK.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 15:29
So that's why that information is important to me right now.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 15:32
Yeah, yeah.
And if you wanna have a separate meeting to go over that, I'm happy to do that.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 15:35
Wait, yeah, if you just send me the Evelyn's e-mail, that probably would help.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 15:38
OK.
Any other questions about schedule and and and I think we're all familiar, but this is about a year later than we had anticipated and or planned and or told bodies yet.
So I don't know.
I I prefer we keep this close to our chest and then when we go to the board in well actually probably when we go to the RTC in February to request a PSA extension or a psne funding and when we go to the board in March for our.
PS and E Amendment I think that's when we'd probably daylight this information to those to those governing bodies.
Not seeing any other questions.
Yeah, Phil.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 16:20
Yeah. I just wanted to note that the Vave report did say that there would be another two months of design time assigned to the precast concrete viaduct.
That was kind of embedded in the report.
So you know the the, the timelines, the 10 month timeline might be more like a 12 month timeline.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 16:44
OK.
That's good to know.
Thank you.
Yeah. And like I said, we haven't gone over this with with you.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 16:47
You're welcome.

- RT** **Robert Tidmore** 16:49
Well, with RM or or you know any of their Subs?
So right we need.
We need to.
We need to corroborate that, but that's that's a good that's a good heads up to know now.
- PD** **Phil Doody (MME)** 16:57
OK.
- RT** **Robert Tidmore** 17:02
OK. Just again, quickly moving on to right away approach. So as I said, we'll hopefully have the right of way needs identified in our final schematic package.
Then we'll hire our appraiser and we'll use County Road property team Kimberly and her team to to manage the right of way process. RTC is going to send encroachment, removal letters and it sounds like Gray stills will, at least for the mobile homes, will go out in June. Of 2025.
Do you know yet? Oh, OK.
- GB** **Grace Blakeslee** 17:26
We just sent them.
Actually, we sent them last year and then we just sent ones this year.
So my email's blowing up.
Yeah, not good.
- RT** **Robert Tidmore** 17:32
OK, I'm sure.
- GB** **Grace Blakeslee** 17:33
No fun.
- RT** **Robert Tidmore** 17:35
And then remaining encroachments.
When do you know when those plan to go out?
- GB** **Grace Blakeslee** 17:41
That was actually, that's a good question for this team. The way that we've been working through with segment 9 is we RTC identified the encroachments and provided the encroachment exhibits.
Then we met with the city and went through the schematic plan on how we were going to

address those encroachments, but that what the city had said, and I'm just giving this as an example, because how it might play with segment 10 and 11 is that then they.

Wanted to do a field visit to look at the encroachments and determine if the solution we've talked about was agreeable before sending the letter.

So that's a little bit unknown because for the city, I would say, you know, we thought we would be out there with the 60% design in the summer ground truthing the encroachment conflicts and the solutions. And we haven't done that.

So we have the letters from our perspective for 9 ready to go.

But we needed that.

So if that's the same process, if the other encroachment removal letters wouldn't happen until after 60% design in a field visit, I'm not sure I'd let people's input on how that process would work.

RT Robert Tidmore 18:39

Yeah. I think obviously earlier is better just from getting people to get out of the way. I think it would really depend on the nature of the encroachments in my head.

I'm thinking there are a couple structures along the way that are gonna be bigger, longer lead issues, but in the majority of the encroachments that I'm thinking of are offenses and other things that can relatively easily be moved, I think.

You know, we'll have to talk to RRM, but you know, if we have a pretty good idea of what our right of way needs are at the final schematic package, that could be a good place to go out and do that.

GB Grace Blakeslee 19:16

And at this point for fence encroachments, what we're saying is we've done a lot.

So you know, it's got a lot of back and forth in RTC. So it's kind of we're grappling with it.

But where we landed is RTC would replace the fence on the property line because it's just.

We're worried if we tell the property owner to do it, they're going to put it in the wrong place or something like that.

So right now we're thinking our approach will be to let them know they're encroaching, then a second letter saying what we're going to do about it and then RTC will be responsible, even if at our cost to move the.

Fences and that.

That's just we've been going back and forth internally, but that's where we're at right now.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 19:51

Hey, Matt. When you when you guys do with encroachments?

Do you guys rebuild the fences if people are encroaching on the county right away?

MM

Matt Machado 20:02

We haven't had a practice of of pushing people back, but.

In general, you don't have to. No, there's no there. No legal obligation. If it's an encroachment, you remove it and you walk away.

But I think what Grace is saying is it makes sense.

But she's trying to keep the peace a little bit too, because people are coming.

So include.

RG

Riley Gerbrandt 20:21

Yeah.

MM

Matt Machado 20:21

So I think it's a low cost solution that keeps the peace so.

RG

Riley Gerbrandt 20:23

Totally. Totally.

MM

Matt Machado 20:27

Makes sense to me, but I don't think legally you have to do it, no?

RG

Riley Gerbrandt 20:31

No, that that takes total sense.

SW

Steve Wiesner 20:36

Yeah, I would just add to that, that that has been our practice.

Matt, if you look at wholesale widening projects that we've done like in the former RDA area or even just one off projects, if somebody has a well established fence that's in our right away and our project moves it, we we almost 100% of the time, Reb.

That set and we're doing that even today, like on the Green Valley project and other projects.

So yeah, we do that. As a matter of just form.

RT

Robert Tidmore 21:02

Makes sense?

RG

Riley Gerbrandt 21:02

It's Wayne in guys, Kayla.

GB

Grace Blakeslee 21:04

And not to put too much energy on it.

Part of it is that the property owner then has to hire a surveyor to get the property's boundary right, and if they don't get a survey, they put in the wrong place.
So just all the complications that go along with that.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 21:15

Right. Makes sense.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 21:15

You mentioned the RTC is gonna move the fence, is it?

On this project in the RTC is gonna pay for it or is it happening prior to the project?

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 21:22

Oh.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 21:26

We've got both options.

We'd have to work it out with the team.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 21:29

OK.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 21:29

And I think for segment 7, they made it as part of the project.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 21:34

Top my head.

That seems to make sense, particular where we have walls and structure next to the next to the property line.

We'd have to rebuild it twice, potentially.

Mike.

MS **Mike Sherrod** 21:46

Yeah. Just to clarify on 2nd 7 that there was a slight slightly different process.

The the catch of the county helped Doug Doug help the city with those encroachments.

So the the owner was offered the option to move the fence and rebuild it to their liking.

You know, we we could stake the line for them.

Or if they took no action, it would just be demolished and replaced with the chain link fence and most a group of the owners moved their their fence and rebuilt it the way they wanted.

But there were a handful of all nighters on a handful.

Two or three properties where we just put chain link back in.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 22:27
Like that.

MS **Mike Sherrod** 22:27
And that was a project cost.
That was part of the bid pack.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 22:35
Sounds like we have some options there.
We can.
We can sort of tweak it as we go along and I'm sure it'll be context dependent too.
OK.
All right, I think that concludes right of way approach.
And now?
Any questions on what I went over?
OK, good. All right, let's jump into the I'll stop sharing.
Oh good.
Let's go to the bluebe.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 23:10
We're starting here in the top portion at 17th Ave. beginning of segment 10.
As we gone through here, Rob has clarified a few of the remarks in this portion. We previously had a 14 foot wide trail, 10 foot from center line of track based on the futures you pert, the direction is to reduce the trail width to 12 feet.
And in this area.
The lighting would remain between the trail and the track.
And that's from 17th to Rodeo Creek Gulch. Once we pass there, then that's when the the blanket comment that Rob shared in in his overview to move the lighting to the right of way switches where the we get more constrained segment 10.
How many of the schematic related comments do you want, Rob?
Do you want me to skim through those and focus more on the Virginia and Zepurt?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 24:16
Yeah, I would say.
Let's focus on the bigger issues, which I think are the Virginia and the zeph coordination.
But if you know, I think a lot of them are pretty straightforward like that one right there about, you know, removing the guardrail and just having a fence at the right of way line.
To me, I think that's pretty straightforward, but I I would say if you have questions or

disagree or need direction in order to move forward with some of those comments, then we we should talk about them.

KS

Kayla Szubielski 24:41

OK.

That doesn't seem like a major scope related item to me.

So we could work through that during design.

RT

Robert Tidmore 24:45

Right, agreed.

KS

Kayla Szubielski 24:56

Buffering here.

So on the southern side, this is a location that.

As Rabbi had mentioned, where we are showing the need for a low retaining wall, this one was 1 1/2 to 2 feet tall necessary for the track realignment and so based on the direction of proceeding with similar direction that we're using for 8-9.

The request is for room to revisit the grading in this area to see if there's a way to eliminate the need for this retaining wall.

RT

Robert Tidmore 25:33

Exactly.

KS

Kayla Szubielski 25:43

There was maybe this.

I don't know if you do wanna talk about this one, rob, but there was a comment during schematics about.

Ditch on the coastal side related to the rail line. And so just a high level question of how does that impact the work related to Roaring Camp?

Is roaring camp going to also take on the necessary drainage on the southern side associated with the rail line?

And their track realignment.

RT

Robert Tidmore 26:14

Yeah, I think that would be a question for for grace and Riley.

Just wondering if you you've had that discussion. If so, you have thoughts about how that may be handled or or do we just ignore it since it's gonna be part of the coordination with ronkamp?

GB

Grace Blakeslee 26:31

Were you? I mean previously were you include?

I guess I can answer that.

One what we've asked for in camp to do is to replicate existing condition.

So I think that's an important detail we should continue to work out with them, but it's question is when you are working on the schematic plans, did the design include recreating that ditch on the coastal side of the rail?

That, that, that would be a change, it would be removed from the plans.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 27:02

Cool Kayla.

Do you remember?

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 27:03

OK, we're gonna breakdown.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 27:05

I believe we.

I believe we were gonna show it on the southern side.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 27:12

Hey Cortana.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 27:12

Was.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 27:12

OK.

I'll make a note to to work through that a bit more on our end.

MS **Mike Sherrod** 27:16

And just for clarity for the.

Ready for the big package?

We do wanna segregate and identify areas of responsibility for roaring camp versus the contractor.

So if the ditch is associated with anything to do with boring camps work, it should stay with boring camp and not be on the contractor.

We should.

We should separate those two cleanly.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 27:42
See if I can close a few more apps. This file seems to be.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 27:45
To the extent like that, we're looking to separate things geographically as well.
Are we looking to?
Do not have the contractor be working on the rail side of the corridor and doing work.
Over over that area.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 28:09
I I think that remains to be decided.
I think if there if there's a need for retaining walls to accommodate the track relocation, then we're gonna have to have.
The you know the project contractor come in and build those and that's part of that sequencing to be sort of figured out a 65% design because we don't know yet where we're gonna need walls.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 28:24
Yeah, yeah.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 28:27
So we'll have to, we'll have to revisit that.
Ideally, brewing camp would just do it all, but I don't think that's gonna be possible, particularly since we have some fill conditions in segment 10.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 28:48
Was relaunching my blue beam.
Hey.
Continuing on some adjustments, you see these lines, thicker lines here in red.
This is where we are going to make some adjustments to the trail alignment shifting into part of the county property here to the north to allow more offset for that future zpert.
Then coming over to.
The bridge structure.
This is the area where the the latest direction is to look at, not impacting or looking at the setting. The impacts of the proposed structure in relation to the existing rail bridge and making sure the trail bridge abutments are designed to meet any kind of rail loading.
In general, we just need to also get in here and add in the break and bank and ordinary high watermark as we're looking at what the option and and solution is here. If the bridge structure needs to move previously we.

You are rebuilding a portion of the.

Maybe don't be. If we call them abutments, the the upper wing walls of the structure were getting rebuilt with our project. Phil, I see your hand raised.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 30:38

I just wanted to ask more about what the interaction is that Riley was discussing.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 30:48

The.

You mean the comment that Rob had that as we have these, you know where we have structures and in close proximity that the?

Design concept for the trail team would need to evaluate the impact to the existing structures and foundations.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 31:09

Exactly. I mean, you do realize they are pile supported structures?

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 31:16

Your, your, your piles.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 31:18

Did both of them.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 31:21

Yeah, they OK.

Yeah. So they what?

What we need is better understanding of.

Your assessment of the existing structures and the impact of the the new structures to to the existing structures.

So as as a blanket comment, a lot of.

What we need to understand is.

Where you guys are in relatively close proximity to existing foundations and and existing walls or abutments, we need to make sure that they're not interacting and affecting one another.

When we looked at the Harbor Bridge, for instance, there's battered piles in in some of those abutments in in the bents and things like that, we want to make sure that, you know, there's there's no.

Effects to the existing structures or foundations.

So generally speaking, a a railroad would just blanket say stay 25 feet away from our existing structures so that we're sure that there's no.

Interaction between new and existing structures, but obviously that's not feasible in our corridor due to the the corridor.

With constraints, so we didn't need more information from you guys.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 32:45

I'm just gonna, you know, just say out loud. I think, you know, analyzing the effect of the new structures on the existing structures is gonna, you know, add more Engineering's design scope.

You know, I I certainly don't wanna see interference between piles, but I think, you know, there are some geotechnical rules of thumb where if you have a certain spacing between piles, there's not really pile group interaction or reduction, you know, so depending on the level of of you.

You know what you want us to do.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 33:17

Mm hmm.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 33:18

You know, this could be a a expensive or inexpensive.

You know, task that you're requesting, so it might.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 33:27

Yeah.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 33:27

It might.

It might be good to really maybe in a another meeting with you and your team, understand what exactly you're expecting here.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 33:37

I agree, and I think the best thing to do would get, you know, the structures, teams together.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 33:38

OK.

Thank you.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 33:44

And talk about some of the the questions that you just raised and what we're expecting.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 33:48
And geotechnical too.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 33:51
Sure.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 33:51
Yeah. OK.
Let's do that when future date. Thank you.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 33:56
Mm hmm.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 33:57
Riley, do you? Do you think that's something that you could provide?
Relatively soon and and I ask that because where I'm trying to work through the scope with RRM right now for final design and you know things like this, we're gonna wanna incorporate into the into the PS and E contract amendment and you know to meet that February R.
Meeting. You know, I've told RRM we need to have a ballpark idea of of cost by mid January.
So getting getting this this direction sooner rather than later would would be helpful.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 34:34
Why don't you identify from your team who needs to be part of that conversation? Given what Phil and I just discussed and.
I know from our perspective, our team.
That would need to meet with that is, is relatively small.
It would be our structures lead maybe with you Technical Support as well and our civil lead.
So I think schedules wise.
And I think most of them are working over the holidays, not taking any significant amount of time off, so.
It should be feasible if I get some names from you guys and.
Availability. Then we can look at schedules and calendar that.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 35:21
OK. Bill, would that would that be yourself and the rest of the MMA team?

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 35:27

I think we'd want to have Pacific Crest engineering.

Who's doing the geotechnical engineering in?

In many cases, this is a geotechnical engineering question. You know, based on some preliminary calculations that I did the reactions from the trail bridge are orders of magnitude less than the reactions from the railroad bridge. Just under dead loads at the harbor.

You know, I know that we're not talking about the harbor, but in the live loads are obviously orders of magnitude less as well, so.

Structurally, you know we can quantify loads too.

We can come up by interferences between battered piles, depending on the level of information that we have about the existing bridge. But some of this does need to be and is by virtue of geotechnical question.

Of how soil?

Can be mobilized and share loads or you know, one structure can interact with another structure via the soil. So.

I'm again. I'm envisioning this more than just simple surcharges that you would see as a surcharge acting on a retaining wall.

So it would be a combined Mm. Pce RRM, you know, probably meeting with the RTC to discuss what level of you know, analysis we need to provide.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 36:54

OK, so, so Kayla, could I have? Could I have you and Mm reach out to Riley and just try to schedule that meeting with, you know, understanding your guys schedule availability.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 37:05

Yes.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 37:05

OK. Thanks.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 37:09

You're gonna be attendance as well, Rob.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 37:12

If I can, yes, if I'm not available, then just go ahead and have it without me.
And I just.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 37:19

Me.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 37:20

I wanna clarify something.
Oh, I was gonna move on.
So go ahead. Go ahead Rodney.

RM **Rodney Cahill, MME** 37:26

Could I ask about the right of way on the northwest side of the bridge and?
Whether.
That's.
A.
An opportunity to to to go toward the green line in that location.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 37:46

Yeah, I was actually gonna go there myself.
And just to clarify what we've talked about previously at the other zipper coordination meeting, that adjustment in red.
That this project is not proposing to do so that that the the ZEPHRIT project would make that adjustment in red.
And I I I had understood that we would try to stay within the right of way as part of our project.
But I see in Green Kayla that that you guys probably coordination with with Mme had made those those recent adjustments.
So yeah, happy to.
I think that would be a good thing for us to talk about and get on the same page.
Right now about what this project is doing versus what zephrit is gonna come back and fix later, because I I the the reason we went with the red being a separate issue was that there was no way for us to get the 12 foot clearance in that area.
That they were requesting without some additional tree retaining wall right of way impacts.
And so we decided that should come later, and similarly on the on the east side of the Gulch.
So maybe, Radi, you could talk about Kayla, whomever that Green Line came from could talk about what you're showing there and why or where that's coming from.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 39:06

I think I may have generated that early on, but I think part of it was just seeing how much separation we could get to make that problem kind of go away as far as the structure interaction of our structure on the existing and when I saw the red.
Line I go.
Well, there's an opportunity to push the bridge out as far as we can to the right of way to the north there, so.
I I probably instigated that as it.
Is this possible?

Because it does benefit us in reducing that possibility of interaction.

Substantially so that that was really what that was all about.

It was.

It was kind of just a question.

Can we do this?

Is really what that green line, at least when I did it anyway, that was my intention.

Can we?

Can we do this and and what would it mean if we do it?

MS

Mike Sherrod 39:54

Another piece of the puzzle here is.

We we need to look at the overall length of the structure because we're hitting the maximums to get a clear span structure to stay out of core jurisdiction, which is what was designed with the schematic earlier schematic set.

So we have that challenge too.

We we can only hit a certain length on the bridge.

KS

Kayla Szubielski 40:16

Which is part of why we previously had a bridge structure with the viaduct like the.

Or peer supported as we approach these.

Other abutment sections.

The direction still to proceed with our assuming that we we meet, we look at this with the structures teams and the geotech.

To rebuild these wing walls as we've designed, designed them previously.

DM

Dale Hendsbee | MME 40:56

I think I mean if I can jump in, I think part of that is we hadn't gotten that far.

You know, when those drawings were produced, it was a question that we posed to the geotechnical engineer.

What is the interaction of the peers? And you know what kind of spacing do we need? And so.

You know, we really hadn't gotten beyond that when this image, you know, the original image was created.

We just tried to maximize what we had and and as Mike said, the span, you know keeping the span within reason and staying out of the area.

All of that.

So that's how that was originally done. And so we have not had that deep discussion with the geotech about how far away we need to be to eliminate interaction or to minimize interaction, so.

Yeah, I think I mean something. We know we would revisit obviously, but I think part of this

is, could we just rearrange things enough that we're really far away? And I think that's, you know, and make it go away is part of what this, you know, green line.

Was all about.

So I guess we need some direction, do we?

Do we not wanna cross the right away and and just try and squeeze it in as close as we can and figure out what the what the interaction limits are based on the geotechnical criteria?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 42:18

That area is the is the public works broomer yard on the West side of Rodeo Gulch Bridge. And it looks like just from the the the cloud, that's probably vegetation in that area.

I don't think there's any physical improvements that would be impacted right there. I I think my my bigger question would be if we do move it that far north, what are the additional environmental impacts?

And can we handle those with an addendum cuz we already are planning to do an EIR addendum for some of these changes, particularly as we get into segment 11 around the Escalona Gulch monarch Grove.

So I think if it's handled by an ER addendum, we can probably.

Accommodate that. But I I don't know if we have tree surveys for that area.

I see a couple trees along the the you know, sort of the center line of the of the Gulch there.

But I don't see any other trees surveys to the West or east of that side, I don't know.

Oh, if we have that information to make an informed decision.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 43:22

Yes.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 43:28

And then I think that the next piece is, are we confident that that sort of green rectangle is the the clear span of the bridge or does that need to be further figured out?

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 43:40

That would have to be further figured out.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 43:42

OK.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 43:42

Yeah, yeah. I think that was just, yeah.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 43:45

Yeah, that, that's fair.

DM Dale Hendsbee | MME 43:46
An image.
An idea I guess is really what it was at that point. I think so, yeah.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 43:50
OK, my question was are are those cyan lines?

DM Dale Hendsbee | MME 43:51
And I think also how far away we need to be.
So yeah, yeah.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 43:57
Those cyan lines aren't that are drawn. There are from a jurisdictional.
They're just shown in their approximating.

RT Robert Tidmore 44:10
It's true.
Yeah, Rodney, I think your hands up.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 44:16
Just to just to let everybody know like what we found from our review of of the.
Current design level plans and information is there was just a, you know, some things in the
bridge concepts that.

DM Dale Hendsbee | MME 44:28
Thank you.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 44:36
When we were reviewing them for impacts to the existing bridges, we didn't have the level of
detail that we needed to to understand what the impacts that there were no impacts.
And so we're looking to the design, the the trail design team to, you know, confirm that there
aren't those impacts.

DM Dale Hendsbee | MME 44:57
Right, I think.
I mean, I think that was our interpretation as well and we were just trying to see. I mean, I
just know the further away we are, the less impact is going to be.
So I push it to the north of the right away.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 45:07
Yeah.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 45:08
I I feel good about it and I have a better feeling as opposed, we have to go back where the original location, you know it.
It's it's more than likely there could be some impact, but we just don't know.
We haven't taken it that far. So I mean it's kind of the difference between.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 45:20
Yeah.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 45:22
The the two images is from 1 extreme to the other so.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 45:26
OK.
So so let me let me try to give some some semblance of direction here.
I think from my perspective and and Matt, I see you join back on. So maybe you can chime in with your thoughts here. But they're talking about needing a little bit of right of way on the West side of Rodeo Gulch from the Broomer yard you can see.
That little triangle piece that's there. I don't think there's any improvements in there. And to me that, that, that that wouldn't seem like an issue. Would you agree?

MM **Matt Machado** 45:54
Yeah, I would agree.
Yeah, I was watching.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 45:55
OK.

MM **Matt Machado** 45:55
I was looking at that as well.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 45:57
OK.
So so I think the right of way is not an issue. I I think what we'd wanna make sure is we don't push our bridge so far north that we run into a a feasibility issue with the prefab structure and the length there and that we don't run.

Into additional environmental impacts that would trigger a need to go beyond an EIR addendum.

DM Dale Hendsbee | MME 46:29

OK, sounds good.

I mean, we're definitely gonna revisit this.

So we'll we'll see. We'll see what we come up with as far as how close we can because obviously moving it has has an impact.

RT Robert Tidmore 46:32

Yeah.

KS Kayla Szubielski 46:55

It's been a long.

Most of the rest of this is still.

Same remarks. Moving the lighting inland, keeping the trail 12 feet width that we have currently and then we can talk about the area here.

Just to the West of 38.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 47:21

Just FYI.

And I know we talked about it in the schematic documents on Thompson Ave.

You just paying back?

KS Kayla Szubielski 47:29

Yes.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 47:30

That's an area where we currently get flooding that water from Thompson comes on to the corridor, and from that lumber yard.

So as you guys are working through how to handle the trail drainage to be aware that that area receives flows from the north also from that kind of a commercial industrial property on the left of Thompson. So heads up.

KS Kayla Szubielski 47:58

Yeah, we we have a note from the schematics about an inlet here near the P.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 48:01

Yeah, I see that in there, yeah.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 48:03
Another inlet here and then the trail is going to be pitched.
So anything coming from this parking lot's gonna sheetflow.
Cross unless we've received other direction.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 48:17
That's good.
Thanks, Riley.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 48:18
So a thumbs up from Rob.
To go through in this area just to the West of 38th, the understanding that we have from Rob is that zipr in the RTC direction is to build a 12 foot wide trail along the right of way to leave space for zpert.
Is to to confirm that with the RTC.
This require temporary construction easements to construct the wall.
Or require additional mobile homes to be moved.
The increase right away cost cost and risk be related to the mobile home parks and then given those potential risks, is it worth considering?
Pushing the trail a little bit further from the right away line to allow the necessary construction space needed to.
Reduce the amount of temporary construction easements so this is a conversation that Rob would like to have.
Grace.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 49:26
Yeah, I think, thanks, Kayla.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 49:29
So once you guys talk about that and then I'll make my my points related, but.
Not specific to the questions you just asked.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 49:37
Yeah, I'll, I'll just add, I so I don't know right now and I think this will be a good thing to get feedback from the structure team on you know if our if our current design, if they think to construct those walls, there will need to be T.
I mean, they're right on the property line. So I was imagining that would be the case, but I think that that would be the first question to answer. And then if so?
What is there a change in mall type that we could do to not require tces?

Or is there a a, a slight say 1 foot, you know, shift inland or inward?

That could be.

That could eliminate the need to put Tcas in here. I think that would sort of be a first.

Feasibility question and then if that's the case, then the question would go to the RTC is, is that a worthwhile effort to pursue given the you know the potential for a contested acquisition in here and and the possibility for that to really bog down the project schedule?

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 50:38

I think related to that would be that the previous design had soldier pile walls and the VAVE study was recommending MSC Walls except for the portion at the culvert head wall.

So Phil, if you if you wanna talk about the construction space needed in those two different wall types?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 50:55

Yeah.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 50:58

Run.

The covert itself, I think you're gonna need an easement, you know, it's just to to work on that and to get all the grades to work out.

On either side of that, the auction those walls on either side of that. I know closer towards 38th for sure. It the wall that's being proposed there along the inland side of the trail would be a condition where you're filling against the wall.

So for instance, you had the soldier pile wall. You can't.

You want to maintain your peers so that they don't cross the property boundary.

So you're losing.

You know several inches there because the pier, you know.

Extends beyond the face of the soldier pile.

You know in most cases.

There's gonna need to be some allowance for people to operate on.

Both sides of the wall.

Construction, you know, obviously you can build right up against the property boundary.

And only work from one side.

And it's conceivable that you can do that with the soldier pile wall with an MSE wall.

You know it is.

You know you're placing.

You know a base course and you're you're building this this up, there's gonna be some Earth work on the foundation and.

You know about filling operation?

That would be.

Waist and lifts and the facing units installed.

So again, that wall system could virtually be built.

You know, all within the trail right of way too.

So I you know, the MSE wall may have the advantage of being something you could put closer to the property boundary.

Because it doesn't have, you know, the footprint of the peers that you have to maintain on the property boundary.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 53:10
Thanks Phil.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 53:10
That's yeah.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 53:12
Describing Phil like the actual peer for the soldier pile.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 53:13
Exactly.
Yeah. So that at, you know, 12:00 on that circle, you know, you wanna have that not extend beyond the property boundary.
Run.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 53:29
I see your hands up.

MM **Matt Machado** 53:30
Yeah. Thanks, rob. I want to point out that that covert that we were just talking about is also the subject of a of a project that Zone 5 is leading right now.
And we were gonna address it as an emergency, but it's probably gonna be designed and go out to bid this winter and that pipeline that runs S goes under a series of mobile homes and. We'll be working to do some temporary repair, but ultimately we may be looking to. Either get the mobile homes, move their their as an encroachment or or something we we're haven't come up with an absolute solution, but my comment is that Rob.
Maybe you and the team can work with our drainage group.
It's going to be led by Rodney and Carolyn and so they've been out there quite a bit trying to put together a plan. But I think what we do may have some positive impacts on this project and.
If we know what your constraints are, we might be able to work together and make it even better than than what we're gonna do anyways.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 54:43
That's a great piece of information.
I think at a minimum we were.
We knew that we needed to extend the culvert all the way to the right of way line because right now it it stopped short of that.
I don't know exactly how far.
Yeah, it looks like.
But four feet?
I'm gonna just ballpark right there and so.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 55:00
This is the existing head wall, but I drew in blue.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 55:02
Yeah.
Thanks Kayla.
Yeah. So we we would need to extend that all the way to the right of way line to fit the trail on top of it.
So if that were something that could be accommodated by, you know, the Zone 5 project that would, that would be fantastic.

MM **Matt Machado** 55:17
Yeah, it's, it's.
I don't know.
You know, we'll have.
Let's talk about it, because our our immediate project was just to rely on the existing pipe 'cause it's failing.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 55:20
Yeah.

MM **Matt Machado** 55:25
But then we do have a a larger plan to to realign and remove some of the encroachments.
It may.
The timing may work, but at a minimum, let's have a conversation.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 55:35
OK.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 55:38
So that I understand you correctly that easements would be needed on both mobile home parks.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 55:46
Well, I I was talking mostly about the wall that's on the northern side of the the inland side of the trail there.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 55:53
OK.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 55:54
And it I it does appear to me that it is virtually on the property boundary.
So you know again.
I I in most cases there's access to both sides of, you know, a retaining wall when you're you're working on them, but you know.
Having a temporary construction easement that allows entrance onto that opposite side of the wall, you know, would certainly make the contractor's job easier.
But the culvert itself, however, where we're constructing new head walls that, you know would be, you know, cast in place or formed.
Yeah, you would need to have access and then also just for, you know, grading, getting all the inverts and et cetera. That area is unique.
So I I definitely wouldn't expect that there'd be atce in that area.

MM **Matt Machado** 56:53
The other point I was trying to make was that we have a drainage easement there, so we we can share that information and that may solve your TCe problems.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 57:01
OK.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 57:01
Nice.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 57:03
Of course, I'm just thinking about it in terms of our work with the mobile home property owners.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 57:09

How tall are these walls?
At least on the northern side.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 57:18
I don't.
I don't recall.
I know it did get taller at the culvert face of wall, but the rest of it they weren't. They weren't significant.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 57:27
I didn't think so.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 57:29
But maybe.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 57:29
Like 3-4 feet, I would imagine.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 57:32
A second. Yep, three or four.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 57:35
I would think, I mean obviously to to Phil's point and to get a lot easier to construct. If you've got a space on the on the outboard face of the wall.
But something that's like three or four feet high, it's feasible to construct it.
Just from one side, I mean I'm thinking you could maybe do a you know block wall or something like that even.
So I think there's some wall types that could be considered that would if if.
Not able to be obtained. You could construct the walls at the property line without needing to be on on that side.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 58:18
And especially since it's a fill situation, you're you're it's not like you're cutting the trail below the elevation of those buildings.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 58:24
Yeah.
Yep.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 58:32
Dusty.

DO **Dusty Osburn** 58:34
I agree with Riley saying about the construction generally being done on both sides of the walls, and I'd like to add that there's usually a drain like a back drain that's required, and also some sort of drain like drainage on top of the wall to allow you know.
Water to move away to some place where it can get off of there.
So you're gonna have, you know, some additional work behind the wall as well for that kind of drainage surface drainage.
So.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 59:04
But dusty, these are there's actually fill conditions.
So the wall with the the trail would be on fill that we would.
Yeah.

DO **Dusty Osburn** 59:14
OK.
Well that sorry, I read the plans backwards. Thank you.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 59:19
Yeah, correct.
Correct me if I'm wrong, anybody but that that's OK.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 59:22
That's right.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 59:22
That's correct. I think for sake of time, we should keep moving along. If there's time at the end if people want to come back to this when we can.
Got a lot to cover still.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 59:32
Yeah, yeah, I guess.
I guess the question for for RTC you can Mull on this and what we can revisit at the end is you know given that we we may need space behind the wall or in front of the wall along the property line. Would you guys consider allowing us to?
Shift both the relocated track and the trail. Let's say inland a foot or so.

On or inward a foot or so on each side to prevent the need for TC es. If it looks like getting these trees become, you know, is gonna become a problem.

For the project and schedule.

So we don't need an answer right now, but I think that would be that's the question.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:00:12

What about the? What are the? Where's the lighting going?

Is it gonna be on the the outside part of the trail?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:00:19

Have to be on the outside.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:00:19

Yeah.

I think that would be a conversation we would like.

It's possible, rob.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:00:28

Yeah. OK.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:00:29

I.

I the ideal would be to put up on the on the on the edge, and if trees are a challenge, then let's figure out what we can do without needing the TCAS, and an option could be to move the trail.

It would just be with the understanding that when Zeper comes through here, depending on what the final solution is, that we, you know we we would have to.

Redo some of the trail work, maybe all of it.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:01:05

OK.

Great. That, that, that's helpful.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 1:01:05

I know you want to punt it, but I just wanna make a point that the I think the distance between the center line of track here and the trail as it's currently designed was around 13 feet.

And what we and I think understand is under Zephyr, we'd have to acquire a right of way to even meet all of the passenger rail clearances anyway.

So that would be something for RTC to consider if we're going to have to be acquiring right

away through this area for separate anyways.
How a shift right now may or may not.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:01:34
Yeah, well.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 1:01:35
You know, we might be amenable to a shift that.
Gets more of a minimum for the freight. If we know that there's gonna be right away
acquisition for zephard.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:01:43
I think we.
I think we already have that grace looking at the the details here.
So the way it's constructed on the plan here is that we've got the trail and then we've got 11
foot nine between the edge of the fence and the track center line. And then from track center
line to the southern boundary, it's 8 foot 10.
Or maybe to the wall.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 1:02:08
Right.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:02:10
So what we're showing here would enable.
Great to operate would enable then in the future.
The tracks did not have to be.
Again adjusted, I know we're going to rebuild the tracks, right?
Rail needs.
So your points.
You know some consideration that your your your point could be.
Considered, but I think what we would end up doing would be acquiring.
A.
Yeah, we'd have to see which which side of the tracks would would acquire from if we're
gonna fit both facilities through so.
If we kept the the plan as shown here, then we would just need acquisitions from the southern
side to to enable separate.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:03:04
Or have a narrower trail.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:03:07
Have a narrow track right?

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 1:03:07
I guess that's where I was coming from with the one mile shift.
What? Really.

The outcome and then I guess my other point, which is kind of maybe for other people to consider, Rob and I discussed when we talk about final design and final design costs is I think for RTC and it's an obvious this is a very, very challenging area for.

A number of reasons and that I think it's very likely the RTC is going to want to see an alternative alignment option outside of the right of way in this area.

And so I I would.

I would recommend that we we include that in the final design.

I know that's not the direction.

The county has said that they were going, but I think the fact that we're dealing with a mobile home encroachment, removals and that if it's a separate project, we're gonna have more impacts to the mobile homes and that are unknown at this point.

I could see the Commission wanting to see an alternative alignment in this location.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:03:57
You're saying?

We would need to.

You want us to provide?

You want us to to carry now an alternative to locate the trail outside of the RTC right away.

OK. Yeah.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 1:04:12
And you and I can talk about that from the cost perspective. But I think from a project risk perspective.
That's that's something that we should be really be considering given the commissions to do projects going forward and the mobile home encroachment, removal location. Even though I think we can accomplish that, I think it's a little hard for this Commission to stomach that we're asking them to remove.

The encroachments that then we may have another project coming forward that's going to further impact on the mobile homes.

That's unknown at this time, so I'm just thinking about how the Commission might react to that.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:04:43

Was it more the consideration of the the encroachments and the removals as opposed to the cost grace?

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 1:04:49

Yeah. You and I had talked about that.

You had mentioned that there might may not be significant cost savings. I'm thinking more of the political side of things as we interface with both the trail and the Zephyrt project.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:05:04

You have an idea of the the East West.

Limitations on where that, yeah.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 1:05:10

We looked at three different. Oh, sorry.

Yeah, I think we maybe can have a separate conversation because we looked at three different options.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:05:17

OK.

MM **Matt Machado** 1:05:19

When you say you looked at three different options, are you talking like a a alignments like Bromer, Portola or Eastcliffe?

Is that what you what you're getting at?

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 1:05:27

It's like the exactly.

So there's the bromer. There's the Milton kind of option and then a cop option that would include Nova as well. That was looked at in the UCS. So I wouldn't say that Rtes has a position on any one of those per SE, although we did get a lot.

Of input from the public as part of Zephyr on those alignments.

Potential alignments.

MM **Matt Machado** 1:05:48

Mm H.

I don't know where the county would stand with that, but I got to tell you that we, and I'm glad Steve's on the call.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 1:05:54

OK.



Matt Machado 1:05:58

Steve, maybe chime in here too, but one of our higher priorities for improvement is East Cliff.

We have a lot of PED and bike worries down there, so I mean it's it's a pretty good distance from what we're talking about here. But the further you go South, it's, you know, a little less traffic down there too.

But anyways, Rob, when you guys have this conversation please.

And Steve into it as well.



Grace Blakeslee 1:06:24

And I'd appreciate everyone's input, you know, from a strategy point of view as we deal with our elected officials around this issues. Is this just trying to to navigate the various inputs?

So I'm not trying to direct it, but just giving it a lot of thought how we are we're gonna get to yes on this one in the project risk.



Robert Tidmore 1:06:40

Mm hmm.

OK.

We're in capital jurisdiction.

There's a funny line in here.

Yeah, we are.



Riley Gerbrandt 1:06:47

Yeah.



Robert Tidmore 1:06:47

At least, yeah, so.



Matt Machado 1:06:48

Yeah.



Robert Tidmore 1:06:51

Kailash. Jessica. Katie, do you want to be looped into that conversation as well?



Kahn, Jessica 1:06:58

Yes, please.

Thank you.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:07:00
Yeah.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:07:04
It depends on where that that cutoff would change, right?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:07:04
OK.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:07:08
I mean, if you're coming down 38, that would be capital. If you're coming down further to the east, the West then that that like at 30th then?
Loop everybody in for for direction.
Rob, with respect to this question about moving the trail.
My direction would be.
Let's find out what is is feasible here with.
A property line wall.
I I just have a a feeling that that would be something that would be able to be done without too many significant challenges.
I I just.
I just have a feeling it it could be done so that would be my initial direction would be. Then let's.
Try to make it work engineering wise. If you were for finding challenges then we would revisit it.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:08:09
That makes sense. Thanks Riley. Rodney.

RM **Rodney Cahill, MME** 1:08:17
Is the RTC saying that?
The Zippert project.
Would consider moving the trail.
Outside of the right away? Or is this part of the trail project to consider the zipper's impact on encroachments?

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:08:37
It's both, Rodney.
So what?

RT Robert Tidmore 1:08:41
Yeah, no.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 1:08:42
What Grace just said is because of the challenges of this, the right away encroachments here in the political.
You know, conversation regarding it that.
She's wanting to explore, moving the trail out of the rail corridor as part of segment 10:00 and 11:00.
A separate conversation is being had about, you know, if in the future Zephyr comes along and say the trail is already, it is constructed through here. We're looking at how do we make both facilities work.
And and those options include options of.
Trail diversions off the right away.

RT Robert Tidmore 1:09:29
OK.
Let's move on.
We got all of segment 11 to get through.

GB Grace Blakeslee 1:09:32
But I wanna say something else.
And I'm just kidding.
Go ahead, Robin. Go ahead.

RT Robert Tidmore 1:09:35
Nope.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 1:09:36
You had me.
I was like great.

RT Robert Tidmore 1:09:44
But there's nothing.
I just pan through segment 10 while we're talking.

KS Kayla Szubielski 1:09:47
OK.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:09:47
There's nothing else to discuss.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:09:49
OK. Like.
Hold my comment.
Vertical.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:09:57
OK.
So we're going to sign 11.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:09:59
Yes.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:10:00
OK.
I'm actually following along in the blue beam separately so that can zoom in more.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:10:08
Yeah, so I I.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:10:09
Try not to zoom in and out.
So I've been known to make people.
Oceansic.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:10:16
I'll just. I'll just quickly go through this one. We we had a couple areas where we had a little bit of overlap between the separate conflict and where the trail is designed.
I didn't notice this when we did our our walkthrough with the HDR team.
Back in October, there's a.
There's basically a 2 foot overlap, so our options here are having separate slightly. Adjust your alignment to the inland side to avoid the conflict reducing the DG Buffer which is shown by that.
A sand pattern on the drawing between the trail and the parked cars and or reducing lane widths on Cliff Dr. which are currently 11 feet wide, which would actually make it consistent with the lane width reductions that were pursuing east of the crosswalk. To provide that additional space.

On the coastal side to accommodate bikes and PEDs.

So those are our options here to eliminate that conflict, which I I think we would want to try and do given that there is some, there's some walls and some infrastructure in here and it's a it's a tight right of way so I think.

My preference would be can we reduce lane width first? No, it would be a city of Capitola question and then.

Then then I, then before we pursue.

Narrow or getting rid of that DG Buffer, because I think that's that's an important safety issue so that we're not opening car doors into into the trail.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 1:11:43

On the on the screen here the DG Buffer is between kind of between the the what are curbs maybe?

KS Kayla Szubielski 1:11:51

Yes, but the the roadway curve along the parallel parking and then we have the retainer curve for the A/C of the trail that you see here.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 1:12:05

Well, I'll let City win.

See if if they have a comment.

KJ Kahn, Jessica 1:12:13

So I think you all are aware that we have a shoreline armoring project on this stretch of Cliff Drive that we have currently have under design.

I think we're gonna start constructing probably down with construction of it prior to the construction of this project based on your new timeline.

I gotta be honest, I don't think I could give you an answer about laying list right now.

I'd wanna bring in our consultant to have a more detailed discussion about that, which I think we should probably have anyway.

So I gotta say, I can't really comment on this right now just based on.

Yeah, I I think we're gonna need to have a deeper conversation about it.

RT Robert Tidmore 1:12:57

OK.

KJ Kahn, Jessica 1:12:57

And we can do that at the beginning of the year, but.

Yeah, I I couldn't answer if that's a good idea right now we are have just identified what our project's going to be.

So I think we're far enough along to make some informed decisions. I just would like to bring in our consultant.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:13:13
OK.

Riley, what's your sense of the ability to to adjust separate slightly here?

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:13:22
I think we can.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:13:24
OK.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:13:24
Just just looking at.
We would tighten up this.
I think we would just, I think it's feasible, Rob.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:13:33
OK.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:13:35
Yeah.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:13:35
OK.
I guess that's actually the first preferred option. I should have started there.
OK.
Well, that's great.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:13:42
I think I mean if you if you wanted let let did you did you want to reduce the lane widths?
I mean, let let us know what you need right?
Like if it's preferable to reduce the lane width because that's what the the city wants to do with the street.
Diet. That's that's one thing that should be considered if it's. If it's not, then.
I'll bring it up with the team.
To confirm, I'll, I'll. I'll bring it up with the team to confirm anyway, but.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:14:20

Yeah, no. Understood. Sorry. I should've.
I should've clarified.
We can't accommodate.
We can't eliminate the conflict by just narrowing lane width.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:14:27
Oh OK. Gotcha.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:14:28
So we we would need both.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:14:30
Got it. OK.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:14:31
Yeah, we'll we'll follow up with you.
I think the design we I think the the outcome is we won't need any major tweaks in this area
which is good.
Trail.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:14:56
Yeah.
Rob, we can follow up after about the remarks for the ramp.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:15:02
Yeah.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:15:07
In general, kind of the stretch along E Cliff area we have some environmental challenges that
are are requiring us to limit our our improvements. So we we'll have to follow up on that.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:15:16
All right.
OK.
Thank you.
I've forgotten about that constraint.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:15:28
OK.
Now we're over other side of Capitola along Monterey Ave. from Monterey to Coronado.

The design team is working with the city of Capitola and the county to locate the trail up along Park Ave.

We have two different alternatives that we're studying, one that would eliminate both Class 2 bike lanes and one that would eliminate.

The eastbound but would preserve the northern westbound Class 2 bike lane.

Did meet initially with the CPUC have verbal support for a new formal crossing at Coronado?

Which would be required and critical to being able to crossover and switch from inland to coastal at at Coronado.

So we did get that verbal from them.

We have some of the previous.

Va language in here.

It's it's no longer relevant if we're able to get support from City of Capital, a council, we're gonna go to a meeting in January.

With one of those two alternatives to move forward.

RT

Robert Tidmore 1:16:41

Thanks Kyle.

Yeah. And I think we can.

We don't need to go through the vave discussions. I'm, I'm.

I'm optimistic that we'll get City Council to approve one of the two options.

See, I see Jessica shaking her head.

Yes. So I think she agrees with that. OK, great.

I was gonna say something in here and I can't remember what it was.

KS

Kayla Szubielski 1:17:06

Maybe this idea here that we were starting to talk about is?

RT

Robert Tidmore 1:17:08

Oh yeah, thank you. Yes.

KS

Kayla Szubielski 1:17:12

The room and Mme team are gonna meet to look at what alternatives we may have to bring users from Park Ave. back down into the rail corridor.

Previously we had a switch back ramp.

Now that the trail's moving up on Park Ave. we're eliminating that Southern sidewalk. It's getting replaced with the class one trail.

We're gonna see if there's any kind of alternatives through here.

The ramp back down without a switch back to reduce the the footprint through this area.

Since we're switching sides of the track, it becomes a constrained point for the future Zperp

project and the alignment through here we've seen a few different iterations from Zpert, so we're trying to.

The best of our ability leave enough space without.

Shifting further on the southern side, which would trigger taller retaining walls on the steep slope and more environmental impacts to some trees.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:18:17

Great. And there's a note here for me.

So Riley, this is this is one of two areas where we need that final separate alignment from. I know verbally we have talked about the fact that you went in, in your, in your new alignment.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:18:27

Mm hmm.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:18:32

You show that you can hit that crossing sort of where it is currently, which is great for the Coronado crossing. So, and I think I got your verbal confirmation there.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:18:36

Yes.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:18:43

So that's good.

And then I think the question for us is what happens?

East of there.

Between the Coronado crossing and the New Brighton Bridge because the previous iteration had the the the train pushing towards the coast and requiring us to push our trail out towards the coast.

Which increases impacts to Esha and there's a there's a monarch autumnal roof site out there.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:19:09

Yeah.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:19:09

So we're curious if you have updated information for us.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:19:14

Let me see if I have anything that's happened in the.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:19:18
Your inbox.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:19:19
In my inbox since.

No, not since the start of the meeting. I know. So I would.

I don't have those in hand. I talked to.

I know that they were preparing them and they have the alignments put together.
From.

There, there's couple options through here, right?

So one one thing we're going to the community with is is.

It is a station location at New Brighton Road or up on McGregor, you know have a considerable difference in preference.

If it's the if we have to. If we're putting it up on McGregor, then there would be alignment changes which would.

Change the conversation.

Some add this particular location.

My understanding is the.

The impacts haven't changed significantly if we keep the alignment on the existing bridge over New Brighton Rd.

So I think we're gonna be for the time being relatively in the same conversation as we were before, Rob, about this location from Coronado to the New Brighton driveway.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:20:36
OK.

So, so roughly A2 foot coast would shift.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:20:41
Yeah.

But I don't. I think the trail.

That the rail is well, so we're we're holding the alignment at the bridge for sure.

And then the alignment over Coronado, we can hit that existing crossing.

So I think the.

The shift is gone, but we still have.

We still have conflict because of the proximity.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:21:12
Mm hmm.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:21:13
Because of the new 12 foot offset request.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:21:16
Yep, Yep.
So this would definitely be one area where because of the nature of this structure.
The viaduct structure.
We want to explore how we can.
Either eliminate or or mitigate that that conflict.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:21:41
So this was an area that was identified in the VA VE 2.
Further review the viaduct structure to see if.
If I retained Phil was an option through here and that was pending some further geotechnical findings through this area.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:21:54
Mm hmm.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:22:01
In the backup option was to look at.
If the precast slab on pile is enough of a cost savings compared to the FRP decking through here.
Seems if we were on a viaduct.
We could look at what?
What are the impacts to shift over 2 feet?
It would be more feasible, but shifting over 2 feet and doing a retained fill, those walls are gonna be just growing exponentially.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:22:32
That was that was my thought as well.
Yeah, I I don't think we're gonna be able to do both of those things.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:22:37
So which of the two would take priority?

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:22:39
Especially you.
Have you have loading conditions too the the loading conditions?

Which obviously make it challenging irrespective.

I'm. I'm just thinking back again to like the the prior questions, Rob, I know I was like is there is there a way just to avoid the Esha somehow?

If we're already up on Park Ave. to Coronado, is that changed the the conversation at all?

Is there ways to?

I think outside the box through here that would avoid the Esha.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:23:15

I mean by, by staying up on the road for further.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:23:18

Mm hmm yeah.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:23:20

The problem is, there's not a. There's not a great place to reenter.

So you'd be staying up along McGregor all the way, probably until New Brighton.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:23:32

Yes, we were.

That's we were trying to work through before, right?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:23:50

She can't.

There's there's streams and other Esha in between the roadway and the the the rail line. This this whole stretch.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:23:57

Mm hmm.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:23:59

And and no right of way.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:24:03

Mm hmm.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:24:08

The priority through here, what is the priority?

Is it to ship?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:24:12
It it seems like it's. Yeah. Stay, stay as a viaduct and shift away from from Zippert.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:24:23
Yeah, I mean, I just the the amount of infrastructure that we're we're talking about within.
This would be 1 area where you wanna minimize the.
The impacts to future infrastructure.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:24:44
Yeah.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:24:46
If I mean here, here's a thought.
What if you somehow mean?
What if you did? You get over to.
Is there a show that you could avoid that you could maybe like in a conversation with State
Park?
Like you know, get in their property somehow and then head back over to the rail line. Like if
you went, if you went eastward somehow.
Is the actually just the the wetlands and the riparian in there?

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:25:20
I also worry about the.
Is that gonna trigger more than an EIR addendum?
Because we went through the whole 4F process for all of our impacts through this area.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:25:24
Right.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:25:32
Could be a timing.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:25:34
Do you guys have 4 app impacts since your trail?

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:25:35
Cost.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:25:38

No, we don't currently.

We got them to sign off on it.

I don't know if they would if we were trying to get from McGregor back to the rail line.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:25:48

Listener.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:25:48

I was actually talking.

Yeah, I was actually talking about going somehow from going from Coronado over to the parking lot and just up that way and then diving back.

Out when you don't impact the Yesha.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:26:02

2.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:26:03

On on the north side of the the driveway.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:26:13

Yeah, I don't know.

I I think I think we're getting outside of the we're switching gears considerably and I yeah.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:26:19

Sorry.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:26:21

So Riley, ISM.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:26:23

Yes.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:26:24

Yeah, I think I think.

Let's look at this effort alignment.

Hopefully it's still a 2 foot shift and we'll we'll just, you know, there'll be some some additional impacts, but I don't think from what I remember, we could do the VA adjustment and switch to retaining wall without triggering. Uh addendum.

So I'm assuming a 2 foot shift over probably would have similar additional impacts to a retaining wall, maybe less.

And so we could still accommodate that within uh our addendum.
So let's let's go with that direction.
Then rally will look for that exhibit whenever you guys have it.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:26:57
Yeah. I asked again.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:27:00
K.
Thank you.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:27:03
Our bridge structure is not well. I guess it depends on outside of fencing, but we're almost to the 25 foot from center line of track for a majority of it.
Through here, shifting the trail 2 feet towards the coast to make more space for the few Jersey Pert alignment.
It's just before this oak trail crossing.
This is kind of rotated.
Through here.
So this stretch there is some wetland that we're we were already previously impacting it, it just might increase a little bit of the mitigation impacts for ratios we can can do that.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:27:55
I saw I think I saw Phil's hand go up.
Phil, did you wanna jump in on something?

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:28:00
I just wanted to in that area, if the trail continues to get shifted towards that wetland, you know we.
Depending on how far the shift is, that could potentially be an area where you start looking at a viaduct as well. Since the grades are dropping off.
Further, you get from the center line of the track.
That's all right.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:28:26
Contour signature looks like another two feet, isn't.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:28:29
Oh.
Maybe not so much there. Yeah.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:28:32
And then I think it goes back up again.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:28:35
Yeah, it does go back up.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:28:35
I think I think there's a little valley between the the rail line and then the road.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:28:37
Oh.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:28:38
Yeah, you could kinda see the. You could see the contour signature here.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:28:41
OK.
So you would literally be pushing that into that flow line then basically.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:28:46
2nd.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:28:46
OK.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:28:47
Correct.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:28:49
I have anything else to add there?

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:28:58
The VA direction was to maintain a viaduct at Oak Trail.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:29:09
Yeah, my question here was just looks like there's increased impacts.
I'm. I'm guessing that's just because the peers are bigger and so there's a greater diameter.
OK.
Alright, so it's it's minimal.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:29:18
Yeah, it was in relation to switching from the FRP to the precast lab on pile, we're anticipating.
Larger or deeper, once we get into the study, heavier structure.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:29:35
Play.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:29:36
But not not significant.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:29:36
I think I think, yeah, I think related to to all of the vav thing just so everyone is aware we're gonna, you know, we're gonna reassess as the design team goes into final schematic. They're gonna reassess the feasibility of these VAVE suggestions and as well as the the potential cost savings and trying to take into account any additional right of way or or mitigation costs that that would that would be increased as part of this.
And if we have time at the end, I I would love to get an update from from grace. From you on the segment 5 mitigation, because I, I've, I've heard from Conservancy that those costs keep going up.
And so I just wanna be mindful that as we're talking about this value engineering process that we don't save costs on to construction only to gain them back during mitigation because it's so hard to do this work.
So hopefully there's time at the end to have that discussion.

GB **Grace Blakeslee** 1:30:34
Sounds good.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:30:36
We've had some really good feedback and dialogue as well with MME and with the county and bringing, making sure in this final schematic phase we're reviewing the direction provided from this meeting that we are consulting and engaging the cost estimator so we don't get too far into a.
Design process on something that.
Ends up costing more.
Buffers.
OK.
Continuing along, we have locations that have been identified to look at lowering the trail to eliminate the surcharge wall.

Potentially having just an upper wall that's a soil nail wall which would need to be reviewed. We would.

This would require the additional geotechnical criteria for design, because that's a new wall type that we don't have parameters for currently.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:31:45

Does MME know right now we have about 25 feet from where the wall would be to the edge of the right of way.

Is that is that enough space for soil nails or we wouldn't need right of way?

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:32:00

It does vary depending on the height of the wall. 25 feet sounds like a pretty good amount of space. So because soil nails don't have the same length as tiebacks.

It's it's pretty likely that a 25 foot long or 25 foot space is is gonna be adequate without any right of way or encroachments onto their properties.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:32:31

OK, I think my my preference in here would be as you're working through any iterations that we we try to avoid.

Any right of way needs here.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:32:47

Kayla this wall does get pretty high in some a couple places, doesn't it?

I can't.

I'd have to go to the wall profiles, but it it's not insignificant, retaining wall so.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:33:02

It was a two tiered but once if we are implementing the recommendation to lower the trail and make it just a soil nail on one side, yes it is gonna get significantly taller.

So this is an example.

When we start to look at how we implement the different pieces of these comments that there's gonna be some priority and hierarchy of what piece we do first, so.

At first level, we would see well, how tall is a wall here and if we were to do a proceed with a soil net wall, try to first step determine what is that footprint that's needed.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:33:37

Uh huh.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:33:38

Phil, like, do the first the first level passive. OK, this is now. And we see. Oh, it's gonna be 30

feet, 35 feet then come back to the team and share what we found before. We continue moving on.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:33:39

I think so, yeah.

Yeah, I think what Rob was saying too is, is that, that's gonna be one of the long lead time items in the the schedule.

So yeah, getting it advising on that is gonna be our first priority, I think.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:34:19

The priority would still be to avoid right away needs.

Yeah.

Do you need the geotechnical criteria to be able to determine?

The soil nail.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:34:35

Certain, yeah, certainly. All all of the soil nail wall is, you know, suitable given that it the the conditions are are the correct conditions.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 1:34:38

Yeah.

Beginning.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:34:45

There's certain applications where.

Cylinder walls are not favorable.

Additional geotechnical you know, investigations will be needed in in those areas.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 1:35:00

OK.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:35:03

OK.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 1:35:04

Yeah, there's there's design criteria that's unique. And then also is the soil just suitable for soil nail? So those are the two things we'd have to look at as part of this next phase of work with the geotech.

Nical.

KS

Kayla Szubielski 1:35:25

Thank you.

I see a note here about the zipper alignments are shifting north in this area and you made a remark that is it worth looking at roaring camp, locating the track to the north or inland to help reduce costs?

RT

Robert Tidmore 1:35:41

Yeah.

I'll call this my Riley idea outside the box, thinking, I just looking at the topographic signature, it looks like we could.

There's some space to shift the trail without our track without.

Needing any major improvements.

And hard to tell trees.

But it doesn't look like any any trees super close.

I mean, we'd be talking a three or four foot shift, but based on the steepness of those walls or or the those slopes, that could be a you know, a pretty decent reduction in mall height.

I guess this would be a question for grace is do you think?

I mean, they're already offering and proposing to do quite a bit on their dime, and I don't know what's feasible to keep asking for, but.

That was one thought I had.

If you think it's, it's possible.

GB

Grace Blakeslee 1:36:30

Give an idea about how many feet.

Not exact, but just order magnitude.

I think they'd be amenable to it.

Have to I think they probably would have the question, you know, let's go out there and look at it, of course.

But I I don't think it's.

I think it's an option.

RT

Robert Tidmore 1:36:52

That would help with that whole soil nail not needing right away feasibility thing too.

KS

Kayla Szubielski 1:37:20

I should get a new keyboard my my shift key sticks.

This was a schematic design comment that I think is worth discussing since it's related to our alignment.

Comment coming through here.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 1:37:41

What Rd.

What Rd. is that there?

KS Kayla Szubielski 1:37:44

This is New Brighton, yeah.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 1:37:44

New Brighton Dr. Rd. OK yeah.

KS Kayla Szubielski 1:37:47

And so up up to the north, I took a clip of the last iteration of the zephr alignment we've received.

And so I just wanted to check what the direction would be.

Are we gonna stay where we are?

This comment was asking if we could push.

Closer to the coastal right away where possible.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 1:38:05

We're up now.

We're we're we're up.

Oh, should you go closer?

Well, we're gonna have a station in here is, you know what the original design there is that question of whether or not we're gonna push it up to McGregor.

But that's a.

Unresolved at the moment, but for a station to be through here then.

I think you'd wanna stay.

Where you're at.

KS Kayla Szubielski 1:38:39

The direction is we can keep the trail trail alignment at its current location across New Brighton Rd.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 1:38:40

We'll give.

Yep, Yep.

KS Kayla Szubielski 1:39:11

Been along the.

Working again at viaducts globally, whether we can change those from FRP over to the precast slab on pile.

During the schematic phase.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:39:29

Kayla, I was gonna take a minute to just put this out there again. Is there a preference of the material or is it purely cost driven?

Which?

System is the best suited.

Is it you know the the FRP has advantages over the precast?

And you know the the the if it's a cost based and the VA report is right then the.

Precast has a a cost advantage over the FRP, but is there from the agency's perspective, a preference one way or the other?

You know, if they the costs were the same.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:40:18

What we talked about in our 1213 stage gate meeting for 8-9 was that the FRP offers the ability to maintain and remove segmented panels and maintain the slope underneath.

And that the obviously the precast would would reduce that ability or eliminate that that ability and that the RTC team had not fully.

Digested. I guess the the maintenance implications of that switch so.

Right now our current direction is to proceed with the precast because it's cheaper.

And you know, potentially stronger should a tree or something else fall on it.

But that we don't we we haven't gotten RTC confirmation on.

How that impacts maintenance, I think the the bigger issue for maintenance was on segment 9 where there was no right of way adjacent to it.

So you would have to get maintenance easements to maintain that slope. We don't really have that issue on segment 11 as much because there's State Park property.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:41:14

Yeah.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:41:23

But I don't know if RTC you have. You have additional thoughts or direction on that at this point because right now we're proceeding with precast.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:41:30

No new direction, but you're you're correct, Rob that.

With access on the on the right of way to be able to walk down and go underneath your the

structure.

You know, it's less of an issue than you have it for. Segment 7 for sure or segment 9.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:41:53

I'm hearing that that you're expressing probably a preference for the precast system based on. Primarily, the cost of it.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:42:03

Yes.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:42:04

And that OK.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:42:05

That's it's primarily posture and.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:42:08

OK.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 1:42:08

OK, right.

And I think I know we harp on this over and over throughout that process, but we're not convinced the cost savings are going to be as high as as they were projected just because of the foundation.

Required to support it so you know we're going to study that further obviously and that's why we're asking the question. You know, if we if we do show that the cost come out the same or or higher for the precast due to the weight due to the found.

And other parts of the substructure.

That there is the option to go back for the others if it ends up being more costly.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:42:48

Yeah, I I would say just like with that, that wall conversation.

As you guys, as the design team makes these discoveries, just let let me know and I will you know make sure we get give you guys.

Direction on these decisions so that you're not waiting until the final schematic package to get, you know, to get this feedback from us.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 1:43:10

Right. OK.

No, that's good.

OK. 'cause, that's just that's I mean it does fit into all of it.

The walls and all the other things that we go through because we know the soil is really bad in some areas and that does limit the system that you can use.

RT Robert Tidmore 1:43:16

Yeah.

DM Dale Hendsbee | MME 1:43:25

And so that's we're gonna discover that in places. We just need to figure out where we can and can't use the VA suggestions as we go through those or at least in our opinion that we can't.

We don't.

We don't recommend them. So. OK, good. Thank you.

I appreciate you guys clearing that up.

KS Kayla Szubielski 1:43:52

That there's no longer a formal crossing at the previous.

And New Brighton rail crossing here. This is not one of the ones that we're pursuing with the CPUC.

RT Robert Tidmore 1:44:06

That'll be between RTC and state parks.

KS Kayla Szubielski 1:44:09

So the trail would just continue along and we won't show any kind of new concrete track panels or ramping through here.

Correct.

RT Robert Tidmore 1:44:23

Well, we were.

We needed to make it so that a fire truck can access across the tracks here, and because this is an existing private crossing that does not have public access, I believe the the e-mail conversations we were we had going back and forth were that the we can just.

The RTC can just update an agreement with state parks for them to use this crossing and keep it a private crossing.

Are you?

KS Kayla Szubielski 1:44:52

Maybe I wasn't.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:44:52
Are you?

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:44:52
Maybe I wasn't aware it was a private crossing.
I didn't find a private.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:44:56
Yeah, it's a private.
It's a private crossing, so private crossing is when it's not at a public right of way, like a public St. and it's only used for, you know, a specific specified individuals and not available for general public to cross so.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:44:59
OK.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:45:16
Typically you would have like gates, and that's my understanding, right, Rob, is that the, you know, the access would be restricted to State Park personnel and maintenance and emergency vehicles and would be probably gated otherwise.
People wouldn't be able to drive across it.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:45:31
I don't know that we'd have a gate there.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:45:31
Something to that effect.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:45:33
There's a gate at New Brighton Road to access the existing fire Rd.
So a a vehicle could not get to the tracks currently and and in the future.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:45:46
Yeah, so provided the the general public is is not, you know, allowed or permitted to to access a private crossing and it's a private crossing.
And Gates are sometimes, like, not, not arms, like crossing gates, right?
I'm just talking about like, a a swing gate or something or or even some other things.
A chains. It could be employed for keeping the general public off.

Sometimes that's needed, but in a general sense.
Private crossing doesn't need to be designed for public grade crossing.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:46:19
Right.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:46:24
I guess I just never found the private crossing number in my previous research. So OK, thank you.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:46:27
Yeah, sorry I can send that to you.
Yep.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:46:33
After that location, looking at.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:46:33
Yeah. Quick, quick, quick.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:46:36
Says soldier Pilewall with MSE.
It's one or the other.
A replace soldier by wall. Sorry. With MSE, wall through the stretch.
We can study that.
Similar remarks, we need geotechnical parameters to be able to study MSE walls. We also need to look at this in the proximity to the rail line and it be whether or not it's gonna fall within the zone that would be subject to a railroad surcharge.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:47:14
It would also be helpful for.
The agencies to give us direction on, you know which one of the many varieties of MSC Walls they're envisioning here.
Because basically all of them are proprietary so.
You know, it'd nice to have a an idea of which wall system you want to go with.
Run.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:47:45
Yeah, I don't have.
I do not have familiarity with those.

I guess this would need to come from RTC since you would eventually own these improvements.

Do you have thoughts on that or is that a that can be a follow up action item for RTC to provide?

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:48:02

We have no thoughts at this point.

We don't know the the the details on it, so we would need to work through that with the design team.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:48:13

As a starting point, do you have any?

But MSE Wall systems are you using on segment 12 for example?

Is that, would that be a starting point?

You want our team to look at.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:48:27

We would need to.

Let's just meet 'cause I I don't.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:48:29

OK.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:48:29

I don't even know where those ones at. I haven't been involved in the segment 12 design so.

MS **Mike Sherrod** 1:48:35

I think the.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 1:48:35

Yeah.

MS **Mike Sherrod** 1:48:36

Place to start. I think the place to start, Phil.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:48:36

Got me flat footed.

MS **Mike Sherrod** 1:48:39

So there was no product types selected, it was just through the value analysis. A generic MSA

wall would be more cost effective.

I believe it's up to our group to figure out what what makes the most sense.

A starting point for a conversation would go back to the VA team, which was Mark Thomas when they did their cost calculations. What system were they envisioning?

That seems to me the easiest thing to do.

We start there.

DM Dale Hendsbee | MME 1:49:06

Right. I mean.

MS Mike Sherrod 1:49:07

Based on something so they may have that well, we're using this type.

DM Dale Hendsbee | MME 1:49:12

And a lot of it has to do with aesthetics, right?

It's the facing of the wall that's, you know is unique and proprietary because the anchorage and the facing go together and the anchorage systems to go with them.

So it's, you know, in the course the facings can be.

Quite a variety and they all have the cost implication as well.

So in some of these you probably would never see.

So it that that's kind of what we're asking or just there are a lot of different versions out there.

So we just something as a benchmark that's.

If they're using it on segment 12 or whatever that we could have some consistency, which would probably make sense.

I mean to me anyway, through the trail system. But yeah, that would help us to have a baseline to start with.

RG Riley Gerbrandt 1:49:55

Understand Mike and and Dale.

Maybe Phil, too. Could you draft up?

A.

One or two paragraph e-mail that I could send over to to Mark Thomas.

That would encapsulate the question that you have at hand as a starting place.

And we can then get their way in. I mean, I could ask the question, but I might miss something that you're keen on, so.

DM Dale Hendsbee | MME 1:50:16

Yeah. Yes, yeah, absolutely, yeah.

Right now, understood.

Yeah. No, that's fine.
We can do that, yeah.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:50:25
OK.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:50:27
We got 7 minutes left. Keep going through the alignment, rob, OK.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:50:30
Yes, yes, I think I'm trying to look through if there's any critical pieces they could ignore that.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:50:34
This was.
Ignore it.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:50:38
Yep.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:50:38
So are we keeping the trail where it is?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:50:42
Separate separate's moving inland so that conflict doesn't exist anymore.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:50:45
K.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:50:49
Come back to that guardrail question.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:50:55
Similar remarks on viaducts.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:50:56
Umm.
Yeah, states drive.
There was request to move US S but Zephrit is clear of our of our trail here so.
I think that's that's an updated comment from schematic design.
So we can we can move on past that.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:51:14
Gonna look at this Virginia item at the states.
Reduce overall length of the viaduct.
Use a soldier pile or MSE fill wall on the approaches.
I miss you.
All similar remarks would have to look at.
Surcharge from the rail.
We're looking at the different wall types through here if we can.
How much of that we could reduce from a viaduct if usable?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:51:46
Right. And there's there's right of way impacts here as well?

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:52:01
We have a portion from the VA we suggesting to look at an MSC wall pending with the drainage solution would be.
For along with adjacent residence.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:52:12
Play.
I just wanna. Yeah, I just wanna add that when you have utilities behind the MSE walls, it does pose a problem.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:52:14
Yep.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:52:22
So that's one of the things that MSE walls, you know, you try to avoid.
So even if we switch to MSE wall for a portion of that, you may not be able to fully depending on on that culvert behind it. You may have to have something different in that one little area.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:52:44
OK.
I.
I I think my understanding is we do need to accommodate drainage underneath the trail in this area 'cause we would be building the trail on top of an existing pipe so that should be taken into account in the in the design and if it's not feasible to use.
An MSE wall there then. Then we can't.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:53:04
K like yeah, I should.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:53:04
Unless the county wants to to to redirect drainage in the area.
Be nice.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:53:12
Kayla, you should say can't as opposed to can.
It just needs the soil reinforcement that is buried in the soil behind the wall just interferes with utility sometimes, so you know you have to consider that interaction when you're selecting the wall.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:53:37
OK.
So the priority is the drainage and then the wall type will be.
Secondary, is there any updates that the counter needs to provide us in relation to this property at this time?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:53:50
Started negotiations.
Well, not negotiations.
I started discussions with the property owner. She's potentially open to it, but she she wanted to get an appraisal and we're a long way away from that.
That's one of those ones where I'm hoping we can start.
We can do an early appraisal after our final schematic design because that I think that's gonna be one of our more tricky acquisitions. At least she's supportive of the project.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:54:15
Yeah.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:54:17
I'm just.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:54:17
For those that don't know, it's a newer property owner.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:54:20
Yes.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:54:23
Are there any encroachments that they have with us or on our TC property?
Rob, so you're aware.
I think there's as as it affects drainage through this area.
I think there's some one point. There was county pipes from the north that went through the property to the north and then discharged in there, so.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:54:43
Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.
I'm I'm familiar.
Yeah, there's pipes underneath underneath her property.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:54:49
The one on the north.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:54:51
On the South.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:54:53
Yeah, I'm talking about the one in the north.
There was some Rd. drainage or something like that that came up South and then just charges.
At like Station 116 somewhere around there.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:55:05
That's true, yes, from the adjacent private property, correct.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:55:07
And then go then goes underneath the the tracks. If there was, you know, drainage improvements needed there. There might be a way to.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:55:10
Right.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:55:17
Look at minimizing the that flow, that that could potentially help the the trail.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:55:26

Right. There's also. Yeah. There's also a storm drain line that connects in from the South too. So we wouldn't be able to fully eliminate it.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:55:32
Got it. OK.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:55:33
Yep.
All right, so 2 minutes left. I think all those comments along improving the connections at Marvista.
I think we get those are pretty minor.
We can adjust that. I think the big question in here is where where is eppert landed Riley? If you could give us an update.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:55:48
Yeah, I can I have.
I can, yeah.
So we did two analysis, which is is why we have a had a little bit delay in getting these final information to you.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:55:51
Awesome.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:56:00
I was expecting the exhibits already, so I apologize for that, but.
We we can avoid the impacts to the trail through here.
From marvista.
To State, Park and even even beyond State Park.
What we can do is shift the the track alignment to the to the coast so we can leave the trail as it is from marvista to the State Park.
And then it makes a little bit of a challenge at this that the Marvista crossing for for Zephyr, because then you have to come back in and there'll be some things that we need to resolve, but we'll just resolve those in the future.
If separate goes forward, goes forward.
We did also look at the option of. Yeah, we also did look at the option of could the trail go on the coastal side?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:56:55
Great news.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:57:01
Should it desire to do so?
And that could also work as well.
And then we could.
Then we could bring the trail over at State Park.
I have a feeling that's not desired.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:57:13
Correct.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:57:14
We did look at that as well.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:57:15
I think we'll keep it as is. Thank you. That's awesome.
Alright. Well, we're at 11.
I know there's a there's a zipper thing or AVAVE thing.
Here, we'll we'll look at that in final design.
Thank you everybody.
That was a lot.
I think that was a a great discussion.
I appreciate everybody's input.
And we'll share this recording and RM will put together meeting minutes, which we'll share out probably after the holidays.

MM **Matt Machado** 1:57:49
Awesome. Thank you all. Great discussion.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:57:50
Thank you.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 1:57:51
Alright, thank you.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:57:51
Yeah. Thank.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:57:52

Thank you all and and Rob, as soon as I get any additional information, I'm gonna touch base with you.

MM **Matt Machado** 1:57:53
Merry Christmas.

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 1:57:56
He said, oh, look, I'm not fasting here.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:57:58
OK, sounds good.
Yeah, happy.

RG **Riley Gerbrandt** 1:57:59
Yeah.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:57:59
Happy holidays everybody.

PD **Phil Doody (MME)** 1:58:01
Yeah. Happy holidays.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:58:01
Do you have a?

DM **Dale Hendsbee | MME** 1:58:02
Mom, this you too?

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:58:04
Do you have a meeting after this?

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:58:05
Yeah, no.
Can talk.

MS **Morgane Staaake** 1:58:09
You want me to stay on Kayla?

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:58:09
Vivi.

RT **Robert Tidmore** 1:58:11
Thanks, Riley.

KS **Kayla Szubielski** 1:58:11
Sure, you can pause the OR end the recording maybe.

MS **Mike Sherrod** 1:58:20
Hmm.

☐ **Robert Tidmore** stopped transcription