

Gautho, Julia

From: Gary Sultana <g5948sultana@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 12:15 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Coastal Rail Trail Options

Keep the trail on the rail corridor. SAFTEY FIRST. Ahead of private special interests.

Gary Sultana

Gautho, Julia

From: joshatar@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 11:57 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Coastal Rail Trail Options

Just writing to express my opinion that the trail on the rail corridor should remain there as planned and not move to a dangerous detour on Park Avenue.

thank you!

josh

Gautho, Julia

From: shahe moutafian <shahemoutafian@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 11:47 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Coastal Rail Trail

Dear council members,

I believe you have a responsibility to not allow diverting coastal trail travel by bicycle or foot onto unsafe Capitola village streets. The congestion which exists already will be magnified and increase the likelihood of accidents.

Although I think that it may be possible to provide a trail on the south side of Park Avenue, it is not an ideal route given the speeds at which cars travel on the roadway. There has been a history of non-enforcement of speed and noise infractions on this stretch of Park Avenue.

I am a proponent of converting the rail corridor to a safe trail for bikes and pedestrians. I believe with cost overruns, environmental and safety concerns, the idea of a rail and trail in the existing corridor is an unrealistic endeavor.

Yours sincerely,

Shahe Moutafian, resident at 420 McCormick Ave, Capitola, CA 95010

Gautho, Julia

From: Tati <sugarkanebr@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 11:39 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Rail trail

To whom it may concern,

I ride my bike through Capitola on a regular basis (commuting, riding for fun, as well as dining/shopping in Capitola Village). A Rail Trail detour on Park Avenue would be very dangerous to myself and many others.

Please keep the Rail Trail on the rail corridor as proposed.

Thanks,

Tatiana Lima
Sent from my iPad

Gautho, Julia

From: jeremy@orvik.com on behalf of jeremy <jeremy@orvik.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 11:17 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Coastal Rail Trail Options

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To whom it may concern/RTC-

In a suprise to absolutely no one, we cannot build both a train and a trail upon the railroad tracks through Capitola and the Boardwalk areas- additionally, the costs for this train continue to exorbitantly spiral out of control. A train requiring elevated tracks through the Boardwalk and Watsonville areas is bad enough- but now you want divert the "trail" onto city streets AND attempt to pass a sales tax to support it?

A new sales tax?
In Santa Cruz?
With our rents, and PG&E bills that cost more than my car payment?

You have known for YEARS this would be the outcome and have either lied to your public or at best done a monumentally poor job of communicating this project's cost/ limitations.
The voters voted for a TRAIL. We never agreed to this.

Do your jobs. Be honest with the public, including the very distinct possibility that we can not- and never could! Actually build this train.

The Greenway organization has seen this coming for years without your delays and millions of dollars in "studies".

Why didn't our transportation committee?

Tell the truth.
Serve your public.
Be transparent.
Or resign.

Most sincerely,
Dr. Jeremy Orvik
Emergency Physician
And sick of this.
Build the trail- so that my daughter can ride a goddamned bike safely in the neighborhood she was born in.

Sent from my iPhone

Gautho, Julia

From: Jean Mahoney <jmahoney2028@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 11:15 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Coastal Rail Trail Options

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

The trail needs to be on the rail corridor, not on Park Avenue

Jean Mahoney

Gautho, Julia

From: Bill Gray <graybil@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 11:12 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Coastal Rail Trail Options

As a capitola resident, I am outraged that you would consider detouring trail traffic into the town. Voters were clear that bike traffic should not be detoured, rather it should continue to be routed over the trestle. Stop this continued nonsense and follow the direction of the voters. Now.

Bill Gray
1440 Prospect Ave
Capitola
509/9919292

Gautho, Julia

From: Peter Cook <peter@lighthouse Realty.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 10:43 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Coastal Rail Trail Options

Dear Capitola City Council,

It would be a huge mistake to put your section of trail through The Village and along Park Avenue. I live on the Westside where our trail is car free; it's awesome!!! It is heavily used by cyclists as a transportation route including many children going to and from school. You definitely want a similar dedicated car free path in Capitola like we have on the Westside. My son uses the Westside path to and from school every day. I am very thankful that the Westside has this path.

Having bikes go through Capitola Village or on Park Avenue instead of on the rail corridor would be a huge mistake for several reasons. It would be less safe for cyclists and drivers. It would be unsafe for pedestrians in the Village. It would exacerbate traffic conditions in the village. It would direct more e-bikes through the village.

Having a path on the Capitola trestle would be a huge asset for the communities on both sides of the crossing. Residents in the Cliff Wood Heights neighborhood (and all resident further south) would have a great car free route to 41st, Pleasure Point and beyond.

As a Westside resident I would be much more likely to bike the path to south county if it was located on the trestle and along the rail corridor. If you put this path on city streets and through the crowded village my family will be much less inclined to use the path.

Having a cross-county path that is car free will be an incredible asset for our entire county.
Please don't mess this up for everyone!!!!

Thank you.



Lighthouse

REALTY
and Property Management

Peter J. Cook Broker, Realtor®
wk: 831.425.7355 cell: 831.247.7211
peter@lighthouserealty.net
www.lighthouserealty.net CA BRE 01223810



Gautho, Julia

From: Steve Duke <sduke575@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 10:49 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Coastal Rail Trail Options

Hello City Council,

I am a Capitola homeowner and voter and I **do not** support putting the rail trail bike portion onto Park Ave. Please do not approve this. It is unsafe and not what we supported on Measure L.

Thank you,

Steve Duke

916 Sir Francis Ave.

Capitola CA 95010

Gautho, Julia

From: kelly pelot <kpelot4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 10:33 AM
To: City Council
Subject: I oppose the rail trail diversion

Dear City Council,

I oppose the plan to divert the bike path on to surface streets like Park ave. It's already too busy and has been under intense, continual construction for many many months. (not to mention the whole area on Soquel Ave and Park due to numerous housing projects) .The plan for the interim trail which rail banks or lays the path over the tracks is more economical and safer.

Thank you for your time,

Kelly Pelot

Soquel resident who lives off Park Ave.

Gautho, Julia

From: Gayle Ortiz <gayle@gocapitola.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 10:30 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Agenda item 9C

Dear Council,

I ask that you postpone this agenda item until after the RTC fiscal report comes out in late March.

From what I've heard, the findings in the report will make it virtually impossible for the rail/trail to be built. Why not wait to make such important decisions until we know?

Thank you,
Gayle Ortiz

Gautho, Julia

From: david allen <dav_allen@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 10:25 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Please keep the Rail Trail

Hi,

I ride my bike through Capitola on a regular basis (commuting, riding for fun, as well as dining/shopping in Capitola Village). A Rail Trail detour on Park Avenue would be very dangerous to myself and many others.

Please keep the Rail Trail as proposed on the rail corridor.

Thanks,
David Allen

Gautho, Julia

From: GARY CARR <scuffers@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 9:53 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Please go for the interim trail

To the City Council,

Please make the interim trail happen! I am an Aptos resident and I am completely in favor of implementing the interim trail. I have been following this debate for years and I realize that "perfect is the enemy of good". Our communities need to get this trail in place. I am afraid that if we do not take action on the Interim Trail that the powers insisting on the gold plated version with imaginary trains will have effectively stopped all progress.

I am a walker and biker and am looking forward to the day my wife and I can jump on the trail across the street and ride our bikes to Capitola to have some great fish and chips at Britannia Arms - without ever having to get in my car. My wife can get hand made jewelry at Lumen Gallery as well. The positive benefit for residents and businesses seem obvious, and the delays help no one.

Thank you for your consideration,
Gary Carr
Aptos

Gautho, Julia

From: Rachel Adney <rachel.l.adney@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 9:45 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Please vote for the interim trail option

It is my opinion that the Capitola City Council should reject the RTC's plan to reroute the trail onto surface streets. Instead, the RTC must advance the INTERIM Trail Option, which has been proposed as an alternative in the Environmental Impact Report. The INTERIM Trail Option will build the trail on the existing railbed, can be constructed at a fraction of the cost, is more environmentally friendly as it avoids clear-cutting trees, does not require eminent domain of private property, does not redirect the trail onto surface streets, converts the Capitola Trestle into a Trail, aligns with Measure L requirements, can be built without causing traffic disruptions and RTC has enough funding to complete the INTERIM Trail Option Segments 9-12.

Thank you,
Rachel Adney

Gautho, Julia

From: Jack Brown <jack.b.brown@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 9:30 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Upholding Measure L – Keep the Bike Trail on the Rail Corridor

Jack Brown - Executive Director, Coastal Trail Conservancy of Santa Cruz County
PO Box 1666
Aptos, CA 95003
jack.b.brown@gmail.com coastaltrail.org

February 11, 2025

Capitola City Council
Capitola City Hall
420 Capitola Ave
Capitola, CA 95010

Subject: Upholding Measure L – Keep the Bike Trail on the Rail Corridor

Dear Mayor Clarke and Capitola City Council Members,

I am writing to express my organization's strong opposition to the RTC's plan to divert the Coastal Rail Trail onto Capitola city streets and to urge you to uphold the will of the voters by ensuring the trail remains on the rail corridor, as affirmed by Measure L.

The residents of Capitola have already made their voices clear through Measure L, which explicitly supports keeping the trail on the rail corridor and protecting the integrity of our community's transportation future. Any attempt to divert the trail onto our city streets disregards this democratic decision and poses significant safety, environmental, and economic concerns.

Safety Concerns

Diverting the trail onto city streets will increase conflicts between cyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles, particularly in high-traffic areas such as Capitola Village. A dedicated trail along the rail corridor ensures a safe, protected route for cyclists and pedestrians, reducing the risk of accidents and injuries.

Environmental and Community Impact

The rail corridor provides a unique, scenic, and uninterrupted greenway that supports sustainable transportation and recreational use. Moving the trail onto city streets would diminish the environmental benefits and discourage use by families, children, and seniors who seek a safe and peaceful path. Additionally, increased bike and pedestrian traffic on city streets may lead to congestion and disrupt local businesses.

Extremely High Cost of Construction

The proposed diversion of the trail onto city streets would require the construction of a 1,500-foot retaining wall at an exorbitant cost. This unnecessary expenditure diverts crucial funds away from other pressing community needs while imposing a financial burden on taxpayers. Keeping the trail on the rail corridor is not only the safer and more logical choice but also the most fiscally responsible decision. Based on prior poor estimation by the RTC, please take whatever financial number they provide and triple it, then double that number to account for the financing costs that will be borne from the expenditure.

Respecting Voter Intent

Measure L was passed by Capitola voters with a clear directive to keep the trail on the rail corridor. Ignoring this mandate undermines public trust in local government and sets a troubling precedent. The City Council has a duty to respect and uphold the decisions made by its constituents.

I urge you to reject any proposal that diverts the trail onto Capitola streets and to advocate for a solution that aligns with Measure L. Please stand with the residents who voted to preserve the trail's rightful place on the rail corridor. Your leadership in protecting this vision will be remembered as a commitment to safety, sustainability, and democratic integrity.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your decision that reflects the best interests of Capitola's residents, the community of Santa Cruz County and future generations.

Sincerely,

Jack Brown

Executive Director - Coastal Trail Conservancy of Santa Cruz County

Gautho, Julia

From: Tim Brattan <timbrattan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 9:25 AM
To: City Council
Cc: Pedersen, Alexander; felipe.hernandez@santacruzcountyca.gov; info@sccrtc.org; kimberly.deserpa@santacruzcountyca.gov; Manu Koenig; manu.koenig@santacruzcountyca.gov; fkeeley@santacruzca.gov; monica.martinez@santacruzcountyca.gov; eduardo.montesino@watsonville.gov; caldridge@scmetro.org; Michael Rotkin; Kimberly.DeSerpa@santacruzcountyca.gov; Fifth.District@santacruzcountyca.gov; Sarah Christensen
Subject: Build the Interim Trail Option

Dear Capitola City Council members,

I lived for many years in Pleasure Point and was a frequent Capitola visitor. I still frequent Capitola, both as a visitor from Santa Cruz and bike commuter forced to descend into the village, navigate through pedestrians and cars to then climb back out on Monterey and Park Ave next to fast moving vehicles.

What a shame the unused rail corridor and Capitola Trestle - by far the safest and most efficient way to walk/ride through town won't be accessible to me and thousands of others because the RTC plans to divert us all onto unsafe streets. Most will continue to choose driving over riding because of this lack of safety.

The question for your Council is if the RTC's plan is smart policy and allowable for use of the CTC grant money? The active transportation (ATP) funding application submitted to, and approved by CTC stated that:

“This project uses best practices to completely separate bicyclists and pedestrians from motor vehicle traffic constructing a 12-foot wide multiuse path in the rail right of way.”

The project is described to be 4.15 miles which is the whole length (sections 10 & 11) less the Capitola Trestle.

It looks like the RTC may have made a typo here because a “path” is required to have shoulders (2 feet each side). A 12-foot path creates a 16-foot wide trail - which is the width of the preferred “Interim Trail” that keeps the trail entirely within the corridor. Could CTC believe we're building the Interim Trail?

The fact is that a train and trail don't fit. You can't have both. What could you get and what's it going to cost? Can you pay for it? Is what the RTC is proposing a **Class 1 trail** that separates bikes, pedestrians and persons with a disability from cars? **Is a Class 1 trail possible on 48th Ave, through the Village, or on Park Ave?**

There is no evidence that a passenger train will ever run on the tracks. Not a single study has found a an in-county passenger train to be feasible, cost-effective or have enough ridership to impact existing traffic, and the upcoming ZEPRT study is even less likely to do so.

Your Council should reject the RTC's plan to reroute the trail onto surface streets, which would result in the Coastal Trail never existing within Capitola City limits, and move forward with the Interim Trail Option, which has been proposed as an alternative in the Environmental Impact Report for the Santa Cruz Coastal Trail.

The Interim Trail Option will construct the trail on the existing railbed at a fraction of the cost, is environmentally friendly as it avoids clear-cutting trees, allows for future transit options on the corridor, does not require eminent domain of private property, does not redirect the trail onto surface streets, converts the Capitola Trestle into a Trail, can be built without causing traffic disruptions, AND RTC has enough funding to complete Segments 9-12.

Sincerely,

Tim Brattan

Gautho, Julia

From: Pacific Door <pacific.door@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 8:38 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Coastal Trail

City Council Members:

Please reject the RTC's plan to reroute the coastal trail onto surface streets.

Instead, the RTC should advance the Interim Trail Option, which has been proposed as an alternative in the Environmental Impact Report. The Interim Trail Option will build the trail on the existing railbed, can be constructed at a fraction of the cost, is environmentally friendly, avoids cutting so many trees, does not require eminent domain of private property, does not redirect the trail onto surface streets, converts the Capitola Trestle into a Trail, aligns with Measure L requirements, can be built without causing traffic disruptions and RTC has enough funding to complete the INTERIM Trail Option Segments 9-12.

Please do not let the RTC stop the construction of the Santa Cruz Coastal Trail through Capitola and please vote no to their proposed request to divert the Coastal Trail around Capitola City limits.

Please support the Interim trail option.

Thank you,
P.Purpuri
Soquel, CA

Gautho, Julia

From: Will Mayall <will@mayall.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 7:19 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Rail corridor is best way into the Village

Capitola City Council,

We raised our family in Cliffwood Heights and regularly walked into the Village. The unused rail corridor is by far the safest and most comfortable way to walk into town.

It makes no sense to consider an alternative when there is no evidence that a passenger train will ever run on the tracks. Not a single study has found a passenger train to be cost-effective, and the upcoming study is even less likely to do so.

This is a strange time to consider such a complex and expensive issue, especially when the upcoming \$9 million study will almost certainly confirm that our small county cannot afford a zero-emissions passenger train.

It is mind-bogglingly obvious that the rail corridor should be railbanked, which would legally protect it for future trains while allowing immediate use as a trail.

Yours,
Will Mayall

Gautho, Julia

From: Matteus Olmedo <matteusolmedo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 6:37 AM
To: City Council
Subject: Park Avenue trail amendment

I am aware that the council is voting this Thursday regarding a design amendment that would allow the coastal trail to run along Park Ave. I beg the council to vote down this amendment and instead focus on a pedestrian/ bike only coastal trail that protects its users by keeping the trail far away from busy and dangerous streets. A pedestrian/bike trail can be built on the existing railbed, can be constructed at a fraction of the cost, is more environmentally friendly as it avoids clear-cutting trees, does not require eminent domain of private property, and does not redirect the trail onto surface streets. Thank you for your consideration.

Gautho, Julia

From: Brian Peoples <brian@trailnow.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 5:58 AM
To: City Council
Cc: Pedersen, Alexander; felipe.hernandez@santacruzcountycalifornia.gov; info@sccrtc.org; Kimberly De Serpa; Manu Koenig; fkeeley@santacruzcalifornia.gov; sclark@scottsvally.gov; Monica Martinez; eduardo.montesino@watsonville.gov; Corey Aldridge; Brian Peoples
Subject: Reject RTC Proposal to divert Coastal Trail around Capitola

Capitola City Council,

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has proposed to divert the Coastal Trail around Capitola because both the ULTIMATE Trail Option and train cannot co-exist along the corridor, legal challenges by adjacent private-property owners will delay trail for years, California Coastal Commission restrictions may prevent construction of the elevated walls that block beach access and the results of the RTC Rail study show that a new passenger train will never be viable along the Santa Cruz Coastal Corridor.

The Capitola City Council should reject the RTC's plan to reroute the trail onto surface streets, which would result in the Coastal Trail never existing within Capitola City limits. We ask the Capitola City Council to reject the RTC plan and recommend to the RTC that they move forward with the INTERIM Trail Option, which has been proposed as an alternative in the Environmental Impact Report for the Santa Cruz Coastal Trail.

The INTERIM Trail Option will build the trail on the existing railbed, can be constructed at a fraction of the cost, is more environmentally friendly as it avoids clear-cutting trees, allows for future transit options on the corridor, does not require eminent domain of private property, does not redirect the trail onto surface streets, converts the Capitola Trestle into a Trail, can be built without causing traffic disruptions and RTC has enough funding to complete the INTERIM Trail Option Segments 9-12.

Note that the INTERIM Trail Option was proposed by former RTC Executive Director Guy Preston as part of his recommendation to railbank the Santa Cruz Branch Line, which would preserve the railline as a publicly owned transportation asset. In addition, the Federal Railbanking process is a standard approach used by communities across the county to allow for reuse of abandoned railroad systems.

- RTC Agenda Packet Recommended Plan: <https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/2022-02-03-RTC-agenda-packet.pdf>
- News Article: <https://californialocal.com/localnews/santa-cruz/ca/article/show/3023-regional-transportation-commission-rail-banking/>

Also, current RTC Executive Director Sarah Christensen recommended the Capitola Trestle be converted into a trail in September 2021:

▪ Reference:

- RTC Agenda Packet: <https://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2021-09-02-RTC-agenda-packet.pdf>

Please do not let the RTC stop the construction of the Santa Cruz Coastal Trail through Capitola and vote no to their proposed request to divert the Coastal Trail around Capitola City limits.

Best regards,

Brian Peoples



Gautho, Julia

From: Gary Sultana <g5948sultana@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 10:38 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Interim trail option now. Do not divert the trail onto city streets.

Gary Sultana

Gautho, Julia

From: MARK WEGRICH <wegrich@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 9:03 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Interim Trail in Capitola

Your attention please,

Please support the Interim Trail at this Thursdays Council Meeting. The ultimate Trail is a County financial boondoggle. Reviewing the financial status of light rail systems across the country makes it clear Santa Cruz County is heading into a financial black hole to the financial benefit of consultants on the backs of taxpayers. It won't work and will destroy what should be a world class bike and pedestrian trail. Business in the Village will surge with the influx of visitors to experience the trail. Safety would be much improved over the current situation while the Ultimate Trail would worsen public safety. Every crossing poses a risk to pedestrians and cyclists. Does Capitola want to assume the risk of massive lawsuits that will inevitably follow?

Sincerely,

Mark Wegrich
524 Pine St.(Seacliff)
Aptos

Gautho, Julia

From: james cook <jcookster999@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 8:03 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Trail

Please o please keep us safe by providing a bike path that is separate from cars and can be built in a timely and affordable manner. Enough with the ultimate non sense. Interim now!!!!
James cook

Gautho, Julia

From: chris amsden <amsdenfinance@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 7:50 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Park Avenue Traffic Calming Improvements with Coastal Rail Trail Options

I am writing to express disappointment in the recommended actions of the City staff to divert what the citizens were promised as a "rail and trail" that ran along the coastal corridor and existing train tracks, to now be diverted onto Park Ave. 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*.

Now, due to massive cost overruns and incompetence on the part of the County and RTC, the citizens of Capitola are expected to have Segments 10 and 11 of the Rail Trail diverted to the Park Ave. roadway that already has a perfectly functioning bike lane.

Capitola voters approved Measure L in 2018. Measure L is codified in Chapter 8.72 of the Capitola Municipal Code. Its purpose is to enhance pedestrian, bicycle, and traffic safety within the City by encouraging the development of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail. What is absolutely insulting is the City staff's argument that this detour "in Option A and/or Option B is not a "detour" because the Trail does not exist and has no "direct course" in the City. Moreover, Option A and/or Option B are consistent with Measure L because they do not propose the construction of the Trail on Capitola's streets or sidewalks". The intent in Measure L was clearly expressed by the voters - we do not want the "rail trail" being diverted through our city streets.

Please send a message to the County and RTC and say no to diverting the RTC's boondoggle "rail trail" onto Park Ave. Capitola should not suffer the consequences of their mismanagement and should not have the "rail trail" diverted through our city streets. Whether this be routing the trail through Capitola Village rather than across Soquel Creek Trestle, or creating a new path along Park Ave. that already has a bike lane.

Sincerely,

Chris Amsden
Phone: (408) 386-7484

Gautho, Julia

From: jennifer harris-anderson <buzznjen@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 7:19 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Rail Trail through Capitola

Council,

My great grandfather built a home on Blue Gum Ave a hundred years ago. I have been following the rail trail debate for a decade. Please do not approve a diversion of the trail within the Capitola city limits. As per usual, the City of Santa Cruz gets a dedicated trail while Mid-County, Capitola and points South get a fragmented, unsafe version. All because of exorbitant costs and the fallacy of a commuter train that will serve only a privileged few. Capitola should demand that the RTC rail bank the corridor and build the a wider, continuous trail down the center at a fraction of the cost, utilizing the Capitola Trestle and other constricted sections. Hundreds of communities across the country have used rail banking as a solution to active transportation. Rail banking protects the community from any right-of-way lawsuits and allows for a future train if decided upon by the citizenry. Capitola could and should lead the way on this issue. Do the right thing and push back against the bullying tactics of the RTC and the City of Santa Cruz.

Sincerely,

Buzz Anderson
831-566-2100

Gautho, Julia

From: Rob Martin <rob1007@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 6:58 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Coastal Trail

Dear City Council,

Please do not vote to run the coastal trail along Park Ave. This does not seem a good idea. We believe the most viable option is to proceed with the Interim Trail plan, as it can be constructed at a fraction of the cost, is more environmentally friendly as it avoids clear-cutting trees, does not require eminent domain of private property, does not redirect the trail onto surface streets, converts the Capitola trestle into a trail, can be built without causing traffic disruptions.

Sincerely,

Rob and Stella Martin

149 Farallon Ct.

Aptos 95003

Gautho, Julia

From: Jaakko Mella <jaakko831@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 6:31 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Rail and trail

Dear Capitola city council,

I would like to ask you to really consider SC RTC recommendation for a trail next to the road. Please don't fall for trail only proposal. Let save the rail for future.

Thank you

Jaakko Mella

Gautho, Julia

From: Ann Benvenuti <annanana1956@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 6:23 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Reject re-routing

Please don't allow this to happen our Cliffwood heights neighborhood has already been subjected to massive increases in traffic. Don't dump pedestrians and cyclists on us. Enough is Enough! Ann Benvenuti Sent from my iPhone

Gautho, Julia

From: Dan <dbt33@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 6:17 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Proposed re-routing trail

As a homeowner near Park Av for over 28 years I strongly recommend that the council reject the re-routing of trail into areas existing streets. The streets are already overcrowded with traffic this would only make an existing situation even worse. Just look at all the recent traffic issues and efforts to remedy them. These are very controversial and now we are considering making it more congested. Mandatory rezoning will also create future increases in traffic. The only solution is to allow the trail along the existing rail and forget the stupid train at this time. It's just common sense! Daniel Benvenuti.
Sent from my iPhone

Gautho, Julia

From: Mark Murphy <mmsurf1@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 5:45 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Keep the trail on the rail line through Capitola

To Capitola City Council,

Citizens passed Measure L that states our Council members and city staff should not put any funds, time, effort into "Shifting" from the rail corridor on to our city streets.

It appears that those pushing for the "Ultimate Trail Configuration " have no regard for an actual trail and instead would rather route bicycle and pedestrians onto Cliff Ave, through the village causing increased congestion and potential for dangerous intersections with vehicles. I strongly support a "trail on rail, interim trail" using the existing trestle and not wasting millions of dollars for the hopes of having a commuter rail and no trail along this portion of the route.

Please, don't vote to have the trail running through the already congested village.

Thanks for your consideration.

Mark Murphy
426 Rosedale Ct
Capitola, CA 95010

Gautho, Julia

From: Glenda Luening <glendal@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 5:22 PM
To: City Council
Subject: No on Ultimate Trail

Enough with this costly boondoggle. Stop the bleed. Stop the cutting down of trees and ugly retaining walls for a train that is never coming.

Vote Yes on the Interim Trail.

Glenda Luening.



Gautho, Julia

From: Kevin Maguire <kmaguire831@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 8:41 AM
To: City Council
Subject: [PDF] Fwd: 2.13.25 Council Meeting Agenda 9C: Park Avenue Traffic Calming Improvements with Coastal Rail Trail Options
Attachments: Fixed-Speed-Safety-Cameras.pdf

I encourage all of you on the City council to get on a bicycle and ride Park Ave, Ride on Monterey to Bay, ride in front of Gayles on a busy morning, Ride though the Village when there is traffic. You will see how this Painted line "Buffer" is not safe at all. Coming down Monterey to Bay, at 8 am, all those cars drive in the bike lane while turning right. In front of Gayles you go from a Bike lane, going 20 mph passing Cars that are stopped to then No bike lane, Cars parked in front of Gayles, and cars backed up at the stop sign, this is super Un-Safe and skecty. We need a dedicated Lane for bikes To and Thru the Stop sign!

We need more LOCAL Input, a lot of us on connecting Streets didnt get a change to participate in the survey as you only sent it to previous recipients. We already have Cut through traiff issue!

This Traffic Calming is the city's way to circumvent Measure L. Since council member are on the RTC, and voting for items that violate Measure L, that is not allowed. We will be requesting all meeting meetings from RTC past meetings to view Measure L violations.

The proposals to reduce speed "Traffic Diet" Doesnt address the removal of parking spots off street, it just mentions that there could be... Can you broadcast that point better to the community and residents on Park and connecting streets? What impact that will have and all of us!

If 85% of drivers are speeding on Park, can we get Capitola Police Ticket data? Shouldnt CPD be station there all day long and write 100s of tickets!!??

Missing in the Peak traffic times is 7-8 AM and 5-6 PM data, which is truly the Peak times. And during those times, traffic is slow, so how is it that 85% of drivers are going 37 MPH? The Commute time with traffic backed up would skew/bring those averages down. So is it non peak hours 50% of those vehicles going 37 MPH? Or 85% of all traffic?

The latest survey was sent to people that took that before, so the rest of us never got this or an opportunity to give input. Thats not good!

I live on Monterey, and we have the same issue, and more Kids on bikes going to School. Lets make Monterey SAFE as Well!!! I asked about Speed bumps and was told that is not allowed... But its allowed on Clares?

Traffic studies was from 2022, so that data is old and not reflect where we are today.

The proposed Traffic Calming doesn't address Coronado to Kennedy, Why not? That needs to be included for both directions for Bikes and Traffic Diet/calming efforts.

Class II Bike lanes is what we currently have in parts (Just a line) Some of these proposals reduces the Bike lane from 7 or 8 feet down to 5 feet with another 2 Foot 'Buffer" Line... Bike Safety laws says a car should give bikes 3 Feet! So making the Vehicle lane smaller and only having this 2 foot buffer violates that law.

Best for Safety would be a Class IV Dedicated Bike Lane with Physical Barriers. Class I is a mixed use Trail which is better than Class II. but with Bikes going 20-25 mph and people walking/running, its not the safest.

SF and San Jose are starting to implement Speed Cameras. That is really the main way to reduce speeds and make it safe. <https://www.sfmta.com/blog/why-were-introducing-speed-safety-cameras-first-california> Or have some police officers giving out 100s of tickets a day! Why are we not enforcing laws, if you are going over 25mph that should be a Ticket!! Why is SAFTEY not our top priority??

Here is the company SF and San Jose is using. Lets get a Demo of this, since we already have FLOCK Cameras, lets truely make it Safe!! The Traffic Diet will make it dangerous with that lane shift coming down hill, trying to control a vehicle, and narrow lanes, will give drivers anxiety!

<https://www.verramobility.com/government/speed-enforcement/>

WHAT DOES SPEED ENFORCEMENT DO?



Reduce Speeding.



Change Driver Behavior.



Build Safer Communities.

SPEEDING ISN'T JUST A TRAFFIC VIOLATION; IT'S A DEADLY THREAT ON OUR ROADS.



Automated Safety Camera Programs Create Safer Roads and Save Lives

One remarkable feature of automated enforcement is its ability to remove officers from dangerous traffic stops.

COMPREHENSIVE SAFETY SOLUTION: HOW AUTOMATED CAMERA PROGRAMS WORK

COMPREHENSIVE SAFETY SOLUTION: HOW AUTOMATED CAMERA PROGRAMS WORK

Speed safety camera programs utilize advanced technology to detect speeding vehicles and capture photographic and video evidence. These programs offer versatile deployment options. **Beyond capturing speeding vehicles, these programs deliver significant safety benefits:**

Proven to Change Driver Behavior

- The presence and operation of safety cameras raise driver awareness of speed limits, encouraging long-term compliance.

Safer for Everyone

- Reduced speeding creates safer environments for drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists. Lower speeds mitigate crash severity and increase survival chances.

Public Education and Awareness

- Effective programs integrate public awareness campaigns that highlight the dangers of speeding and the importance of obeying speed limits. This multi-faceted approach fosters a culture of safe driving habits.

Real-world data supports the effectiveness of speed safety camera programs. Communities across the country and the globe are using automated safety programs to enforce speed limits and enhance safety in and around schools, parks, intersections, neighborhoods, major roadways, and work zones.

- Kevin

FIXED SPEED SAFETY CAMERAS

SLOW TRAFFIC &
ENHANCE SAFETY



**Reduce
Speeding**



**Change
Driver Behavior**



**Enhance
Situational Awareness**



**Promote
Community Safety**

➤ THE FUTURE OF ENFORCEMENT

- Fixed speed safety cameras provide effective and continuous speed enforcement at dangerous and sensitive locations, including urban interstates, community roads, and school zones.
- Verra Mobility professionals will partner with project stakeholders to customize a speed safety camera solution that works best for your community.

➤ FEATURES

- Three-dimensional radar technology that can detect and track 100+ objects
- Highly accurate speed and lane designation technology
- High-resolution cameras that capture clear event images day and night
- Digital signature at time of capture and internal system self-checks
- Remote safety camera system monitoring
- High-definition video, including 24/7 intersection recording
- Video retrieval and live intersection video streaming*
- LED illumination that minimizes visible light and is respectful to drivers
- Automated license plate recognition capabilities
- Secure chain of evidence with data encryption

*Optional Verra Mobility LIVE subscription

VERRA MOBILITY

- A global leader in smart transportation
- A leading provider of road safety cameras in the U.S.

END-TO-END SERVICES

- Site surveys
- Construction
- Maintenance & field services
- Program training
- Event processing
- Citation printing & mailing
- Reporting tools
- Payment support
- Court support
- Public awareness

FEATURED TECHNOLOGY

- 3DHD tracking radar
- High-resolution images
- High-definition video
- LED illumination
- Secondary speed validation

From: Kevin Maguire <kmaguire831@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2025 8:29 AM
To: City Council
Subject: 2.13.25 Council Meeting Agenda 9C: Park Avenue Traffic Calming Improvements with Coastal Rail Trail Options

Capitola City Council Meeting 2.13.2025 Agenda Item 9C Response Highlighting the City of Capitola's Attempt to Circumvent Measure L

Introduction This document outlines concerns regarding the City of Capitola's approach to implementing traffic and trail improvements, which appear to circumvent Measure L's clear mandate to maintain the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (Trail) within the rail corridor and prohibit detours onto Capitola streets. The City's use of the term "shifting" rather than "detour" seems to be a deliberate effort to find a legal loophole, **undermining voter intent**.

Key Points of Concern

1. Measure L's Intent and Requirements

Measure L was enacted to protect and utilize the Santa Cruz Branch Line Rail Corridor for active transportation and recreation. It explicitly directs the City to:

- *"Take all steps necessary to preserve and utilize the Corridor and Trestle for active transportation and recreation."*
- *"Prohibit the expenditure of any City funds or resources for the construction, operation, or maintenance of a detour of the Trail onto Capitola streets or sidewalks." [41†source]* .

The measure's language clearly prioritizes keeping the Trail within the designated rail corridor.

2. City's Use of "Shifting" as a Loophole

The City Council's agenda report proposes moving the trail from the rail corridor to Park Avenue, describing this as "shifting" the alignment rather than a "detour" [40†source] .

This semantic distinction is troubling because:

- A shift implies a permanent relocation, not a mere temporary adjustment.
- Despite claiming otherwise, this shift fundamentally removes the Trail from its intended rail corridor alignment, placing it adjacent to and physically separated from Park Avenue.

By framing this as a cost-saving strategy, the City attempts to argue that the Trail has no "direct course" and thus cannot have a "detour." This interpretation is contrary to the spirit and clear intent of Measure L.

3. Measure L's Definition of a Detour

The City argues that since the Trail does not yet exist, there is no "direct course" to be detoured from [40†source] . However, the measure's intention is clear: to prevent moving the Trail off the rail corridor and onto city streets or sidewalks. The proposed Park Avenue

alignment effectively functions as a detour by diverting the Trail from its original planned path within the rail corridor.

4. Traffic Diet as a Disguise for Bypassing Measure L

The City is attempting to disguise its efforts to bypass Measure L by incorporating a "Traffic Diet" on Park Avenue as part of the Coastal Rail Trail alignment shift. This strategy involves narrowing vehicle lanes by one foot each and reducing the size of Class II bike lanes [40†source]. However, this plan is unlikely to significantly reduce vehicle speeds, which contradicts the stated goal of improving traffic safety. Instead, the narrowed lanes may create new safety concerns by squeezing different modes of transportation closer together without providing a meaningful deterrent to speeding.

5. Conflict of Interest Concerns

It is important to question whether City Council members who also serve on the Board of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) may face a conflict of interest when proposing or supporting efforts to bypass Measure L. The RTC's role in funding and developing trail projects, including the proposed Park Avenue alignment, creates a potential conflict when council members vote on measures that could circumvent voter-approved mandates. Transparency and accountability are essential to ensure that decisions are made in the public's best interest, without undue influence from overlapping roles.

6. Accountability Questions for the City To ensure the City's compliance with Measure L's requirements, the following questions should be posed to hold the City accountable:

- **Preservation of the Rail Corridor:** What specific steps has the City taken to preserve and utilize the Rail Corridor and Trestle for active transportation and recreation, as required by Measure L? Please provide documentation of these efforts.
- **Expenditure of Resources:** Has the City expended any funds or resources, including staff time, related to the proposed alignment shift to Park Avenue? If so, how is this expenditure justified given Measure L's prohibition on funding for detours?
- **Legal Interpretation:** On what legal basis does the City differentiate "shifting" from "detouring" the Trail, and how does this interpretation align with the intent of Measure L?
- **Environmental Impact:** How has the City assessed the environmental impact of shifting the Trail to Park Avenue, and how does this align with Measure L's preservation goals?
- **Community Engagement:** How has the City involved the community in discussions regarding this proposed alignment, and how has feedback been incorporated?
- **Traffic Safety Data:** What evidence does the City have to support the claim that the Traffic Diet will significantly improve safety, given the minimal reduction in lane widths and Class II bike lane modifications?
- **Transparency:** Will the City commit to publishing detailed reports on its efforts to comply with Measure L and its rationale for the Park Avenue alignment?

7. Impact of the Proposed Realignment

- **Loss of Rail Corridor Usage:** The shift to Park Avenue undermines the vision of utilizing the rail corridor for continuous active transportation.

- **Traffic and Safety Concerns:** The relocation may increase interactions between trail users and vehicular traffic, contrary to Measure L’s safety goals.
- **Environmental Impact:** Although the City claims reduced tree removals 【40†source】 , the environmental consequences of rerouting the trail and associated construction remain significant.

8. Legal and Community Implications The impartial analysis of Measure L already highlighted potential legal ambiguities and enforceability concerns 【42†source】 . By exploiting these ambiguities, the City risks undermining public trust and voter intent. The community’s strong preference, as expressed in Vision Capitola 2016, was to use the Corridor for active transportation 【41†source】 .

Recommendations

1. **Adhere to Measure L:** The City should honor the clear directive to keep the Trail within the rail corridor and avoid any actions that could be interpreted as circumventing this mandate.
2. **Clarify Definitions:** The City Council should engage with legal experts to clarify the definitions of "detour" and "shift" to prevent semantic loopholes from undermining voter-approved measures.
3. **Community Engagement:** Provide transparent updates and seek meaningful community input before making decisions that contradict Measure L’s objectives.
4. **Alternative Cost Solutions:** Explore innovative solutions to reduce construction costs within the rail corridor without relocating the Trail to city streets.

Conclusion

The City’s attempt to "shift" the Trail alignment to Park Avenue is a thinly veiled effort to bypass Measure L’s prohibition on detours. Incorporating a "Traffic Diet" as part of this strategy does little to meaningfully improve traffic safety and instead risks creating additional hazards. Potential conflicts of interest involving City Council members who also serve on the RTC further undermine public trust. Upholding the spirit and intent of Measure L is essential to maintaining public trust and ensuring that Capitola remains committed to safe, sustainable, and voter-approved transportation solutions.

Capitola Resident
Kevin Maguire

Gautho, Julia

From: John <jxmuly@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:45 PM
To: City Council; Gautho, Julia
Subject: I meant 9 Julia Re: Item 8A 8B 8C 8D

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I read this stuff on the quick. My time is highly limited.

Warmly JM

> On Feb 7, 2025, at 4:33 PM, John <jxmuly@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Hey Neighbors

>

> 8A A roundabout is the gold standard and the only non flow interruptive option. Less traffic, shorter pedestrian crossings, will help with e-bikes on the main school route. We will get the money for this in state grants it's not that much and the state Loves roundabouts.

>

> Please choose option 2.

>

>

>

> 8B whatever we do, please do not make it a two car drag race towards the senior housing complex. It's the major school route. It's already dangerous as is.

>

> Make it a forced right turn into Nob Hill at the main entrance. It was nice having a mildly safe street there. I walk there often as Dancecenter a 40 year old business catering to children is right there too. Path to the library. Do your best.

>

> Raised Crosswalks there across Bay Ave and then at Fanmar/Escalona and Monterey Ave (the rail trail as it will soon be) ever my dream. Cheap too.

>

>

>

> 8C not Alternative 1

> Staff is making a good rec here. We save a ton of money as a county, leaves the track area in better shape for a train. Most of the trail will be diverted from the corridor in Capitola already. 100%ish. Why not here too.

>

> I suggest a class IV bike lane. We will get money for it. Great long term ROI on such a project these days. Plus Rail Trail is supposed to be Class I. We deserve at least a IV there to honor the voters (minus Measure L).

>

>

>

> 8D Looks exciting to me.

>

>

>

> nulla trahentium per villa JM

>

Gautho, Julia

From: John <jxmuly@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2025 4:33 PM
To: City Council; Gautho, Julia
Subject: Item 8A 8B 8C 8D

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hey Neighbors

8A A roundabout is the gold standard and the only non flow interruptive option. Less traffic, shorter pedestrian crossings, will help with e-bikes on the main school route. We will get the money for this in state grants it's not that much and the state Loves roundabouts.

Please choose option 2.

8B whatever we do, please do not make it a two car drag race towards the senior housing complex. It's the major school route. It's already dangerous as is.

Make it a forced right turn into Nob Hill at the main entrance. It was nice having a mildly safe street there. I walk there often as Dancecenter a 40 year old business catering to children is right there too. Path to the library. Do your best.

Raised Crosswalks there across Bay Ave and then at Fanmar/Escalona and Monterey Ave (the rail trail as it will soon be) ever my dream. Cheap too.

8C not Alternative 1

Staff is making a good rec here. We save a ton of money as a county, leaves the track area in better shape for a train. Most of the trail will be diverted from the corridor in Capitola already. 100%ish. Why not here too.

I suggest a class IV bike lane. We will get money for it. Great long term ROI on such a project these days. Plus Rail Trail is supposed to be Class I. We deserve at least a IV there to honor the voters (minus Measure L).

8D Looks exciting to me.

nulla trahentium per villa JM