



CITY OF SANTA CRUZ
809 Center Street
Santa Cruz, California 95060

TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

August 21, 2023

**6:00 P.M. GENERAL BUSINESS AND MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST, COUNCIL
CHAMBERS**

Please note: As of March 1, 2023, participation in meetings for City Advisory Bodies is in-person only. Members of the public can continue to stream the audio for the meetings from the City's website, however public comment will no longer be taken virtually and those wishing to address the board must be in attendance at the location provided on the agenda.

Written material for every item listed on the agenda is available for review at the Public Works office, 809 Center Street, Room 201, and online at www.cityofsantacruz.com.

Time limits set by Commission Policy are guidelines. Unless otherwise specified, procedures for all items, are:

- Oral staff report
- Public comment - 3 minutes each; maximum total time may be established by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of an agenda item
- Commission deliberation and action

No action will be taken on items listed under Oral Communications, Announcements, Presentations, and Information Items

Written correspondence may be sent to tpwc@santacruzca.gov. **Please note:** emails received after 12:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting may not reach and be read by Commissioners prior to consideration of an item.

Appeals - Any person who believes that a final action of this advisory body has been taken in error, that decision may or may not be appealable to the City Council. Appeals must be in writing, setting forth the nature of the action and the basis upon which the action is considered to be in error, and addressed to the City Council in care of the City Clerk Administrator. Appeals must be received by the City Clerk Administrator within ten (10) calendar days following the date of the action from which such appeal is being taken. An appeal must be accompanied by a fifty dollar (\$50) filing fee.

Additional Information

The City of Santa Cruz does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. Out of consideration for people with chemical sensitivities, we ask that you attend fragrance free. If you wish to attend this public meeting and will require assistance, such as an interpreter for American Sign Language, Spanish, or other special equipment, please call the Public Works Office at (831) 420-5162 or e-mail sruble@cityofsantacruz.com at least five (5) days in advance so that arrangements for such assistance can be accommodated. The Cal-Relay system number: 1-800-735-2922.

Agenda and Agenda Packet Materials: The commission agenda and the complete agenda packet containing public records, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, are available for review on the City's website: <https://www.cityofsantacruz.com/government/city-departments/public-works/public-works-department-commissions/transportation-and-public-works-commission> and at 809 Center Street, Room 201, Santa Cruz, California, during normal business hours.

Agenda Materials Submitted after Publication of the Agenda Packet: Pursuant to Government Code §54957.5, public records related to an open session agenda item submitted after distribution of the agenda packet are available at the same time they are distributed or made available to the legislative body on the City's website at: <https://www.cityofsantacruz.com/government/city-departments/public-works/public-works-department-commissions/transportation-and-public-works-commission> and are also available for public inspection at 809 Center Street, Room 201, Santa Cruz.

Transportation and Public Works Commission (TPWC)

6:00 PM

Call to Order

Roll Call

Absent with Notification

Statements of Disqualification

Oral Communications

Announcements

Presentations

Approval of Minutes

1. Approval of Minutes for the June 26, 2023 Transportation and Public Works Commission Meeting

Consent

General Business

2. Traffic Calming Toolkit

That the Transportation and Public Works Commission provide feedback on the Traffic Calming Toolkit presentation and recommend that the City Council approve the Traffic Calming Toolkit.

Information Items

3. BCycle Bike Share Program Update

Subcommittee/Advisory Body Oral Reports

Items Initiated by Members for Future Agendas

Adjournment

Scott Ruble

From: Christina Alberti
Sent: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 7:20 AM
To: river@cruzio.com
Cc: Nathan Nguyen; Filipina Warren; Katie Stewart; clbrown23@gmail.com; TPWC; Fred Keeley; Renee Golder; Sandy Brown; Susan Cavalieri; Pauline Seales; Jane Orbuch; Joy schendledecker; Erica Stanojevic; Bruce Van Allen; Russell Brutsche; Christine Barrington; Jeb Bishop; Kristen Sandel; Gillian Greensite; Mike Guth; Jessica york; Beki San Martin; Kevin Crossley
Subject: RE: Thank you

Good morning Barbara,

Thank you for your emails. We have received additional questions from other community members so we updated the San Lorenzo River projects [FAQ that is posted online](#) (see pages 8-11). Questions from your 7/25/23 and 7/31/23 emails are included in the revised FAQ document.

I also listened to your voicemail from yesterday morning and wanted to respond about that as well. The annual San Lorenzo Vegetation Management for Flood Control project RFP draft has been published online since before we brought this item to Transportation and Public Works Commission (TPWC) on 6/26/23. You can review more information on the [Public Works Projects webpage](#) and more specifically [here](#). You also asked if this is an ordinance that will require additional readings. This is not an ordinance; we are seeking City Council's approval in authorizing staff to issues a request for proposal for this annual flood control work. Also for approval is for staff to execute an agreement (after each proposal is scored) and to any approve contract amendments within the approved budget. We sought community and commission input when we brought this item for TPWC recommendation in June.

Thank you,
Christina

From: Barbara Riverwoman <river@cruzio.com>
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2023 5:17 PM
To: Christina Alberti <CALberti@santacruzca.gov>
Cc: Nathan Nguyen <nnguyen@santacruzca.gov>; Filipina Warren <fwarren@santacruzca.gov>; Katie Stewart <kstewart@santacruzca.gov>; clbrown23@gmail.com; TPWC <TPWC@santacruzca.gov>; Fred Keeley <fkeeley@santacruzca.gov>; Renee Golder <rgolder@santacruzca.gov>; Sandy Brown <sbrown@santacruzca.gov>; Susan Cavalieri <susanwcavalieri@gmail.com>; Pauline Seales <paulineseales120@gmail.com>; Jane Orbuch <jorbuch@comcast.net>; Joy schendledecker <schendledecker@icloud.com>; Erica Stanojevic <ericast@gmail.com>; Bruce Van Allen <bva@cruzio.com>; Russell Brutsche <russellb@cruzio.com>; Christine Barrington <yinwisdom@gmail.com>; Jeb Bishop <jeb.bishop@groundswellecology.org>; Kristen Sandel <krsandel@gmail.com>; Gillian Greensite <gilliangreensite@gmail.com>; Mike Guth <mguth@guthpatents.com>; Jessica york <jyork@santacruzsentinel.com>; Beki San Martin <beki@lookoutlocal.com>
Subject: Thank you

July 31, 2023

Dear Christina,

First, let me thank you for all the help you have provided the environmental stakeholder community during the FEMA certification process. I know many of us out here in the field appreciate your accessibility and responsiveness.

I want to thank you, especially, for sending us the link to the [new page](#) where many documents relevant to FEMA Certification are now readily available. I believe all of the documents had been posted elsewhere on your website or

elsewhere on the City website. But they were difficult to access, even for members of the Public Works Commission — as well as for some of us! Your link made this information much more public friendly.

I also want to thank the staff for posting our many questions in a very reader-friendly FAQ format. I really like this way of communicating. It means all our questions and your answers are written down for all of us to refer back to — and also are available for the City Council, community stakeholders, and the general public to review.

This all represents great improvement in accessibility and transparency!

I have 3 more questions I would like to add to the pot. I hope my third question below can take us even further along the road towards improved communication between the Department and community environmentalists.

1. In your answer to our question number #16, you mention a "FEMA certification submittal package". I assume that this package was turned in to FEMA before July 7 with more extensive documentation of the certification process by MBK engineering. I would like to request that this submittal package be posted on the FEMA certification website for public review before the August 9 City Council meeting.
2. Was MBK consulted about any of the variances that the group Protect Our River submitted, especially regarding electronic imaging of the levee and manzanita removal? Has MBK submitted any additional information to the City in addition to the Memorandum on your website.
3. The Public Works Commission at its last meeting encouraged the Department to meet face to face with environmental stakeholders in the near future. I would like to make sure that CWC, the Estuary Project, Protect Our River, the Sierra Club, Groundswell and the California Native Plant Society, at a minimum, would be represented. I think it is appropriate that at least some of us meet before the plan is voted on by the City Council on August 8. Can we arrange this for later this week? Or if this is not possible, can we meet soon after the Council meeting makes its decision? I will happy to help with outreach to the above groups is that would help. I know you are very busy.

Sincerely,
Barbara Riverwoman
for Protect Our River
river@cruzio.com
831 454-0252

Scott Ruble

From: Carolyn L Williams <caro.wms@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 1, 2023 12:51 PM
To: TPWC
Subject: 8/21 Meeting

Re: Meeting 8/21

Hello. My husband and I live at 828 Pelton Ave and have been trying to deal with the detour along our residential street. We want to ensure our voices be heard about the desired outcome of a return to a 2-way West Cliff Drive ASAP. We are hopeful you can reassure us that the detours and routing of vehicles through our neighborhood is a temporary situation until West Cliff is reopened.

We will not accept as 'a given' that our street be a part of any permanent, long term plan to make our street the new beach route/thoroughfare. We hope repairs to the section between Columbia and Woodrow will be done sooner rather than later, (understanding that the bridge repair may take a bit longer) and that it returns to a 2-way street. This is a logical solution and the negative impact to our neighborhood street will be removed.

Also, if we can bring up what seems to be an obvious point: Why use Delaware to Woodrow to Pelton to Columbia at all?? At that point (Delaware and Woodrow) please consider continuing the detour down Delaware to Bay to West Cliff. It's faster, and both are already set as main thoroughfares with a bus route and bike lanes - seems far more sensible and keeps our lower West Side streets safer and quieter.

We are grateful for the time and effort from Matt and Claire and the traffic calming efforts made but to be honest, these undertakings were/are needed anyway, aside from the larger issue of West Cliff Drive.

Please take our little community to heart with you as you contemplate the long term permanent plans for West Cliff Drive. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Carolyn and Larry Williams

Scott Ruble

From: Barbara Riverwoman <river@cruzio.com>
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2023 5:17 PM
To: Christina Alberti
Cc: Nathan Nguyen; Filipina Warren; Katie Stewart; clbrown23@gmail.com; TPWC; Fred Keeley; Renee Golder; Sandy Brown; Susan Cavalieri; Pauline Seales; Jane Orbuch; Joy schendledecker; Erica Stanojevic; Bruce Van Allen; Russell Brutsche; Christine Barrington; Jeb Bishop; Kristen Sandel; Gillian Greensite; Mike Guth; Jessica york; Beki San Martin
Subject: Thank you

July 31, 2023

Dear Christina,

First, let me thank you for all the help you have provided the environmental stakeholder community during the FEMA certification process. I know many of us out here in the field appreciate your accessibility and responsiveness.

I want to thank you, especially, for sending us the link to the [new page](#) where many documents relevant to FEMA Certification are now readily available. I believe all of the documents had been posted elsewhere on your website or elsewhere on the City website. But they were difficult to access, even for members of the Public Works Commission — as well as for some of us! Your link made this information much more public friendly.

I also want to [thank the staff for posting our many questions](#) in a very reader-friendly FAQ format. I really like this way of communicating. It means all our questions and your answers are written down for all of us to refer back to — and also are available for the City Council, community stakeholders, and the general public to review.

This all represents great improvement in accessibility and transparency!

I have 3 more questions I would like to add to the pot. I hope my third question below can take us even further along the road towards improved communication between the Department and community environmentalists.

1. In your answer to our question number #16, you mention a "FEMA certification submittal package". I assume that this package was turned in to FEMA before July 7 with more extensive documentation of the certification process by MBK engineering. I would like to request that this submittal package be posted on the FEMA certification website for public review before the August 9 City Council meeting.
2. Was MBK consulted about any of the variances that the group Protect Our River submitted, especially regarding electronic imaging of the levee and manzanita removal? Has MBK submitted any additional information to the City in addition to the Memorandum on your website.
3. The Public Works Commission at its last meeting encouraged the Department to meet face to face with environmental stakeholders in the near future. I would like to make sure that CWC, the Estuary Project, Protect Our River, the Sierra Club, Groundswell and the California Native Plant Society, at a minimum, would be represented. I think it is appropriate that at least some of us meet before the plan is voted on by the City Council on August 8. Can we arrange this for later this week? Or if this is not possible, can we meet soon after the Council meeting makes its decision? I will happy to help with outreach to the above groups is that would help. I know you are very busy.

Sincerely,

Barbara Riverwoman
for Protect Our River
river@cruzio.com
831 454-0252

Scott Ruble

From: Barbara Riverwoman <river@cruzio.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 28, 2023 3:44 PM
To: alan voegtlen; Alex Rinkert; Ami Chen Mills-Naim; Andrea Boone; Anne Simonton; batya Kagan; Bob Morgan; Bruce Bratton; Bruce Van Allen; Carol Polhamus; Christopher Krohn; Christine Barrington; Crystal Hawley; Dana Bagshaw; Debbie Bulger; debra wirkman; Dion Shattuck; Erica Stanojevic; Gary Patton; Grey Hayes; Jackie Pascoe; Jane Mio; Jane Orbuch; Jeb Bishop; Jerry Busch; Jessica york; John Hall; Joy schendledecker; Judi grunstra; Kaiya Giuliano-Monroy; Keresha Durham; Leslie Wooding; Lisa Sheridan; Lynda Marín; Mary Odegaard; micahposner@cruzio.com; Michael Levy; Michelle Merrill; Mike Guth; Neil Fairbairn; nita hertel; Pauline Seales; Rachel O'Malley; rick longinotti; Roland Saher; Russell Brutsche; senka; Shantanu Phukan; sheila carrrillo; steve bosworth; Susan Cavalieri
Cc: TPWC; Fred Keeley; Renee Golder; Sandy Brown; Gary Kittleson
Subject: Report on Transportation and Public Works Commission Meeting, 6.26.23

June 27, 2023

Dear Protectors of Wildlife,

Here's my report on the highs and lows of the Public Works Commission meeting this last Monday, June 26.

The Highs: Right out of the gate, Ron Goodman, the Commission chair, stated that because of the large amount of correspondence from the community (mostly our group, I believe) they would pull the vegetation management item from the consent agenda. Three of us spoke during the "public comment" period that followed:

- Susan Cavalieri reported on her recent visits to the levee since the removal of all the native manzanita and since the grouting of squirrel tunnels (fumigation is still to come we are told). Susan pointed out that manzanita was a natural inhibitor of ground squirrel activity. This was confirmed by her observations that there were no pink flags (flagging ground squirrel holes scheduled for grouting) in spots where the manzanita had been torn out. But, significantly, pink paint spots were all over open areas. Message: the ecologically valuable manzanita should never have been torn out. It deters ground squirrels, provides erosion control, provides berries and nectar for birds.
- Jane Mio stressed the need for an environmental expert to consult with staff as they are making their plans
- I reviewed the reasons behind our requests for variances to FEMA demands, specifically the unique nature of our high water flows as well as the need to scientifically document the extent of destabilization of the levee with electronic sensors before proceeding with the proposed aggressive policies.

Following public comment Commissioner Candace Brown led off with a long list of questions, almost entirely based on the materials we had sent the Commission. The questions covered resiliency of manzanita roots after mowing, ground squirrels, hydrology, and lots more. She had clearly read our materials quite carefully. Other Commissioners followed with questions or comments. The chair, Ron Goodman, mentioned that he was involved with local wetland restoration. Commissioner Oyate-Crow supported more public input by requesting that the staff respond in writing to the second set of questions that our group submitted back in April. (The new Commissioner, Susan Gilchrist, questioned the connection between the unique hydrology of our river and the current management policy. She made the motion to approve the staff's recommendation.) Two Commissioners, Goodman and one other, recused themselves from the vote.

Finally, although the five qualified Commissioners voted 4 to 1 to approve the vegetation management plan submitted by staff, they also approved an amendment to Gilchrist's motion requiring that the staff meet with concerned community members! So I think we now have official support to pursue a face-to-face meeting with Public Works staff. I hope Brown and other interested Commissioners might participate in this meeting. Council Member Renee Golder offered several months ago to help arrange such a meeting.

I am also thinking we should resume our group meetings, perhaps once every two weeks? Let me know if you are interested in this second stage of the work. We learned that the Commission's recommendation will go before the Council for final approval in August. The annual fall vegetation work will take place sometime between September 1 and October 15.

We've got our work cut out for us.

Now for the lows!

There was nothing in the Agenda Report from the Public Works staff that clearly stated that the Commission would be approving anything except the short and very vague summary. The summary seemed to infer that they were asking for approval of a new bidding methodology - extremely misleading!

The only reference to the full 43-page RFP that the Commissioners were actually being asked to approve was far down the page and almost unnoticeable. It read:

More information about the RFP can be found online at: www.cityofsantacruz.com/publicworksprojects

I think it is unlikely that most commissioners clicked this link. In any case, it led to a webpage listing 25 projects that the whole PW Department is working on, three of which had similar names referring to San Lorenzo River vegetation and/or FEMA certification. It was a time-consuming and frustrating scavenger hunt.

Advisory bodies like the Public Works Commission are appointed precisely to scrutinize proposed City policy more carefully than City Council members can. They are expected to get into the weeds of a proposal, to question the details. How can they do this if the detailed reports aren't made available?

If, among the 25 choices, a Commissioner were able to find the full document, it wouldn't be until **page 14** (Section 4) when they would finally arrive at the meat of the document, at least from an environmental point of view. Unfortunately, I didn't get time to read the critical Section 4 until the day after the Commission meeting.

Here is the direct link to the key section, **Section 4.3 Scope of Work**. This user-friendly link should have been front and center on the Agenda Report from the staff to the Commission. It wasn't included at all. Only the obscure scavenger hunt.

Request for Proposals No. 2333 - San Lorenzo River Vegetation Management for Flood Control
Project <https://www.cityofsantacruz.com/home/showpublisheddocument/94289/638225239410272540>

I was really incredulous when it finally sank in that I wasn't the only one who was unclear about whether a fleshed out proposal even existed, much less where it could be accessed. Jane Mio, director of the city-sponsored Estuary Project and a longtime defender of river wildlife, was not only given very short notice of the Commission meeting but struggled to confirm the existence of the 43-page document and to then access it.

The nail in the coffin was when Commissioner Brown expressed surprise about the existence of the 43-page document during the meeting itself! Even an experienced Commissioner like Brown hadn't know of its existence, probably thinking like I originally did that the vote was on nothing more than the new bidding methodology which was emphasized in the short summary. Candace Brown was the sole dissenting vote, stating that she was voting 'no' because she had not known of the full document and had therefore been unable to read it.

But, yes! There on page 14 of the full document were all the specifications regarding what vegetation can be removed, how it can be removed (what kinds of tools), new aggressive FEMA demands and much more.

The staff is well aware that Section 4.3 of the 43-page document is the crux of the differences between the environmental community and the City. We have been laboring with each other over the details for years, especially since the new FEMA demands? Why were all the new, and more aggressive, policies not flagged for the Commissioners and for the public? If there had not been so many roadblocks to accessing this document before the meeting, our group would certainly have done that!

When I did get around to studying it the day after the meeting, two major changes jumped out at me (1) a relaxation of the rules about how much vegetation can be removed along the river's edge, and (2) establishment of a whole new zone that protects the Coastal Watershed Council's restoration work along the Front St. Development. But it appears that the same protections will not be available for the naturally existing native plants along the rest of the levee.

I think it will become clear as we study Section 4 further that the changes in the proposed RFP represent a major revision to the 2003 San Lorenzo Urban River Plan, a Plan that has, at least minimally, protected much of the levee vegetation for the 20 years it has been in existence. I am afraid that the new proposal will lead to even more extensive wildlife degradation than under SLURP.

This has not been a transparent process, or a process respectful of environmental input. Is it possible that other Commission members did not know of the existence of the full RFP document, or tried to find it and became discouraged because of the difficulty of accessing it without a direct link?

Is a vote valid if the existence of the full document is not even clearly referenced in the staff's Agenda Report to the Commission, nor a user-friendly link provided? Is a vote valid if some members did not even know of its existence? Can the vote be declared invalid and re-scheduled for another meeting?

Again, after reading the above, if you would like to take a look at the full report (especially Section 4.3 Scope of Work) here is the direct link!

Request for Proposals No. 2333 - San Lorenzo River Vegetation Management for Flood Control

Project <https://www.cityofsantacruz.com/home/showpublisheddocument/94289/638225239410272540>

I would like to revive our small group so we can begin to study the new specifications in Section 4, set up meetings with the PW staff, and figure out what kind of effort we want to make to educate City Council members about the key issues— before the Council meeting in August where the RFP will be presented for approval. We may have little more than a month.

Ever hopeful 😊,
Barbara



Transportation and Public Works Commission

Regular Meeting

DRAFT Minutes

6:00 p.m., Monday, June 26, 2023

Council Chambers

Call to Order: 6:00 P.M.

Roll Call: Chair Ron Goodman, Vice-Chair Ryan Meckel; Commissioners: Candace Brown, Robert Orrizzi, Zennon Ulyate-Crow, and Susan Gilchrist.

Absent with Notification: None

Absent without Notification: Commissioner Kyle Kelley.

Statements of Disqualification: Chair Goodman and Commissioner Orrizzi recused themselves from Item 2.

Oral Communications:

At 6:01 P.M., Chair Goodman opened oral communications. There were no speakers and at 6:01 P.M., Chair Goodman closed oral communications.

Announcements:

Commissioner Gilchrist commended the Wastewater Treatment Facility Lab on their work to achieve an "A" rating at Cowells beach.

Commissioner Orrizzi announced the successful launch of BCycle and applauded Transportation Planner Claire Gallogly on the successful launch.

At 6:03 P.M. Commissioner Kelley arrived.

Director of Public Works Nathan Nguyen gave an update on ongoing and upcoming Public Works projects, including the Ocean Street Pavement rehabilitation project and the Westcliff Drive Stabilization Project.

Presentations: None

Approval of Minutes:

1. Approval of Minutes for the May 15, 2023 Transportation and Public Works

Commission Meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Orrizzi moved, seconded by Vice-Chair Meckel, to approve the minutes of the May 15, 2023, Transportation and Public Works Commission meeting.

ACTION: The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Chair Goodman, Vice-Chair Meckel, Commissioners: Brown, Orrizzi, Kelley, Ulyate-Crow and Gilchrist.

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

DISQUALIFIED: None

At 6:08 P.M. Chair Goodman moved item 5 prior to other agenda items. The Commission heard Item 5 at 6:09 P.M.

Consent:

2. San Lorenzo River Vegetation Management for Flood Control Project (m409505)

Operations Manager Filipina Warren presented the San Lorenzo River Vegetation Management for Flood Control Project and answered commissioners' questions.

At 6:11 P.M. Chair Goodman opened public comment and the following people spoke:

Barbara Riverwoman

Susan Cavaliri

Jane Mio

At 6:22 P.M. Chair Goodman closed public comment.

MOTION: Commissioner Gilchrist moved, seconded by Commissioner Kelley, to recommend that the City Council approve the San Lorenzo River Vegetation Management for Flood Control Project (m409505) authorize staff to advertise for Request for Proposals and award the contract.

ACTION: The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Vice-Chair Meckel, Commissioners: Kelley, Ulyate-Crow, and Gilchrist.

NOES: Commissioner Brown.

ABSENT: None

DISQUALIFIED: Chair Goodman and Commissioner Orrizzi.

Commissioner Brown stated for the record that she voted no, due to the fact that she had not read the RFP to be approved.

At 7:01 P.M Chair Goodman moved Item 4 to be heard prior to Item 3.

General Business:

3. Appeal of Parking Changes on Roxas Street, adjacent to 411 Roxas Street - Public Hearing.

Item 3 was heard at 7:30 P.M.

Transportation Planner Claire Gallogly presented the appeal and answered commissioners' questions.

At 7:40 P.M., Chair Goodman opened public comment. There were no speakers and at 7:40 P.M., Chair Goodman closed public comment.

MOTION: Commissioner Ulyate-Crow moved, seconded by Commissioner Brown, that the Transportation and Public Works Commission consider the appeal of the decision to remove parking on Roxas Street adjacent to 411 Roxas Street to install a bike share station location, and at the close of the hearing, deny the appeal.

ACTION: The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Chair Goodman, Vice-Chair Meckel, Commissioners: Brown, Orrizzi, Kelley, Ulyate-Crow, and Gilchrist.

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

DISQUALIFIED: None

4. Appeal of Parking Changes on Frederick Street, adjacent to Frederick Street Park- Public Hearing

Item 4 was heard at 7:03 P.M.

Transportation Planner Claire Gallogly presented the appeal and answered commissioners' questions.

At 7:09 P.M. Chair Goodman opened public comment and the following people spoke.

Chris Miller

Peter Connolly

Sandy Connolly

At 7:18 P.M. Chair Goodman closed public comment.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Meckel moved, seconded by Commissioner Kelley, that the Transportation and Public Works Commission consider the appeal of the decision to remove parking on Frederick Street adjacent to Frederick Street

Park to install a bike share station location, and at the close of the hearing, deny the appeal.

ACTION: The motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Chair Goodman, Vice-Chair Meckel, Commissioners: Brown, Orrizzi, Kelley, Ulyate-Crow, and Gilchrist.

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

DISQUALIFIED: None

Informational Items:

5. Proposed Resource Recovery Collection Rates Increase

Item 5 was heard at 6:09 P.M.

Resource Recovery Superintendent of Disposal Guadalupe Sanchez gave a presentation and answered commissioners questions.

Subcommittee/Advisory Body Oral Reports: None

Items Initiated by Members for Future Agendas: None

Adjournment: 7:42 P.M.



AGENDA REPORT

DATE: 08/09/2023

AGENDA OF: 08/21/2023

DEPARTMENT: Public Works

SUBJECT: Traffic Calming Toolkit

RECOMMENDATION: That the Transportation and Public Works Commission provide feedback on the Traffic Calming Toolkit presentation and recommend that the City Council approve the Traffic Calming Toolkit.

BACKGROUND: The December 2022/January 2023 storms resulted in significant damage to West Cliff Drive. Between Columbia Road and David Way, the storms caused portions of the roadway and path to fail, along with impacts to public access points, utility infrastructure, and the surrounding neighborhood.

One of the secondary impacts of the storm damage has been changes in travel patterns in the neighborhoods surrounding West Cliff Drive as the result of the one-way portion of roadway and the full closure to automobiles at Bethany Curve. At their February 28, 2023 meeting, Council directed staff to retain a transportation engineering consultant to study the overall conditions in the project area and to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Calming Toolkit. That Toolkit overview is for review today.

DISCUSSION: The City of Santa Cruz frequently gets requests for various forms of traffic calming. To date, the City of Santa Cruz has not had the resources to develop a transparent, systematic approach to be able to assess and rank these requests or to select traffic calming feature, nor the funding and staff resources to implement such features.

The storm damage to West Cliff Drive led to changes to travel patterns in the surrounding neighborhoods. As part of the overall consultant contract to study the transportation conditions on West Cliff Drive and surrounding neighborhoods, the consultant team was tasked with preparing a Neighborhood Traffic Calming Toolkit. The Neighborhood Traffic Calming Toolkit is intended to be used for citywide traffic calming requests.

The presentation tonight will go over the elements of the Traffic Calming Toolkit and seek feedback from the Transportation and Public Works Commission. That feedback will be added to a revised version presented to City Council. After feedback from Council, the presentation will be finalized into a final Traffic Calming Toolkit that will be utilized by staff to help process future requests.

FISCAL IMPACT: None

Prepared By:
Claire Gallogly
Transportation Planner

Submitted By:
Nathan Nguyen, P.E.
Director of Public Works

Approved By:

ATTACHMENTS: