

From: [Christine Miguel](#)
To: [giensen@ci.capitola.ca.us](#); [jclarke@ci.capitola.ca.us](#); [mmorgan@ci.capitola.ca.us](#); [morbach@ci.capitola.ca.us](#); [Manu Koenig](#); [Second District](#); [Justin Cummings](#); [Felipe Hernandez](#); [Fifth District](#); [Board Of Supervisors](#); [fkeeley@santacruzca.gov](#); [gblakeslee@sccrtc.org](#); [Robert Tidmore](#); [Jamie Goldstein](#); [City Manager](#); [Sarah Christensen](#); [pkhattis@santacruzsentinel.com](#); [jesse@santacruzlocal.org](#); [Steve Clark](#); [maria.orocho@watsonville.gov](#); [Tania Ortiz](#)
Subject: Subject: Request for Transparency and Fairness in RTC Enforcement Actions
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 2:20:21 PM

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Dear RTC Members,

I am writing with respect to the recent enforcement actions initiated along the Branch Rail Line corridor, particularly in areas such as Segment 10, where no trail construction is currently planned, approved, or funded. According to the most recent Draft Concept Report dated June 6, 2025, the rail-with-trail configuration is proposed only for Segments 13 through 20. Given this, I respectfully question the urgency and justification for enforcement actions in areas where no imminent development is slated to occur.

What is the rationale for pursuing these actions now—before detailed engineering plans have been completed, publicly reviewed, or finalized for large portions of the corridor?

Additionally, there appears to be inconsistent enforcement along the corridor. For example, the corridor width near 41st and 47th Avenues in Capitola seems comparable to the area behind Castle Mobile Estates, assuming no encroachments exist in either location. Yet, residents of Castle Mobile Estates are being required to remove alleged encroachments, while similar enforcement does not appear to be occurring in other comparable areas. This discrepancy raises serious concerns about equitable treatment and the criteria being used to determine enforcement.

Selective or uneven enforcement not only risks undermining public trust but could also raise concerns about discriminatory practices.

Therefore, I respectfully request that the RTC:

1 Clarify the objective standards being used to guide these enforcement actions.

2 Ensure transparency in how decisions are made and communicated to affected residents.

3 Pause enforcement in segments where trail construction is not imminent or funded, until clear and publicly reviewed engineering plans are in place.

4 Apply enforcement policies consistently, with sensitivity to the impacts on residents and communities along the corridor.

Enforcement should be guided by clear necessity, rooted in a transparent process, and mindful of equitable treatment for all corridor neighbors. I appreciate your time and attention to these concerns.

Sincerely,

Christine Miguel

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)