Guidance to CTC

- Why is Santa Cruz allowed to waste tax dollars on a train plan that has no impact on traffic congestion?
- Why are Proposition 116 funds being used to fund a private excursion train operator?
- Does CTC understand the cost and limitations to a train along Santa Cruz Branchline?
- Can CTC provide more guidance to Santa Cruz on viable transportation solutions?
Train Bad Idea for Santa Cruz

- Passenger train not viable / zero impact on traffic (Unified Corridor Study)
- Loss of Historic Timber Trestles (Seascape, Hidden Beach, Capitola)
- Public opposition to the train (petition, Measure L, farmers, lawsuits, business)
- +20 years Coastal Corridor closed for transportation
- Tax dollars funding private company excursion trains
- Active transportation on Coastal Corridor 5x more transportation users than a passenger train (Unified Corridor Study)
Train Not Effective or Affordable

- Studies show train is not economically viable
- Santa Cruz County Population 250,000
HISTORIC TRESTLES

- Over 22 trestles
- Historic Trestles Torn down and replaced
- Trail can not connect to Timber Trestles
Corridor Not Wide Enough

- Train speeds planned to travel 45 MPH
- Corridor 27 feet wide
- Homes and Businesses next to tracks
Tracks Prone to Cliff Collapse and Wetland Submersion

- Tracks along beach
- High Cliffs (Manresa, New Brighten Beach)
- Wetlands (Harkins Slough, North Coast)
Taxpayers Funding Excursion Trains

- $1.6 million per year maintaining Corridor
- $15 million to upgrade tracks for excursion trains
- +20 years of Excursion Trains, no transit solution
Community Backlash to Train

- Ballot Measure L against Train approved in 2018
- 10,000 Signatures for Trail and No Train
- Millions spent on litigation - not transportation
Active Transportation Today
Active Transportation Best Solution Today

Train = 200 people per HOUR
Highway lane = 2,000 people per HOUR
Trail = 800 people per HOUR