

-----Original Message-----

**From:** LibonPV@aol.com [mailto:LibonPV@aol.com]

**Sent:** Friday, March 05, 2004 9:38 AM

**To:** ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jan.beautz@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tony.campos@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mardi.wormhoudt@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; dnortondesigns@msn.com; linda.wilshusen@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; paspence@charter.net; keoghs1@pacbell.net; skennedy@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; ereilly@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; Ranndo@aol.com; redelapaz@ci.watsonville.ca.us

**Cc:** hboerner@santacruzsentinel.com; info@sccarred.org

**Subject:** Discontinue Prop 116 application

Mar 4, 2004

SCCRTC Public Hearing

"Discontinue EIR for future Recreational Rail between Capitola and Aptos and use of Prop.116 funds to acquire ROW"

Just in case you don't know, there is already another bike trail in progress; the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Scenic Trail (In fact some transportation funds were used for this project as well.) And this is without any \$22 million purchase.

It is very clear from all the documents in SCCRTC that this Commission wants to purchase this UP right of way. It's always just been a matter of how. And even though there is no budget plan, no itemized list of maintenance expenses, liability insurance, etc, our commissioners feel confident that this project should proceed. So we are already starting with a misguided priority of spending time and money on an unnecessary project while we continuously read budget cuts to necessary programs: the Metro is struggling to provide a modest bus service, Paratransit struggling to survive, ten year old projects like Amesti Rd, fish-hook restructuring, highway one soundwall, and widening of highway one cannot find funding. Just a partial list.

Any means to justify an end, right? So let's perpetuate some misconceptions here to get what we want. Here we go. Let's tap all our bike friends to sign a petition. Great idea..

Petition by People Power and Friends of the Rail Trail reads:

"Santa Cruz Rail Corridor is a valuable local resource. Please support the Coastal Trolley as a way to secure use of the Corridor for Bikes, pedestrians, and light rail traffic.

**SUPPORT THE RAIL CORRIDOR NOW!"**

Misconception Number one: this petition makes the assumption that the corridor is already owned by Santa Cruz County. No, this Commission is trying to purchase this property; so indeed, no mention of a purchase or any cost to the taxpayer is given. Let's be honest here. This is a \$21 million dollar purchase by you and me. I would sign that petition too because the concept is great, the reality of paying for it is not so great.

Misconception number two: The Coastal Trolley is a way to secure use for bikes, pedestrians, and light rail. No again. No EIR is even being considered at this time for any of those projects. This is only for the purchase of this rail for a trolley. Only an EIR for the six miles from Capitola and Seascape are being considered here. And in fact, safety, traffic, and liability concerns may very well shoot down this trail idea next to a freight train.

But here's the real catch. And here's what these bikers need to know. The cost for a bike trail is an additional \$30 million.. You mean I would have to pay for that. So deception is unraveled and all of a sudden, the joke is on you taxpayers. And please don't wave around your \$11 million dollar tickets because this "free" money will cost you \$22 million over 30 years. We do pay for that "free" money in the form of increased taxes. So when you read about how unaffordable this county is, just point your finger to this commission along with other government officials who resort to lies to spend more of our hard-earned money.

Like many of us do in our own households, take care of existing "to do" lists, don't start new projects like this one and continue on this fiscally irresponsible course. But most important of all, stop spreading these misconceptions to the people.

Libby Huyck

Aptos resident, 8 miles from railroad

-----Original Message-----

**From:** LibonPV@aol.com [mailto:LibonPV@aol.com]

**Sent:** Friday, March 05, 2004 9:50 AM

**To:** ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jan.beautz@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tony.campos@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mardi.wormhoudt@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; dnortondesigns@msn.com; linda.wilshusen@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; paspence@charter.net; keoghs1@pacbell.net; skennedy@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; ereilly@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; Ranndo@aol.com; redelapaz@ci.watsonville.ca.us

**Cc:** hboerner@santacruzsentinel.com; info@sccarred.org

**Subject:** ignorant residents need explanation for your decision

Thank you for the meeting last night. It was indeed "well attended", and you all did a wonderful job recruiting the bike trail enthusiasts, for which this EIR/Prop 116 funds do not clearly pertain. (As you mentioned in earlier meetings.)

Since you seem to thrive on misconceptions, I think you need to explain to the general population why you can listen to comments that are not relevant to the issue on hand. A bike trail wasn't even a part of the project for which EIR/Prop 116 funds are being used for. Please provide Heather with this explanation.

Also I would be most interested to hear from the Metro Commission members who apparently do not mind seeing \$10 million leave their necessary paratransit and bus services for this unnecessary project.

It is unfortunate that many hard-working people do not understand budgets and finances and so you have the fortunate position of spending money freely without regret. Just keep in mind that deceiving the public works for only a limited amount of time. Truth wins in the end and good does prevail over evil.

Thank you again for your time.

Libby Huyck

*Ms. Lillian -*

*Attached is a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the history of the Regional Transportation Commission, its functions, funding, members, programs, etc. Let me know if you can't open the file.*

*For more information, please check out our web site: [www.sccrtc.org](http://www.sccrtc.org)*

*Hope this helps.*

*- Karena Pushnik*

*Senior Transportation Planner*

*Santa Cruz Co. Regional Transportation Commission*

*831/460-3210 (fax 460-3215)*

*Please note new e-mail address: [kpashnik@sccrtc.org](mailto:kpashnik@sccrtc.org)*

*-----Original Message-----*

*From: Ms. Lillian [<mailto:orangehula@yahoo.com>]*

*Sent: Friday, March 05, 2004 3:32 PM*

*To: [info@sccrtc.org](mailto:info@sccrtc.org)*

*Subject: questions..*

*hey there,*

*i was just wondering if you could tell me the history of your organization-(founding date, founding context, founders and social locations, founding place, founding objectives) Im doing a project on transportation org's in santa cruz.*

*thanks so much,*

*Lillian*

*[orangehula@yahoo.com](mailto:orangehula@yahoo.com)*

-----Original Message-----

**From:** CapitolaFish@aol.com [mailto:CapitolaFish@aol.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, March 06, 2004 10:07 AM

**To:** jan.beautz@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tony.campos@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mardi.wormhoudt@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; dnortondesigns@msn.com

**Cc:** council@ci.capitola.ca.us; rdelapaz@ci.watsonville.ca.us; tfitzmaurice@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; Ranndo@aol.com; keoghs1@pacbell.net; ereilly@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; pspence@charter.net; linda.wilshusen@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; info@sccarred.org

**Subject:** RTC Meeting 3/4

During the subject RTC Meeting, Tony Campos stated (to paraphrase) that he was concerned about the Recreational Diesel Train's impact on our citizen's living along the rail corridor. Then, almost in the same sentence, he goes on to say that he looks forward to the day that students can ride the train from Watsonville to UCSC. That convoluted gibberish summed up the whole meeting.

Random Questions: (1) Why didn't someone stand up and tell that herd of bicycle trail enthusiasts, with funny money sprouting from their heads, that there was no provision for a bike trail in the present plan? This group dominated the meeting and turned the theme from an intelligent discussion of the issues into a childish pep rally for a non existing pipe dream. We suspect that the reason nobody spoke up was that, sadly, only three or four of the twelve members even knew this fact. So the odds were against us. (2) Why not let Mardi Wormhoudt stay home and mail her votes in? If it appeals to the UCSC student group, it's a "yes." That would save a lot of time. (3) Why not insist that admittedly uninformed members like Scott Kennedy (and others..) be muzzled until they can spare five minutes of their own time brushing up on the subject? (4) Why not somehow honor the intelligence and clear thinking displayed by Supervisors Pirie and Beautz? Without them, chaos and muddled thought would predominately rule the Commission. They give us a ray of hope. (5) Why not give two other members credit for courage? Randy Johnson for bucking the trend by voting in the "no" column and Richard DeLaPaz for insisting that a sensible and realistic Business Plan be prepared to prove that the Recreational Diesels have even a remote chance for success. We don't believe such a realistic Business Plan is possible.

If the Plan were to acquire the rail corridor, rip up the tracks and turn it into a scenic, county wide, walking and bicycle trail, you would have near unanimous agreement among the citizens. This trail would soon be known World-Wide and attract more tourists in a day than this dollar-draining Diesel would in ten years of failure. Mrs. Pirie is right, let's forget about Sacramento's "strings-attached" money and do it on our own. If there's a will, there is a way. We know, Dennis Norton says that there is no other way. But..would anyone buy a used car from this guy?

Mr. & Mrs. George Fish

-----Original Message-----

From: Sue Renner [mailto:suerenner@earthlink.net]

Sent: Saturday, March 06, 2004 1:44 PM

To: jan.beautz@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;  
mardi.wormhoudt@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tony.campos@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;  
mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; dnortondesigns@msn.com;  
rdelapaz@ci.watsonville.ca.us; skennedy@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; ranndo@aol.com;  
keoghs1@pacbell.net; ereilly@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; paspence@charter.net  
Cc: Linda Wilshusen; council@ci.capitola.ca.us  
Subject: RTC Public Hearing 3/4/04

Dear Commissioners,

*I want to thank you all for your time at the March 4 public hearing. With so much at stake, I think it's important to look carefully and objectively at the proposed plan and everything we've learned so far. Many residents near the corridor have researched and continue to follow developments closely, as it would impact us most immediately and strongly. Emotions come into it as a matter of course--these are our homes. And we all work hard for the little bit of peace and serenity we've carved out, as I'm sure you do. Other residents further away also have taken the time to research, realizing that this affects them too. None of us are backed by a national organization, or have joined a club, or were recruited to wear hats and wave flyers.*

*If the tourist train plan was built on solid financials/economics, showed how it would improve traffic congestion, could actually and effectively mitigate residents' concerns, and demonstrated how it would result in a bike path/trail, that would be one thing. But what we have is something completely different.*

*As I stated at the meeting, I really don't think that \$85k and 2-3 months for an EIR will be anywhere close to sufficient. Already, we have received feedback that our concerns are "out of scope" or otherwise will not be reasonably addressed. The prop 116 funds have serious strings attached that include \$10M diverted from other projects and liability to the state.*

*The 3-project separation (ROW, rec rail, coastal trail) prevents clear communication of all the facts and considerations; what is possible collectively and what is not. If opinions stated at the meeting are representative, it would be safe to say that most people are in favor of a trail. How then, does it make sense to move forward with a tourist train without analyzing feasibility/coexistence with a trail? Unless your intentions are not for trail, but in fact expanded passenger rail. If the*

*latter is the case, I'd ask those Commissioners to state that publicly, for the record.*

*What I'd like to see is for people to step back and re-define our objective clearly and collectively. If county residents want a trail, we should be focusing on that--developing a well-thought out plan to achieve that which we can all be proud of. Going down the current path--116 funds, tourist train--is needlessly dividing our community.*

*Thank you,*

*Sue Renner*

-----Original Message-----

From: Fariss, Michael [mailto:mfariss@woodsidepriory.com]

Sent: Sunday, March 07, 2004 1:13 PM

To: info@sccrtc.org

Subject: RE: I like the Santa Scruz trail & trolley

I like the idea of having Santa Scruz trail because I am a resident of Santa Cruz county who likes to bicycle around where cars are not.

Additionally, I like the idea of a trolley for tourists & for locals. I live in the west part of the county & have a few friends in the East side.

\*\*\* Highway 1 is a bear for local traffic \*\*\*

I would prefer a trolley that looks like San Francisco's trolley or San Jose's historical trolleys because I think they would be more appealing to tourists & locals. Finally, I think that such a line would be most used of it started at the Boardwalk and went to the Aptos Village County Park or to the nearby golf course. This may be attractive to people who are already at the Boardwalk and are interested and going golfing (especially if it was advertised as a "30 minute scenic ride to the golf course with. No parking required." :-).

Perhaps a historic trolley modified to be quieter for use near neighborhoods. Finally this would likely have the most "buy-in" if these modifications were "sold" to the neighbors as "quieter than the existing cement-supply train to Davenport".

-m

-----Original Message-----

*From: Karen Menehan [mailto:edit@massagemag.com]*

*Sent: Tuesday, March 09, 2004 9:22 AM*

*To: SCCRTC Staff*

*Subject: Please purchase the Rail Trail Corridor*

*Dear Transportation Commissioner,*

*I am writing in support of the development of the Coastal Trolley between Aptos and Capitola, and to encourage you to vote to and buy the 31 mile railroad corridor between Davenport and Watsonville, immediately.*

*I am one of the many, many people who will use this corridor on a regular basis.*

*The purchase of this corridor will allow for a 'rail trail' to be built. Such a trail would be immensely useful for both bicycling and walking for work and play. It would be a safe and pleasant place for people of all ages and abilities. Your agency should start building it at once, without further delay, and connect it to the existing path in Monterey County to create a Monterey Bay Sanctuary Trail.*

*In addition, the purchase of the corridor will give our county the potential to begin running transportation-oriented rail service. This is a long term amenity that the people of this county should have a chance to consider.*

*Allowing for a tourist trolley seems like a good way to complete this purchase. The tourist train will have very little impact while bringing in much-needed tourist money to local businesses in Aptos and Capitola.*

*Please vote yes on immediately purchasing this unique corridor.*

*Sincerely,*

*Karen Menehan*

-----Original Message-----

From: joyce banzhaf [mailto:joycebanzhaf@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 09, 2004 9:35 AM

To: SCCRTC Staff

Subject: Please purchase the Rail Trail Corridor

Dear Transportation Commissioner,

Please endorse the Coastal Trolley between Aptos and Capitola and buy the 31 mile railroad corridor between Davenport and Watsonville, immediately.

The purchase of this corridor will allow for a 'rail trail' to be built. Such a trail would be immensely useful for both bicycling and walking for work and play. It would be a safe and pleasant place for people of all ages and abilities. Your agency should start building it at once, without further delay, and connect it to the existing path in Monterey County to create a Monterey Bay Sanctuary Trail.

In addition, the purchase of the corridor will give our county the potential to begin running transportation-oriented rail service. This is a long term amenity that the people of this county should have a chance to consider.

Allowing for a tourist trolley seems like a good way to complete this purchase. The tourist train will have very little impact while bringing in much-needed tourist money to local businesses in Aptos and Capitola.

Please vote yes on immediately purchasing this unique corridor.

Sincerely,  
joyce banzhaf

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Andrew Horne [mailto:andrew@pricehorne.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 09, 2004 10:46 AM

**To:** jan.beautz@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ereilly@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; BDS020@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Ranndo@aol.com; paspence@charter.net; BDS034@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tony.campos@co.santa-cruz.ca.us

**Cc:** info@sccrtc.org

**Subject:** Aptos Train Derailment

From today's Sentinel --- this derailment highlights the continuing safety issues involved with running trains on the UP track. Running a diesel train two and a half times faster than the freight train, 2,160 times / year dramatically increase the risk of a more serious derailment. Please consider what will happen if one of your trains derails and hits someone's house.

March 9, 2004

## **Coast lines**

### **APTOS**

#### **Freight train derailment strands coal cars**

A Union Pacific freight train derailed Monday, stranding a load of coal cars headed to the cement plant in Davenport.

The cause of the derailment was not immediately known.

Last July, after three derailments in two rainy winter months, the railroad announced a \$6.8 million track improvement project designed to keep its biggest customer on the 31-mile line happy.

That customer, RMC Materials, relies on the rail line to ship more than 350,000 tons a year of raw materials and finished product for buildings, highways, and bridges. When the rail line is out of order, it can force that company to resort to trucking, adding congestion to Highway 1.

Union Pacific spokesman John Bromley, who is based in Nebraska, had no information on the derailment or repair schedule Monday night.

-----Original Message-----

From: Craig Metz [mailto:bilygott@hotmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 09, 2004 11:19 AM

To: SCCRTC Staff

Subject: Please purchase the Rail Trail Corridor

Dear Transportation Commissioner,

I feel very strongly that this is our one chance to get this rail corridor and I want you to support this effort. I have never written to you before.

Please endorse the Coastal Trolley between Aptos and Capitola and buy the 31 mile railroad corridor between Davenport and Watsonville, immediately.

The purchase of this corridor will allow for a 'rail trail' to be built. Such a trail would be immensely useful for both bicycling and walking for work and play. It would be a safe and pleasant place for people of all ages and abilities. Your agency should start building it at once, without further delay, and connect it to the existing path in Monterey County to create a Monterey Bay Sanctuary Trail.

In addition, the purchase of the corridor will give our county the potential to begin running transportation-oriented rail service. This is a long term amenity that the people of this county should have a chance to consider.

Allowing for a tourist trolley seems like a good way to complete this purchase. The tourist train will have very little impact while bringing in much-needed tourist money to local businesses in Aptos and Capitola.

Please vote yes on immediately purchasing this unique corridor.

Sincerely,  
Craig Metz

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Williams [mailto:williamsforcongress@onebox.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 09, 2004 11:54 AM

To: SCCRTC Staff

Subject: Please purchase the Rail Trail Corridor

Dear Transportation Commissioner,

Please endorse the Coastal Trolley between Aptos and Capitola and buy the 31 mile railroad corridor between Davenport and Watsonville, immediately.

The purchase of this corridor will allow for a 'rail trail' to be built. Such a trail would be immensely useful for both bicycling and walking for work and play. It would be a safe and pleasant place for people of all ages and abilities. Your agency should start building it at once, without further delay, and connect it to the existing path in Monterey County to create a Monterey Bay Sanctuary Trail.

In addition, the purchase of the corridor will give our county the potential to begin running transportation-oriented rail service. This is a long term amenity that the people of this county should have a chance to consider.

Allowing for a tourist trolley seems like a good way to complete this purchase. The tourist train will have very little impact while bringing in much-needed tourist money to local businesses in Aptos and Capitola.

Please vote yes on immediately purchasing this unique corridor.

Sincerely,  
Joe Williams

-----Original Message-----

From: William LeBon [mailto:b\_lebon@yahoo.com]

Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2004 3:15 PM

To: SCCRTC Staff

Subject: Please purchase the Rail Trail Corridor

Dear Transportation Commissioner,

Please endorse the Coastal Trolley between Aptos and Capitola and buy the 31 mile railroad corridor between Davenport and Watsonville, immediately.

The purchase of this corridor will allow for a 'rail trail' to be built. Such a trail would be immensely useful for both bicycling and walking for work and play. It would be a safe and pleasant place for people of all ages and abilities. Your agency should start building it at once, without further delay, and connect it to the existing path in Monterey County to create a Monterey Bay Sanctuary Trail.

In addition, the purchase of the corridor will give our county the potential to begin running transportation-oriented rail service. This is a long term amenity that the people of this county should have a chance to consider.

Allowing for a tourist trolley seems like a good way to complete this purchase. The tourist train will have very little impact while bringing in much-needed tourist money to local businesses in Aptos and Capitola.

Please vote yes on immediately purchasing this unique corridor.

Sincerely,  
William LeBon

-----Original Message-----

From: Lucca McCaleb [mailto:LuccaMc@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2004 6:27 PM

To: SCCRTC Staff

Subject: Please purchase the Rail Trail Corridor

Dear Transportation Commissioner,

I live directly on the traintracks on Lennox St and my house strongly supports the rail trail from Davenport to Watsonville. I think it would be a great place to just stroll along in the day or night and chat with neighbors, aswell as an easy transportation bike route.

Please endorse the Coastal Trolley between Aptos and Capitola and buy the 31 mile railroad corridor between Davenport and Watsonville, immediately.

The purchase of this corridor will allow for a 'rail trail' to be built. Such a trail would be immensely useful for both bicycling and walking for work and play. It would be a safe and pleasant place for people of all ages and abilities. Your agency should start building it at once, without further delay, and connect it to the existing path in Monterey County to create a Monterey Bay Sanctuary Trail.

In addition, the purchase of the corridor will give our county the potential to begin running transportation-oriented rail service. This is a long term amenity that the people of this county should have a chance to consider.

Allowing for a tourist trolley seems like a good way to complete this purchase. The tourist train will have very little impact while bringing in much-needed tourist money to local businesses in Aptos and Capitola.

Please vote yes on immediately purchasing this unique corridor.

Sincerely,  
Lucca McCaleb

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Wofsc@aol.com [mailto:Wofsc@aol.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, March 14, 2004 10:22 AM

**To:** mardi.wormhoudt@co.santa-cruz.ca.us

**Cc:** jan.beautz@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tony.campos@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; linda.wilshusen@co.santa-cruz.ca.us

**Subject:** Corridor Facts

We read your article this morning on the "Rail Corridor." The theme of which seems to be that we, the naive public, must wait until all of the "facts" are in before making a judgment about the desirability of diesel trains destroying the tranquility and health of our family neighborhoods. The RTC has been studying this rail-dream for the last 25 years that we can remember and the conclusion has always come up extremely negative. To evaluate this proposal is not an exercise in rocket science, it's just using native common sense.

We live in your district and, like you, no where near the rail corridor. We sincerely wish that you did live near the corridor so that you could look forward to breathing the filthy, diesel fumes and try to sleep at night as the lumbering freight trains roll into your dreams since that will be the only time that they can now run. Yes, we think that your grandiose pure thoughts about those endless environmental studies would quickly turn into brute realism if you and your family's health and peaceful existence were involved.

The rest of your thoughts in the commentary were factual. However, you state that this whole controversy has nothing to do with the rail trail but during the RTC Meeting of March 4th, you sat there like a silent bump on a log. Why didn't you speak up and tell those hoards of cyclists that they were wasting their breath and our time with their right arguments at the wrong meeting?

Wanda Washington

-----Original Message-----

*From: Wes Swift [mailto:wswift@ebold.com]*

*Sent: Monday, March 15, 2004 2:33 PM*

*To: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission*

*Subject: Re: Public Hearing Re: Continuation of Recreational Rail EIR and Use of Proposition 116 Funds*

*I'm terribly sorry that I didn't make the meeting of the 4th, but I do want to get actively involved with getting the purchase approved of the rail line. Since I do live in one of the neighborhoods where SCARRED has it's roots, and am known as the "Train Guy", I need to help quell the fears of the Iron Monster. First off, I need a pretty thorough briefing on the facts, and hope someone there could bring me up to speed on the minutia of the proposal (ie default risks, freight revenue projections). I do work part time at Roaring Camp, own a rail car, and am well aware of the current operating position of UP.*

*Please contact me at 831-476-4113, I want to help.....*

*Wes Swift*

*www.yv330.com*

---

*Wes Swift –*

*Your e-mail regarding acquisition of the rail right-of-way and recreational rail was received and will be forwarded to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) for their consideration.*

*In terms of getting more information, please check out our web site:*

*<http://www.sccrtc.org/transit.html#acquire>*

*For information from advocate groups that support projects, see the Friends of the Rail Trail site: <http://santacruztrail.org/>*

*For information from advocate groups that oppose recreational rail, see the SCCARRED site: <http://www.sccarred.org/>*

*Please let me know if you need more information.*

*- Karena Pushnik*

*Senior Planner, SCCRTC*

*831/460-3210*

-----Original Message-----

**From:** RJonesPE@aol.com [mailto:RJonesPE@aol.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 17, 2004 9:18 AM

**To:** ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jan.beautz@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tony.campos@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ereilly@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; tfitzmaurice@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; keoghs1@pacbell.net; paspence@charter.net; Ranndo@aol.com; rdelapaz@ci.watsonville.ca.us; dnortondesigns@msn.com; mardi.wormhoudt@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Linda Wilshusen

**Cc:** thonig@santacruzsentinel.com

**Subject:** Tourist Train Safety

RTC Commissioners and Staff,

The March 15th Mercury News carried a Local section article on a tragedy that someday will be a Sentinel front page headline. *"Ventura (CA). Teen killed by train while hanging out ... with friends at a popular spot along an unfenced stretch of railway near the beach ..."* The RTC's plan to put a tourist train from Aptos to Capitola is a staggering 2100% increase in rail traffic; more traffic than has ever been on that line in its 100+ year existence. This volume on an uncontrolled, unfenced right-of-way is an invitation for disaster. A walking/biking trail only five feet from the tracks with no barrier, as Friends of the Rail Trail recommend in the March 4th public meeting, only compounds this danger. Despite FORT's implication that railroads are a benign transportation mode, just the opposite is true. Railroads are damn dangerous. To create a useless tourist train only to obtain Proposition 116 money, among many ills, also demonstrates a callous disregard for public safety, especially children who seem to be attracted to trains. The RTC should stop this reckless pursuit of the tourist train. If allowed to operate, will be just a matter of time before my headline prediction becomes a reality.

Robert Jones

Aptos

-----Original Message-----

**From:** CMarch4515@aol.com [mailto:CMarch4515@aol.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 17, 2004 11:35 AM

**To:** info@scrtc.org; info@sccarred.org

**Cc:** council@ci.capitola.ca.us

**Subject:** TRAIN !

 **Keep that train & station out of my backyard !! Our yard backs up to Jade Street Park --**

**We don't need it or the expense - GET HWY 1 BUILT TO 6 LANES, that's what we need !!**

**From a couple of 70+ year olds & a veteran of 2 wars -**

**Charles & Carol Marchbank**

**Nova Drive**

**Santa Cruz**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** CMarch4515@aol.com [mailto:CMarch4515@aol.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 17, 2004 11:35 AM

**To:** info@sccrtc.org; info@sccarred.org

**Cc:** council@ci.capitola.ca.us

**Subject:** TRAIN !

**🌐 Keep that train & station out of my backyard !! Our yard backs up to Jade Street Park --**

**We don't need it or the expense - GET HWY 1 BUILT TO 6 LANES, that's what we need !!**

**From a couple of 70+ year olds & a veteran of 2 wars -**

**Charles & Carol Marchbank**

**Nova Drive**

**Santa Cruz**

---

Charles & Carol Marchbank –

It is unfortunate that inflammatory misinformation is circulating about the future Recreational Rail. The Jade Street station was dropped in favor of a station along Cliff Drive leading down into Capitola Village. For more information about the project as well as the status of the Highway 1 projects, please see the Regional Transportation Commission web site ([www.sccrtc.org](http://www.sccrtc.org)).

- Karena Pushnik  
Senior Planner  
SCCRTC  
831/460-3210

**From:** Michael Park [michael@somonokio.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 18, 2004 2:40 PM  
**To:** ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; jan.beautz@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;  
tony.campos@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;  
ereilly@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; tfitzmaurice@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us;  
keoghs1@pacbell.net; paspence@charter.net; Rando@aol.com;  
rdelapaz@ci.watsonville.ca.us; dnortondesigns@msn.com;  
mardi.wormhoudt@co.santa-cruz.ca.us  
**Cc:** Linda Wilshusen; Gini Pineda; Rachel Moriconi; Karena Pushnik  
**Subject:** Auto emissions declining  
To: Members and staff of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
From: Michael Park, Santa Cruz resident

Re: Article on auto emissions, freeway building, congestion inducement

Dear Commissioners and staff,

Please read the following article and add it to the public record (in the information agenda for the next RTC meeting). I am confident that you will find it interesting, particularly as it addresses local concerns related to the expansion of Highway 1.

You may find that this article contradicts some of the information in circulation regarding the widening of Highway 1, particularly as far as emissions are concerned. While there may be an increase in vehicle miles traveled, that doesn't necessarily translate to an increase in emissions, a common reason many people object to the widening project. On the contrary, automobile emissions nationwide have been declining for the last 30 years despite increased traffic.

With highest regards,

Michael Park

Note: I have highlighted certain points [**in bold**] that I think will be most relevant for you.

-----  
Driving Policy with Distractions  
By Joel Schwartz  
Published 03/16/2004  
[<http://www.techcentralstation.com/031604E.html>]

According to a new report by the Public Interest Research Group (PIRG) "building new highways will do little to alleviate traffic congestion in the long run and likely will exacerbate already severe air pollution problems in metropolitan areas across the country." PIRG asserts the only solution is to restrict how much people can drive and build more public transit.

The report, "More Highways, More Pollution," is the latest effort by anti-automobile activists to torture the data until it gives the desired confession. In fact, **despite a tripling of urban driving during the last 30 years, air pollution has dropped dramatically, while areas that have more freeway lane-miles per capita have lower traffic densities.**

Driving and Air Pollution

PIRG claims that building more highway capacity will increase driving and therefore air pollution. But if building highways inevitably increases air pollution, we should have seen a huge increase in air pollution during the last few decades. In fact, just the opposite occurred. While 60 percent of the nation's ozone monitors violated the 1-hour ozone standard in the late 1970s, only 10 percent

do so today. Areas with the worst pollution achieved the greatest gains. For example, the San Bernardino area exceeded the 1-hour standard more than 150 times per year in the late 1970s, but only 20 to 30 times per year today.

The nation has likewise made great progress on airborne particulate matter (PM). Only a few percent of the nation's monitoring locations still violate the PM10 standard. About 20 percent violate EPA's new and much more stringent PM2.5 standard, but PM2.5 levels have steadily declined, dropping by about 40 percent during the last 25 years. Recent monitoring data show these declines are continuing.

Although at least 90 percent of urban carbon monoxide (CO) emissions come from motor vehicles, more than 99 percent of the U.S. has met the federal carbon monoxide (CO) standard since the early 1990s. The remaining few locations recently came into attainment.

Despite most nitrogen oxides (NOx) coming from motor vehicles, the entire U.S. has been in attainment of the nitrogen dioxide standard for more than a decade. Air toxics have also declined. Although benzene comes mainly from motor vehicles, ambient benzene levels dropped more than 70 percent around the U.S. between 1989 and 1999.

### Highways and Air Pollution

PIRG reports that total miles driven in urban areas tripled between 1970 and 2002. Thus, **America achieved extraordinary air pollution reductions despite vast increases in driving.** These facts are lost on PIRG, which ignores past pollution trends and claims pollution is "severe" and getting worse. In PIRG's imaginary world "The experience of the last 30 years has shown that limits on tailpipe emissions -- while necessary -- are not enough to resolve the problem of vehicular air pollution. Any strategy to reduce health threats from air pollution must include a strategy to curtail the growth of vehicle travel."

Ironically, even PIRG's own numbers don't support its conclusions. For example, PIRG notes that "Vehicles are 80 to 99 percent cleaner per mile than vehicles produced in the late 1960s" (emphasis in original). Let's assume then that per-mile emissions of the average vehicle declined 90 percent since the late 1960s -- the middle of PIRG's range. If driving hadn't increased, this would have led to a 90 percent decrease in total emissions. Or put another way, if emissions equaled 1.0 in 1969, they would equal 0.1 today. Now let's add a factor of three increase in driving:  $0.1 * 3 = 0.3$ . In other words, even with a tripling of driving, technological improvements in vehicle emissions control reduced total emissions by 70 percent.

On-road measurements show vehicle emissions are dropping about 10 percent per year due to fleet turnover. Driving is increasing only about one to 3 percent per year, for a net decline in emissions of 7 to 9 percent per year. Because more-recent vehicle models continue to start out and stay cleaner than earlier models, fleet turnover will continue to clean the air. New SUVs have been as clean as new cars for the last several years, so the popularity of larger vehicles won't affect future air quality. EPA regulations that phase in during the next few years require an additional 70 to 90 percent reduction in new-vehicle emissions from both cars and diesel trucks, ensuring that most remaining motor-vehicle pollution will be eliminated during the next 20 years or so. PIRG's fanciful claims notwithstanding, **technology will continue to win the battle against air pollution without the need to restrict people's travel choices.**

### Highways and Congestion

PIRG believes that building highways "induces" more demand for travel, eliminating any gains from extra road capacity. If people had an infinite demand for automobile travel this might be the case. But in the real world, cities with more highway lane-miles per capita actually have lower

traffic densities, as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Relationship between Driving and Highway Miles  
[<http://www.techcentralstation.com/images/pirg1.gif>]

Notes: Analysis by Wendell Cox, based on 1999 data from the Texas Transportation Institute for urbanized areas with more than 1 million population. Each point represents an urbanized area. Slope is statistically significant at the 99.9% level.

As transportation researcher Randal O'Toole puts it, "travel that is 'induced' by added capacity is actually travel that had been repressed or shifted by capacity shortages." [1] Between 1980 to 2000 the number of cars in the U.S. increased 50 percent, while total miles driven increased 75 percent. Yet the number of road miles increased by only about 5 percent. **Recent increases in congestion aren't due to building more freeways, but are "due to more driving without a similar increase in freeways."** [2]

Most Americans consider the unparalleled convenience and flexibility of the automobile to be a great benefit. Even with increasing congestion due to lagging road investments, most Americans still prefer driving to other modes of transportation. PIRG wishes it were otherwise, but getting people to use transit is no easy task. Metropolitan planning organizations, the regional agencies that draft metropolitan transportation plans, predict that even spending thousands of dollars per capita on new urban transit services -- hundreds of billions on a nationwide basis -- would at most reduce single-occupant-vehicle trips by a few percent below "business as usual." And the urban densities required to make transit viable will increase congestion, because per-capita driving decreases only modestly with increasing density.

Instead of providing infrastructure for the types of transportation Americans most desire, PIRG instead aims to end highway building and increase transit. Where the vast majority of Americans see great net benefits to automobile travel, PIRG sees only costs. Rather than pursue the "public interest," PIRG seeks to override Americans' preferences.

### False Premises

PIRG's staff carefully chose and structured the data to tell the story they wanted. But even here they didn't do a very good job. PIRG used EPA's official inventory of VOC and NOx emissions for its estimates. However, these inventories have never passed a real-world validation test. For example, PIRG claims, based on EPA estimates, that 29 percent of volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions come from on-road vehicles. But real-world studies in several cities show the actual contribution ranges from about 50 to 85 percent. PIRG could have bolstered its anti-automobile case if its staff were familiar with basic air pollution science.

Indeed, PIRG didn't even bother to check its central claim that per-capita pollution emissions correlate with ambient pollution levels. They don't. As shown in Figure 2, there is no correlation between PIRG's estimate of emissions per capita and actual measured ozone levels. Several factors could explain this. First, PIRG naively used EPA's incorrect emissions inventory. Second, pollution levels vary based on differences in weather from place to place. Third, urban form affects pollution levels. **Higher population density means more emissions per unit area. Suburbanization might increase driving, but it reduces the density of emissions much more.** Ambient pollution levels are what matter for health. If higher per-capita emissions don't translate into higher ambient pollution levels, then PIRG's entire study is based on a false premise.

Figure 2. PIRG's Estimate of Per-Capita Motor Vehicle Emissions vs. Ozone Levels  
[<http://www.techcentralstation.com/images/pirg2.gif>]

Notes: Each point represents a single metropolitan statistical area (MSA). "NOx + VOC per capita" is for 1999 and is from the PIRG report. All MSA's with more than 1 million population are included. "Ozone exceedances" is the number of 8-hour ozone exceedances in 1999 at the worst location in each MSA. Ozone data were downloaded from EPA at <http://www.epa.gov/air/data/repsus.html?us~usa~United%20States>.

Most people prefer auto-based lifestyles, and technology and fleet turnover are mitigating air pollution. **Instead of trying to make motorists miserable, scarce transportation dollars should instead be allocated to reflect the actual relative demand for transit and auto travel.** That would allow cities to provide the additional automobile infrastructure necessary to keep up with travel demand, reduce road congestion, and provide a transportation system that meets people's needs.

PIRG's report should provide grist for courses in critical thinking, but shouldn't be taken seriously as a guide for policymakers.

Joel Schwartz is a visiting fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and the author of the AEI study "No Way Back: Why Air Pollution Will Continue to Decline." He recently wrote for TCS on New Source Review.

[1] R. O'Toole, *The Vanishing Automobile, and Other Urban Myths* (Bandon, OR: Thoreau Institute, 2001).

[2] Ibid.

Copyright © 2004 Tech Central Station - [www.techcentralstation.com](http://www.techcentralstation.com)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Rebecca Downing [mailto:rebecca@transparentseas.com]

**Sent:** Friday, March 19, 2004 3:13 PM

**To:** info@sccrtc.org

**Subject:** To: Linda Wilshusen or Karena Pushnik

Although the minutes from the March 4, 2004 meeting are not available yet, I was surprised at the way the highlights from the meeting were drafted. The part about the EIR for the rec trail reads more like a newspaper article than an official statement of the event. It also seems to have a slight bias toward the rail project. Comments like "well attended" and "stay the course" don't really add to the information required to highlight the meeting and aren't very objective.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Downing

***Continuation of Environmental Review for the Recreational Rail Project and Use of the***

***Proposition 116 Funds:*** The Regional Transportation Commission held a well attended public

hearing regarding future uses of the rail corridor. More than 300 people packed the County

Government Center to express their views about passenger rail and the coastal bicycle/pedestrian

path within the rail right-of-way. After 3 hours of public comment, the RTC decided to stay the

course, complete the Environmental Impact Review document for recreational rail and to pursue

Proposition 116 funds for acquisition of the rail corridor.