

## Wyatt, Rosie

---

**From:** Arthur, Bruce (capcouncil@aol.com)  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 13, 2025 1:31 PM  
**To:** City Council  
**Subject:** Previous email  
**Attachments:** Letter to council.docx

Unfortunately my proof reading is in need of an overhaul. Please find the corrected e-mail attachment.

Bruce

Yesterday I read a letter to the editor in the Sentinel. It alluded to how selfish Capitola was for not wanting to allow the RTC to use our streets for their trail diversion through the Village. The city was holding hostage the rail trail segment by sticking to an ordinance that was passed by a majority of the Citizens. Now, I can agree that the RTC owns the rail right of way and can develop it generally as they see fit. But the City has the responsibility to protect the quality of life that the citizens of Capitola have come to expect from their elected officials. The city council was elected to represent the citizens and pledged to uphold the laws of the city. One of those laws was outlined in measure L. It was passed by a majority of voters and codified into law. Fortunately, elected officials can't choose which laws they can overlook. If the majority of the council wants to move the trail through the Village, then they need to change the law. That would require another vote from the public. It seems to me that this whole tempest in a tea pot can be solved easily. The RTC can build the trail across the Trestle now. The right of way isn't going anywhere. They can convert it to rail in the future.

Capitola shouldn't be labeled as selfish or as holding the rest of the county hostage by looking out for our best interest. The RTC doesn't hold sway over our city streets and shouldn't be able to coerce elected officials to act otherwise. As an elected official there are many boards and commissions on which they are required to participate. They are there to represent the city, and by extension the people of Capitola. When the good of the citizenry is being challenged by an action of that board or commission, the councilperson has an obligation to defend the city's interest above all others. Not doing so would be disingenuous to their oath of office.

I can only hope that reasonable minds may prevail over an issue that seemed to have been resolved by passing measure L.

Sincerely,

Bruce Arthur