



RE-ROUTE THE ROUTE

THEY SAY/WE SAY

TEXAS CENTRAL SAYS:

In order to operate at planned speeds, high-speed trains require gentler curves than the I-45 corridor allows at some points, which is why following the I-45 corridor is not ideal for the project.

WE SAY:

In fact, the HC-4 curve that runs through the community of Hockley on the current proposed route is a dangerous curve. In order for safety to be a priority, it's important to avoid having a large curve with the potential for train derailments - and suggests that curves aren't truly the obstacle to a different route.

TEXAS CENTRAL SAYS:

Texas Central operates as a railroad and thus has the right to utilize eminent domain.

WE SAY:

The only state authority that governed high-speed rail and explicitly granted eminent domain to a selected private company was abolished by lawmakers in the 1990s. Texas Central is currently seeking a legislative "fix" to secure the power of eminent domain, which they wouldn't have to do if they were truly certain that a high-speed rail company could already invoke that power to take the land needed to finish the project.

TEXAS CENTRAL SAYS:

One of the advantages of the proposed route is that it requires the fewest number of land parcels.

WE SAY:

The cost savings from building the rail using fewer land parcels should not come at the risk of public safety or ignoring important environmental concerns. It may cost more to build the rail the right way, but Texans' lives and livelihoods are a much more important consideration. The proposed route may be the best for Texas Central, but it isn't the best for Texas.

Source for Texas Central's arguments: <https://www.texascentral.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Step-1-Screening-of-Corridor-Alternatives-Report.pdf>

FOLLOW US
& TAG



@REROUTETHEROUTE