

EDITOR: GUEST EDITORIAL: LETTER; GOES FOR BOTH DISPATCH AND FREELANCE;
GOVERNANCE ABUSE IN BAD TRANSPORT POLICY, VTA & COG, WHERE WE KEEP MAKING
THE SAME MISTAKES, AND CALL IT "SUCCESS"

Handwritten signature: Governance Abuse continue

From: Joseph P Thompson (translaw@pacbell.net)

To: echalhoub@weeklys.com; mmoore@weeklys.com; allcouncilmembers@ci.gilroy.ca.us; editor@garlic.com;
chamber@gilroy.org; president@gilroyedc.org; jane@gilroy.org; info@sanbenitocog.org;
supervisorkosmicki@cosb.us; supervisorzanger@cosb.us; sbcsuper@supervisor.co.san-benito.ca.us;
supervisorsotelo@cosb.us; supervisors@cosb.us; supervisorogonzales@cosb.us; cityclerk@hollister.ca.gov;
roxymontana2@aol.com

Date: Friday, May 3, 2024 at 11:41 AM PDT

Handwritten signature: All COG

**PUBLIC COMMENT: NEXT MEETING: REAL OR VIRTUAL; REGULAR OR SPECIAL; STUDY SESSION OR
PRIVATE RETREAT OR
PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

Dear Friends, Editor,

Thanks for reporting about transportation, a favorite of mine.

So, as with previous editions at the mayor's spot, what is the cost of a bus ride? train ride? Bullet Train ride? and how much of the cost will the passenger pay, and how much of it will the taxpayers pay? DejaVu all over again, Yogi.

When is socialism a better transportation solution than the private sector?

Why don't our leaders follow their own experts' advice about transport funding?

They concluded "user fees" is best; but we reject that advice, and add a 1/4 cent here, and a 1/2 cent there, here, there, and everywhere, and what do we get in the end? What percentage of bus seats are transported empty? How much does that cost us?

Lousy public sector transit, where only the public sector union employees win, while the rest of us pay higher, higher, and higher gas taxes, and other taxes. Why don't we cut spending instead of raising taxes, fees, fines, assessments, mandates, etc.?

Why did we denationalize the railroads after they were nationalized during the Wilson Administration?

Why did Lincoln say "no" to Gen. Granville Dodge, at the White House in 1864, when Dodge, who was later UPRR top civil engineer, told the President that the transcontinental railroad should be owned by the government. Dodge recites his interview with Lincoln in his seminal "How We Built the Transcontinental Railroad."

During the debate in 1970 on creation of the National Railroad Passenger Act (a/k/a Amtrak), advocates promised that it would be "self-sufficient in three years." How'd that work out?

By 9/11/01, taxpayers' subsidies to Amtrak, in hundred dollar bill stacked together, reached higher than the World Trade Centers had stood.

We had Amtrak, but our airport security didn't serve us well.

In 2009 Mark Derry published a letter in which I predicted that the price of a gallon of gas would rise to \$10.00 to fund the bankrupt-from-conception Bullet Train.

Looks like I was too optimistic. Today, I'd venture to say it will be closer to \$20/gallon. History teaches us that public sector "services" come with a fatal price tag.

Today's leaders have us on the Road to Serfdom, same route taken by the USSR.

Joe Thompson, Past-President 1999-2001, 2006, Gilroy-Morgan Hill Bar Assn.,

Past-Chair, Legislation Committee, Transportation Lawyers Assn.,

408-848-5506; TransLaw@PacBell.Net

Handwritten signature: Joe Thompson

JOSEPH P. THOMPSON
Attorney at Law
8339 Church Street, Suite 112, Gilroy, CA 95020
Post Office Box 154, Gilroy, CA 95021-0154
Telephone (408) 848-5506; Fax (408) 848-4246
E-Mail: TransLaw@PacPell.Net

Fax (408) 842-2206

August 24, 2007

Editor Email: editor@garlic.com, editor@gilroydispatch.com

The *Dispatch*

6400 Monterey Road

Gilroy, CA 95020

Re: **Bullet Train: Tourists' Panacea, Taxpayers' Hell**

Dear Editor,

The proposal to build the Bullet Train in California is proof that socialists have taken-over our government. Based on past cost overruns, the price tag on this extreme boondoggle is about \$75-\$80 billion in today's dollars. Paid back interest on these bonds will also burden our children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren with billions more. Annual operating losses will exceed those of all Lite Rails combined. Fares won't cover 1% of operating expenses, estimated at \$1 billion/year. Bond debt will bury us.

Technology exists to build it, but how do we pay the construction costs, and operating costs? It's technologically incompatible with existing railroads, so it will need BART-like right-of-way. Eminent domain power, included in the legislation creating it, ensures that it will plow through Gilroy and Morgan Hill and any other place, regardless of opposition. But it cannot cross the UPRR's tracks because the Class I railroads' eminent domain trumps Bullet Train's eminent domain power, according to UP's top commerce counsel on the West Coast. Tourists will ride it, but enjoy a 99% taxpayer subsidy for rides that will cost more than those on the Concorde Supersonic Jets. Local small business owners will pick-up the tab, maybe getting 10% back from tourist dollars if we're lucky.

In 1970 Congressmen stood up in Congress and proclaimed that Amtrak would be "self-sufficient in three years." Yeh. By 9/11/01 taxpayers had thrown about \$30 billion in subsidies down that black hole, but did we have adequate airport security?

In 1863 General Granville Dodge, who was later UPRR's top civil engineer, and who discovered the Sherman Pass over the Continental Divide, was summoned to the White House. He later said that he told the President that the government should own and operate the transcontinental railroad. Lincoln, who as a young member of the Illinois Legislature had seen government owned railroads in Eastern and Midwestern States go bust and shutdown operations in the 1830's and 1840's, said no. He said that private enterprise must do it, although the government would assist with

When will we ever learn?

development incentives (my words, not his). They did it. And what did taxpayers receive in the deal? They got about \$460 million (measured in 1940 dollars) more than the value of the land granted to the railroad corporations because of Section 22 in the original Interstate Commerce Act (lower freight rates for government shipments).

A hundred years ago the Progressive Movement, led by William Jennings Bryan, sought nationalization of the railroads and other industries, but their passion was rejected by voters.

When the railroads were nationalized in 1917 during the Administration of Woodrow Wilson, government genius so botched-up shipping that rail traffic came to a standstill. That experiment failed, just as Lincoln predicted it would. In the Transportation Act of 1920 the railroads were de-nationalized, and came to be the envy of the world's nations today; the backbone of our nation's commerce.

Instead of making taxpayers pay for Bullet Train, like we pay for County Transit, Caltrain, Amtrak, Lite Rail, etc., etc., while motorists are paying 100% of their own transport costs, seeing our politicians rewarding transit wastefulness, why not use the unlimited power of capitalism? Have you been on I-5 lately to see the uninterrupted 24-7 tonnage flowing North-South in California? I appeared before the Bullet Train commission five times over the last decade and told them that if they put enough UPS, Fedex and Postal Service tonnage on their trains, then they would not need to ask the taxpayers for a dime. Did they listen?

Like Amtrak's promoters, their pie-in-the-sky predictions show that they did not listen, nor did they learn from history, either United States or world history in the last century and one-half. So, hold on for the ride, and warn your children and grandchildren, our leaders will strap taxpayers to the rocket to Hell. We'll be paying unimaginable sums to attempt what Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and the USSR failed to achieve, despite all their promises to their citizens that socialism could bring utopia. If they fund it with gas taxes, be prepared to see \$10/gallon for gas at the pumps. They'll tax motorists out of their cars, leaving them to ride our Trojan Horses, and bike or walk the rest of the way.

Caveat Viator!

Respectfully yours,
JOSEPH P. THOMPSON, ESQ.

Member, Executive Committee, Debtor-Creditor-Bankruptcy Section, SCCBA
Member, Legislation Committee, Transportation Lawyers Assn.
Member, Association for Transportation Law, Logistics & Policy
Candidate, American Society of Transportation & Logistics
Winner, AST&L's Best Research Paper Award 1997
Past-President, Gilroy-Morgan Hill Bar Assn.
Post-Doctoral Student, Transportation Law & Policy

When will we ever learn?

JOSEPH P. THOMPSON
Attorney at Law
8339 Church Street, Suite 112, Gilroy, CA 95020
Post Office Box 154, Gilroy, CA 95021-0154
Telephone (408) 848-5506; Fax (408) 848-4246
E-Mail: TransLaw@PacPell.Net
January 28, 2004

Fax (408) 842-2206
Editor
The *Dispatch*
6400 Monterey Road
Gilroy, CA 95020

Re: Bullet Train or Trojan Horse?

Dear Editor,

When Amtrak was formed in 1970, Congressmen promised that it would be profitable in three years. Well, after 33 years, taxpayers have paid \$31 billion in subsidies, with no end in sight. As *Traffic World* reported, that is a stack of \$100 bills higher than the World Trade Center stood. Supporters of the Bullet-in-the-Brain train will make profit building and operating it, just as VTA does operating Black Hole Lite Rail. However, taxpayers will be the losers. The galley slaves will need to quicken their strokes so that the recipients of their labors will enjoy their rides. Will Rod be successful in converting us to a socialist society, living in concrete high-rise Dirodonominiums like the USSR's "affordable housing"? Until Rod was appointed to HSRA, they had projected a \$900 million annual operating loss (truth probably doubles their estimate), but now they project a profitable operation. "Profitable" in the same definition of VTA's "profit." I do not swallow this big lie. Do you?

As with Caltrain, Lite Rail, and Amtrak, taxicabs and limousines would be cheaper for the taxpayers. But have we learned anything from the history of the last Century? If we defeated the USSR, then why are we adopting their philosophy?

I appeared before the High Speed Rail Commission (before it became an "authority") five times and told the commissioners that if they put enough Fedex, UPS, and Postal Service tonnage on their train, then they would not need to ask the taxpayers for a dime. Instead of following a capitalist model, they insist (with Bechtel Corporation's—the builder—support) that California must have a Soviet-style horizontal elevator. Well, if voters believe that B.S., then they deserve to wear this albatross around their necks. But ask yourselves, do our children and grandchildren deserve the consequences of our compulsive spending disorder? Are we building the future for them, or welcoming a monster Trojan Horse? *Caveat viator.*

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH P. THOMPSON

Candidate: American Society of Transportation & Logistics
Member: Legislation Committee, Transportation Lawyers Assn.

From: Joseph P Thompson <translaw@pacbell.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2024 11:16 AM
To: Monica Gomez; SBC Board of Supervisors; sbcsuper@cosb.us; supervisorkosmicki@cosb.us; supervisorzanger@cosb.us; Supervisor Bea Gonzales; Supervisors; supervisorsotelo@cosb.us; Angela Curro; cityclerk@hollister.ca.gov; San Benito Civil Grand Jury; Roxy Montana; Michael Moore; Erik Chalhoub; Gilroy Dispatch Editor
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT: ON BEHALF OF MOTORISTS PAYING EVER-INCREASING GAS TAXES SO POLITICIANS CAN "GIVE" NEARLY-"FREE" BOONDOGGLE PUBLIC SECTOR TRANSIT FIASCOES LIKE COG's EMPTY BUS SEAT "ESSENTIAL SERVICE"
Attachments: COGUMHG02-24.pdf

Dear Friends,

For the 18th year in a row, I repeat my comment to you about your governance abuse, as we see gas taxes reach historic highs, and await the next gas tax increase on 7-1-24, gouging motorists, self-sufficient motorists who pay 102% of the cost of our own transport, plus 99% of the cost of transit systems' riders' costs, fully amortized costs. If you use legal accounting methods, GAAP as required by the IRS and FTB regs, and not the illegal Enron-style, Bernie Madoff-style, "off-book accounting," where you omit your capital and fixed costs, then you'll begin to pull the wool off your eyes and see truth in transportation.

What will you do when you tax motorists out of our cars? I've stood at your podium many times and showed you what your ruinous transport funding policy will do. All you have to do is extrapolate from your current truthful financials, not the ones that you get from your corrupt staff.

I authorize you to include these remarks in the official record of proceedings so that future generations will know that you were warned.

Caveat viator.

Joe Thompson
(408) 848-5506

E-Mail: TransLaw@PacBell.Net

cc: SBC BOS

cc: Hollister City Council

cc: Editor: Guest Editorial, or Letter to Editor, all Editions

**Remarks to the Council of Governments of San Benito County
by**

Joseph P. Thompson, Esq.

[SAME PUBLIC COMMENT EVERY YEAR 2006-2024]

***Unmet Needs Hearing 2024: Emperor Transit First is Stark Naked-
COG is Taking us Places That we Don't Want to go, While
Making our County Unlivable & Unaffordable, and the
Small Business Killing Fields-***

***COG's Directors Refuse to Make Highway Safety COG's Top Priority-
While "partnering" with VTA & TAMC & AMBAG to Ruin the Region,
but they Refuse to Abolish COG, Remove the Malignant Cancer, and will
Not Even Consider Reform by Privatization and Free Enterprise Solutions
COG's Directors, Like the Bell, California City Council, Ought
to be Prosecuted for Fraud and Violation of their Fiduciary Duty
to the Taxpayers of San Benito County***

Mr. Chairman, and Directors, ladies & gentlemen, thank you for allowing me to address the Joint Powers Authority (unelected and unresponsive and unaccountable to the voters) on the subject of unmet needs of the residents of our community for transportation services. My name is Joe Thompson. I am here volunteering my time to help you with this important issue. I am not here on behalf of any clients. I am not being paid. I have no ulterior motive or hidden agenda. I am here because I promised you that I would give you the benefit of my small sum of transportation experience and knowledge to help you achieve the right answers for our transportation needs.

I am attaching my previous remarks for previous years for your shameful ugly dog and pony show you, like the hypocrites you are, describe as the "unmet transit needs" hearing, another indication of why California is bankrupt, its Counties are bankrupt, and its Cities and Towns are bankrupt. Your policy was conceived insolvent and born bankrupt, but you all pat yourselves on the back proclaiming "success" and watch as COG gives itself "A" on its "report card" (Baloney-BS). While you cling to your radical socialist policy, we have become the worst State, and one of the worst Counties in the worst State. in America, and you'll continue to make this County unlivable for our children and grandchildren. Your "success" is our ruin. Why aren't you ashamed of yourselves? How can we get you out of office ASAP?

I am a former charter member of COG's Transit Task Force, COG's Citizens Rail Advisory Committee, Citizens for Reliable and Safe Highways, and I served on the executive committee of the debtor-creditor-commercial law section of the SCCBA. I am also a member of the Association for Transportation Law Logistics & Policy, the legislation (Past-Chair), arbitration, intermodal, freight claims and bankruptcy committees of the Transportation Lawyers Assn., and a candidate for the American Society of Transportation & Logistics. I have also been a member of Gavilan Employers Advisory Council and am founder of the SBC Small Business Incubator. I have given you a copies of my petitions, position papers and letters, including the transportation infrastructure proposal for restoration of intermodal facilities for the Central California Coast Region, and my various letters regarding the amendments and revisions to the

Regional Transportation Plan service to Hollister. I have also provided you with a copy of my paper, "ISTEA Reauthorization and the National Transportation Policy," which was published by the *Transportation Law Journal* and in *Transportation Lawyer* in 1997.

Summary of Petition to COG for Strategic Transportation Planning

COG's unconstitutional Directors' conduct has sold-out the County's taxpayers and citizens so that they can curry favor with their special interests, e.g., public sector union employees, subsidy recipients, and the employees of the Joint Power Authority who reward themselves with taxpayers' money to feather their nest, and plump their salaries, benefits and pensions, lying all the way and laughing at anyone who begs for truth in transport.

Our local government's growing reliance on our taxes and the ever-increasing number of tax-based districts, authorities, joint powers boards, agencies, etc., combined with the imposition of new taxes, fees, assessments, grants, subsidies, premiums, surcharges, bonds, etc., falls especially hard on small businesses. As a result, the small business failure rate (4 out of 5 in the first five years, up 81% over the previous year, and the family farmers and personal bankruptcy rates (dramatically higher) are increasing, destroying jobs, investments, savings and lives. Hopelessly oppressed small business owners cannot pay their rent and their mortgage payments. Families are torn asunder by the emotional turmoil of foreclosures and evictions which accompany their failed businesses. The victims of the failed businesses and destroyed families become more dependent on local government for assistance. Thus, a spiraling effect grows in our community like a Black Hole or a malignant tumor. It is time to break this cycle and halt Black Hole Government before it is too late. The growth of the public sector tumor must be eradicated if we hope to survive to compete in the global economy of the coming new century. We must take back our government from the bureaucrats and Soviet-style planners who feast off OPM (other people's money). We must bring an end to the creeping socialism that breeds in out-of-control government and its dependence upon money from taxpayers. Otherwise, our fate will be the same as the USSR. When government is the largest employer in the county, the burden on small business and families is fatal. We must demand a return to private sector solutions with user-fees replacing taxpayers' dollars, and thereby reduce government's excesses before we kill-off all small businesses and ruin the capitalistic formula of America's successful past. This petition raises issues which must be addressed by our elected representatives before undertaking further strategic transportation planning for our County. This is a "reality check" and may require a "paradigm shift."

Definitions Previously Adopted by COG

Transportation needs of a community always have, and always will, exceed the community's resources. Defining the terms, e.g., "unmet needs," "transit," "reasonable," "cost," "benefit," establishes both the target of our efforts and their scope. For example, if you include a resident's need to travel to Hawaii for his vacation as an "unmet need" for his transit convenience, then the target becomes much larger. There is a direct correlation between the target we define and the cost of meeting the goal. The broader you define the "unmet needs," the greater will be the need for money to pay for the transportation services you decide to offer. This is true for all modes of transportation, air, water, rail and highway.

There is no “free” transportation in any mode; a cost must be borne to provide the service. How to pay for the inevitable cost is the problem once you determine what service you will provide. Who should pay? Whether the transportation service is owned by private investors or the public, this funding issue is inescapable. Equipment, labor, fuel, supplies, insurance, maintenance, administration, etc., all must be paid or else no service can be offered by the carrier. COG recognized this when it voted unanimously to privatize County Transit.

The truth in transportation costs and benefits must be disclosed to both those who use the service and those who pay for the service. Concealing or distorting costs and benefits is unacceptable policy, especially when the taxation power of government is employed to subsidize insolvent transportation operations.

COG’s definitions are unsound and irrational because they do not result in a reasonable burden on those who pay for the service compared with the benefit to the user of the service. COG’s definitions are not based on truth in transportation costs. For example, “unmet needs” is defined by excluding the needs of those who pay for the service. It is illogical to define society’s needs by excluding the needs of those who make it possible for a service to be provided. Furthermore, it is unreasonable to require the taxpayers to furnish 98% of the funds (fully-amortized amount) while the user of the service pays only a 2% “co-pay.” The layers of government overhead deflect the money paid by the taxpayers from reaching the goal, so it has been said that for every \$100 of federal taxes paid, only \$5 is returned to local government to fund transit services. This increases the insolvency, bankruptcy and small business failure rate in the community, which causes an increase in “unmet needs” for transportation. This vicious cycle kills the goose that lays the “Golden Egg.” In other words, by adopting a model of government-ownership of transportation services, the source of the subsidies is diminished as the service increases. Eventually, there is too much for the middle-class taxpayer to bear, paying for both his own transportation, and the riders on government-owned transportation service. Amtrak is a perfect example, and application of this model to Amtrak has resulted in its collapse, and caused the \$2 billion re-bailout by Congress. Recent decisions by Congress and the Surface Transportation Board to allow Amtrak to haul freight reveal how the genesis of the revenue issue brings us back to the truth in transportation costs. But think of the social costs that society had to endure between 1970, when Amtrak was formed, to the future when it is hoped that it will become “self-sufficient.” You can better meet the “unmet needs” of the community if you adopt a private-sector model for transportation solutions. Instead of killing the Goose That Lays the Golden Egg, the taxpayers will be better able to assist local government in its effort to address all the “unmet needs” of the community you serve. The federal government’s decision to privatize Amtrak is a lesson for local governments like ours. We must now implement COG’s decision.

Proposed Redrafting of Definitions

I believe that we ought to redraft the definitions that the COG Board previously adopted to reflect the truth about transportation costs and benefits. Fairness to the taxpayers requires it; history of public sector transportation fiascoes demands it. COG’s transportation definitions ought to adhere to the California Transportation Commission’s mandate to local governments to plan future transportation infrastructure improvements on “user fees” rather than on higher taxes.

I again refer you to the study by the Harvard University Professors, José A. Gómez-Ibáñez and John R. Meyer, *Going Private: The International Experience with Transport Privatization* (Wash, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1993), which I mentioned in my letter to you and which I have shown you at previous COG Board meetings. The revised definitions ought to be based on a full disclosure of all the costs that public-ownership of transportation services imposes on the largest segment of the population. It must include the personal insolvencies, bankruptcies, and business failures that excessive and abusive taxation causes. I believe that we ought to be guided in our effort by studies that have shown us the most efficient methods of providing vital services to our community, e.g., John D. Donahue, *The Privatization Decision: Public Ends, Private Means* (New York: Basic Books, 1989), which I have also shown you at previous COG meetings. If you ignore the truth about transportation costs and benefits in your transportation definitions, then you will condemn future generations to certain failure of the infrastructure so vital to success of our economy. We must not tolerate those who would conceal the truth from the public, or seek to mislead the taxpayers, without whom your effort to satisfy “unmet needs” would be futile.

Conclusion

I support your efforts to help our residents satisfy as many of their “unmet needs” as is feasible, while not undermining the work by utilizing the wrong tools for the job. You would not perform a surgery with a dirty scalpel. You would not fight an epidemic by spraying Ebola Virus in the air. You would not throw gasoline on a fire to extinguish it. So why try to satisfy “unmet needs” with socialism. History has shown that it will not work; it will backfire on you, and then we will have more “unmet needs” than before you started. Remember, there are no “Welfare-to-Work” trains running in the USSR today. We are creating “unmet needs” with the socialist transit policy of urban counties, when we should be following COG’s unanimous decision to privatize passenger bus transportation. We will only worsen budget deficits with the socialist system.

I’ve said this over and over again each passing year, yet COG’s Directors do absolutely nothing to reform and change the sick, unsound, unsustainable transport policy that dooms the future of our County. History will condemn our memories for this failure, while the mass transit radicals will proclaim your “success” right up to the collapse of our government. Shame on the COG Directors for their steadfast refusal to change and restore our free-enterprise roots in transport that helped make America great. It is a sad, despicable thing to see ones friends and neighbors kow-towing to Emperor Transit First, while sacrificing the health and safety of more than 99% of the County’s residents. Shame.

Joe Thompson

FINANCING ALTERNATIVE “A” FOR PASSENGER (BUS & TRAIN) SERVICE

(Santa Clara County & VTA & COG & TAMC & AMBAG, Etc., Model-Soviet Style)

EXCESS TAXATION → →

INSOLVENCY & BANKRUPTCY & SMALL BUSINESS FAILURES & HIGHER

TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES & MORE UNAFFORDABLE HOUSING → →

UNMET NEEDS → → HIGHER TAXES

FINANCING ALTERNATIVE "B" FOR PASSENGER (BUS & TRAIN) SERVICE
(Taxpayer-Friendly Model-Capitalism)

INCREASED RELIANCE ON FREE ENTERPRISE → →
LOWER TAXES & TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES &
MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING, FEWER BANKRUPTCIES & SMALL BUSINESS
FAILURES → →
FEWER UNMET NEEDS → → LOWER TAXES → →
MORE BUSINESS ENTERPRISE → →

Why COG won't make highway safety our top transport priority? Here in this statute they have discretion to do so, but they refuse to do it. Why?

Section 99401.5 of the California Public Utilities Code:

Prior to making any allocation not directly related to public transportation services, specialized transportation services, or facilities provided for the exclusive use of pedestrians and bicycles, the TPA shall annually do all of the following:

- a. Consult with SSTAC
- b. Identify the transit needs of the jurisdiction . . .

c. Identify the unmet transit needs of the jurisdiction and those needs that are reasonable to meet. . . . The definition adopted by the TPA for the terms "**unmet transit needs**" and "**reasonable to meet**" shall be documented by resolution or in the minutes of the agency. The fact that an identified transit need cannot be fully met based on available resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet. An agency's determination of needs that are reasonable to meet shall not be made by comparing unmet transit needs with the need for streets and roads.

d. Adopt by resolution a finding for the jurisdiction . . . The finding shall be that

- (1) there are no unmet transit needs,
- (2) there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, or
- (3) there are unmet transit needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet.

e. If the TPA adopts a finding that there are unmet transit needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet, **then the unmet transit needs shall be funded before any allocation is made for streets and roads within the jurisdiction.**

[So, why don't COG's Directors define "reasonable" in terms of millions of dollars of subsidies. For example, they could limit the subsidies to \$9 million (level in 2001), or today's level (how many millions of dollars?), and say NO to any more wasteful deficit spending. In that way COG's Directors could place a cap, a ceiling on the waste. If they don't, where will it end?]

jpt

Analysis of County Transit Primary Effects
on San Benito County

Pros:

- Subsidy recipients get welfare (minimal fares)
- COG employees get salaries and benefits (99% from taxes)
- MV Transportation, Inc.'s shareholders get profits (ditto)
- “”“”“” employees get union wages & benefits (ditto)

Cons:

- Taxpayers pay 99% of all transit riders' costs
- Air pollution from empty buses (98% of seats move empty)
- Congestion added to highways and streets for no benefit
- Road surface maintenance costs increased for no benefit
- Private sector carriers put out of business, by COG's uncompetitive business practices of setting fares lower than total costs in violation of the Unfair Business Practices Act, which deters other carriers from entering the marketplace for carriage of passengers
- Conceals massive deficit spending with non-GAAP accounting methods (same as those used by Enron's executives)
- Hides taxpayers tax subsidies under "other revenue" in their financial statements
- Causes gas prices to be higher by robbing gas taxes from motorists to pay for mass transit boondoggles
- Undermines economy of the County by adding confiscatory levels of taxes&fees to pay for socialist mass transit, destroying the small and very small business owners' livelihoods, making housing unaffordable, and the County unlivable for tax payers (while subsidy recipients and trough feeders thrive under the current socialist policy)