

ALL C. J. G.

PUBLIC COMMENT: NEXT MEETING, REAL OR VIRTUAL; REGULAR OR SPECIAL; STUDY SESSION OR PUBLIC WORKSHOP; AND ESPECIALLY THE SO-CALLED "MOBILITY PARTNERSHIP" VTA & COG; MOTORISTS & TAXPAYERS REPLY TO TRANSIT DEMAND FOR HIGHER TAXES SO THAT LOCAL ELECTED LEADERS CAN REWARD FRAUD, WASTE & ABUSE AND REWARD THEIR SPECIAL INTEREST FRIENDS

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

To: mmoore@weeklys.com; supervisorkosmicki@cosb.us; supervisorzanger@cosb.us; sbcsuper@supervisor.co.san-benito.ca.us; supervisorgonzales@cosb.us; supervisors@cosb.us; supervisorsotelo@cosb.us; supervisorcurro@cosb.us; info@sanbenitocog.org; cgj@sanbenitocourt.org; sbcsuper@cosb.us; roxymontana2@aol.com; rwells@edcsanbenito.org

Date: Saturday, June 15, 2024 at 08:38 AM PDT

Dear Friends,

Recent history teaches us that reliance on "community advisory boards" or "citizen watchdog committees" is badly misplaced to offset the governance abuse stemming from false promises made by Statists like COG. 

Skeptics remember the Citizens Watchdog Committee appointed by COG's partner in the unconstitutional "Mobility Partnership." The watchdogs were so lax that the VTA was judged the worst transit agency in the nation by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

During the same time a county Grand Jury report blasted VTA's directors for governance flaws, fiscal irresponsibility, and taxpayer abuse. And during the same time VTA rejected South County's plea for median barriers on U.S. 101 between Gilroy and Morgan Hill because "they didn't have the money." While pleading poorhouse on the safety issue, they transferred \$52.6 million to their employee pension plans. After more deadly cross-over accidents, VTA "found" the money and spent less than \$2 million to install the barriers.

During the same watchfulness watchdogging by the citizens' watchdog committee, VTA's auditors found numerous abuses.

After ignoring MIT, the Grand Jury, and their own auditors, they had their own auditors audit and they confirmed what the outside auditors had found.

Then VTA fired its General Manager, paying his Golden Parachute on his way out. The "new" GM, from San Francisco, where they really do know how to waste tax dollars, established "new VTA," and there was no change in policy whatsoever. Governance abuse continues to this day. Local government leaders, who drink the same Koolaid, do absolutely nothing.

Lenin would be so proud of them.

We ought to recall the COG directors, who govern without the consent of the governed, and show them how pleased we are with their taxpayer abuses and phony sham watchdogs, nothing more than lapdogs of the Statists.

Caveat viator.

Joe Thompson,

Charter-Member SBCCOG Citizens Transit Advisory Board;

Charter-Member SBCCOG Citizens Rail Advisory Committee;

Past-Chair, Legislation Committee, Transportation Lawyer Assn.

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

Post-doc student, transportation law & policy, Norman Y. Mineta International Institute for Surface Transportation Policy Studies;

Transportation Research Board, Georgetown U.; and

Library of Congress

(408) 848-5506;

E-Mail: Translaw@PacBell.Net



OPINION

THE GILROY DISPATCH

Oversight of Valley Transportation Authority a bad joke on taxpayers

Dear Editor,

Skeptics remember the Citizens Watchdog Committee appointed by the Valley Transportation Authority. The watchdogs were so lax that the VTA was judged worst transit agency in the nation in a study of all the nation's transit agencies by the renowned Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

During the same time a county Grand Jury report blasted VTA's directors for governance flaws, fiscal irresponsibility, and taxpayer abuse. And during that same time VTA rejected South County's plea for median barriers on U.S. 101 between Morgan Hill and Gilroy because they "didn't have the money."

While pleading poorhouse on the safety issue, they transferred \$52.6 million to their employee pension plans. After more deadly cross-over accidents, VTA "found" the money, and spent less than \$2 million to install the barriers.

During the same watchfulness watchdogging by the citizens' watchdog committee, VTA's auditors found numerous abuses.

After ignoring MIT, the Grand Jury, and their own auditors, they had their own auditors audit and they confirmed what the outside auditors had said. Then VTA fired its General Manager, paying his Golden Parachute on the way out. The "new" GM, from San Francisco, where they really do know how to waste tax dollars, established "new VTA," and there was no change in policy whatsoever.

And our leaders do absolutely nothing about this. We need to recall all the VTA directors to show them how pleased we are with their abusiveness and appointing phoney watchdogs.

Joe Thompson, Gilroy

PUBLIC COMMENT: ALL-YEAR MEETINGS

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 redefine 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. Lott, Jr., *The Privatization Decision: Public Ends, Private Means* (New York: Basic Books, 1990), 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 the 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 job market 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" before you started. Remember, there are no "Welfare-to-Work" trains running in the USSR. 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 senseless, unsound, unsustainable transport policy that dooms the future of our County. History will not soon forget to damn 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 transportation. 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.

Joe Thompson

FINANCING ALTERNATIVE FOR PASSENGER (BUS & TRAIN) SERVICE
 (Santa Clara County & VTA) (COG & TAMC & AMBAG, Etc., Model-Soviet Style)

EXCESS TAXATION → →
INSOLVENCY & BANKRUPTCIES & 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 ENTERPRISES → →

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 subsidy under "other revenue" in their financial statements

Causes gas prices to be higher by robbing gas taxes from motorists to pay for mass transit bondoggles

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)

From: Joseph P Thompson <translaw@pacbell.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 4, 2024 10:33 AM
To: City of Hollister; SBC Board of Supervisors; supervisor Kosmicki@cosb.us; supervisorzanger@cosb.us; Supervisor Bea Gonzales; Supervisors; supervisorsotelo@cosb.us; Angela Curro; Monica Gomez; Roxy Montana; rwells@edcsanbenito.org; cityclerk@hollister.ca.gov; Michael Moore
Subject: Fw: Hollister General Plan: Revised EIR, Draft General Plan, Draft CAP, and Draft ALPP
Attachments: CogRejectsCaltrain.pdf; COGUMHG02-24.pdf; FALSEGODSOCIALISM.pdf; GOVERNANCE ABUSE IN SBC 2017.pdf; L51.COGsPOLICYFLAWS.pdf; L167.BiggestPolicyFlaw.pdf; L178.COGsPOLICYFLAWS2009.pdf; L182.COGsPOLICYFLAWSDejaVu-4nd.pdf; L189.ABOLISHCOG100811.pdf; L191.DirtyGovt021513.pdf; L192.COGsRevenuell.pdf; LESSON16tofcCOFC.pdf

PUBLIC COMMENT: NEXT MEETING; REAL OR VIRTUAL; REGULAR OR SPECIAL; STUDY SESSION, OR PRIVATE RETREAT, OR PUBLIC WORKSHOP; AND ESPECIALLY THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL "MOBILITY PARTNERSHIP" VTA-COG

Dear Friends,

Thank you for inviting public comment. I now repeat my comment sent previously during other planning episodes in SBC. See attached.

Please see that your staff includes this for the official record of proceedings, so that future generations will know that you were warned. As we see radical socialism infecting and ruining California, my personal observation of governance abuses in SBC as I previously said to you, and others in local, State and Federal government, goes double today. Your policy and governance abuse have us on the Road to Serfdom, same route taken by the USSR. I urge you to reject the quicksand of socialism, and build our children's future on the bedrock of capitalism.

Thank you.

Joseph P. Thompson, Esq.

Past-Chair, Legislation Committee, Transportation Lawyers Assn.

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

Charter Member, SBCCOG Citizens Transit Task Force

Charter Member, SBCCOG Citizens Rail Advisory Committee

Post-Doc student, transport law & policy, Norman Y. Mineta International Institute for Surface Transportation Policy Studies, SJSU;

Transportation Research Board, Georgetown U.; and Library of Congress

(408) 848-5506

E-Mail: TransLaw@PacBell.Net

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: City of Hollister <generalplan@hollister.ca.gov>

To: "translaw@pacbell.net" <translaw@pacbell.net>

Sent: Wednesday, July 3, 2024 at 02:47:51 PM PDT

Subject: Hollister General Plan: Revised EIR, Draft General Plan, Draft CAP, and Draft ALPP

[View this email in your browser](#)

City of Hollister Development Services Department – Planning Division
ATTN: Eva Kelly, Planning Manager
339 Fifth Street, Hollister, CA 95023

Information regarding the proposed project can be accessed at: <https://hollister2040.org/>.

Public comments may also be sent to City staff (generalplan@hollister.ca.gov) prior to the meeting or afterwards.

Draft Plans Available for Public Review!

In 2020, the City of Hollister kicked-off the General Plan Update, a document that serves as the blueprint for the City's growth and development over the next 20 years. The Draft 2040 General Plan addresses topics that shape City decisions about land use, environmental justice, housing, economics, arts and culture, transportation, conservation, open space, public services, safety, and noise. Creating the Draft 2040 General Plan relied on community feedback, input from the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), recommendations from the Planning Commission, and direction from the City Council to ensure that the community's vision and priorities are correctly captured.

In September 2023, the City Council provided feedback to add new planning areas to the proposed Sphere of Influence (SOI). The SOI indicates land that is likely to be annexed into the City in the future. Any proposed amendment to the SOI must be approved by the San Benito County Local Agency Formation Commission. The updated Draft 2040 General Plan incorporates Council direction, but is largely the same as the draft published in April 2023.

In tandem with the General Plan Update, the City of Hollister is also developing a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and foster a more sustainable community through 2045 and beyond. The Draft CAP helps implement the community's General Plan 2040 vision, goals, and policies. Topics in the Draft CAP include the causes and

Copyright © 2024 City of Hollister, All rights reserved.

You are receiving this email because you opted in via our website.

Our mailing address is:

City of Hollister
375 Fifth Street
Hollister, CA 95023

[Add us to your address book](#)

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe from this list](#).

This email was sent to TransLaw@PacBell.Net

[why did I get this?](#) [unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)

City of Hollister · 375 Fifth Street · Hollister, CA 95023 · USA



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
May 16, 2003

Fax: (831) 637-4104
Mr. Bill Satterlee, Editor
Hollister Free Lance
P. O. BOX 1417
Hollister, CA 95023

Fax: (408) 842-2206
Mr. Mark Derry, Editor
Gilroy Dispatch
6400 Monterey Road
Gilroy, CA 95020

Re: SBC Rejects Extending Caltrain from Gilroy to Hollister

Dear Bill and Mark,

Madison said in *The Federalist, No. 41*, "A bad cause seldom fails to betray itself." Last night's unanimous (5-0) decision by the SBC Council of Governments to reject "extending Caltrain" from Gilroy to Hollister shows us again the genius of the Father of the Constitution.

As Senator John McCain said about Amtrak, by any rational measuring rod Caltrain is a "failed experiment." Relying on rural common sense to tell socialist transit advocates that their uncommon nonsense is unacceptable, COG's Directors then proceeded to initiate privatization of the government passenger bus monopoly. While recognizing the importance of railroads, they refused enlargement of Black Hole Government. These Directors have courageously marked a new course: Back to the Future, back to America's free-enterprise roots. Could it be that Transportation Secretary Mineta's challenge to government leaders is bearing its first fruit? He said in 1995, "The crucial question in transportation today is: 'What should government do, and what should it leave to others?'" "They answered Secretary Mineta's "Crucial Question" with a courage born of necessity: Government does not belong in the transportation business. While private-sector transport is not without its problems, our generation's experiment with socialist transport has produced obvious answers: Emperor Transit First is stark naked. We are witnessing a counter-revolution, but do our leaders in Sacramento and Washington have the common sense of our local government leaders and the Father of our Constitution? *Caveat Viator!*

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH P. THOMPSON

Member, SBC Citizens Rail Advisory Committee
Member, Transportation Lawyers Association
Member, Association for Transportation Law, Logistics & Policy
Member, Citizens for Reliable and Safe Highways
Member, Conference of Freight Counsel
Candidate, American Society of Transportation & Logistics

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

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

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→→

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)

JOSEPH P. THOMPSON

Attorney at Law

8339 Church Street, Gilroy, CA 95020

158 Central Avenue, Salinas, CA 93901

981 Fremont Street, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Post Office Box 154, Gilroy, CA 95021-0154

Telephone (408) 848-5506; (408) 984-8555

Telecopier (408) 848-4246

E-mail: translaw@pacbell.net

February 20, 1999

The Honorable Rita Bowling, Chairwoman
Council of San Benito County Govts.
3220 Southside Road
Hollister, CA 95023-9631

Re: Taxpayers and Transportation Policy

Dear Mrs. Bowling,

Thank you for allowing me to address the COG Board of Directors at their meeting on Feb. 18, 1999. Regarding the Report dated 2/18/99 from Mr. Walt Allen, Transportation Planner, to the COG, "Rail Service Study for Hollister/Gilroy Branch Line," I would like to take this opportunity to reply to Mr. Allen's Report.

I. Assumptions. At the threshold, your special duties that the voters entrusted to you require that you question basic assumptions upon which the Report is based, and the authorship source of the Report. If the underlying assumptions are unquestioned, then you are in danger of having your decision premised on faulty, irrational information fed to you by persons and entities with their own self-interest, rather than the best interest of the residents of the County, distorting the truth and misshaping the facts.

1. The False God of Socialism Assumption: Public-Sector Transportation. The authors' first unstated assumption is that government should provide transportation free, or nearly so, to the public. No where in the Report is it revealed that such a philosophy of government has been shown by history to be ruinous for a society. If this assumption was correct, then the USSR would have won the Cold War. Blind acceptance of this assumption will condemn future generations to a sad fate where they will curse our memory. For an accurate description of the state of public-sector transportation erected on this False God of Socialism assumption, I urge you to read Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago* (1973), ch. 2, "The History of our Sewage Disposal System." The true cost of such a public-sector enterprise is not disclosed by the authors of the Report. In fact, so-called "senior transportation planners" at metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) like MTC, VTA, TAMC, SCCRTC, etc., never include "negative externalities," i.e., adverse consequences, in their cost-benefit analyses, although they do include "positive externalities," e.g., congestion and smog reduction. Since the authors of those reports gain their income from the tax subsidies that all three

Hon. Rita Bowling, Chairwoman
Council of Governments
February 20, 1999
page 3

investment in our infrastructure. Worse than the Y2K bug on your computer's hard drive is socialism in your infrastructure. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has recently recommended that local government base future transportation infrastructure on "user fees" rather than on new taxes. The authors' False God of Socialism assumption conveniently ignores both history and the CTC's instruction to local government. Will we learn from our history, or ignore it?

If the authors' False God of Socialism assumption is correct, John F. Kennedy would have said, "Ask not what you can do for your country. What can your country do for you?" If they were right about this, then the Populist Party platform plank, *viz.*, government ownership of railroads, telegraphs and telephones, would have carried the day during the elections of the 1890s decade, when public outcry to the Robber Barons crested. Williams Jennings Bryan's Plumb Plan would have kept the railroads government-owned after WWI if the authors' premise was correct.

If the authors' False God of Socialism assumption was correct, then Abraham Lincoln would not have said in his Second Inaugural Address that no man should dare to ask a just God's blessing to wring his bread from the sweat of another man's brow.

If the False God of Socialism assumption was correct, then Governor Wilson would never have recommended the "Yellow Pages Test" of government as he did in *California Competes*.

The primary reason that the authors' Report omits mention of this assumption is that consultants and advocates for taxpayer-funded transit do not make any money unless they can convince elected officials, and dupe the public, into believing that there are no alternatives. If the tax dollars stopped, then they would be out of jobs. That is why you see them in the "revolving door" moving between MPOs and consultants' offices, milking the taxpayers by deceiving the elected representatives. As a general rule, they downplay the expense of public-sector transportation by an average of 50%, while at the same time they inflate "ridership" projections and anticipated revenues by an average of 50%. This finding was made after an exhaustive study of the previous 100 years of councils just like yours. Harvey A. Levine, *National Transportation Policy: A Study of Studies* (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1978).

2. The Pork Barrel Assumption: Politicians Know What's Best. This assumption, which I also call "The MTBE Assumption," is not stated by the authors. Like the False God of Socialism Assumption, you must adopt it before you can accept the recommendations in the authors' Report. If this assumption, politicians know best, was true, then the taxpayers would not have had to pay the \$1+ trillion to bail out savings and loans after TEFRA, and the transportation industries would not

\$186 billion, and TEA-21 rose to \$218 billion, how many people, primarily middle-class taxpayers, will be forced to suffer declining standard of living in the future to support such abusiveness by our government and public servants?!?! Although there have been terrible highway crashes, taking a disgraceful toll of motorists of all ages, unborn, children, teens, adults, and elderly, VTA routinely transfers many millions of our transportation dollars to its employees bloated pension plans (most recently, January 1999, \$52.29 million to PERS). The authors would have us ignore the bureaucrats' spending priorities. Their assumption is that we must close our eyes to the human suffering which those selfish decision-makers at our MPOs like VTA make every day with our money.

Ask yourselves: "Why did Mayor Brown threaten to privatize Muni when it was revealed that they were operating nearly 50% of their bus fleet without meeting CHP's safety standards for passenger buses?" Was Mayor Brown admitting that the private sector could do a better job? Do you believe that he would ever fulfill such a threat when it would mean the loss of vast political patronage in San Francisco for the Mayor? Are you willing to establish that model for our County? Are you willing to accept the priorities revealed by the VTA?

4. The Womb to Tomb Government Assumption: Unelected Bureaucrats Will Address Your Every Need.

A related assumption which the authors fail to mention in their Report is that we can trust bureaucrats, unelected and unresponsive to the electorate, to make wise decisions for everything we need from the womb to the tomb. This fallacy must be rejected for the same reasons that you denounce the False God of Socialism Assumption. Until Christ's Golden Rule becomes part of human nature, this assumption is false.

5. The Black Hole Government Assumption: Each Little Tax Increment Will be Painless for the Taxpayers.

The next unstated assumption, which I call "The Black Hole Government Assumption," is one in which the authors expect that each "little" tax increment imposed on the taxpayers will have no adverse effect. They think it will be painless. Their thinking can be shown for what it is by imagining yourself exposed to the ravages of a blood-sucking leech. One leech, say on your foot, takes a few tablespoons of your blood, is satisfied, and falls off. You survive. Two leeches will take twice as much of your blood. Again you survive. Now, keep adding leeches to this thought experiment (don't try this at home!). If your body was totally covered with leeches, you would be dead. Somewhere between the first leech, and total body coverage, a fatal number of leeches, all sucking their own little sip of your blood, attach themselves to you. That number will depend on many factors. Suffice it to say that each person has such a number, but there are an infinite number of leeches

8. The Vacuum Assumption: This Scheme is the Only Thing Happening. The next assumption that the authors fail to reveal in their Report is one wherein they pretend that no other tax-funded government program is already draining dollars from us, and that middle-class incomes have been increasing. As shown in the accompanying Petition, this assumption is false, and must be rejected for the same reasons as stated under the Black Hole Government Assumption. Many people have already reached the fatal number of leeches sucking their blood. Look at the number of bankruptcies and their rate of increase in this District. Look at the small business failure rate. Look at the sky-rocketing price of housing. If you have already been forced to tax the beds in our hospitals and convalescent homes to run the socialized buses, what will you have to tax to run socialized passenger trains?

9. The Grantism Assumption: If the Money is Called a Grant Then it is Not a Tax Subsidy. You will notice that the authors' Report distorts the meaning of words to conceal the truth as much as possible. For example, the use of the word "grant" instead of "taxpayers hard earned dollars," or "taxpayers' subsidy," is commonly used by authors like those of this Report. Whether the dollars from the taxpayers are called taxes, fees, grants, subsidies, or pork-barrel handouts from the Treasury, the effect is the same. And furthermore, the corollary assumption, that tax dollars from the federal government are somehow different from the taxpayers' dollars that are spent by local, regional and state governments is just as fallacious. The California Supreme Court has held that a fee is not a tax, and therefore, the Legislature need not comply with the California Constitution (2/3 supermajority requirement) whenever it enacts "fees" as opposed to enacting taxes. *Sinclair Paint Co. v. State Board of Equalization*, 15 Cal.4th 866, 64 Cal.Rptr.2d 447, 937 P.2d 1350 (1997). This is contrary to the will of the people as shown by Proposition 13 and Proposition 218. So, it is vital that our local elected representatives voice our concern that the Constitution be enforced and that no new taxes be placed on the backs of the taxpayers. The impact of all these taxes by all the multiplicity of taxing authorities, joint powers boards, redevelopment agencies, municipalities, regional authorities, etc., whose malignant growth can be seen in the explosive growth of our Public Utilities Code in California (which has doubled in size during twenty years of "deregulation" of the industries), may be seen if you read the accompanying Petition.

10. The Trojan Horse Assumption: Beware of Greeks (and Transit Advocates) Bearing Gifts. The most insidious assumption that the authors make is that this federal money has no strings attached. Hailed by the politico-transit alliance as "devolution," i.e., returning power to local and state government, all of the ISTEA (Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act) reauthorization legislation, e.g., BESTEA, NEXTEA, HOTTEA, etc., was laced with poison like Jim Jones' Koolaid. Although bipartisan supporters never once mentioned it, the draftsmen of TEA-21 inserted broad

which was published in the *Transportation Lawyer* (1997). Your special duties to the electorate and residents of the County, and, equally important, your duties to future generations of County residents, require that you adopt strategic transportation planning that is in the best interests of the greatest number of people, not the best interest of consultants and others who feast off the taxpayers. In honor of the self-reliant pioneers from the Donner Party, ranchers and farmers who originally settled this County, you must be guided by the American virtues of independence, self-reliance, and respect for private property which they bequeathed to us, and for which our fathers fought to preserve for us. Rejecting all forms of socialist planning for our transportation infrastructure, I believe that you should adopt the following recommendations to guide us into the next century.

1. The COG Board must refuse to become a partner with another government because partners are responsible for each other's debts.

2. The COG Board must reject the philosophy of public-sector transportation advocates like the transit planners at VTA, TAMC, and other MPOs.

3. The COG Board must obey the mandate of the Government Code to preserve previous generations investment in our infrastructure, chief of which is capitalism.

4. The COG Board must reject invitations to spread socialism into this County, which are extended by self-serving promoters of taxpayer-funded programs that impose unacceptable burdens on the middle-class, homeowners, small business owners, and cause housing to become more unaffordable. COG must denounce the politico-transit alliance and Soviet-style planners.

5. The COG Board must obey the instructions of the CTC to plan infrastructure on "user fees" and not on new taxes. COG must place the taxpayers' well-being as its highest priority.

6. The COG Board must instruct the staff of the County transportation agency to include all negative externalities in their cost-benefit analyses, including small business failures and personal bankruptcies, and their human suffering, resulting from excessive taxation by all levels of government.

7. The COG Board must demand truth in transportation from the staff of the County transportation agency, and any other proponent of public-sector transportation in any mode, i.e., highway, railroad, etc., so that our elected representatives have an accurate factual basis upon which to make decisions for strategic transportation planning.

PUBLIC
COMMENT -
NEXT
MTE.
GOVERNANCE
ABUSE
IN
SBC

DISPATCH

OPINION

DECEMBER 23, 2016

LETTERS

Public Transit Doesn't Pay for Itself

California law requires that the transit agencies earn 10% of their expenses from their "farebox" meaning what their riders pay. It is like Safeway or K-Mart accepting 10% of the sales price as payment in full. Such pricing by any business would soon plunge it into Bankruptcy Court.

The bankrupt transit agencies, conceived insolvent, born bankrupt, and kept running by massive taxpayer subsidies from motorists, truckers and motorcyclists, keep up their boondoggle operations thanks to the deaf, dumb and blind management by their so-called "Directors."

But what if they violated their "farebox recovery rate" mandated by the Legislature, and earned less than 10% from their patrons?

Well, they do, if you use generally accepted accounting principles in calculating their farebox recovery rate. They don't use Generally Accepted Accounting Principles accounting, which everyone is required to use by federal and State tax regulations.

The transit agencies use Enron-style, "off-book" accounting, which our Supervisor, San Benito Council of Governments Chairman said was "generally accepted government accounting."

By using non-legal accounting, they falsify their financial performance, and our local government officials condone this governance abuse of the taxpayers.

You have a double standard in transport policy; one for transit agency boondoggles like VTA and Council of Governments, and one for the rest of us.

SBC BOS have repeated their requirements of "full cost recovery" for a variety of government enterprises that they do. But with COG, it's not "full cost recovery" from County Transit users. Instead, it's "full cost recovery" where the "full" is the taxpayer who is forced to subsidize the bankrupt transit (actually two of them in San Benito County) operation.

Do your readers a service and report his gang-rape of the taxpayers. We're about to be treated to a new exhibition of this COG governance abuse when the BOS, as its first official act of ERF, makes what they call "committee appointments" to CVG. The truth is that COG is a joint power authority, not a "committee," which governs without voter consent, and thus violates the civil and constitutional rights of the citizens.

JOE THOMPSON

Joe Titow, Esq.

Gilroy

JOSEPH P. THOMPSON

Attorney at Law

8339 Church Street, Suite 210, Gilroy, CA 95020

Post Office Box 154, Gilroy, CA 95021-0154

Telephone (408) 848-5506; Fax (408) 848-4246

E-mail: TransLaw@PacBell.Net

January 17, 2002

FAX (831) 636-4160

Honorable Rita Bowling, Chairwoman
San Benito County Council of Government
481 Fourth Street
Hollister, CA 95023

FAX (831) 636-4310

Mr. George Lewis, Executive Director
San Benito County Council of Government
375 Fifth Street
Hollister, CA 95023

Re: Public Comment on EIR for SBC 2001 RTP

Dear Mrs. Bowling and Mr. Lewis,

Thank you for inviting public comment on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the San Benito County (SBC) 2001 Regional Transportation Plan.

Please add this letter to the responses to the EIR that form the public record of your proceedings, and instruct your staff to include copies of the 50 letters regarding SBC's transportation policy that I sent to COG's Directors between Jan. 21, 1999 and Dec. 29, 2001, together with the documents that I presented to you and the COG Directors and staff at the hearing.

1. Author: I am a member of the Association for Transportation Law, Logistics & Policy (formerly Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners Association), Citizens for Reliable and Safe Highways (CRASH), Transportation Lawyers Association, Citizens Rail Advisory Committee, Safe Kids Coalition, SBC Citizens Transit Task Force, Conference of Freight Counsel, and other professional organizations. These remarks are personal and not made on behalf of a client or any professional or governmental organization to which I belong or for which I serve my community. I have done post-doctoral study of transportation law and policy at the Norman Y. Mineta International Institute for Surface Transportation Policy Studies.

2. Background Materials Supplementing These Remarks: The background for these remarks may be found in my paper "ISTEA Reauthorization and the National Transportation Policy," 25 *Transportation Law Journal* pp. 87-*et seq.* (1997). Additional background for these remarks is found in my paper that I wrote while serving on the Government Review Council of two local chambers of commerce in response to Valley Transportation Authority's invitation for public response to the widening of U.S. 101 between San Jose and Morgan Hill, entitled, "**El Camino Real 2000: A Transportation Business and Logistics Perspective on the Proposed Widening of U.S. Highway 101.**"

sector transportation has on local small businesses, and the adverse effect it has on affordable housing by imposition of additional “traffic impact fees” on house prices to support public-sector transit.

9. The EIR and RTP fail to distinguish between transportation infrastructure and transportation business operating on the infrastructure, i.e., for-hire carriage of property and people.

10. The EIR and RTP fail to mention restoration of intermodal facilities for this Region has recommended by Transportation Secretary Mineta, the Director of Caltrans Highway Programs, as I recommended to the California Transportation Commission (with positive response by the CTC’s Chairman) at the CTC’s meeting in December 2001 at the PUC in San Francisco.

11. The EIR and RTP propose an unfeasible transportation alternative in high-density apartments and condominiums (4,000 units in ten years) built around two railroad stations on the Hollister Branch Line north of Hollister, and fails to mention the cost of \$20-\$40 million that the taxpayers would be forced to absorb to refurbish the track to passenger-carrying condition, nor does it mention the massive annual operating subsidies required to operate the passenger service.

12. The EIR and RTP make no mention of viable alternatives available by reliance upon members of the American Shortline Railroad Association.

13. The EIR and RTP make no mention of the decision of the Amtrak Review Council to liquidate Amtrak, and the remarks of Senator John McCain of Arizona who said that Amtrak is a failed experiment, and that Caltrain is equally flawed as Amtrak, and doomed as is all socialist transportation in the long-run.

14. The EIR and RTP make no mention of the massive financial losses sustained each year by SBC’s County Transit, and fails to disclose that in Year 1999-2000 County Express provided heavily-subsidized passenger service for only 101.6 people/day, nor does it reveal the fully-amortized cost of such public-sector transit, or that it would be cheaper to buy ever rider their own automobile, and that the government monopoly is anti-competitive, discriminatory, and prone to massive waste, especially if the operation is unionized (like BART, VTA, etc.). It does not disclose that the riders enjoy nearly free (99% fully-amortized costs paid by taxpayers, not fares) rides while forcing motorists to pay for all of their own transportation expenses, too.

15. The EIR and RTP make no mention of the \$24 billion losses sustained by Amtrak, nor reveals the losses sustained by Caltrain (*Mercury News’* Mr. Roadshow Gary Richards reported that only 11% of operating costs for Caltrain are paid for by fares--the percentage would be much lower if capital costs were included), yet it irrationally contains an alternative transportation plan to extend Caltrain to this relatively poor agricultural County.

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@PacBell.Net
August 20, 2007

FAX (831) 636-4160
Honorable George Diaz, Chairman
San Benito County Council of Government
481 Fourth Street
Hollister, CA 95023

Re: Public Comment COG Meeting Agenda, September 2007: COG's Biggest Policy Flaw

Dear Mr. Diaz,

Thank you for inviting public comment on vital issues affecting the people of our County. Thank you for giving me a few minutes to present my views. Please make this part of the official record of the meeting so that future generations will know that you were warned of COG's mistakes.

1. Author: See my letter to you (copy enclosed), dated July 18, 2007, regarding COG's many policy flaws, as to which I was not given the courtesy of a reply.

2. Background: At the Policy Workshop, COG's many policy flaws were made apparent, and the arrogance of COG shown to be exceeded only by its ignorance.

3. COG's Irrational, Unsound, Unsustainable Policy – The Signal Biggest Flaw:

In my opinion there is no greater flaw, as revealed by COG's Policy Workshop, and by its despicable practices, its governance flaws, its mismanagement, and its abuse of taxpayers, than its blatant bias and prejudice against the most beneficial means of transport in our County: privately owned and operated vehicles. Please admit, and have your policy reflect, that 98.6% of the trips, as shown by COG's own data, are made in privately owned vehicles, and paid for by the people using them, not by the taxpayers. And unless you admit to being hypnotized by the APTA-VTA-TAMC radicals, tell the truth in COG's policy that 99% of the cost of County Transit is paid for by motorists gas taxes, sales taxes, use taxes, and other taxes and fees including government impact fees ("traffic impact fees"). Once you admit the folly of COG's policy, then, and only then, it can be changed to reflect the will of the people of our County. *Caveat Viator!*

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH P. THOMPSON

Encl. [Our Answer to TAMC's Bad Advice]
cc: COG Board of Directors
cc: SBC Board of Supervisors

Reject anti-auto and truck policies advocated by APTA, VTA & TAMC. Embrace self-help, user funded, private-sector transport as our only hope.

JOSEPH P. THOMPSON
Attorney at Law
8339 Church Street, Suite 114, Gilroy, CA 95020
Post Office Box 154, Gilroy, CA 95021-0154
Telephone (408) 848-5506; Fax (408) 848-4246
E-mail: TransLaw@PacBell.Net
January 12, 2009

FAX (831) 636-4160
Honorable Chairman or Chairwoman
San Benito County Council of Government
481 Fourth Street
Hollister, CA 95023

Re: Public Comment SBCCOG Meeting, Public Hearing, Jan. 15, 2009: If Abe Lincoln Came to COG Today He'd Be Thrown Out and Bankrupted

Dear Mr. Or Madam Chairman, Chairwoman, as the case may be.

Thank you for inviting public comment on the miasma, sickening curse you call "policy," which, if truth prevailed, would be admitted as it really is: radical socialist boondoggle deficit spending, ballooning taxpayers' dollars wastefulness you hypocritically call "success." Thank you for allowing me to present my views, which you've studiously ignored all these years, thereby inflicting the pain you perpetrate on us, making our County unlivable more each time you waste our tax dollars to keep your bankrupt, polluting urban mass transit system running. Please make this part of the official record of the proceedings so that future generations will know that you were warned of the flaws in our policy.

1. Author: See attached letter.

2. Background Materials Supplementing These Remarks: The background for these remarks may be found in the attached letter, including the Santa Clara County Grand Jury Report that I gave to all COG Directors and all SBCBOS, and other local and state and federal elected officials, and in my paper "ISTEA Reauthorization and the National Transportation Policy," 25 *Transportation Law Journal* pp. 87-*et seq.* (1997). Additional background for these remarks is found in my paper that I wrote while serving on the Government Review Council of two local chambers of commerce in response to Valley Transportation Authority's invitation for public response to the widening of U.S. 101 between San Jose and Morgan Hill, entitled, "**El Camino Real 2000: A Transportation Business and Logistics Perspective on the Proposed Widening of U.S. Highway 101,**" and also "**Don Pacheco Y 2005: A Transportation Business and Logistics Perspective on the Proposed Highway 152 & 156 Intersection Changes.**" I previously gave copies of these papers to each Director of COG, and to each of the SBCBOS, and will you please direct your staff to add them to these remarks for the formal record of these proceedings.

Response to Public Hearing Notice SBCCOG 1/15/09--COG Policy Failures Marching-On! 1

cc: COG Board of Directors
cc: SBC Board of Supervisors

JOSEPH P. THOMPSON
Attorney at Law
8339 Church Street, Suite 114, Gilroy, CA 95020
Post Office Box 154, Gilroy, CA 95021-0154
Telephone (408) 848-5506; Fax (408) 848-4246
E-mail: TransLaw@PacBell.Net
August 23, 2009

FAX (831) 636-4160
Honorable Anthony Botelho, Chairman
San Benito County Council of Government
481 Fourth Street
Hollister, CA 95023

**Re: SBCCOG Meeting Agenda 8/20/09: SBC Highway Route Selection Jurisdiction:
Public Comment: COG Illegal Usurpation of Lawful Authority of SBCBOS**

Dear Mr. Botelho,

Referring to the SBCCOG meeting agenda 8/20/09 Item No. 7, please include this for the formal record of the proceedings for public comment. Also, please include this for public comment on Item No. 5 when you restore it to your agenda (please not on consent because it's about taking more of our taxes to waste on your boondoggle wastefulness).

1. Identity: See previous letters.

2. Background: Read the County Code, which you swore an oath to protect and defend. Read the Brown Act, which you violate with COG and with the "Mobility Partnership" with VTA. Read your own deceptive financial reports, which show how badly you're raping the taxpayers every month, over and over again.

3. Comment: Thank you for placing this item on the agenda because it proves, once again, that COG is violating the constitutional rights of three County Districts' citizens. You violate your oath of office each time you preside at COG. Your questions from chair of COG prove the point I've made to you numerous times, your denials notwithstanding. Who has the lawful authority to make decisions about highway construction in our County? Not COG. Only the BOS have a mandate from all five County Districts' citizens. COG lacks representation from three Districts, but COG purports to act on behalf of all five Districts' citizens. Since no voters ever voted to grant COG this power, COG's imposition of tax burdens, i.e., highway construction taxes, mass transit tax subsidies, COG acts illegally by denying the franchise rights of three County Districts' citizens. By doing so it violates the due process and equal protection rights of those citizens. Bluntly, COG taxes without representation by increasing our tax burdens on all SBC's taxpayers but denying lawful representatives to taxpayers of three Districts.

Concealing tax increase proposals by failing to disclose the subject of tax increases when the COG "agenda" (non-disclosure, no transparency "agenda") contains a topic of debate for the purpose

Response to COG's Proposed 2009 Revision to County's Regional Transportation Plan—A Sick Plan being made worse by the Radical Socialists that our Leaders Tolerate. Another Plea for Reform, or ouster of COG's Directors.

COG's Lies and Deceit to the People—Just Like the Soviet Union's Planners
[Here's an Example—You Can Find Many Others When You Ignore the Lies]

This goes double for COG's 20-year RTP

2005 San Benito County Regional Transportation Plan –Baloney & B.S. from COG
Big Brother DoubleSpeak: You Don't Have Economic Vitality with Socialism—Catastrophic
Disaster is What You get from COG's Socialism-Communism

Proposed Changes from 2001 RTP

General Goals and Policies

Goal 1 To support the economic vitality of the region, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency. San Benito County jurisdictions:

Policy 1.1 Shall promote improvements in all modes of transportation to respond to growing demand for commuter and commodity travel. They shall give funding priority to major road improvements that address critical safety concerns and provide increased capacity for commuter and commodity travel. They shall also give funding priority to commuter rail/transit improvements that facilitate movement between Hollister and the San Francisco Bay Area.

Goal 2 To increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users. San Benito County jurisdictions:

Policy 2.1 (In conjunction with the safety improvements specified in Policy ~~1.1~~ 1.1 above) shall give next funding priority to minor road improvements that affect the safety of the greatest number of users and projects that increase safety for school children or the elderly.

Policy 2.2 Shall ensure that the integrity of inter-regional transportation facilities, including road, rail, and aviation facilities, can be maintained during and after major natural disasters.

Goal 3 To increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and freight. San Benito County jurisdictions:

Policy 3.1 Shall promote alternative modes of transportation, including rail and bus transit, rail freight, and pedestrian and bicyclist travel.

Policy 3.2 Shall ensure that pedestrian and public transit facilities are accessible to all persons, regardless of physical capabilities.

Streets and Highways

Goal 8 To construct and maintain a street and highway system that is safe, accommodates well-managed demand from existing and future development, and is well maintained. San Benito County jurisdictions:

- Policy 8.1 Shall give priority, among all street and highway projects, to the improvement of roadways and intersections that experience the worst safety records. The next highest priority shall be given to projects that reduce weekday congestion and that serve to maintain the existing roadway system.
- Policy 8.2 Shall give priority, among all street and highway maintenance projects, to maintenance projects that improve safety for the greatest number of persons and to maintenance projects required for fire and police equipment to respond quickly and safely to emergencies throughout the county.

Goal 9 To design, construct, and maintain the integrity of streets and highways to serve their designated purpose and be compatible with the land use to which they are adjacent. San Benito County jurisdictions:

- Policy 9.1 Shall construct (or cause to be constructed if private), roads, highways, and selected urban arterial streets for regional or interregional travel. Such facilities shall be designed to the minimum standard of the local jurisdiction within which they are located. Such standards shall emphasize safe and efficient *automobile, motorcycle, truck, and transit* operation. Where appropriate, the jurisdiction shall accommodate the safe movement of agricultural equipment on the facility.
- Policy 9.2 Shall construct (or cause to be constructed if private), urban collector and local streets primarily for intra-city travel. ~~Such facilities shall be designed to the minimum standard of the local jurisdiction within which they are located. Such standards~~ shall accommodate vehicular travel but shall emphasize safe and efficient *pedestrian and bicycle* travel.
- Policy 9.3 Shall construct (or cause to be constructed, if private), streets in downtown areas primarily to serve business activity. ~~Such facilities shall be designed to the minimum standard of the local jurisdiction within which they are located. Such standards~~ shall include wide sidewalks and encourage diagonal parking where feasible to increase the number of parking spaces close to businesses and to facilitate the calming of traffic on major downtown streets.

Goal 10 ~~To~~ New transportation facilities shall be planned to promote compact urban development, prevent urban sprawl, and prevent ~~the premature~~ conversion of prime farmland ~~caused by new transportation facilities~~. San Benito County jurisdictions:

- Policy 10.1 Shall provide transportation incentives to developers of compact, infill development in existing urbanized areas to minimize the premature construction of new streets and highways.

possibly require the provision of transit facilities in conjunction with and financed by the developer.

Policy 14.2 Shall encourage automobile and bicycle parking facilities at major rail and bus transit stations.

Non-Motorized (Pedestrian and Bicycle) Travel

Goal 15 To encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel within urbanized areas. San Benito County jurisdictions:

Policy 15.1 Shall require bicycle-parking facilities at major rail and bus transit stations and in downtown business districts.

Policy 15.2 Shall ensure that urban streets are safe for bicyclists through regular cleaning and maintenance.

Policy 15.3 Shall ensure that existing sidewalks are safe, free of obstruction, and accessible to all persons.

Policy 15.4 Shall plan, design, and construct bicycle facilities in conformance with state standards, as outlined in "Planning and Design Criteria for Bikeways in California" (Caltrans).

Policy 15.5 Shall construct pedestrian walkways in high-density areas that currently lack adequate pedestrian facilities.

Goal 16 To facilitate pedestrian and bicycle travel within new development and between new development and existing urban areas. San Benito County jurisdictions:

Policy 16.1 Shall require sidewalk facilities in all new development in or adjacent to urban areas. ~~Such facilities shall include sidewalks on both sides of the street that are a minimum five (5) feet wide, if separated from the street by a planter strip, or six (6) feet wide if located next to the curb.~~

Policy 16.2 Shall require all new multi-family residential and large commercial development to provide easily identified pedestrian facilities connecting all parts of the development and providing access through parking areas and across driveways.

Policy 16.3 Shall design and construct all new bridge structures with sufficient width to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists.

Goal 17 To create a new pedestrian and bicyclist facility connecting urban areas with major recreational areas. San Benito County jurisdictions:

Policy 17.1 Shall plan and construct a combined pedestrian and bicycle path along the San Benito River ~~from San Juan Bautista to the Pinnacles National Monument.~~

~~Shall work with special event sponsors to ensure that adequate provisions are made for heavy traffic and parking demand during special events.~~

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The Council of San Benito County Governments has adopted short- and long-term objectives that are designed to guide the agency's work program until the next update of the Regional Transportation Plan. Also, in accordance with the new Regional Transportation Guidelines, the Council of San Benito County Governments has also adopted performance measures by which the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan will be judged during adoption of that document.

Short-Term Objectives (by 2010)

- Objective S.1 To increase the capacity of the street and highway system to accommodate projected short-term growth.
- Objective S.2 To serve 350 commuter round trips per weekday of service with commuter rail and express bus service connecting Hollister to Gilroy.
- Objective S.3 To reduce the rate of fatal vehicular accidents throughout San Benito County
- Objective S.4 To develop a recreational trail for pedestrians and bicyclists along the San Benito River from San Juan Bautista to Hollister.
- Objective S.5 To develop a transportation emergency preparedness and response plan that identifies emergency transportation systems, including emergency corridors and reliever routes.
- Objective S.6 To convert the old Highway 25 corridor in Hollister from use as a state highway to use as a business-oriented main street that includes increased parking, pedestrian, and bicyclist opportunities.
- Objective S.7 To develop a plan for commodities transportation that designates appropriate routes for large trucks throughout San Benito County and protects rural roads and residential and downtown business districts from degradation caused by large trucks.
- Objective S.8 To increase rideshare and intra-county transit operations by 10 percent over current (2000) levels.
- Objective S.9 To develop and initiate implementation of a comprehensive bike and pedestrian plan.
- Objective S.10 To improve Hollister Municipal Airport operations by lengthening the main runway, installing an Instrument Landing System, and constructing additional hangars for general aviation use.

JOSEPH P. THOMPSON

Attorney at Law

8339 Church Street, Suite 114, Gilroy, CA 95020

Post Office Box 154, Gilroy, CA 95021-0154

Telephone (408) 848-5506; Fax (408) 848-4246

E-mail: TransLaw@PacBell.Net

October 5, 2011

FAX (831) 636-4160

Honorable Margie Barrios, Chairwoman
San Benito County Board of Supervisors
Hollister, CA 95023

FAX (831) 636-4310

Hon. Jaime Delacruz, Chairman
San Benito County Council of Government
Hollister, CA 95023

Re: Public Comment BOS Oct. 2011 & COG Meeting Agendas - Volunteering Once Again to Assist Local Government to Establish Sound, Sustainable Transport Policy to Replace the Failure of Your Current Regime COG-VTA Insanity

Dear Madam and Sir,

Thank you for inviting public comment on the miasma, mess and Hell Hole that you've dug for the citizens and taxpayers of our County, you lovers of VTA ultra-radical socialism (see why I told you not to go to bed with VTA?)?! You've fallen into VTA's "BART-to-San Jose Boondoggle Trap" with your illegal, unconstitutional "Mobility Partnership," by doing just what that 800-Pound Gorilla tells you to do. You've earned the condemnation of the taxpayers, again. I warned you time and again, but you refuse to listen, and we suffer for your arrogance and ignorance in transport policy.

Please add this to the "public comment" for your next meeting agenda.

1. Author: See previous letters, legal memoranda, lawsuits, emails, etc. I have 48 years of transport industry (rail and highway) experience on the Central California Coast Region, 31 years of practice of transportation law, 35 years of doctoral and post-doctoral study of transportation law and policy, at Santa Clara University School of Law, Norman Y. Mineta International Institute for Surface Transportation Policy Studies, San Jose State University; Transportation Research Board, Georgetown University; and at the Library of Congress. I'm a member of the Association for Transportation Law & Logistics (formerly the Association of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners (charter member of the Santa Clara Valley Chapter), Transportation Lawyers Association (committees on Legislation (Past-Chair), Freight Claims, Bankruptcy, and Intermodal Transport), and a candidate for the American Society of Transportation & Logistics. I am licensed to practice before the California Supreme Court, the United States Supreme Court, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and all U.S. District Courts in California.

2. Background Materials: See my hundreds of letters, faxes, legal memoranda and three

Policy Advisory Committee Application-On One Condition: That You Honor the First Amendment Right of Free Speech, and Not Punish Those Who Voice a Dissenting Point of View, That You Not Betray the Citizens of Our County by Chilling the Exercise of First Amendment Rights as You Did the Last Time I Volunteered to Serve Pro Bono on TTF 1

their unconstitutional conduct. I won't serve hypocrites in local government, so if you cannot abide this condition, then do not accept my application, and do not appoint me to hypocrisy-filled government. Worse than any other thing, Lincoln held "base hypocrisy" intolerable. I agree with that transportation attorney, our 16th President. It's your base hypocrisy that has brought us to the ruinous position, i.e., 5th worst County (economically) in the USA. Perhaps, if you had listened to me, rather than muzzle me, opened your ears when I brought you the UP's Industrial Development Department's "open check book" for local rail-oriented economic development on the Hollister Branch Line, our County's citizens and taxpayers would not be prostrate, broke, busted, and bankrupt today. But you'll never turn around our local economy if you cling to your Sovietization, VTA-poster child mentality of statist, socialist, communist, Marxist, Stalinist policy of screwing the taxpayers so you can reward your special interest monopolists and public-sector union employees. If you have the same closed-minded hypocrisy today as you did then, I won't waste my time and be subjected to more of your "base hypocrisy." So, if you're still hypocrites, please disregard my application. If you've got an open mind to alternative, pro-business, free enterprise, private-sector transport solutions, like you did when you adopted my dissent on your Caltrain extension vote ten years ago, then please consider my application. There's no middle ground: you either are hypocrites still, or you reject your "base hypocrisy."

4. Abolish COG: With motorists paying 102+% of their transport costs, including all highway and street construction and maintenance, and our elected leaders stealing from those gas tax revenues to give our money away to special interests at COG, VTA, TAMC, etc., to keep their bankrupt transit operations moving, the time is "high noon" to abolish COG. Gas taxes from motorists and truckers are used by COG to subsidize COG's unconstitutional, unsound and unsustainable transit boondoggles, yet COG's Directors refuse to protect the taxpayers from this disrespect, this abuse, and this unconstitutional violation of our rights. In COG's long history of abuse, the level of the damage being inflicted on local motorists and truckers has never been so high as it is now. Like the Bell, California City Council, we need to turn the COG rascals out of office ASAP. The longer we delay, the greater the harm that they will inflict on us, our economy, our lives, our families and our community. The only possible conclusion for the Policy Advisory Committee is to demand real social justice: immediately abolish COG. If appointed, I will work tirelessly, as God grants me the strength, to accomplish the goal of returning us to our American roots in transport policy, as I have tried, unsuccessfully, for ten years of COG, RAC, TAC, & TTF meetings, special meetings, workshops, etc., to convince the unconstitutional COG Directors, kingdom-makers, waste-rewarders, Marxist, Leninist, Stalinist betrayers in our local government. *Caveat viator.*

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH P. THOMPSON

cc: COG Board of Directors
cc: SBCBOS

Policy Advisory Committee Application-On One Condition: That You Honor the First Amendment Right of Free Speech, and Not Punish Those Who Voice a Dissenting Point of View, That You Not Betray the Citizens of Our County by Chilling the Exercise of First Amendment Rights as You Did the Last Time I Volunteered to Serve Pro Bono on TTF 3

SAN BENITO COUNTY SMALL BUSINESS INCUBATOR

Abraham Lincoln Learning Fortress for Responsible Enterprise Education

6445 Vineyard Estates Drive, Hollister, CA 95023

Telephone (408) 848-5506; Fax (408) 848-4246

E-mail: TransLaw@PacBell.Net

February 15, 2013

FAX (831) 636-4010

Honorable Anthony Botelho, Chairman
San Benito County Board of Supervisors
Hollister, CA 95023

FAX (831) 636-4310

Hon. Anthony Botelho, Chairman
San Benito County Council of Government
Hollister, CA 95023

FAX (831) 636-4310

Honorable Ignacio Velazquez, Mayor
City of Hollister
Hollister, CA 95023

Re: Public Comment-COG, BOS;---Next Meetings: COG Continues to Violate Our Laws, Our Civil Rights, and our Constitutional Rights; *San Benito County Taxpayers v. County of San Benito Council of Governments, San Benito County Board of Supervisors, et al., San Benito County Superior Court, Unlimited Jurisdiction, Case No. CU-10-00019*

Dear Mr. Chairman and Mr. Mayor,

After the third lawsuit I filed for the taxpayers of San Benito County against COG and BOS, i.e., San Benito County Superior Court Case No. CU-10-00019, you had your Mobility Partnership VTA General Manager Michael Burns publish a letter in the *Hollister Free Lance* in which he promised that COG-VTA would obey the Brown Act.

Now, after I dismissed that case on the good faith assumption that COG-VTA would start obeying our law, e.g., Sunshine in Government Act, aka "Brown Act," COG started the 2013 year with its first meeting by immediately violating the Brown Act. COG's agenda published to the public stated it would discuss goals and plans, but made no mention that it would seek imposition of two new forms of taxation. No advance warning was given to the public that COG's Directors would vote to have COG impose a COG sales tax like the VTA does in SCC. No advance warning was given to the public that COG's Directors would vote to have COG impose a vehicle per miles traveled tax.

Thus, COG continues its former pattern of misconduct, flaunting the law its Directors were sworn to uphold, and violating the taxpayers' rights, civil rights, and constitutional rights as alleged in the Complaint the taxpayers filed three times in the past ten years, including the above-mentioned case.

**Government Code Request to Reverse Illegal
COG Vote Taken in Violation of Brown Act's Requirements
and Sunshine in Government Law**

You don't know the first damn thing about private-sector transport, and never consider them, and are so radical socialist that you refuse to place them on your agendas for consideration. You ought to be terminated ASAP, just as the Gilroy *Dispatch* said about the VTA.

I've represented the taxpayers in San Benito County Superior Court in three lawsuits against you for violations of our laws.

I've written extensively on the subject of transportation law and policy, locally, Statewide, and in the academic literature.

I'm a member of the Transportation Lawyers Association, and serve on its Legislation (past-Chair), Intermodal, Bankruptcy and Freight Claims Committees.

I'm a member of the Association for Transportation Law and Policy (formerly the Association for Transportation Law, Logistics & Policy, and before that it was the Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners Association until the Congress terminated the ICC in 1995).

I'm a member of the Gilroy-Morgan Hill Bar Association, and a past-President (twice).

In 1996 I received the Best Research Paper Award in the Nation from the American Society of Transportation & Logistics, presented to me in Omaha at the AST&L's annual meeting, and afterward met with UP's top Intermodal chief at UP's headquarters to convey Gilroy Economic Development Corporation's Executive Director, the late Bill Lindsteadt, desire to restore intermodal service for the Central California Coast Region.

Ten years ago, at his request, I attended UPRR's Industrial Development Department's Forum on behalf of SBCEDC's Al Martinez at the Economic Development Forum that they presented in Pleasanton for Northern California local governments. Then I brought back the message from UPRR and presented it to you, BOS, EDC and other audiences. Predictably, but revealingly, you did nothing, and shockingly did not have the courtesy to respond to UP's offer to bring rail-oriented economic development to our bankrupt County. Just for that alone you ought to be abolished and your pensions eliminated, and be prosecuted like the Bell, California City Council defrauders.

Three years during his administration I attended Governor Wilson's Regulatory Reform Roundtable at the invitation of the Governor's OPR (Office of Policy Research) as a member of the Association for Transportation Law, Logistics & Policy, and have since circulated the conclusion of the Roundtable, the Governor's Executive Order to downsize government and abolish burdensome regulations, which our Legislature has totally ignored, while California plunged to 50th worst State in the Nation, and this County sunk to almost the worst County in the Nation.

I've submitted numerous letters, memoranda, position papers, three lawsuits, numerous emails and faxes, all of which you've totally ignored, scoffed at me from your podium, laughed when I've explained why your policy is killing us, and how your bias and prejudice damages us and our children, and clung to your radical socialist concepts for government, just like Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin did.

Until we terminate you and the other unaccountable, non-transparent, unelected, corrupt, special interest protectors promoting crony capitalism, i.e., radical socialist joint power authorities like you, we will continue to slide down the slippery slope route taken by the USSR.

Background. Please see the most recent taxpayers' Complaint (see copy attached), San

**Government Code Request to Reverse Illegal
COG Vote Taken in Violation of Brown Act's Requirements
and Sunshine in Government Law**

SAN BENITO COUNTY SMALL BUSINESS INCUBATOR

Abraham Lincoln Learning Fortress for Responsible Enterprise Education

6445 Vineyard Estates Drive, Hollister, CA 95023

Telephone (408) 848-5506; Fax (408) 848-4246

E-mail: TransLaw@PacBell.Net

February 17, 2013

FAX (831) 636-4160

Honorable Anthony Botelho, Chairman
San Benito County Council of Government
481 Fourth Street
Hollister, CA 95023

Re: Public Records Act Request: COG's Wastefulness Disclosed or Concealed by COG's Directors? Transparency or Falsehoods Perpetrated as "Transparency"? Search for Truth-in-Transport

Dear Mr. Botelho,

Please refer to California Government Code provisions known as the Public Records Act (hereinafter the "Act"), Government Code §§6250-6270, which Act applies to the SBCCOG, and especially to §6250, which states, "In enacting this chapter, the Legislature, mindful of the right of individuals to privacy, finds and declares that **access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state.**"

Regarding COG's repeated attempts to falsify its financial results from the taxpayers, and your other efforts elsewhere to recover full cost fees for government activities, I hereby make the following request for public records under the Act:

1. What money does COG use to compile in its budget report under the topic "revenue"?
2. What percentage of COG's "revenue" comes to COG thru the collection of fares?
3. What percentage of COG's "revenue" comes to COG thru taxpayers' subsidies, regardless of the name or label applied to them, e.g., "grants"?
4. What expenses of COG are used to compute "farebox recovery" in COG's reports?
5. What expenses of COG are not used to compute "farebox recovery" in COG's reports?
6. What expenses of COG are used to compute operating expenses of County Transit?
7. What expenses of COG are not used to compute operating expenses of County Transit?
8. What percentage of seats are transported empty each day by County Transit buses?
9. How many vehicle miles per year are County Transit's buses operated with no passengers on board?
10. How much money does County Transit require from tax subsidies to transport each passenger?
11. Do you have written authorization from COG's Directors authorizing COG's staff to select the operator for County Transit bus operations? If so, please provide me with a copy of it.

**ABRAHAM LINCOLN LEARNING FORTRESS FOR RESPONSIBLE
ENTERPRISE EDUCATION**

Transportation Facts, Factoids & Septage

Lesson #16

Q: Could the SBC industrial and commercial employment base be increased, serving agribusiness and others, if COG would use our federal stimulus money to build an intermodal facility on the Hollister Branch Line?

A: Yes. If we build one like Imperial County recently did for their agribusiness, as recommended by the Governor's Goods Movement Plan. Economical, truck competitive service, and friendly to the environment, COG's Directors must re-think their priorities. Harnessing the superior capabilities of the private-sector over the public-sector, we can capture enough revenue to accomplish the badly-needed transportation improvements that cry-out for an affordable solution. An intermodal facility, where trailers and containers are loaded onto and off of railroad flat cars, is the best way that to have real Smart Growth transport for the future of SBC:

1. Facilitate High-Paying Industrial Jobs, Greater Commerce and Trade
2. Improve Transportation (Passenger and Freight)
3. Stimulate Local Economy, Stop Job Flight
4. Create Local Jobs, Increase Industrial & Commercial Tax Base
5. Increase Local Capital Spending and Investment
6. Reduce Highway Maintenance Expenses, Gets Tonnage Off Local Roads
7. Reduce Air Pollution and Improve Air Quality
8. Reduce Highway Congestion (Divert Trailers & Containers to Rail Routes)
9. Improve Highway Safety and Reduce Accidents
10. Increase Local Government Tax Base By Growing Private Sector
11. Create Transport Options for Growers, Packers & Shippers & Receivers
12. Improve Product Profitability During Truck Shortages
13. Reduce Border Crossing Delays for NAFTA Products Trade
14. Retain Affordable Housing by Reducing Traffic Impact Fees
15. Maintain Character and Environment of County
16. Preserve Agricultural Land and Small Farms
17. Reduce Fuel Consumption, Improve Air Quality
18. Reduce Driver Fatigue-Related Accidents
19. More Responsive Management to Competitive Marketplace
20. Less Government, Less Taxes, and Therefore, Greater Competitive Success Rate and Fewer Business Failures and Bankruptcies

TransLaw Joe Thompson, TransLaw@PacBell.Net, 408-848-5506

www.JosephThompson-Law.com