

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

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

Sent: Friday, February 04, 2005 12:48 PM

To: Ranndo@aol.com; keoghs1@pacbell.net; paspence@charter.net; dnortondesigns@msn.com; ereilly@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ARivas4747@aol.com; jan.beautz@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; BDS020@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tony.campos@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tfitzmaurice@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mardi.wormhoudt@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mrotkin@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; info@sccrtc.org

Cc: gbookwalter@santacruzsentinel.com

Subject: RTC Meeting Misinterpretation

Commissioners,

Based on Commissioner Norton's questions following my presentation on Item 30 I think I failed to make myself clear on an important point. For that I apologize. I used the terms "blackhole" and "trash can" when referring to public comments. I was not implying that the Staff fails to forward comments to the commission, quite the contrary. The Staff does a great job in forwarding and including comments in the meeting packets.

My reference was the treatment of the comments made by the public after they have been distributed by Staff. Meaningful, constructive comments and ideas from members of the public almost never show up as agenda items for discussion. I illustrated it yesterday by saying that my e-mail comments on the protocol for dealing with the DEIR would never have appeared on the agenda had Commissioner Keogh not entered them into the record. Further, even though my comments and the RTC response were on the record there was no discussion of them. They were accepted by the commission with no action which implied that Mr. Moose's interpretation of CEQA criteria was correct and I was wrong.

I should point out that Mr. Moose either did not carefully read the Business Plan or did not fully understand it. In his first paragraph beginning at line 17 he states *"The Business Plan also discusses the current condition of the tracks as a reason why the trains would operate at speeds that would enable four round trips rather than nine round trips per day. The Business Plan provides an analysis of what is happening currently and does not outline future potential."* He is incorrect.

The Business Plan, in fact, states that the "current condition of the track" prohibits passenger rail service and that a future upgrade to Class I is needed just to get to the four trips per day level. Further, had Mr. Moose read Table 5-3 and done some simple math he would have seen that an additional (and hugely expensive) upgrade to Class II would still not allow for nine trips per day. Nothing beyond Class II was even contemplated by the Plan. Mr. Moose's legal interpretation of "feasible" (or as he puts it "potentially feasible" whatever that means) suggests that any "potential" decision by the commission (no matter how far-fetched) that might lead to nine trips per day (e.g., spend the money for Class III and put a Bullet Train on that line) would be sufficient to retain the original DEIR. I think that parsing CEQA is contrary to just understanding the practical and realistic project parameters and limitations.

My point is simple. A DEIR by CEQA's rule-of-reason has to be feasible within the context of the project. The Business Plan and other sources (e.g. Big Trees railroad) has clearly shown that the original nine trips per day is not feasible and thus should not become an alternative scenario. The only scenario that is feasible is that contained in the RTC's own Business Plan and it should be the only one up for debate by the commission when or if the question of certification is raised. If the commission insists on retaining the nine trip scenario (with better justification than Mr. Moose's) then the Business Plan needs to include all of the costs and measures associated with the remediation of the many environmental issues associated with that scenario; these costs are currently not included. And the commission must go on record as committing to those costs and measures.

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

From: JoSinger@aol.com [mailto:JoSinger@aol.com]

Sent: Saturday, February 05, 2005 8:14 AM

To: info@scrtc.org

Subject: passenger train input

An article in yesterday's newspaper regarding commuter train ACE, states that ACE has a \$1.2 million budget shortfall, largely do to low ridership. If this train with a much larger pool of potential riders can't meet its expenses, how can this train from Wattsonville to SC do it? I would guess that local tax payers do not want this expense added to the already high taxes. I sure don't!!!

What is the Quiet Zone and why should one residential area qualify for it and not all the other housing areas around the train tracks?????????

Thanks for keeping me informed. JoAnn Singer (josinger@aol.com)

JoAnn Singer –

Your comments regarding Passenger Train Input were received and will be forwarded to the Regional Transportation Commission for their consideration. For more information on this and other local transportation projects, please see the Commission's web site:

www.scrtc.org

The web site also has an option to sign up for Enews should you be interested in receiving periodic updates about specific projects.

In response to your two questions:

1. The RTC is not currently considering implementing a passenger train from Watsonville to Santa Cruz.
2. A Quiet Zone is a Federal Railroad Administration designation that allows less use of train horns at at-grade rail crossing with roadways, if safety requirements are met. The RTC has not yet decided if and where it would pursue Quiet Zones.

Thank you for your comments.

- Karena Pushnik
Senior Transportation Planner
Santa Cruz Co. Regional Transportation Commission
831/460-3210 (fax 460-3215)

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

From: Jerry Roane [<mailto:JRoane@Austin.rr.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2005 3:07 PM

To: info@sccrtc.org

Subject: Advanced transportation between Santa Cruz and San Jose

Dear Santa Cruz Transportation Commissioners

I would like to introduce you to a patent pending revolution in transportation. The TriTrack is a four-passenger dual-mode electric car that is a safe, quick, sustainable alternative to traditional cars.

There is a program through Caltrans that is set up to promote new transportation technologies. The request for proposals is not yet published, but it should be coming up in the next month or so. We hope to fund R&D for a 3000 foot test track, and follow up with a demonstration guideway to showcase the TriTrack to the public.

Any demonstration guideway is only the first step of an area-wide approach to building these guideways throughout the city; it would be the first in a set. This is a paradigm shift in how highways are built and how energy is distributed to the automotive fleet. The TriTrack is intended to replace the four passenger car in cities that have dangerous levels of ozone and other engine pollutants. The NOx reduction is 10:1 compared to current cars. The guideway is elevated so it uses basically no land and can be run down the edge of existing streets to minimize the impact on the community. This triangular highway for the TriTrack is many times cheaper to construct and can be built for the most part down regular city streets where phone and cable TV are run now.

We are working on a proposal for a shuttle version of this system between San Jose and Santa Cruz near CA-17. 17 has a high fatality rate due to its many turns and elevation changes. The TriTrack guideway would traverse the mountain ridge close to the expressway, but would take a straighter path over the mountain ridge. We have looked at the map data from the USGS and chosen a route that illustrates the benefits of the TriTrack in these beautiful natural surroundings.

This route should cost \$5 million for a 21 mile dual guideway from Los Gatos/San Jose to Santa Cruz. (\$230,000/mile) over this challenging mountainous route. The ability of the TriTrack to climb straighter up the mountainside as it goes over the center peak allows the route to be straightened considerably. The TriTrack car body shell wraps around the guideway and cannot come off, keeping the occupants safe. The 515 collisions, 136 injuries and two fatal crashes on expressway 17 (2002) could be eliminated with this guideway. From a cost justification standpoint, the automobile crash cost and hospitalization of those involved in accidents on this stretch of highway would more than pay for the guideway. The added bonus is that pollution is cut and traffic can flow at 18,000 passengers per hour over this route. For reference, 17 carries 80,000 cars per day with occupancy rate of 1.3 persons per car. It was designed for 40,000 passenger vehicles per day and reached that in 1968. The TriTrack would equal the capacity of this multi-lane expressway. 25,000 workers drive this commute to silicon valley each day. These workers would gain 428 hours (18 days) a year of time lost in dangerous congestion. It is estimated to cost \$200,000,000.00 to

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

From: Paul Elerick [mailto:elerick@cruzio.com]

Sent: Monday, February 14, 2005 2:29 PM

To: General Info

Subject: Banner-Press Editorial

Dear Friends at the RTC:

Here's a recent newspaper editorial that you may already be aware of. We think it's a logical analysis of Measure J's failure to win voter approval.

Paul Elerick
Campaign for Sensible Transportation

Paul Elerick –

Your email regarding the Banner-Press Editorial was received and will be forwarded to the Regional Transportation Commission for their consideration. The RTC Chair has indicated an interest in writing a guest editorial for the newspaper to correct factual errors in the editorial and to indicate that there appear to be a wide range of reasons why people did not vote for Measure J.

Thanks for writing.

- Karena Pushnik
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
831/460-3200

Wednesday
February 9, 2005

What Part of NO Don't You Understand?

In last November's General Election, Santa Cruz County voters flatly rejected Proposition J, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's at-

tempt to convince voters they should commit to a 30-year, half-cent sales tax that would have raised \$363 million, primarily for widening an 8.4 mile stretch of Highway 1 from Morrissey Boulevard to the San Andreas Road/Larkin Valley Road exit. The name the SCCRT Commissioners chose for Measure J, "Transportation Improvement Sales Tax," was a bit of political chicanery, which didn't fool the people at the polls.

Also included in the measure was a very controversial tourist trolley, and a small sop to voters that promised a portion of the tax money would be used for fixing some of the county's notoriously pot-holed roads, and other small transportation-related projects that are almost universally desirable.

The SCCRTC Commissioners seemed to be saying "Voters be damned," when they decided on Jan. 20, after a public hearing on the widening of Highway 1, to go ahead and spend \$8 million on studies of the environmental impact of seven different alternatives for "Improving Highway 1." Among the options to be studied are ramp metering and aux-

iliary lanes, or adding a lane in each direction for the entire 8.4-mile stretch of Highway.

The voters have said absolutely NO to the Highway 1 widening project, speakers at the Jan. 20 public hearing said emphatically NO to the project, but the commissioners are apparently convinced that they know more about what's good for the voters than the voters do.

The roads under Santa Cruz County's purview are, in many cases a mess. Particularly those in the mountain areas. Some of those roads have received no significant maintenance nor improvement for decades, aside from an occasional patching of potholes that became so gigantic they could no longer be ignored, or the removal of slides which regularly occur causing partial or total road closures.

Since the SCCRTC has \$8 million dollars to putter away, we believe it could be much better spent in an effort to help solve long-standing problems of county-owned roads rather than squandering away that much money trying to justify a pie-in-the-sky "maybe someday" project on state-owned Highway 1, which the voters have already resoundingly disapproved.

Our question to the SCCRTC Commissioners is - "What part of NO don't you understand?"

Editorial

----Original Message-----

From: David Eselius [mailto:deselius@earthlink.net]

Sent: Monday, February 14, 2005 10:06 AM

To: Beautz, Janet K.; Pirie, Ellen; Wormhoudt, Mardi; Campos, Tony; Stone, Mark W.

Cc: SCCRTC Staff; Editorial SC Sentinel; City Clerk Watsonville; Coonerty, Ryan; Cynthia Mathews; Emily Reilly; Mike Rotkin; Tim Fitzmaurice; Ed Porter; Madrigal, Tony; Randy Johnson; Dene Bustichi; Cliff Barrett; Stephany E. Aguilar; Paul Marigonda; Stephanie Harlan; Michael Termini; Kirby Nicol; Dennis Norton; Bruce Arthur; Rich_Krumholz@dot.ca.gov; lwhite@scmtd.com

Subject: Scotts Valley to Watsonville Transportation Corridor

February 14, 2005

To: Santa Cruz County Supervisors, members

Cc: CALTRANS (ex officio, Rich Krumholz)
Capitola, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, and Watsonville City Council members
METRO Board, members
Santa Cruz Sentinel
SCCRTC, members

Subject: Scotts Valley to Watsonville Transportation Corridor

Coincident with the election of the Santa Cruz City Council in 1998 the city's political movements aimed its attention at affecting the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) objectives.

This has lead to the questioning of basic transportation assumptions made since 1998, by the SCCRTC.

As a result, necessary transportation improvements for the county's "Fishhook" (a.k.a., Highway 1 and 17 interchange) and Highway 1 widening require further unbiased studies.

In support of a greater understanding of projected transportation requirements in Santa Cruz County, CALTRANS is to develop a "Scotts Valley to Watsonville Corridor Study."

Politics and Transportation: The repercussions of the county's increasingly inadequate transportation systems are important. Transportation problems have a ripple effect upon society and commerce.

Poor transportation adds to the costs of living within Santa Cruz County, makes securing a living more difficult, and decreases commerce sales. Santa Cruz County's transportation capacity also influences the state's transportation needs.

With the current strengthened economy, approximately 25% of employed (tax paying) Santa Cruz County residents travel to jobs in Silicon Valley, and beyond. This commuting workforce is one of the county economic pillars.

Before I retired, my standard workday was ten (10) to eleven (11) hours. On top of that, because employment and traffic was high in Silicon Valley at that time (it was the '90s), my daily commute was approximately two to three (2-3) hours a day. I would get up for work at five AM and return to home at seven or eight o'clock at night.

It is tough to earn enough money to provide for a family in Santa Cruz County: poor transportation infrastructures do not help family life.

Watsonville -- The social impact of commuting is a greater challenge upon South County residents. It takes longer to get to Silicon Valley, which has higher paying jobs and a variety of career paths.

A congested Highway 1 adds an additional one (1) to two (2) hours a day to a South County commuter's commute.

Proper access to Silicon Valley is essential to support the projected population growth within the Watsonville area.

Watsonville endorses highway projects that provide for county residents.

Scotts Valley – Scotts Valley has neither endorsed nor rejected the highway-widening project.

Capitola -- Capitola is very dependent upon the economic commerce resources of shopping centers and tourists. As such, traffic jam prone periods (lets say 3 PM to 8 PM) have a corresponding negative impact upon the city's sales tax revenue. In addition, adversely affected by traffic congestion are Capitola residents.

Capitola has neither endorsed nor rejected the highway-widening project.

Santa Cruz City – Current SCCRTC transportation policies appear to be developed from North County alternative transportation politics. Those politics do not accommodate automobile use.

Alternative City Councils of Santa Cruz have indicated little interest in commerce, commuters, tourists, or traffic jams. Several successive Santa Cruz City Councils have identified bicycles, buses, walking, and Prop 116 funds as transportation priorities. There was also a 1999 City Council's "city without cars" plan.

Santa Cruz City's transportation politics is influenced by a coalition of anti-business, anti-development environmentalists, bicyclists, socialists, and ordinary anarchist. The organizational foundations of coalition oligarchy clans was established 30-years ago, they retain using the label "Progressives."

With exceptional organizational abilities and resources, coalitions of groups form an oligarchy of clans to influence politicians and community groups. Anti-automobile transportation clans have redirected scarce resources to alternative transportation.

Attempts were even made to turn CALTRANS' Highway 1 Mission Street widening project into a 2-lane road (with bicycle paths).

Santa Cruz City Councils did not support Highway 1 expansion, and withdrew from the SCCRTC highway build authority.

METRO Transit Bus Involvement – With their three (3) aligned votes, the Santa Cruz METRO representatives are influential members within the SCCRTC. The METRO representatives push for HOV/buss lanes, HOV/buss on ramp metered lanes, Highway 1 bus stops, more METRO funding, rejecting mixed-flow lane use, etc.

METRO's political entanglement in expanding the highway appears to have been influenced by anti-automotive clans. At one time METRO supporters wanted the METRO staff to become the Highway 1's "design-build" authority.

METRO Board representatives have inherent conflicts-of-interest within the SCCRTC: transit funding METRO interests vs. the county's need for better automotive transportation.

SCCRTC – There is little doubt that road building Santa Cruz County is a political process. The most organized and active political movement within North and Mid County is the Progressive political movement. Therefore, the SCCRTC has represented the political ideology of the Progressives.

To the detriment of county transportation needs, some SCCRTC staff, and some of the commissioners, have labored to implement the Santa Cruz political alternative transportation agenda. Alignment of staff functions have provided for the political needs of the commission. Consultants track the political needs; their reports reflect those needs.

Some political clans view the investment in automobile transportation as counter productive to transportation. Bicycles, buses, walking, and a railway right-of-way remain the transportation priority of the SCCRTC.

SCCRTC transportation intent and purposes requires re-identification and re-establishment.

Lack of SCCRTC Transportation Planning: California's enactment of SB 45 in 1997 transferred from CALTRANS the intra-county "State Transportation Improvement Program" (STIP) funding (and responsibilities) to regional county transportation commissions.

However, having in 1997 transferred the funds (and responsibilities), the state legislatures failed to also transfer needed transportation planning and engineering experiences to the SCCRTC. Therefore, there is a high probability that Santa Cruz County transportation funding cannot provide necessary county transportation facilities.

The following are SCCRTC 2004 (**bold**) projects identified within the "Annual Report on New Starts, Proposed Allocations of Funds for Fiscal Year 2004, Report of the Secretary of Transportation to the United States Congress:"

***** "The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) completed a Major Investment Study (MIS) in 1999 to evaluate improvements in the Watsonville to Santa Cruz Corridor." ... "The MIS projects include the purchase of the rail right-of-way for future transportation uses, including a bike/pedestrian path along the right-of-way and partial funding for High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes on the parallel highway."**

The SCCRTC completed the \$1-million railway MIS in 1999. No CALTRANS Highway 1 (or Fishhook) transportation studies were requested, or provided, to support assumptions within this MIS. The MIS report reflects the transportation intent of Santa Cruz clan political involvement.

To this day, the actual SCCRTC Watsonville to Santa Cruz Corridor transportation priority remains: purchase of the railway right-of-way and a bike/pedestrian path along the right-of-way.

The HOT lane on Highway 1 was later replaced with the requirement for HOV lanes.

CALTRANS original Fishhook capacity improvement proposal was rejected by the SCCRTC. Instead of Fishhook transportation capacity improvements, the SCCRTC required Fishhook operational improvements.

***** "A state highway and an underutilized freight rail line run through the length of most of the corridor."**

Highway 1 – Highway 1, the Fishhook interchange, and Highway 17 are the only continuous routes through the county. Highway 1 serves as the commuter and commerce spine linking Monterey, Watsonville, Aptos, Santa Cruz, University of California at Santa Cruz, Silicon Valley, and beyond.

Between Soquel and Morrissey, on Highway 1, there are currently 40.2 million trips per year. Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) travel-forecasting 2020 model projects 52.7 million trips per year.

The essential AMBAG's 20-year demographic projections for Highway 1 and Fishhook expansions have not been taken into consideration by the SCCRTC. In addition, capacity limits of Highway 17 to/from Silicon Valley require consideration within any Santa Cruz County transportation corridor study.

Railway right-of-way -- The railway right-of-way purchase is going to be expensive and could operate at financial long-term losses. Building a "**bike/pedestrian path along the right-of-way**" is reported to cost \$20-million to \$40-million above right-of-way purchase price.

Operation of the freight line service is essential to the local economy and transportation services. If freight line service would be discontinued, job losses within Davenport and other areas will be

the result. Local construction prices will also increase. Truck traffic will increase on local roads. Road maintenance costs will increase.

A “**future transportation uses**” for the rail right-of-way has not been identified, nor has an adequate railway right-of-way use-plan, or an adequate long-term cost-plan, been presented for public review.

A voter’s referendum may be necessary to prompt the SCCRTC to define and justify the purchase of the railway right-of-way.

***** “Major bus improvements within the corridor received the highest priority and the largest amount of projected funding.”**

With three (3) METRO Board members and two (2) Santa Cruz City representatives on the SCCRTC, it has been assured that major bus improvements received the highest priority and the largest amount of projected funding.

Relative to actual improved county transportation, the METRO transit service received a disproportionately large amount of funding from the SCCRTC.

***** “A feasibility study for the HOT lanes concluded that toll-free High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes would better meet project objectives and eliminated the toll lane alternative from further consideration.”**

The feasibility study for county HOT lanes indicated HOT lanes were impractical. However, no viable feasibility study indicated the county’s political HOV lanes were practical.

It appears HOV lane configuration, in Santa Cruz County, is counter-productive to highway capacity improvements.

***** “The SCCRTC programmed \$3.34 million to commence the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Highway 1 Widening in September 2002.”**

More than two (2) years have passed since the SCCRTC has approved \$3.34 million for Highway 1’s widening EIR. Little has been done to complete the EIR (which, as it turns out, is a good thing).

It would appear that the SCCRTC’s highway transportation long-term planning was inadequate and over-whelmed by political opinions. Because an adequate transportation corridor study is not available, the current EIR study will be limited in its success.

The SCCRTC presented an under-developed sales tax Measure J in November 2004. That sales tax measure, and the manner in which it was presented, decreased public approval of highway expansion from a initial high 61% yes vote to the final 43.3% yes sales tax vote.

There is a need for the SCCRTC to provide for transportation accountability that is more than: bicycles, buses, walking, and a railway right-of-way.

The SCCRTC has not executed its fiduciary public transportation responsibilities for balanced and verifiable county transportation improvements.

The Scotts Valley to Watsonville Transportation Corridor Development: A “Scotts Valley to Watsonville Highway Transportation Corridor Study” needs to be developed, by CALTRANS, for the SCCRTC. Without a proper transportation corridor study, both purpose and direction have been lacking within the SCCRTC operations.

CALTRANS' highway corridor studies are focused, technical analyses for specific highway facility segments. These studies incorporate a multidisciplinary approach to identifying both short- and long-term highway segment improvements.

From the corridor studies, CALTRANS would develop capacity and operational Project Study Reports (PSRs), with associated costing, and overview drawings.

AMBAG's 20-year Santa Cruz area demographic projections would provide CALTRANS needed transportation design guidance. An EIR is than developed from the "Scotts Valley to Watsonville Highway Transportation Corridor Study."

It is noted that CALTRANS has previously conducted several transportation studies in Santa Cruz County. What is being requested is a corridor capacity/operational study, from Scotts Valley to Watsonville, which is based upon AMBAG's 20-year demographic projections. The study would include part of Highway 17, the Fishhook interchange, and Highway 1.

There is also the problem that it may take ten (10) to fifteen (15) years to "fund, plan, design, EIR, and construct" the needed capacity/operational changes to the corridor. In fifteen (15) years, the county's population most likely will have grown significantly.

Within the corridor study there is a need to identify time-to-completion (relative to projected population growth), and how well the corridor plan accommodates future county demographics.

Large public comment meetings could occur after the CALTRANS corridor study is drafted. I hope that further negative manipulation of public opinion will than become less evident (at least until after the technical studies are completed and available).

CALTRANS' "Scotts Valley to Watsonville Highway Transportation Corridor Study" will result in revised highway drawings, Fishhook interchange drawings, and PSRs. In turn, the new design package will provide the necessary corridor designs for properly completing SCCRTC's \$3.34 million EIR.

Funding: California Transportation Commission (CTC), STIP funds, US Congress, California State Legislatures, and local sales tax funding will become more readily available when the SCCRTC has:

- Provided to the CTC a Santa Cruz County demographic projection transportation corridor plan (from Scotts Valley to Watsonville).
- Put in place the management structures necessary to implement the transportation corridor plan.
- Provide necessary public support.

Sincerely,

David G. Eselius
1312 Laurel Street
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831-429-9695

Thank you for your comments. They will be forwarded to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

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

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

Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2005 7:50 AM

To: Ranndo@aol.com; keoghs1@pacbell.net; paspence@charter.net; dnortondesigns@msn.com; ereilly@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; ARivas4747@aol.com; jan.beautz@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; BDS020@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tony.campos@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; tfitzmaurice@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mardi.wormhoudt@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mrotkin@ci.santa-cruz.ca.us; info@scrtc.org; gbookwalter@santacruzsentinel.com

Subject: Light Rail Reality

San Jose State University, Department of Economics
DAVID S. SAURMAN PROVOCATIVE LECTURE SERIES
presents:

Randal O'Toole

"The Insanity of Light Rail Transit: San Jose as a Test Case"

Tuesday, February 22 , 2005

5:15–6:45 P.M.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library, Room 225 (Second Floor)

150 E. San Fernando St. (@ 4th St.), San Jose

THE GENERAL PUBLIC WELCOME TO ATTEND this FREE event.

Astronomical housing costs, suffocating traffic congestion, and pollution are taking a heavy toll on our quality of life. Are these all inescapable consequences of modern life or the results of bad government policies?

San Jose has devoted enormous sums and unending time to the construction of light rail transit lines that allegedly will alleviate the problems. But urban economist Randal O'Toole argues that such heavily subsidized public transit throws away resources to only make matters worse. Come and hear his case for market-based alternatives to government planning.

ABOUT THE SPEAKER - RANDAL O'TOOLE

Dr. O'Toole is an economist with the Thoreau Institute (<http://www.ti.org>) and director of the American Dream Coalition, which is dedicated to finding free-market solutions to urban problems. In its review of O'Toole's book, THE VANISHING AUTOMOBILE AND OTHER AMERICAN MYTHS the American Planning Association says that "O'Toole is an articulate skeptic who marshals a formidable array of facts and figures to argue against the major tenets of smart growth." In 1998, Yale University named O'Toole its McCluskey Conservation Fellow. In 1999 and 2001, he was the Scaife Visiting Scholar at the University of California at Berkeley, and in 2000 he was the Merrill Visiting Professor at Utah State University.

ABOUT THE DAVID R. SAURMAN PROVOCATIVE LECTURE SERIES:

The Department of Economics invites students, faculty, and the general public to consider intellectual arguments on controversial topics. Presenters in the Provocative Lecture Series are noted for their outstanding scholarship and public speaking ability. This lecture series fosters the tradition of higher education to challenge ideas and develop critical thinking in an environment of respect and intellectual discourse. Our goal is for you to develop the critical thinking skills necessary to reach your own informed position on controversial issues. We invite you to attend, to relax, to ponder, and to enjoy the thought process.

For further information, contact:

Jeffrey Rogers Hummel
Department of Economics
San Jose State University
P.O. Box 4644
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
(925) 926-0807
jhummel@gguol.ggu.edu

Libby Huyck –

Your email regarding the San Jose State Economics Department's lecture series was received and will be forwarded to the Regional Transportation Commission for their consideration.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you for writing.

*- Karena Pushnik
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
831/460-3200*

