

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
Board of Directors

**FROM:** Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

**DATE:** June 8, 2009

**SUBJECT:** Weekly Legislative Update: Week of June 1, 2009

---

### **FEDERAL**

***Highway Account:*** The Obama Administration warned lawmakers that the Highway Account, which funds federal-aid highway programs, will run out of money in August without congressional action. According to the most recent estimates provided by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the Office of Management and Budget, the account needs an estimated \$5 billion-\$7 billion to maintain current spending rates through the end of FY 2009. Both agencies also said an infusion of \$8 billion-\$10 billion would be necessary for the account to survive FY 2010.

Congress approved an emergency transfer of \$8 billion in general treasury dollars last fall to address a similar shortfall, the first time in the history of the Highway Account that such an action was needed. However, this time around, the Obama Administration is insisting that any legislative efforts to prop up the account be fully offset by savings or cuts elsewhere.

The immediate problems facing the Highway Account further complicate a long-term rewrite of federal surface transportation policy and funding. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman James Oberstar (D-MN), who is taking the lead as the pertinent Senate committees have heavy workloads, laid out a new timeline in the House for the consideration of the successor legislation to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), which currently is set to expire at the end of September. This new timeline assumes:

- House Highways and Transit Subcommittee mark-up by the end of June.
- House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee mark-up in July, along with the drafting of the financial title of the bill by the House Ways and Means Committee.
- Full House vote by the end of July.

Even if Oberstar can stick to this new timeline, the Senate is another matter. To his credit, Oberstar has gotten the ball rolling, but as is typical of most major legislation, much of the heavy

lifting and political compromise dealing with various program and funding details will be left to the Senate and future conference committee negotiations. So far, the key players in the Senate seem to be coalescing around the following principles to guide the drafting of their bill:

- Continuing the federal government's active involvement in transportation policy.
- Maintaining the national character of the interstate and federal-aid highway systems.
- Ensuring the efficient movement of people and goods.
- Enhancing safety.
- Reducing congestion and its effects.
- Creating sustainable funding through a trust fund.
- Substantially consolidating and refocusing highway and transit programs.
- Establishing funding and performance criteria.

**Global Warming:** The amount of heat-trapping carbon dioxide seeping into the atmosphere will increase by nearly 40 percent worldwide by 2030 if ways are not found to require mandatory emissions reductions, according to a report issued by the Energy Information Administration (EIA). The report also indicates that world energy consumption is expected to grow by 44 percent over the next two decades as the global economy recovers and continues to expand, with the biggest increases in energy use coming from developing countries such as China and India.

While substantial growth is expected in the use of renewable energy sources such as hydropower, wind and solar, the overall growth in demand will require continued reliance on fossil fuels, especially oil and coal. As a result, the EIA report predicts a steady increase in emissions of carbon dioxide, the greenhouse gas that scientists say threatens a serious warming of the Earth later this century. According to the report, between now and 2030, global carbon dioxide pollution is expected to increase by 39 percent. That translates to 33 billion metric tons in 2015 and 40 billion metric tons by 2030, compared to 29 billion metric tons in 2006.

The EIA report points out that its analysis is based on current regulatory and legal requirements, and does not assume the enactment of laws or international treaties requiring reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Any such action would force shifts away from fossil fuels and less carbon pollution being released. Along those lines, Congress is currently considering legislation that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the United States by 17 percent by 2020 and about 80 percent by mid-century. Meanwhile, an international conference is scheduled for December to try to work out a treaty requiring emissions reductions.

**Economy:** Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned that rising debt is contributing to a spike in longer-term interest rates, and he said now is the time to start working on reining in deficits. According to Bernanke, failing to curb deficits could eventually erode investor confidence and endanger the economy's prospects for long-term health.

The White House estimates that the federal government will rack up an unprecedented \$1.8 trillion budget deficit this year. The recession has taken a bite out of tax revenues paid by individuals and companies. At the same time, the federal government's spending has risen. Billions of dollars have been paid to shore up banks, and to help the unemployed and others hurt by the current economic downturn, the longest since World War II.

Bernanke acknowledged that Congress and the Obama Administration face “formidable near-term challenges” that must be addressed as they take steps to stabilize the nation’s financial system, reduce home foreclosures and spur banks to lend more freely. The success of these efforts will be crucial to turning the economy around. At the same time, Bernanke warned politicians not to let those challenges “hinder timely consideration of the steps needed to address fiscal imbalances.” He commented, “Unless we demonstrate a strong commitment to fiscal sustainability in the longer term, we will have neither financial stability nor healthy economic growth.”

Bernanke said getting the budget deficits under control is especially important given the huge wave of baby boomers hitting retirement who will be tapping Social Security and Medicare. The financial health of those two programs is already fading faster under the weight of the recession. Last month, the federal government warned that they are headed for insolvency years sooner than previously expected. Unless changes in Social Security are enacted, the retirement fund will be depleted in 2037, four years sooner than projected last year. The Medicare Trust Fund is in even worse shape. It is projected to become insolvent in 2017, two years earlier than expected.

**U.S. Supreme Court:** Supreme Court nominee Sonia Sotomayor raced through a crucial set of meetings with senators on Capitol Hill, working to reassure Republicans who worry that she would bring ethnic and gender bias to her decisions. Sotomayor told senators from both parties that while her background has shaped her worldview, she believes in following the law and would not let her life experiences inappropriately influence her judging.

President Obama’s first Supreme Court choice met privately with 10 key Republican and Democratic senators at the same time the leaders of the Senate Judiciary Committee were huddling to try to cut a deal on when her confirmation hearings should begin. Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy (D-VT) wants the process to begin next month, with the goal of holding a final confirmation vote on the Senate Floor before Congress leaves in early August for a month-long summer recess. He is negotiating with Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-AL), the panel’s ranking GOP member, who says he would rather go slower and delve more deeply into Sotomayor’s voluminous record of rulings during her 17 years as a federal judge. Sessions said he prefers to hold her confirmation hearings in September.

President Barack Obama is pushing for a quick timetable, hoping to spare Sotomayor the potential pitfalls of a drawn-out public debate on her confirmation during the customary August news lull and get her seated in time to participate in discussions on which cases the high court will hear when its official session begins in October.

Still, Republicans said they are concerned about a speech that Sotomayor made in 2001 in which she said she would hope that decisions made by a “wise Latina” with a breadth of life experiences would be better than those of a white male judge without similar experiences. The remark has fueled suspicions among conservative lawmakers that Sotomayor fits the mold they have long accused Democrats of using for choosing judges: an activist who will bring her political views and personal agenda to interpreting the law.

## **STATE**

**State Budget:** Declaring that “California’s day of reckoning is here,” Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger said the state should turn its dire budget straits into an opportunity to make government more efficient. Speaking to a rare mid-year joint session of the Legislature, the Governor acknowledged that the billions of dollars in spending cuts that he has proposed to close a projected \$24.3 billion hole in the budget will be devastating to millions of Californians. “People come up to me all the time, pleading ‘Governor, please don’t cut my program.’ They tell me how the cuts will affect them and their loved ones,” he remarked. “I see the pain in their eyes and hear the fear in their voice. It’s an awful feeling. But we have no choice. Our wallet is empty. Our bank is closed. Our credit is dried up.”

In the face of such adversity, Gov. Schwarzenegger noted that “there are also some great opportunities.” Among the reforms that he said should be enacted are:

- Making school textbooks available in digital formats, thereby freeing “hundreds of millions of dollars that could be used to hire teaches and reduce class sizes.”
- Using privately run correctional facilities as part of an effort to reduce the costs of state prisons.
- Giving local governments more opportunity to run things without interference from Sacramento.
- Giving school districts more flexibility, and not tying their hands “with strict rules like who is allowed to mow the lawn or fix the roof or do the plumbing.”
- Abolishing some state boards and commissions.
- Selling off some state property.

Adhering to his sometimes-relentless optimism, Gov. Schwarzenegger expressed his belief that legislators could set partisan differences aside and ignore pressures from special interests. “Let’s use this crisis as an opportunity to make big and lasting change,” he commented. “Let’s not think just in the short-term. Let’s think about the long term. I have faith in all of you. I have faith in our ability to once again come together for the good of the state.”

The short-term problem faced by lawmakers is closing the budget gap in time for California officials to go to the private investment markets and borrow billions of dollars to get the state through the first months of FY 2010. Controller John Chiang has warned that without such loans, the state’s coffers will run dry by the end of July. He said as a practical matter, the budget must be patched up by mid-June in order to give officials time to borrow the money.

Gov. Schwarzenegger has proposed a plan that relies mainly on deep cuts in nearly every program funded by state government. They include reducing spending on K-12 schools,

community colleges, and the University of California and California State University systems; releasing some non-violent prisoners a year early; cutting pay for most state workers and laying off others; closing 80 percent of the state's parks; and eliminating or paring back health and human services programs. In the case of transportation, the Governor is recommending using local gas tax subventions and \$336 million in unexpected Public Transportation Account "spillover" revenues to pay debt service on transportation-related general obligation bonds.

## **REGIONAL**

***Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain):*** At its June 4 meeting, the Caltrain JPB declared a fiscal emergency for FY 2010. This action allows Caltrain to enact service cuts and fare increases at an accelerated pace. The JPB then took public testimony on a series of service modification and revenue enhancement strategies, but did not take any action, opting to vote on a final operating budget at its July 2 meeting.

To close the budget gap, Caltrain is considering cutting midday service in half, raising parking fees by 50 percent and increasing the rates for the GO Pass Program. The public was generally supportive of these strategies. Meanwhile, Caltrain staff recommended removing several controversial strategies from consideration, including eliminating weekend and Gilroy service, implementing a general fare increase, and charging a fee to bring a bicycle on board the trains.

**NOTE:** Also contributing to this report were Susan Lent with Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld; Mark Watts with Smith, Watts & Company; and Scott Haywood, VTA's Policy and Community Relations Manager.

**From:** Board.Secretary

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 10, 2009 3:39 PM

**To:** Board.Secretary

**Subject:** April 2009 VTA, Inter-Agency Partners, & Contracted Services Ridership

To VTA Board of Directors:

Attached is the Ridership information for April 2009.

*Deborah Harrington*

*Board Secretary*

*Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority*

*408.321.5773*

## MEMORANDUM

Writer's Direct Telephone: (408) 321-7005

**TO:** VTA Board of Directors

**THROUGH:** Michael T. Burns  
General Manager

**FROM:** Donald A. Smith, Jr.  
Chief Operating Officer

**DATE:** June 3, 2009

**SUBJECT:** VTA, Inter-agency Partners, and Contracted Services Ridership for April 2009

---

April 2009 total monthly system ridership for bus and light rail was 3,695,221, a decrease of 0.6% over April 2008. The average weekday system ridership for April 2009 was 1% less than April 2008 and the first average weekday ridership decrease since June 2005.

Bus average weekday ridership for April 2009 was 108,381, a 1.5% decrease compared to April 2008, and the first bus ridership decrease since July 2007. Light rail recorded an average weekday ridership of 32,912 for April 2009, a slight increase of 0.7% compared to April 2008.

Three of VTA's inter-agency partners, Caltrain, ACE Express and Capitol Corridor trains, recorded ridership decreases of 4.9%, 16.4%, and 4.6%, respectively. The remaining inter-agency partner services (Dumbarton Express, Highway 17 Express, Monterey-San Jose Express, and Caltrain Shuttles) experienced ridership increases for the month of April 2009 when compared to April 2008.

All contracted services recorded ridership decreases compared to last year.

The ridership decreases experienced by VTA and our partner agencies and contracted services are indications that the weakened economy coupled with increased unemployment has impacted ridership.

<b><u>VTA Ridership</u></b>	<b>April 2009</b>	<b>April 2008</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>
<b>VTA System Boardings</b>	3,695,221	3,716,099	-0.6%
System Average Weekday	141,293	142,695	-1.0%
<b>Bus Boardings</b>	2,834,150	2,862,170	-1.0%
Bus Average Weekday	108,381	110,011	-1.5%
<b>Light Rail Boardings</b>	861,071	853,929	0.8%
Light Rail Average Weekday	32,912	32,684	0.7%

<b><u>Inter-agency Partners Ridership</u></b>	<b>April 2009</b>	<b>April 2008</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>
<b>Dumbarton Express Boardings</b>	23,042	19,575	17.7%
Dumbarton Average Weekday	1,047	890	17.6%
<b>Highway 17 Express Boardings</b>	27,596	26,160	5.5%
Highway 17 Average Weekday	1,023	980	4.4%
<b>Monterey-San Jose Express Boardings</b>	2,714	1,888	43.8%
Monterey-San Jose Average Weekday	85	54	57.4%
<b>Caltrain Boardings</b>	1,006,241	1,058,315	-4.9%
Caltrain Average Weekday	39,115	39,936	-2.1%
<b>Caltrain Shuttles Boardings</b>	74,315	71,199	4.4%
Caltrain Shuttles Average Weekday	3,378	3,236	4.4%
<b>Altamont Commuter Express Boardings</b>	60,360	72,178	-16.4%
ACE Average Weekday	2,744	3,281	-16.4%
<b>Capitol Corridor Boardings</b>	138,623	145,234	-4.6%
<b><u>Contracted Services Ridership</u></b>	<b>April 2009</b>	<b>April 2008</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>
<b>Paratransit Boardings</b>	90,801	92,646	-2.0%
Paratransit Average Weekday	3,681	3,781	-2.6%
<b>ACE Shuttles Boardings</b>	17,790	21,410	-16.9%
ACE Shuttles Average Weekday	809	973	-16.9%
<b>IBM/Hitachi Light Rail Shuttle Boardings</b>	2,396	2,674	-10.4%
IBM/Hitachi Shuttle Average Weekday	109	122	-10.7%

From: Board.Secretary  
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2009 4:02 PM  
To: Board.Secretary  
Subject: MuniServices Cash Receipts Analysis 2009 Quarter 1

To VTA Board of Directors:

Enclosed is the report of our actual sales tax receipts for the third quarter. The news is worse than expected with countywide sales taxes down 20.9%. Our projection was for an 8% reduction. This, of course, not only affects VTA but all jurisdictions that receive sales tax revenues. I wanted to get this to you as soon as possible.

Michael T. Burns  
General Manager

sent by:  
Deborah Harrington  
Board Secretary  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
408.321.5773

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This email (including any attachments) may contain confidential or privileged information that is protected disclosure. Even if the email is addressed incorrectly, it is only for the use of the individual(s) or entity for whom it is intended. If you are not the intended recipient (or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient) do not copy, distribute, or disseminate this email. Instead, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message and delete this email (including all copies and backups) from your files.

**Local Sales/Use Tax**  
**Cash Receipts Analysis**

The Cash Receipts Analysis report (CRA) is designed to give jurisdictions an analysis of sales and use tax cash receipts from the State Board of Equalization (SBE). The CRA includes comparisons by quarter, by fiscal year-to-date, and by benchmark year. The report not only includes the cash receipts for your jurisdiction, but all jurisdictions in your county-wide area, other counties throughout your region, regions throughout the entire state, and Statewide totals.

The left-side section of the CRA is the quarterly performance. The six most recent quarters are reflected. This section illustrates the percentage change from each quarter's cash received by your jurisdiction to the same quarterly period in the prior year.

The middle section of the CRA is a fiscal year-to-date comparison. The amounts shown reflect a fiscal year starting from July of each year and ending in June of each year and only include sales tax received fiscal year-to-date. Each subsequent quarter into the fiscal will add one additional quarter to the fiscal year-to-date performance analysis.

The right-side section of the CRA is the benchmark year analysis. Benchmark year is simply the four most recent quarters totaled together to complete one full year of sales and use tax receipts. This analysis compares the most current benchmark year with the same four quarters of the prior year. A percentage change is calculated.

The CRA directly reconciles with the three cash advances and cleanup payments received from the SBE.

**SANTA CLARA VTA**  
SALES TAX NET CASH RECEIPTS ANALYSIS (BRADLEY BURNS 1%)

	QUARTERLY CHANGES						FISCAL YEAR TO DATE				MOST RECENT FOUR QUARTER TOTAL			
	2006/4	2007/1	2007/2	2007/3	2007/4	2008/1	FISCAL YR	FISCAL YR	FISCAL YR	FISCAL YR	BENCHMARK	BENCHMARK	BENCHMARK	
	2007/4	2008/1	2008/2	2008/3	2008/4	2009/1	2007-2008	2008-2009	\$ CHANGE	%CHG	YR 2008/1	YR 2009/1	YEAR	
	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	4 QUARTERS	4 QUARTERS			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	\$ CHANGE	%CHG
1 <b>SANTA CLARA VTA</b>	0.9	0.8	-2.7	-3.9	-11.1	-20.9	164,184,338	148,635,266	-15,549,072	-9.5	164,184,338	148,635,266	-15,549,072	-9.5
MONTEREY CO.	1.3	-3.6	-2.1	-1.2	-11.3	-16.7	56,513,910	52,323,549	-4,190,361	-7.4	56,513,909	52,323,550	-4,190,359	-7.4
SAN LUIS OBISPO CO	8.9	-8.0	-3.4	0.3	-15.4	-16.1	42,003,618	38,430,101	-3,573,517	-8.5	42,003,618	38,430,101	-3,573,517	-8.5
SANTA CRUZ CO.	-3.4	-5.0	-5.3	-0.2	-9.2	-14.5	31,517,534	29,318,955	-2,198,579	-7.0	31,517,534	29,318,956	-2,198,578	-7.0
CENTRAL COAST	2.6	-5.4	-3.3	-0.5	-12.2	-15.9	130,035,062	120,072,605	-9,962,457	-7.7	130,035,061	120,072,607	-9,962,454	-7.7
FRESNO CO.	-3.2	-3.6	-4.7	-4.0	-2.5	-14.6	116,290,376	109,024,023	-7,266,353	-6.2	116,290,377	109,024,023	-7,266,354	-6.2
KERN CO.	1.7	0.5	1.8	6.7	0.4	-13.1	119,215,785	118,243,661	-972,124	-0.8	119,215,785	118,243,662	-972,123	-0.8
KINGS CO.	9.5	2.9	7.3	5.4	0.0	-8.4	12,985,798	13,152,296	166,498	1.3	12,985,799	13,152,297	166,498	1.3
MADERA CO.	4.9	-12.9	-9.3	2.1	-17.2	-15.7	13,682,490	12,331,511	-1,350,979	-9.9	13,682,489	12,331,512	-1,350,977	-9.9
MERCED CO.	0.4	-3.9	-5.1	0.3	-13.8	-16.2	24,197,383	22,181,244	-2,016,139	-8.3	24,197,383	22,181,244	-2,016,139	-8.3
SAN JOAQUIN CO.	-0.9	-3.8	-5.3	-5.4	-12.6	-16.7	92,971,410	83,944,114	-9,027,296	-9.7	92,971,409	83,944,113	-9,027,296	-9.7
STANISLAUS CO.	-2.4	-7.5	1.1	-9.2	-5.7	-11.8	68,071,134	63,859,466	-4,211,668	-6.2	68,071,134	63,859,465	-4,211,669	-6.2
TULARE CO.	6.4	-1.3	3.6	3.5	-15.3	-14.0	46,910,581	44,339,450	-2,571,131	-5.5	46,910,581	44,339,451	-2,571,130	-5.5
TUOLUMNE CO.	0.0	-6.3	-0.1	-8.6	-11.1	-9.6	6,044,993	5,607,356	-437,637	-7.2	6,044,993	5,607,356	-437,637	-7.2
CENTRAL VALLEY	0.1	-3.1	-1.5	-1.2	-6.4	-14.1	500,369,950	472,683,121	-27,686,829	-5.5	500,369,950	472,683,123	-27,686,827	-5.5
LAKE CO.	0.2	-3.0	4.4	23.4	-13.4	-18.6	5,614,543	5,553,042	-61,501	-1.1	5,614,543	5,553,043	-61,500	-1.1
MENDOCINO CO.	1.0	1.8	-4.8	2.6	-7.1	-17.8	12,916,111	12,100,792	-815,319	-6.3	12,916,111	12,100,793	-815,318	-6.3
SHASTA CO.	-3.4	-5.0	-5.0	-5.5	-9.6	-18.2	28,123,936	25,546,460	-2,577,476	-9.2	28,123,936	25,546,460	-2,577,476	-9.2
NORTH COAST	-1.8	-3.0	-3.8	0.0	-9.4	-18.1	46,654,590	43,200,294	-3,454,296	-7.4	46,654,590	43,200,296	-3,454,294	-7.4
ALPINE CO.	-30.8	-40.7	-1.6	5.1	-32.6	7.5	217,939	206,704	-11,235	-5.2	217,938	206,704	-11,234	-5.2
AMADOR CO.	-1.7	6.2	-13.6	-9.1	-14.7	-12.9	4,865,147	4,255,920	-609,227	-12.5	4,865,146	4,255,921	-609,225	-12.5
CALAVERAS CO.	-2.9	4.3	-8.4	-6.8	-15.9	-26.1	3,427,515	2,956,087	-471,428	-13.8	3,427,515	2,956,087	-471,428	-13.8
DEL NORTE CO.	7.6	-7.0	3.9	0.2	-5.5	-12.8	2,372,353	2,297,471	-74,882	-3.2	2,372,354	2,297,471	-74,883	-3.2
HUMBOLDT CO.	-0.8	1.4	-0.2	-1.7	-9.0	-12.6	17,417,838	16,437,341	-980,497	-5.6	17,417,837	16,437,342	-980,495	-5.6
LASSEN CO.	4.1	-5.4	-20.0	-4.2	-17.2	-20.5	2,780,525	2,354,959	-425,566	-15.3	2,780,525	2,354,959	-425,566	-15.3
MARIPOSA CO.	-0.8	8.0	-1.6	10.9	-6.3	-11.8	1,708,185	1,696,978	-11,207	-0.7	1,708,186	1,696,979	-11,207	-0.7
MODOC CO.	10.3	10.5	5.0	10.7	-8.9	-13.2	925,262	917,737	-7,525	-0.8	925,262	917,737	-7,525	-0.8
MONO CO.	-7.2	-0.4	-3.9	-2.2	-12.0	-24.8	2,708,951	2,414,193	-294,758	-10.9	2,708,950	2,414,194	-294,756	-10.9
PLUMAS CO.	-10.0	2.9	-9.3	3.5	-15.2	-29.2	2,395,257	2,137,009	-258,248	-10.8	2,395,258	2,137,008	-258,250	-10.8
SAN BENITO CO.	9.7	-6.1	-9.5	-4.9	-19.4	-18.1	5,557,745	4,853,343	-704,402	-12.7	5,557,746	4,853,344	-704,402	-12.7
SIERRA CO.	-8.1	8.0	-6.8	-10.1	-28.9	-27.2	237,512	195,102	-42,410	-17.9	237,512	195,102	-42,410	-17.9
SISKIYOU CO.	2.8	-0.7	4.1	3.3	-9.1	-18.0	5,227,356	5,005,486	-221,870	-4.2	5,227,357	5,005,487	-221,870	-4.2
TEHAMA CO.	7.1	-5.2	-1.6	-1.4	-21.5	-29.9	6,776,257	5,890,156	-886,101	-13.1	6,776,256	5,890,156	-886,100	-13.1
TRINITY CO.	1.3	-7.8	-1.5	-0.6	4.6	-10.0	753,560	742,693	-10,867	-1.4	753,560	742,692	-10,868	-1.4
OTHER NORTHERN	1.0	-0.8	-4.0	-1.6	-13.0	-18.2	57,371,402	52,361,179	-5,010,223	-8.7	57,371,402	52,361,183	-5,010,219	-8.7

**SANTA CLARA VTA**  
SALES TAX NET CASH RECEIPTS ANALYSIS (BRADLEY BURNS 1%)

	QUARTERLY CHANGES						FISCAL YEAR TO DATE				MOST RECENT FOUR QUARTER TOTAL			
	2006/4	2007/1	2007/2	2007/3	2007/4	2008/1	FISCAL YR	FISCAL YR	FISCAL YR	FISCAL YR	BENCHMARK	BENCHMARK	BENCHMARK	
	2007/4	2008/1	2008/2	2008/3	2008/4	2009/1	2007-2008	2008-2009	\$ CHANGE	%CHG	YR 2008/1	YR 2009/1	YEAR	
	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	4 QUARTERS	4 QUARTERS			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	\$ CHANGE	%CHG
ALAMEDA CO.	0.5	-4.6	-6.8	-10.0	-12.4	-17.3	246,377,990	218,249,927	-28,128,063	-11.4	246,377,990	218,249,927	-28,128,063	-11.4
CONTRA COSTA CO.	-0.8	-1.7	23.7	-3.4	-9.3	-12.4	137,036,977	136,917,528	-119,449	-0.1	137,036,978	136,917,528	-119,450	-0.1
MARIN CO.	1.6	-0.1	-3.1	-3.1	-11.5	-18.0	44,088,264	40,219,426	-3,868,838	-8.8	44,088,264	40,219,426	-3,868,838	-8.8
NAPA CO. %CHG	4.8	2.1	-1.5	1.6	-3.0	-12.9	25,783,290	24,857,111	-926,179	-3.6	25,783,290	24,857,112	-926,178	-3.6
SAN FRANCISCO CO.	5.2	3.1	0.6	6.5	-8.6	-15.2	149,153,706	142,891,817	-6,261,889	-4.2	149,153,706	142,891,818	-6,261,888	-4.2
SAN MATEO CO.	2.8	16.4	1.3	0.8	-9.9	-28.8	132,392,623	119,776,113	-12,616,510	-9.5	132,392,623	119,776,114	-12,616,509	-9.5
SANTA CLARA CO.	2.3	2.9	-4.1	-2.8	-9.7	-21.5	341,251,573	309,414,378	-31,837,195	-9.3	341,251,573	309,414,378	-31,837,195	-9.3
SOLANO CO.	-2.1	-6.4	-6.5	-1.7	2.5	-7.5	61,720,528	59,764,434	-1,956,094	-3.2	61,720,529	59,764,433	-1,956,096	-3.2
SONOMA CO.	-2.1	-3.4	-5.1	-2.6	-9.9	-16.4	76,868,519	70,583,187	-6,285,332	-8.2	76,868,520	70,583,186	-6,285,334	-8.2
S.F. BAY AREA	1.5	1.3	-0.4	-2.8	-9.4	-18.5	1,214,673,470	1,122,673,921	-91,999,549	-7.6	1,214,673,473	1,122,673,922	-91,999,551	-7.6
BUTTE CO.	-3.4	-2.8	0.8	-2.6	-7.5	-11.8	26,644,598	25,309,013	-1,335,585	-5.0	26,644,597	25,309,012	-1,335,585	-5.0
COLUSA CO.	-0.6	-0.2	6.3	12.8	24.4	180.9	2,971,982	4,451,115	1,479,133	49.8	2,971,982	4,451,115	1,479,133	49.8
EL DORADO CO.	1.8	2.6	-3.3	1.0	-15.2	-18.7	19,017,549	17,337,324	-1,680,225	-8.8	19,017,549	17,337,324	-1,680,225	-8.8
GLENN CO.	4.4	-11.1	11.2	-8.2	-6.9	-18.3	3,215,246	3,057,722	-157,524	-4.9	3,215,246	3,057,721	-157,525	-4.9
NEVADA CO.	-5.6	-12.7	-2.1	-6.5	-18.6	-15.5	12,948,625	11,598,015	-1,350,610	-10.4	12,948,625	11,598,015	-1,350,610	-10.4
PLACER CO.	-4.0	-4.5	-13.3	-6.8	-16.3	-17.8	73,049,883	63,254,168	-9,795,715	-13.4	73,049,883	63,254,169	-9,795,714	-13.4
SACRAMENTO CO.	-5.5	-2.8	-6.5	-2.5	-10.0	-15.3	204,466,602	187,402,532	-17,064,070	-8.3	204,466,602	187,402,532	-17,064,070	-8.3
SUTTER CO.	-8.3	-4.7	-9.6	-9.1	-7.6	-13.7	13,920,442	12,548,150	-1,372,292	-9.9	13,920,442	12,548,150	-1,372,292	-9.9
YOLO CO.	4.2	12.7	3.6	5.5	-1.8	-10.5	33,188,690	33,012,806	-175,884	-0.5	33,188,690	33,012,806	-175,884	-0.5
YUBA CO.	-15.1	-11.7	-4.6	10.3	-1.7	-18.2	5,297,915	5,143,178	-154,737	-2.9	5,297,916	5,143,178	-154,738	-2.9
SACRAMENTO VALLEY	-4.1	-2.3	-6.0	-2.6	-10.4	-13.8	394,721,532	363,114,023	-31,607,509	-8.0	394,721,532	363,114,022	-31,607,510	-8.0
<b>NORTHERN CALIF</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>-0.8</b>	<b>-2.0</b>	<b>-2.2</b>	<b>-9.2</b>	<b>-16.6</b>	<b>2,343,826,006</b>	<b>2,174,105,143</b>	<b>-169,720,863</b>	<b>-7.2</b>	<b>2,343,826,008</b>	<b>2,174,105,153</b>	<b>-169,720,855</b>	<b>-7.2</b>
RIVERSIDE CO.	-2.8	-8.3	-8.9	-8.2	-14.9	-16.8	284,839,609	250,273,831	-34,565,778	-12.1	284,839,609	250,273,831	-34,565,778	-12.1
SAN BERNARDINO CO.	-2.9	-6.9	-3.7	-8.8	-14.2	-18.2	300,704,131	267,491,145	-33,212,986	-11.0	300,704,130	267,491,145	-33,212,985	-11.0
INLAND EMPIRE	-2.9	-7.6	-6.3	-8.5	-14.6	-17.5	585,543,740	517,764,976	-67,778,764	-11.6	585,543,739	517,764,976	-67,778,763	-11.6
IMPERIAL CO.	12.5	-3.0	3.4	-4.8	-11.5	-9.2	22,388,915	21,121,348	-1,267,567	-5.7	22,388,915	21,121,349	-1,267,566	-5.7
INYO CO.	4.2	-0.4	-12.2	8.1	-9.2	-5.3	3,325,443	3,168,326	-157,117	-4.7	3,325,443	3,168,327	-157,116	-4.7
OTHER SOUTHERN	11.5	-2.7	1.1	-3.1	-11.2	-8.7	25,714,358	24,289,674	-1,424,684	-5.5	25,714,358	24,289,676	-1,424,682	-5.5
LOS ANGELES CO.	1.2	-1.2	-2.9	-1.9	-11.1	-15.8	1,379,215,529	1,271,445,584	-107,769,945	-7.8	1,379,215,529	1,271,445,584	-107,769,945	-7.8
ORANGE CO.	-0.8	-3.1	-4.6	-5.0	-12.3	-17.6	573,351,582	517,769,017	-55,582,565	-9.7	573,351,582	517,769,017	-55,582,565	-9.7
SAN DIEGO CO.	-1.7	-1.5	-3.0	-2.0	-9.9	-15.1	473,726,580	438,854,548	-34,872,032	-7.4	473,726,580	438,854,548	-34,872,032	-7.4
SANTA BARBARA CO.	-5.9	-2.4	-2.1	-2.3	-10.5	-14.9	57,071,158	52,936,517	-4,134,641	-7.2	57,071,159	52,936,516	-4,134,643	-7.2
VENTURA CO.	9.8	-8.1	-7.5	-8.2	-17.9	-14.8	121,670,533	106,879,357	-14,791,176	-12.2	121,670,533	106,879,357	-14,791,176	-12.2
SOUTH COAST	0.5	-2.0	-3.5	-2.9	-11.5	-16.0	2,605,035,382	2,387,885,023	-217,150,359	-8.3	2,605,035,383	2,387,885,022	-217,150,361	-8.3
<b>SOUTHERN CALIF</b>	<b>-0.1</b>	<b>-3.1</b>	<b>-4.0</b>	<b>-3.9</b>	<b>-12.0</b>	<b>-16.2</b>	<b>3,216,293,480</b>	<b>2,929,939,673</b>	<b>-286,353,807</b>	<b>-8.9</b>	<b>3,216,293,480</b>	<b>2,929,939,674</b>	<b>-286,353,806</b>	<b>-8.9</b>

**SANTA CLARA VTA**  
 SALES TAX NET CASH RECEIPTS ANALYSIS (BRADLEY BURNS 1%)

	QUARTERLY CHANGES						FISCAL YEAR TO DATE				MOST RECENT FOUR QUARTER TOTAL			
	2006/4	2007/1	2007/2	2007/3	2007/4	2008/1	FISCAL YR	FISCAL YR	FISCAL YR	FISCAL YR	BENCHMARK	BENCHMARK	BENCHMARK	
	2007/4	2008/1	2008/2	2008/3	2008/4	2009/1	2007-2008	2008-2009	\$ CHANGE	%CHG	YR 2008/1	YR 2009/1	YEAR	
%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	%CHG	4 QUARTERS	4 QUARTERS			AMOUNT	AMOUNT	\$ CHANGE	%CHG	
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	0.0	-2.1	-3.1	-3.2	-10.8	-16.4	5,560,119,486	5,104,044,816	-456,074,670	-8.2	5,560,119,488	5,104,044,827	-456,074,661	-8.2

From: Board.Secretary  
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2009 5:47 PM  
To: Board.Secretary  
Cc: Burns, Michael  
Subject: Response to Ross Signorino

To VTA Board of Directors:

Attached is a letter from Jim Lawson, Executive Policy Advisor, in response to Ross Signorino, Interested Citizen, requesting for a cost comparison between Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Light Rail Transit (LRT). Mr. Signorino requested this information at the June 4th Board of Directors meeting.

Thank you.

~~~~~  
Yolanda L. Cruz  
Assistant Board Secretary  
Voice: 408.321.5669 Fax: 408.955.0891



June 11, 2009

Mr. Ross Signorino  
803 Cascade Drive  
San Jose, CA 95129

Dear Mr. Signorino:

The attached information is provided in response to your request at the June 4<sup>th</sup> Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority's Board of Directors Meeting. At the meeting you requested a cost comparison between Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Light Rail Transit (LRT).

As with many simple requests, the answer is a bit more complicated than one could wish. The attached information from the United States General Accounting Office (GAO) provides a range of comparison costs for the construction of LRT vs. BRT. The costs are based upon surveys performed by the GAO and show that, in general, the cost of constructing BRT is less than the cost of constructing LRT with some overlap at the high end of BRT and the low end of LRT.

The costs given are in FY2000\$ which was the year the survey was conducted. It is reasonable to assume that the relationship of the costs of BRT vs. LRT remains the same.

On the subject of operating costs, the GAO determined that neither service has a consistent advantage.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need further clarification.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jim Lawson".

Jim Lawson  
Executive Policy Advisor

cc: Board of Directors

Attachment

June 9, 2009

### Comparison of Light Rail and Bus Rapid Transit costs

A United States General Accounting Office (GAO) study and accompanying testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs in June 2003 offers insight into cost comparison between Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). The GAO visited transit agencies in several cities, including Dallas, Denver, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, San Diego, and San Jose in an effort to obtain cost information. Capital costs typically include the costs to plan, design, and construct a project (as below). These amounts are presented in 2000 dollars and regular escalation rates would apply in order to update amounts for current dollars, though these calculations have not been made. The results of the cost review are:

| <b>Capital and Operating Cost Comparison Between Light Rail and Bus Rapid Transit (in 2000 dollars)</b> |                                               |                            |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
|                                                                                                         | <b>BRT</b>                                    | <b>LRT</b>                 |
| <b>Average Capital Cost</b>                                                                             | \$680,000 / mile (on city streets)            | \$12.4M / mile (low end)   |
|                                                                                                         | \$9.0M / mile (on HOV lanes)                  | \$34.8M / mile (average)   |
|                                                                                                         | \$13.5M / mile (on busways)                   | \$118.8M / mile (high end) |
| <b>Average Operating Cost</b>                                                                           | neither service type has consistent advantage |                            |

*Source: United States General Accounting Office report for the Federal Transit Administration and Accompanying testimony before the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the U.S. Senate. Report GAO-03-729T, June 24, 2003.*