

# BILL REFERRAL

4

DATE: COMMITTEE ACTION \_\_\_\_\_

TO: DATE \_\_\_\_\_

FROM: THEODORE H. KOBEY, JR., Legislative Representative

REPLY NO LATER THAN:

A.B. 2494 S.B. \_\_\_\_\_ Relating to Amtrak service

STATUS: pending in Assembly Ways and Means. Passed Assembly Transportation.

Please review the attached measure to determine its effect upon the City of Sacramento and complete the following questions as appropriate. During your analysis of this measure, if questions arise, please feel free to contact me at 5346. This questionnaire should be returned to me for presentation to the Council Committee on Law and Legislation. PLEASE LEAVE THE BILL ATTACHED TO THIS FORM.

## PLEASE TYPE YOUR RESPONSE

1. Briefly describe the provisions of the bill. (Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

It would authorize a third San Joaquin Amtrak train, and route all three trains through Sacramento, thus providing new train service to the San Joaquin Valley and the Bay Area three times a day.

2. Should this measure be: (please circle desired position)

Supported      Opposed      Support if Amended

Placed on Watch List      Other (Explain)

3. Please explain your reasons for the above determination, including how this measure affects your Department and the fiscal impact of this measure to the City. (Your analysis will be used in communicating with the Governor and the Legislature, so please make your comments in a format that can be used in a letter to those officials.) (attach additional sheets if necessary)

Additional train service to Sacramento would increase transportation options, promote the economic wellbeing of Sacramento, and make travel to the San Joaquin Valley and the Bay Area more convenient for all area residents. There would be no cost to the City. Traffic on local roads and freeways would be somewhat reduced.

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 25, 1985

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—1985-86 REGULAR SESSION

**ASSEMBLY BILL**

**No. 2494**

Introduced by Assembly Member Costa

March 8, 1985

---

An act to amend Sections ~~12270~~ and ~~12271~~ of the Vehicle Section 14035 of the Government Code, relating to vehicles transportation, and making an appropriation therefor.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2494, as amended, Katz Costa. Driver Services Fee Account Rail passenger service development.

Existing law requires registration and license fees and other receipts of the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Department of the California Highway Patrol to be deposited in the Motor Vehicle Account in the State Transportation Fund.

This bill would redesignate the Motor Vehicle Account as the Driver Services Fee Account in the State Transportation Fund.

Under existing law, the Department of Transportation is authorized to enter into contracts with the National Rail Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK) to provide commuter and intercity rail services. The department is also authorized to construct, acquire, or lease and improve and operate rail passenger terminals and related facilities along specified corridors, including the so-called San Joaquin route covering the Los Angeles-Bakersfield-Stockton-Oakland corridor.

This bill would expand the existing Los Angeles-Bakersfield-Stockton-Oakland corridor to include Sacramento, and would express the intent of the Legislature that the department enter into a contract with AMTRAK to

provide an additional third train over the expanded San Joaquin route.

Under existing law, petroleum violation escrow funds, as defined in federal law, are disbursed to the State of California by the federal government and are deposited in the Federal Trust Fund in the State Treasury, a continuously appropriated fund.

This bill would, to the extent permitted by federal law, appropriate \$5,700,000 of the money in the Federal Trust Fund received by the state from the petroleum violation escrow funds, as defined in federal law, to the department for the purposes of the bill, as specified.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: ~~no~~ yes. Fiscal committee: ~~no~~ yes. State-mandated local program: no.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

- 1    ~~SECTION 1. Section 42270 of the Vehicle Code is~~  
2    ~~SECTION 1. Section 14035 of the Government Code~~  
3    ~~is amended to read:~~  
4    14035. (a) The department may enter into contracts  
5    with the National Rail Passenger Corporation under  
6    Section 403(b) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970  
7    (45 U.S.C. Section 563(b)) to provide commuter and  
8    intercity passenger rail services. ~~Such~~ The contracts may  
9    include, but are not limited to, the extension of intercity  
10   passenger rail services or the upgrading of commuter rail  
11   services.  
12   (b) The department may contract with railroad  
13   corporations for the use of tracks and other facilities and  
14   the provision of passenger services on ~~such~~ terms and  
15   conditions as the parties may agree.  
16   (c) The department shall be the only public agency  
17   eligible to receive funds pursuant to Section 1614 of Title  
18   49 of the United States Code.  
19   (d) The department may construct, acquire, or lease  
20   and improve and operate rail passenger terminals and  
21   related facilities which provide intermodal passenger  
22   services along the following corridors: the San Diego-Los  
23   Angeles corridor, the San Francisco Peninsula commute

1 corridor, the Los Angeles-Oxnard corridor, the San  
2 Bernardino-Riverside-Los Angeles corridor, the San  
3 Jose-Oakland-Sacramento-Reno corridor, the Los  
4 Angeles/Bakersfield/Stockton/Oakland Los  
5 Angeles-Bakersfield-Stockton-Oakland-Sacramento cor-  
6 ridor, and the Los Angeles-Santa  
7 Barbara-Oakland-Davis-Redding corridor.

8 (e) *It is the intent of the Legislature that the*  
9 *department enter into a contract with the National Rail*  
10 *Passenger Corporation to provide an additional third*  
11 *train over the San Joaquin route running between*  
12 *Bakersfield and Oakland and to extend the existing route*  
13 *to Sacramento.*

14 SEC. 2. *Notwithstanding Sections 13340 and 16361 of*  
15 *the Government Code, and to the extent permitted by*  
16 *federal law, the sum of five million seven hundred*  
17 *thousand dollars (\$5,700,000) of the money in the Federal*  
18 *Trust Fund, created by Section 16360 of the Government*  
19 *Code, received by the state from the designated*  
20 *petroleum violation escrow funds as defined by Section*  
21 *155 of the Further Continuing Appropriation Act of 1983*  
22 *(P.L. 97-377) or other federal law, is hereby appropriated*  
23 *to the Department of Transportation for the purposes of*  
24 *Section 14035 of the Government Code, as amended by*  
25 *this act.*

26  
27  
28 **All matter omitted in this version of the**  
29 **bill appears in the bill as introduced in the**  
30 **Assembly, March 8, 1985 (J.R. 11).**  
31  
32

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON PVEA RAIL FUNDING

WHEREAS, rail passenger service is an integral component of Sacramento's public transportation system.

WHEREAS, Sacramento's Amtrak station served over 127,000 trips during 1984, ranking among the top forty stations in the nation, and eighth highest in California.

WHEREAS, the state commitment to intercity public transportation includes support of over 40 trains daily serving San Francisco, San Jose, and Peninsula communities, 6 trains daily serving Los Angeles, Orange County, and San Diego county communities, and 4 trains daily serving East Bay and San Joaquin Valley communities.

WHEREAS, Sacramento is the largest city in California which does not have State-supported intercity or commuter rail service.

WHEREAS, the City of Sacramento has itself made a major commitment to improved public transportation, including planned expenditures of over \$20 million to establish an 18-mile rail transit system.

WHEREAS, the market for rail passenger service to Sacramento was studied by the Sacramento-Stockton-San Francisco corridor study, which recommended operation of three daily round trip trains between Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area.

WHEREAS, the Planning and Conservation League has proposed that funds derived from the Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA) be used to provide three daily round trips trains linking the San Francisco Bay Area with Sacramento and Stockton and one additional round trip train extending to Fresno and Bakersfield.

WHEREAS, \$5.7 million of PVEA funding would provide adequate support to operate this service as a three year demonstration project; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Sacramento City Council, that it respectfully memorializes the California State Legislature and the Governor of California to dedicate \$5.7 million of PVEA funding to the purpose of operating additional state-supported passenger train service.

RECEIVED  
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

MAR 27 1985

AM

7 8 9 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 5 6

**OFFICERS**  
 MICHAEL H. REMY  
 President  
 DWIGHT STEELE  
 Senior Vice President  
**Vice Presidents**  
 B. J. EASTMAN  
 [Redacted]  
 ST  
 Valley  
 JOHN HOBBS  
 Southern California  
**Executive Director**  
 GERALD H. MERAL, Ph.D.  
**General Counsel**  
 COREY BROWN

**THE PLANNING AND  
 CONSERVATION LEAGUE**



1228 N ST., SUITE 33 • SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 • (916) 444-8726

March 25, 1985

Hon. Anne Rudin

Dear Anne:

According to your request, I have enclosed a resolution which the City of Sacramento may wish to adopt supporting our attempt to obtain Petroleum Violation Escrow Account funding for rerouting the San Joaquin Train service through Sacramento. Please call me if you have any questions, or need any further information. Many thanks for your interest in supportin AMTRAK service.

best regards,

*Gerald H. Meral*

Gerald H. Meral  
 Executive Director

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**AUDUBON SOCIETY**  
 BAY AREA CHAPTERS  
**CALIFORNIA NATIVE**  
**PLANT SOCIETY**  
**CALIFORNIA STATE**  
**PARK RANGERS ASSN.**  
**CALIFORNIA TROUT**  
**CALIFORNIANS**  
**AGAINST WASTE**  
**FRIENDS OF THE**  
**EARTH**  
**GREENPEACE PACIFIC**  
**SOUTHWEST**  
**LEAGUE TO SAVE LAKE**  
**TAHOE**  
**MARIN CONSERVATION**  
**LEAGUE**  
**MONO LAKE**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**TRAIN RIDERS ASOC.**  
**OF CALIFORNIA**  
**WESTERN RIVER GUIDES**  
**ASSOCIATION**  
**WILDERNESS SOCIETY**  
 Nick Arguimbau  
 San Francisco  
 Peter Bahr  
 Inverness  
 Jan Denton  
 Sacramento  
 Mark Dubois  
 Sacramento  
 Phyllis Faber  
 Mill Valley  
 Dr. Rimmon Fay  
 Venice  
 Scott Ferguson  
 Laguna Beach  
 Scott Fleming  
 Berkeley  
 Margot Fauer  
 [Redacted]  
 G  
 D  
 Marie Gilliam  
 Newport Beach  
 Dorothy Green  
 Los Angeles  
 Jane Hall  
 Riverside  
 Totton P. Heffelfinger  
 San Francisco  
 Alice Howard  
 Oakland  
 Michael Jacobs  
 Santa Cruz  
 Richard Jacobs  
 San Francisco  
 Fred Lang  
 South Laguna  
 Philip LeVeen  
 Berkeley  
 Yale Maxon  
 Berkeley  
 Dean Meyer  
 Hayfork  
 Corwin Moccine  
 Inverness  
 Carol Moss  
 Los Angeles  
 Royce Neuschultz  
 Studio City  
 Gary Patton  
 Santa Cruz  
 Ralph Perry  
 Los Angeles  
 Bob Rhab  
 San Anselmo  
 Denis Rice  
 Tiburon  
 Antonio Rossmann  
 San Francisco  
 Paul Sedway  
 San Francisco  
 Phil Stanbro  
 Round Mountain  
 David Tam  
 Oakland  
 Paul Wack  
 Santa Barbara  
 William Wilcoxon  
 Laguna Beach  
 Charles Wray  
 Tiburon  
 Norm Zelman  
 Beverly Hills  
**EMERITUS**  
 Lewis Butler  
 Bill Evers  
 [Redacted]  
 Alfred  
 [Redacted]  
 Joseph  
 Mel  
 Nathan  
 Helen Reynolds  
 Richard Wilson

**ASSOCIATE MEMBERS**  
**COMMITTEE FOR**  
**GREEN FOOTHILLS**  
**LAGUNA GREENBELT**  
**ASSOCIATION**  
**CALIFORNIA PLANNERS**  
**FOUNDATION**  
**URBAN CREEKS COUNCIL**  
**CALIFORNIA**  
**COUNCIL**

**"The Planning and Conservation League has been instrumental in the passage of every major piece of environmental legislation in California." — resolution of the California Legislature.**

The Planning and Conservation League was founded in 1965 by a group of citizens concerned about the loss of environmental quality in California. PCL has played a major role in the passage of such important legislation as the California Environmental Quality Act, the State Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the Coastal Protection Act, and many other laws devoted to protecting and enhancing the environment of California. PCL is dedicated to a governmental process that will result in carefully planned decisions about the use, protection and development of California's resource base. PCL believes that resources should be managed to produce a sustained economy, and to enhance the urban and natural environment that makes California such a wonderful place to live and work.

The following organizations are members of the Planning and Conservation League. Like the organizational members of the Board of Directors listed on the other side of this letterhead, they have joined to support our goals and ideals, but do not necessarily concur in every PCL legislative action. They support PCL to preserve the environment of California, and to let the Legislature and the Administrative branch of government know that they are interested in what State government does to enhance the quality of life in California.

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Amigos De Bolsa Chica                                 | Ecology Switchboard<br>(San Francisco)          | Pacific Palisades Residents<br>Association, Inc.   |
| ARC Recycling Center<br>(Sacramento)                  | Educational Futures Project                     | Pelican Alliance for Safe Energy                   |
| Better Transportation Coalition<br>(Santa Ana)        | Environmental Action Committee<br>of West Marin | Peninsula Open Space Trust                         |
| Billboards Limited                                    | Environmental Forum (Larkspur)                  | People for Open Space                              |
| BSA Explorer Post #87<br>(Reseda)                     | Friends of the River                            | Planet Drum Foundation                             |
| California Agrarian Action Project                    | Friends of the Sea Otter                        | Point Reyes Bird Observatory                       |
| California Alpine Club                                | The Fund for Animals Inc.                       | Redwood Chapter North Group,<br>Sierra Club        |
| California Native Plant Society —<br>Lone Pine        | Garden Study Club of the Peninsula              | Redwood Chapter, Sierra Club                       |
| California Native Plant Society,<br>Monterey Chapter  | Hayward Area Planning<br>Association            | Save San Francisco Bay<br>Association              |
| California Native Plant Society,<br>San Diego Chapter | Hillside Gardeners of Montclair                 | Santa Clara Valley Audubon<br>Society              |
| Citizens Coordinated for Century 3<br>(San Diego)     | Institute for the Human<br>Environment          | Sempervirens Fund                                  |
| Citizens Planning Association<br>(Santa Barbara)      | La Canada Valley Beautiful                      | Small Wilderness Area<br>Preservation              |
| Committee for Green Foothills                         | Lake Tahoe Audubon Society                      | Smith River Alliance                               |
| Conservation Call                                     | Land Trust of Santa Cruz County                 | Solana Beach Women's Civic Club                    |
| Delta Drinking Water Defense Fund                     | Let's Improve Santa Ana                         | Sonoma County Tomorrow                             |
| Desmount Club   | Los Angeles Audubon Society                     | Southern California Botanists<br>Dept. of Bio Sci. |
| Diablo Hiking Club                                    | Marin Garden Club                               | Tamalpais Conservation Club                        |
| Diablo Valley Fly Fishermen                           | Natural Resources Defense Council               | Temescal Canyon Association                        |
| Dr. Seuss Foundation                                  | The Nature Conservancy                          | Tri-City Ecology Center (Fremont)                  |
| Ecology Action Educational<br>Institute (Modesto)     | Northern California Recycling<br>Association    | Willits Garden Club                                |
| Ecology Center of Southern<br>California              | No Oil Inc.                                     |  |
|   | Northcoast Flyfishers                           |  |
|   | Oceanic Society,<br>San Francisco Chapter       |  |
|   | Ojai Valley Garden Club                         |  |
|   | Orinda Garden Club                              |  |

**OFFICERS**  
**MICHAEL H. REMY**  
 President  
**OWIGHT STEELE**  
 Senior Vice President  
**Vice Presidents**  
**BARBARA EASTMAN**  
 Bay Area  
**DAN FROST**  
 Central Valley  
**JOHN HOBBS**  
 Southern California  
**Executive Director**  
**GERALD H. MERAL, Ph.D.**  
**General Counsel**  
**COREY BROWN**

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**AUDUBON SOCIETY**  
**BAY AREA CHAPTERS**  
**CALIFORNIA NATIVE**  
**PLANT SOCIETY**  
**CALIFORNIA STATE**  
**PARK RANGERS ASSN.**  
**CALIFORNIA TROUT**  
**CALIFORNIANS**  
**AGAINST WASTE**  
**FRIENDS OF THE**  
**EARTH**  
**GREENPEACE PACIFIC**  
**SOUTHWEST**  
**LEAGUE TO SAVE LAKE**  
**TAHOE**  
**MARIN CONSERVATION**  
**LEAGUE**  
**MONO LAKE**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**TRAIN RIDERS ASSN.**  
**OF CALIFORNIA**  
**WESTERN RIVER GUIDES**  
**ASSOCIATION**  
**WILDERNESS SOCIETY**

**Members**  
**Rich Argumbeau**  
 San Francisco  
**Peter Barr**  
 Inverness  
**Jan Denton**  
 Sacramento  
**Mark Dubois**  
 Sacramento  
**Phyllis Faber**  
 Mid Valley  
**Dr. Ramon Fay**  
 Venice  
**Scott Ferguson**  
 Laguna Beach  
**Scott Fleming**  
 Berkeley  
**Margot Feuer**  
 Malibu  
**Gerry Fox**  
 San Diego  
**Douglas Graham**  
 Palo Alto  
**Maria Githam**  
 Newport Beach  
**Dorothy Green**  
 Los Angeles  
**Jane Hall**  
 Riverside  
**Tatton P. Hertenberger**  
 San Francisco  
**Alice Howard**  
 Oakland  
**Michael Jacobo**  
 Santa Cruz  
**Richard Jacobo**  
 San Francisco  
**Fred Lang**  
 South Laguna  
**Philip Leveen**  
 Berkeley  
**Yale Mazon**  
 Berkeley  
**Dean Meyer**  
 Mayfield  
**Corwin Moore**  
 Inverness  
**Carol Moss**  
 Los Angeles  
**Royce Neuschul**  
 Studio City  
**Gary Patton**  
 Santa Cruz  
**Ralph Perry**  
 Los Angeles  
**Bob Reed**  
 San Anselmo  
**Dennis Rice**  
 Tiburon  
**Antonio Rosemann**  
 San Francisco  
**Paul Sedway**  
 San Francisco  
**Phil Stendero**  
 Round Mountain  
**David Tarr**  
 Oakland  
**Paul Weiss**  
 Santa Barbara  
**William Wilcoxon**  
 Laguna Beach  
**Charles Wray**  
 Tiburon  
**Norm Zelman**  
 Beverly Hills

**EMERITUS**  
**Lewis Butler**  
**Bill Evers**  
**Alfred Heller**  
**David Hirsch**  
**Joseph Houghtaling**  
**Mel Lane**  
**Nathaniel Ovington**  
**Helen Reynolds**  
**Richard Wilson**  
**ASSOCIATE MEMBERS**  
**COMMITTEE FOR**  
**GREEN FOOTHILLS**  
**LAGUNA GREENBELT**  
**ASSOCIATION**  
**CALIFORNIA PLANNERS**  
**FOUNDATION**  
**URBAN CREEKS COUNCIL**  
**CALIFORNIA**  
**ROADSIDE COUNCIL**

# THE PLANNING AND CONSERVATION LEAGUE

1228 N ST., SUITE 33 • SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 • (916) 444-8726



November 25, 1984

Charles R. Imbrecht, Chairman  
 California Energy Commission

Dear Chairman Imbrecht:

Attached is a proposal for use of funds from the Petroleum Violation Escrow Account. The proposal was developed by CalTrans, although they have not yet submitted it as an official proposal. We understand that they will be happy to undertake the project if it is selected for funding.

We have filled out the PVEA Concept Summary Sheet, which is attached, but the project description has more information. While we would be happy to provide additional information, you can undoubtedly obtain more information from CalTrans directly.

We believe that this proposal is very appropriate for funding under the PVEA program. First, it can save substantial energy directly by reducing energy consumption in transportation. Second, once the service is established, the energy savings will continue into the future, unlike some other PVEA proposals. Third, since the project will demonstrate an effective technology which can be used in rail transit throughout California, the additional energy savings of 3,000,000 gallons of fuel will also continue into the future.

When the total potential savings (over 4.9 million gallons of fuel annually) are considered, this proposal must rank as one of the most cost effective being considered as a PVEA proposal, since the total outlay would be only 5.7 million dollars.

We hope that you will give this proposal very serious consideration. Thank you for allowing to submit it to you.

sincerely,

*Gerald H. Meral*

Gerald H. Meral  
 Executive Director

cc: Leo Trombatore, CalTrans  
 Dana Reed, Business and Transportation Agency

PETROLEUM VIOLATION ESCROW ACCOUNT PROPOSAL

Agency: Department of  
Transportation

Contact Person: Matt Paul

Telephone: 916-322-9019

I. PROJECT TITLE: Expanded Amtrak San Joaquin service.

II. PROJECT SUMMARY:

A. OBJECTIVE: The objective of this proposal is to reduce gasoline consumption by providing San Joaquin Valley residents and visitors with expanded travel alternatives. ?

B. APPROACH: This proposal would fund an expansion of Amtrak rail passenger service in the San Joaquin Valley on a demonstration basis for three years to determine if additional rail service will significantly increase public use of mass transportation in the San Joaquin Valley. Past experience on this route and others indicates that increased frequency is a primary inducement to increased rail ridership and that small route additions (e.g., Stockton-Sacramento) can be very cost effective on an incremental basis. If successful at the end of three years, funding for the expanded service would be included in the State's rail program.

In order to maintain high energy efficiency, self-propelled railcars would be used for all proposed new rail services under this project.

C. ELEMENTS: Proposed for Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA) funding is the incremental increase in State expense to provide a new third round-trip train on the existing Oakland-Bakersfield route and direct rail connections to Sacramento for all three round trips, the latter replacing existing connecting bus service from Stockton. Two local Sacramento-Bay Area round trips would also be established in conjunction with the Sacramento service, since all Amtrak equipment in Northern California is serviced in Oakland. The third San Joaquin would include connecting bus service between Bakersfield and Los Angeles, the same as the two existing trains.

D. TERM OF PROJECT: The expanded service will continue indefinitely; however, PVEA funding is only being requested for three years.

- III. FUNDING: Funding for this proposed increase in service for a three-year demonstration period is requested as follows:

| <u>PVEA Funds</u> | <u>Amtrak Funds</u> | <u>Total Funding</u> |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| \$5,700,000       | \$5,300,000         | \$11,000,000         |

Funding after PVEA period--State law requires that an intercity rail passenger service recover 55 percent of its operating cost from service revenues after three years in order to be eligible for continued State funding. If the proposed service is successful in significantly increasing train usage during its three-year demonstration period, funding for subsequent years would be provided from the Transportation Planning and Development Account through the normal budget process. The Transportation Planning and Development Account is the funding source for the State's existing rail passenger program.

IV. APPLICABLE PROGRAM

State Energy Conservation Program

V. PROJECT BENEFITS:

- A. ENERGY BENEFITS: It is estimated that the net energy savings during the three-year demonstration period will total at least 1.95 million gallons of liquid motor fuel. Decreased automobile usage will save at 2.78 million gallons of gasoline, while the expanded train operation will use approximately 0.8 million gallons of railroad diesel fuel. The following chart details the fuel savings/substitution during the three-year demonstration period. Savings will, of course, continue as long as the trains are operated.

|                                      |            |
|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Total New Train Riders               | 660,000    |
| Total New Passenger-Miles            | 88,700,000 |
| New Riders Diverted from Automobiles | 410,000    |
| Auto Fuel Saved (gallons)            | 2,780,000  |
| Train Fuel Used (gallons)            | 834,000    |
| Net Fuel Saved (gallons)             | 1,945,000  |

One of the primary benefits of this demonstration of energy-efficient railcars is that it is likely to lead to conversion of other state supported rail services from locomotive-hauled services to diesel and electric railcars. This could bring energy savings in the range of 3,000,000 gallons of diesel fuel oil annually.

- B. OTHER BENEFITS: This proposal will provide more convenient rail service to the public in the San Joaquin Valley, thereby improving travel alternatives. The present service provides morning and evening trains in

each direction; the third train would run on a roughly midday schedule, thus providing a greater variety of schedule choices for the traveler. This will increase the utility of rail service to persons who do not have access to automobiles and/or are of limited mobility, as well as increase the attractiveness of rail service to automobile users. Amtrak has gathered data which demonstrates that current users of train service are predominantly diverted from single-occupant use of larger automobiles.

Replacing the existing Sacramento-Stockton bus connection with direct rail service will, in addition to the above, greatly increase the attractiveness of the San Joaquins for travel to and from Sacramento. Although the existing bus travel is operated exclusively for train passengers, it is not as comfortable as a train, nor is it wheelchair accessible. For these reasons, many would-be travelers are discouraged by the lack of direct train service. The midday schedule will greatly improve the attractiveness of service to and from Sacramento, as it will provide a through car from Bakersfield, eliminating the necessity of transferring.

#### VI. PARTICIPANTS:

The San Joaquins are used by all types of persons, for both business and personal uses. Past surveys have shown that San Joaquin passengers represent a general cross section of Valley residents. Additionally, the trains are the only wheelchair-accessible mode of intercity public transportation in the Valley. Current ridership is approximately 250,000 per year.

#### VII. COSTS:

Lifetime cost calculations are not applicable to this proposal because the service does not have a fixed (or assumed) lifetime. PVEA funding is only requested for three years, but the service itself will continue indefinitely. Energy savings will continue to occur as long as the service operates and will actually increase as ridership increases.

Revenue and cost estimates for the three-year demonstration period of expanded service are summarized in the following chart. The figures include the existing service. The current level of service is also shown.

|                | <u>Expanded Service</u><br><u>(Three-year Totals)</u> | <u>Current</u><br><u>Service</u><br><u>(Annual)</u> |
|----------------|---|---|
| Operating cost | \$43,400,000  | \$7,600,000   |
| Equipment cost | \$ 5,300,000  | \$1,000,000   |

|                    |              |             |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Passenger revenues | \$23,200,000 | \$4,500,000 |
| Amtrak funds       | \$10,500,000 | \$1,300,000 |
| PVEA funds         | \$ 5,700,000 | --          |
| State funds (TP&D) | \$ 9,300,000 | \$2,800,000 |

#### VIII. LEVEL OF EXPANSION:

This proposal will expand the number of trains in the San Joaquin Valley by 50 percent and the number of cities served by each train by 36 percent. Total train miles will increase by 115 percent, while operating costs will increase by 88 percent. By the third year, passenger revenue will increase by 101 percent.

#### IX. MINIMUM LEVEL

The project cannot be reduced in scope if the objective of increasing rail service in the San Joaquin Valley and extending service to Sacramento is to be achieved.