

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
Figure 2		Transit & Specialized Transit	Jeff	Flynn	LAVTA would like to request that our paratransit service be separated out in the "Specialized Transit for seniors and persons with disabilities" category. LAVTA is a mandated service under the ADA just as East Bay Paratransit is.	Historically the Cities of Livermore and Dublin have allocated their city-based paratransit funds to LAVTA for administration of both mandated and non-mandated services. Restructuring the formula would require each of the two cities to develop their own paratransit programs and would require full restructuring of how the funds are allocated in the area. Staff recommends retaining the same formula as in the current measure, which significantly increases the amount of funding to LAVTA for paratransit services.
Figure 2		Transit & Specialized Transit	Jeff	Flynn	Under "Mass Transit", please provide the methodology for comment on how the percentages are determined. ACE will receive over twice as much as LAVTA, yet ACE has half of LAVTA's ridership and has support from two other counties.	Transit operation funding is allocated roughly proportionally to ridership
		Transit & Specialized Transit	Jeff	Flynn	Under "Specialized Transit for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities", please provide the methodology for comment on how the non-mandated percentage is allocated. Based on the prior Measure B split by planning area, East County only receives 0.21%. We believe this is less than should be allocated to our service area. Also as mentioned in bullet No. 1, we believe that LAVTA should be separated out from non-mandated operators.	The funding allocation is based on population of 70 and older. See above for paratransit services.
N/A		N/A	Jeff	Flynn	Is there language in the TEP that states that the allocation formulas will be reassessed on a periodic basis such as with the Census?	There is already language that says that the allocation formulas will be reassessed on a periodic basis,
N/A		N/A	Bruce	Williams	Why is the data all presented with a 2042 time horizon? As I understand it, the proposal would be for a permanent extension of the sales tax, and a vote on an expenditure plan every 20 years (so the next vote will be in 2032, correct?).	The tax will be collected beginning in January 2013 and the tax is permanent, but that the expenditure plan is through 2042 and will be updated periodically.
N/A		N/A	Bruce	Williams	Given that all of the projects and programs won't be fundable in the 20 year expenditure plan time horizon, how will decisions be made about what is funded, and when? This is true not only for named projects, but even more so for project groupings (like TOD). Will there be calls for projects to determine which projects are truly ready to go? How will regional equity (both between and within planning areas) be policed? While we have specific questions as indicated below, this general comment is true for all categories.	Funding for the Major Commute Corridors and TOD/PDA capital category will be allocated through the Alameda CTC Capital Improvement Program, which is a five-year document, updated every two years. The CIP will include provisions for geographic equity. For capital investments in which the TEP is only a portion of the funding, project sponsors will be required to develop a full funding plan to identify how the project will be fully funded. If they are not able to develop a full funding plan and receive environmental clearance in 7 year, with possible 1-year extensions, the project will be considered undeliverable and the funds will remain within the same modal category.
Figure 3		Local Streets & Roads	Bruce	Williams	<i>I am confused about the following categories of projects in bold and what they mean for Oakland specifically:</i> Major Commute Corridors – while Oakland is very happy to see \$441 million reserved for North County in this category, we are concerned that the named projects alone could eat up all of the funds specified (and also note the footnote that any arterials are fundable from this source). Oakland is critically interested in obtaining funds - over and above pass through - for Citywide street resurfacing, and we need to know to what extent this source is a potential source for funding local arterials IN ADDITION to Oakland Army Base Transportation Infrastructure Improvements. In summary, I'm confused about whether the named projects are examples of how the funds COULD be used, or if the named projects are REQUIRED uses.	There is a separate category for countywide freight corridors under the Major Commute Corridors with a separate dollar amount. Specific projects will be determined as part of the capital improvement program which is updated every 2 years.
Figure 4		Highways & Freight	Bruce	Williams	I-880 Improvements: Local Access and Safety Improvements – Is it determined how much of the \$85 million is devoted to Oakland projects?	Funding in this category will be allocated to projects based on readiness
Figure 4		Highways & Freight	Bruce	Williams	Freight and Economic Development – What are the assumptions about how this funding will be used? Would improvement of truck routes be an allowed use?	Chapter 2 describes the freight program and allows for improvements on designated truck routes.
Figure 5		Bicycle and Pedestrian	Bruce	Williams	Bicycle and Pedestrian: Gap Closure on Three Major Trails – how much of this funding is devoted to Oakland Bay Trail and East Bay Greenway projects? We submitted a CWTP request for a bike ped bridge over Oakland Estuary and other funds to complete gaps in our Bay Trail, and we assume that at least the bike/ped bridge is fully funded in this item but it is difficult to determine.	Project investments in these trails will be funded based upon readiness
Figure 5		Sustainable Land Use & Transportation	Bruce	Williams	PDA/TOD – again, we are happy to see nearly \$200 million devoted to this category in North County, but we wonder how individual projects will be funded, and how equity will be maintained between cities.	Funding for the TOD/PDA capital category will be allocated through the Alameda CTC Capital Improvement Program, which is a five-year document, updated every two years. The CIP will include provisions for geographic equity.
Figure 5		Sustainable Land Use & Transportation	Bruce	Williams	Sustainable Transportation Linkages Program – What is it? I can't find a description anywhere, but perhaps I've missed it. Is this where CBTP projects ended up?	See chapter 2.
N/A		N/A	Bruce	Williams	While I am not questioning any of the funding levels for individual programs in this email, I hope to submit comments prior to the Steering Committee that may include requests to amend funding levels or further specify uses.	Comment noted.
Chapter 1	1	Fulfilling the Promise to Voters, paragraph 2.	Jo Ann	Lew	The first sentence refers to improvements, but there is no mention of maintaining the current system. Recommendation : Revise sentence to say "...the need to continue to maintain and improve the County's...."	Comment will be incorporated
Chapter 3	1	Governing Board, last paragraph	Jo Ann	Lew	The 1% rate is the same as the current Measure B and the 5% rate is higher. If Alameda CTC supplements the current staff to administer the tax, both rates should be lower since it is unlikely Alameda CTC will duplicate its current costs and staff. The 1% and 5% rates are not justified. Recommendation : Lower the 1% rate to 0.75% and the 5% rate to 3%.	The administration cap is now at 4% with a 1% salary cap.
Chapter 3	3	Plan Updates, paragraph 1	Jo Ann	Lew	Regarding the reference to "initiation of the tax in 2012", if the tax measure passes in November, how is it possible to begin collecting the tax in 2012? Recommendation : Clarify the start and end of the 30 year period.	The tax will be collected beginning January 2013, and this has been clarified in the TEP.
Chapter 3	4	Responsibility of Fund Recipients, paragraph 1	Jo Ann	Lew	There is no mention of recipients signing a Master Funding Agreement. Recommendation : Include a requirement that recipients sign a Master Funding Agreement.	All fund recipients will be required to enter into agreements to receive the funds.
Chapter 4	1	Administration of the Plan, bullet No. 3	Jo Ann	Lew	I do not understand the Board hiring staff and consultants. The Alameda CTC Executive Director and authorized managers should hire staff and staff should contract for consultants on a competitive basis. Recommendation : Delete the first sentence after "Salary and Administration Cost Caps" because it does not address cost caps.	This has been clarified.
Chapter 4	1	Administration of the Plan, bullet No. 5	Jo Ann	Lew	I am unclear on how this will be enforced. Recommendation : Explain enforcement of this bullet item.	Compliance will be evaluated on an annual basis through the submission of annual compliance reports similar to the current method.
Chapter 4	1	Plan Update Process, bullet No. 6	Jo Ann	Lew	There appears to be a conflict between the first and second sentence. The use of the word "perpetuity" gives the appearance the tax will be collected forever while the second sentence refers to a June 30, 2042, end date. Recommendation : Rephrase the first sentence to be consistent with the second sentence.	This has been clarified.
Chapter 4	1	Plan Update Process, bullet No. 6	Jo Ann	Lew	Regarding the reference to "implementation in November of 2012", if the tax measure passes in November, how is it possible to begin collecting the tax in the same month? Also, 30 years after November 2012 is November 2042. Recommendation : Clarify the start and end of the 30 year period.	This has been clarified.
Chapter 4	2	Taxpayer Safeguards and Audits, bullet No. 14	Jo Ann	Lew	I am unclear on the meaning of "expeditiously" as used here and how the Alameda CTC intends to enforce the timely use of the funds. Recommendation : Clarify "expeditiously" and refer to the Master Funding Agreement for expeditious use of funds.	This is clarified in the funding agreements.

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
Chapter 4	2	Restrictions on Funds, bullet No. 15	Jo Ann	Lew	I am unclear on how this will be enforced. Recommendation : Explain enforcement of this bullet item.	Compliance will be evaluated on an annual basis through the submission of annual compliance reports similar to the current method.
Chapter 4	3	Restrictions on Funds, bullet No. 18	Jo Ann	Lew	The reference to “all investments” is too restrictive and would prevent local jurisdictions from exercising its authority to make local decisions in regards to its streets and roads. It is not always economical or efficient to expand a local project to meet both “complete streets requirements” and “Alameda County guidelines.” Recommendation : Provide flexibility in meeting “complete streets requirements”, particularly when funding is not available but improvements are necessary.	The language indicates that all modes must be considered in all fund expenditures per Complete Streets and Alameda CTC guidelines, which will be under development in the coming year.
Chapter 4	3	Restrictions on Funds, bullet No. 19	Jo Ann	Lew	Is the policy a requirement? Recommendation : Change “will develop a policy” to “shall develop a policy.”	This policy will be developed beginning early 2012.
			Keith	Carson	<p><i>The eight people who submitted the letter requested the following TEP process improvements:</i></p> <p>- Provide background data for staff’s proposals, namely A) a comparison of proposed funding and identified need for each program; B) a detailed breakdown of each project and program category; C) the geographic distribution of the project expenditures; D) detail of how the performance evals and public input, including polling results, contributed to the staff proposal; E) all data from the EMC phone poll, including crosstabs, original data from online surveys, input from individual workshops including dot voting, toolkit data collected, and any other input collected to inform the development of this plan; and F) an explanation as to why the East part of the County was over-sampled relative to its percentage of population in recent polling results, and how this may have affected the polling results.</p> <p>- Revise the TEP development schedule to allow time for information to be thoughtfully analyzed and considered by the CAWG, TAWG, Steering Committee and the full Alameda CTC Board.</p>	The polling cross-tabs and public outreach report are on the Alameda CTC website. The projects and programs are included in Chapter 2 of the TEP. Capital projects in the Major Commute Routes and TOD/PDA categories will be allocated based upon readiness through the Capital Improvement Plan process described above. The Alameda CTC may consider a time extension.
		Dave	Campbell			
		Manolo	Gonzalez-Estay			
		Lindsay	Imai			
		Michele	Jordan			
		Bette	Ingraham			
		John	Knox White			
			Matt	Vander Sluis		
		“Bayfair Connector” (Project #240180)	Pat	Piras	<p>This project should be re-identified as MultiCounty. While it happens to be located in the Central Area, its purpose is primarily to serve passengers to or from East and South County (as well as Santa Clara County). Only a small portion of any benefit will accrue to Central County.</p> <p>Since this is included in the CWTP under “Vision projects”, on what basis is it included in the draft TEP?</p> <p>Also, what is the current estimate of the number of homes to be displaced by the project, and where are they located?</p>	By funding it in the TEP, it will be moved out of the Vision category in the CWTP. It will be recategorized as multi-county. We will work with the project applicant to request more on this project regarding construction impacts.
		Alameda to Fruitvale BRT	Pat	Piras	<p>The draft TEP (Figure 2) includes a project labeled “City of Alameda to Fruitvale BART BRT” for \$9M, which appears to correspond to, and fully fund, project #24007, but which is described in the CWTP list as “Rapid Bus” instead. However Beth pointed out to me project #98207 (Broadway/Jackson) which has a much larger cost, and would connect to 12th Street BART.</p> <p>Which project is proposed to be included in the TEP? If the “Fruitvale” connector, is it a separate ROW “true” BRT, or a “Rapid”? If the former, the costs looks way too low. Also, If the Fruitvale Connector is the TEP project, how would it be operated, and at what annual cost and fund source(s)? AC Transit staff does not seem to be involved in anything about the project.</p>	The project is the Rapid Bus and has been corrected in the TEP.
		“Broadway Streetcar”	Pat	Piras	<p>This is combined in the draft TEP with “College Broadway Transit Corridor” (#240372 for \$5M) so it appears to have a cost of \$5M, but I can’t find a project number in the CWTP list. What is it, since AC Transit staff do not seem to know about this either?</p> <p>Also, same questions about annual operating cost and fund source(s) as above.</p>	This project will include transit and access to transit improvements in the Broadway Corridor. Operating costs will need to be identified as part of the project development and funding plan requirements.
		BART to Livermore – Phase 1	Pat	Piras	<p>What is expected to be accomplished for the proposed \$400M investment?</p> <p>Also, what about requiring a “match” from San Joaquin County, since a large purpose for the project would be to serve them?</p>	This funding, combined with regional funds, will begin the first phase of an a transit extension from the current BART terminus with the goal of extending BART service eastward.
		Highway Efficiency” Projects (Figure 4 in the draft TEP)	Pat	Piras	<p>What analysis has been or will be done to identify GHG and emissions reductions from these projects? Health impacts, including cumulative, on residents in the area of these projects should be quantified also.</p>	The CWTP includes evaluation of the GHG emissions reductions for projects and programs in the CWTP, out of which projects and programs are being funded with the TEP. There will not be a separate TEP analysis.
		“Specialized Transit for Seniors and People with Disabilities”	Pat	Piras	<p>In particular, there should be strong performance requirements for the “non-mandated” programs, especially to ensure cost-effectiveness, productivity, and non-discrimination. Any taxi-based program should be required to have an accessible component, consistent with the jurisdictions’ general obligations under Subtitle A of Title II of the ADA.</p> <p>Further, if this program is kept as a silo for a specific category of population, it should be broadened to include accessibility improvements on fixed-route transit and travel training for the target populations. The reallocation of funds for this “project category” (item #25 in the “Implementing Guidelines”, and shouldn’t it be “program category” instead?) should be more flexible and include accessible fixed-route.</p>	The funding agreements that guide these expenditures will include performance requirements. PAPCO has been working on these this year. The Gap Grant program can be used for accessibility improvements on fixed route service, and is currently being used to fund senior and disabled travel training.
		Complete Streets (Implementing Guideline #18)	Pat	Piras	<p>I continue to urge that it is one of the most practical ways to try to control the rate of paratransit eligibility. The statement that says that “All investments made on local streets and roads will conform to Complete Streets requirements and Alameda County Guidelines to ensure that all <i>modes</i> are considered in the expenditure of <i>local streets and roads funds</i>” (emphasis added) should be broadened to ensure that “all users” are considered, and the requirements should apply to all applicable categories, including but not limited to: Ped/Bike, PDAs/Land Use, CBTPs, Technology, etc.</p>	The language in the complete streets category has been adjusted to accommodate this.
			Joe	Spangler	<p>ATA’s recommendations agree with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC’s) findings on the poor cost-effectiveness of major construction projects now under consideration. They also align with Alameda County Transportation Commission’s (ACTC’s) own telephone poll of county voters. Respondents clearly stated that they would strongly support a 1% transportation sales tax—if it funds transit service, sustainable transportation solutions, and infrastructure maintenance over expensive capital projects with minimal benefits countywide, such as extending BART to Livermore. Recommending costly construction projects in the TEP and CWTP is a ...failure to present community-supported transportation funding priorities to the voters in 2012 [and] will result in significant voter opposition to a measure that...could otherwise pass with strong support.</p>	Comment noted.
		Transportation Expenditure Program (TEP) Allocations	Joe	Spangler	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transit Operations funding – 30% 2. Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety – 9% 3. Local Streets and Roads – 18% 	Transit operations (including paratransit) are funded at 31%, Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety at 8.4%, and Local Streets and Roads at 30%

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		Transportation Projects (CWTP and TEP):	Joe	Spangler	<p>1. Fruitvale Bridge "lifeline" retrofit (an Alameda County submittal) - \$40 million - This would provide the City of Alameda's first and only lifeline connection to the rest of Alameda County following a major earthquake, which is a critical public safety priority. The City of Alameda is the only community currently without guaranteed post-earthquake access to the rest of Alameda County. This upgrade should include bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, transit-exclusive lanes, and two general-purpose lanes for autos.</p> <p>2. Bus Rapid Transit from Alameda Point to Fruitvale BART- \$9 million - This project is listed in several plans and is needed before Alameda can absorb its share of projected regional housing growth. The Alameda City Council has insisted that MTC and ABAG direct transportation funds to projects like this before housing is planned. This BRT project—which would be the City of Alameda's first—adds a significant new transit corridor that will benefit the entire island and is integral to supporting redevelopment and housing growth at Alameda Point.</p> <p>3. Estuary Crossing Shuttle Project (a CBTP Submittal) - <\$50 million - A West End/Oakland bicycle and pedestrian connection has been a city and county active-transportation priority for more than a decade. This shuttle, identified as the best cost-effective mid- to long-term option, connects West Alameda to regional transportation, job centers, and educational opportunities in downtown Oakland.</p> <p>4. Bay Trail Gap Closures, including \$114 million for North County - This program will allow for the completion of a number of local and regional projects on the Bay Trail, another long-promised regional priority. Two in particular are the Cross Alameda Trail supports core CBTP priorities and has been through community planning processes. The Shoreline Project would resolve significant safety and use conflicts between bikes and pedestrians on Alameda's busy southern shore path.</p> <p>5. CBTP Projects - \$60 million - Alameda County has produced many solid Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs). Many Alameda CBTP projects will assist underserved communities. This infrastructure program will finally prioritize the implementation of community-based projects identified in CBTPs throughout the county. The City of Alameda's CBTP projects include many needed bike and safety projects in Alameda's underserved neighborhoods.</p>	The Rapid Bus from Alameda Point to Fruitvale BART is included in the plan for \$9M; the Estuary Crossing Shuttle is eligible under bike and ped grants; the Bay Trail is included along with other major trails in the County for \$264 M; CBTP projects are fundable through the Bike/Ped program, the TOD program, the Transit Innovative grants, the Technology and Innovation grants, all of which have a combined value over \$463 M.
		AC Transit District Operations	Joe	Spangler	AC Transit bus service must be returned to 2000-2001 levels countywide before the county begins expensive capital projects or new service extensions to the former farms of East County. Statewide transit funding cuts have rewritten the ground rules for public transit operations, with multiple major service cuts decimating service in the past decade. Program funding in the proposed "Measure B3" must restore transit operations far beyond the increase in the tax rate.	AC Transit has received the highest funding level of any transit operator representing an over 94% increase for transit operations and over 100% increase in paratransit funding.
		Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety (Facilities, Programs)	Joe	Spangler	<p>After decades of auto-exclusive planning and engineering, funding for needed bicycle and pedestrian facilities continues to fall behind. Increasing program funding money for bike and pedestrian projects will help offset past inequities in funding and bring multiple benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improving conditions for bicycling and walking builds closer-knit communities. - Bicycle and pedestrian projects promote economic development and have increased economic benefits over traditional roadway construction projects. - Bike and pedestrian projects improve transportation equity in communities of concern, providing important, low-cost connections to jobs, education, and the community. 	Bicycle and pedestrian funding include over \$387 M in its category and the overall TEP includes a Complete Streets Policy which will generate additional investments in bicycle and pedestrian facilities, as well as over \$500 M for TOD/PDA investments which will also support bike/ped investments.
		Local Streets and Road (Maintenance, Repair)	Joe	Spangler	TEP funding for local streets and roads should also increase. Since the countywide transportation sales tax rate is expected to double to 1%, reducing the TEP funding allocation for local streets and roads to 18% will still net Alameda County 50% more funds for road repaving and maintenance over current Measure B levels. Since the City of Alameda's roads—like those in many other communities—are considered just above "at-risk" by MTC, Alameda County should increase TEP funding to maintain existing roadways instead of building new road and rail projects that are quite likely to cost far more than current projections indicate.	Funding for local streets and roads is 30% in the TEP.
		ATA Opposition	Joe	Spangler	ATA strongly opposes including the proposed Livermore BART extension and additional freeway projects in the TEP or CWTP. <i>Why?</i> According to MTC's cost-benefit ratio calculations, the BART extension to Livermore—which is currently opposed by the City of Livermore—is worse than all but 9 of the 76 regional transportation projects proposed for funding from the proposed transportation sales tax. In addition, BART's EIR unrealistically projects that the Livermore BART station would have 30,000 daily entries and exits. (The Dublin/Pleasanton station only has 14,000 daily entry/exits.) Given BART's previous inaccurate and overly optimistic predictions, ATA believes that the likelihood of 30,000 passenger entry/exits daily in Livermore is very slim. ATA can see many better ways to spend the funds that would be required to build this unwise and costly extension.	The proposed TEP includes funding for investing in transit improvements in the Tri-Valley towards the goal of extending BART beyond its current terminus. As the project moves through the environmental process, alternatives will be evaluated in the corridor. The proposed TEP includes language that if a project becomes infeasible, the funding will remain within the modal category. The Phase 1 project is estimated to cost about \$1.2 billion. \$400 million of new sales tax revenue is proposed for the Phase 1 project. Over \$100 million of bridge toll revenues are already allocated to BART to Livermore. The MTC Project Performance Assessment results showed BART to Livermore Phase 1 Project scoring 5.5 in the overall targets score, putting the project in the top third of the 76 projects scored. It has showed a cost benefit ratio of 1.0. A BART to Livermore is recommended in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's 2007 Regional Rail Plan. The Phase 1 Project is expected to generate over 20,000 new BART riders which produce significant and measurable environmental benefits, including, reduce over 400,000 vehicle miles
			Joe	Spangler	<p>Transportation Must Support and Follow Housing Density, Growth: The CWTP has, unfortunately, de-prioritized transportation spending in the areas where the Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) anticipate most of Alameda County's additional housing growth. The current (2008-14) housing plan forecasts that 46% of all new housing will be built in northern Alameda County (North County) with 38% of new housing will be added in southern and eastern Alameda County (referred to here as South County and East County, respectively) combined. The SCS plan will very likely recommend even more housing in northern and central Alameda County (North County and Central County, respectively) in the future.</p> <p>The CWTP and TEP should allocate additional transportation funding to those urban core and infill areas that are projected to experience the greatest housing growth. (The Alameda City Council has already sent a letter to MTC and ABAG stating that transportation funding must follow housing if MTC and ABAG expect cities to meet the RHNA goals.)</p>	Funding for the TOD/PDA capital category will be allocated through the Alameda CTC Capital Improvement Program, which is a five-year document, updated every two years. The CIP will include provisions for geographic equity. Funding is also included in the plan to support TOD/PDAs to perform project develop activities to become ready for the capital investments.
			Joe	Spangler	Voter Support and Public Benefit: ...the funding in this new measure should return public regional transportation and transit service back to historic (2000-2001) levels, not promise funding for new capital projects that provide few benefits countywide while increasing regional transportation operating costs.	The Transportation Vision adopted for the TEP includes a multi-modal plan that meets current and future needs.
			Joe	Spangler	Cost Effectiveness and Return on Investment, Not Capital Projects and Cost Overruns: Voters who will be asked to support this tax increase and extension must have strict cost controls and guarantees to protect against continued cost overruns and poor returns on their investment. The current control (requiring the Board of Supervisors to vote for one-year extensions if projects take too long to be built or exceed budget projections) has proven woefully inadequate: a package of 26 projects exceeded their promised costs by 244% over what was promised in 2000. This insufficient regard for voter-approved infrastructure investment has left public transportation underfunded and has reduced funding options for more cost-effective, beneficial projects. There must be checks and balances for projects whose costs explode.	All capital projects in the current expenditure plan (Measure B 2000) had cost increases since those dollar amounts listed in the expenditure plan were not escalated dollars. However, the amount of funding each project received from the Measure remained within the funding amounts listed in the plan plus the plan-authorized cost escalation rates. If the TEP is approved by voters, the Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC) will receive updates on project and program progress, will review project and program expenditures and audits, and will be able to call any project or program sponsor in for a presentation to address fiduciary or TEP timeline deadlines concerns the IWC has, per it's issues identification process.
		Station Modernization and Capacity Improvements	Carter	Mau	\$90M will begin to fund some of BARTs station and capacity improvements; however, the need in Alameda County is much greater. Reinvestment in BARTs 40-year-old stations in Alameda County is crucial to supporting the emerging Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in Alameda County. Local jurisdictions and the Alameda CTC anticipate substantial growth and land use change in transit-oriented development (TOD) around BART stations and trunk line bus routes. The Alameda CTC's polling indicates "Modernizing aging BART stations" is an investment that is supported by the public (5.08 on a scale of 7.0). Part of the station modernization program includes overhaul or replacement of BARTs escalators and elevators. As we discussed, in order to meet some of the modernization and capacity needs at the BART stations, it would be helpful if these types of improvements could also be funded from the PDA/TOD Infrastructure category...Good TOD does not stop at the BART fare gate...guidelines for the category need to make it clear that BART is an eligible recipient of the PDA/TOD funds, and that the cities and BART need to work cooperatively to determine the investment of these funds for the specific station TODs and PDAs.	BART investments in modernization include \$90 M in the plan, and additional funds are eligible for these purposes through the TOD/PDA program. In addition, if the Irvington BART station is funded by outside funding sources, those dollars (\$120M) may be used by BART for operations/maintenance needs

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		Irvington Station Funding	Carter	Mau	The City [of Fremont] is to seek the use of redevelopment funding to build the station. While we understand the availability of redevelopment funding is still uncertain, if funds for the Irvington station are found from another source other than the Alameda CTC funding, we respectfully request that the funding in the draft expenditure plan be directed for BARTs infrastructure needs, such as station modernization or the Hayward Maintenance Complex, rather than reverting back into the expenditure plan general fund for redistribution.	Please see above.
		Hayward Maintenance Complex (HMC)	Carter	Mau	The HMC is critical to ensure that BART can provide reliable and efficient transit service in Alameda County. HMC supports the replacement of BARTs railcar fleet. HMC facilities will improve BARTs ability to accommodate growing demand for additional BART core ridership and future service, including Warm Springs, Berryessa and SVRT Expansion projects. This project has some local match funding, but requires additional funding to advance.	Please see above.
		Transit Operating Funds	Carter	Mau	The draft TEP does not include any operational funding for BART. While BARTs capital needs (especially reinvestment) have traditionally been a priority, BART does not cover all of its ongoing annual operating costs from the farebox. In addition, if BART is to extend high-capacity transit service further into the Tri-Valley area, an additional operating subsidy would be required to cover the additional operation and maintenance costs not covered by the farebox for that project. Therefore, some of the Transit Operating funds should be designated to BART for its ongoing and future operating costs.	Please see above. BART does receive operational funds for paratransit services, which represents a 94% increase over current funding amounts.
		Consistency with Transit Sustainability Project (TSP)/Fare Transfer Barrier	Carter	Mau	MTC is anticipated to provide conclusions and recommendations from its TSP early in 2012. One of their focus areas is the Inner East Bay, in order to optimize transit network performance. Use of transit operating funds by all operators should be consistent with the findings of the TSP. Furthermore, pending the results of the TSP, Alameda CTC should consider how the fare transfer barrier between BART and AC Transit (and other operators, as need be) could be mitigated, potentially with Alameda CTC transit operating funds. This is relevant not only to develop a more robust and seamless transit network, but also because in the past, many TOD projects have requested funding for the replacement of BART commuter parking. This presents a substantial financial challenge to TOD implementation. Reducing the fare transfer barrier could provide a robust substitute investment, and meet many other Alameda CTC objectives.	Alameda CTC is planning to develop a Transit Plan for Alameda County which will address many of these issues beginning in 2012 that will tier off the TSP work.
		East Bay Paratransit (EBP) - BART funds	Carter	Mau	The increase from 5.6% to 6% for EBP is greatly needed and appreciated, but as the demand for mandated American Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit is increasing, these funds will provide a small percent of the total need. BART supports the 4.5% for AC Transit; however, since BART is responsible for, and pays for 31% of the costs of EBP, we request that our share be increased from 1.5% of the total funds to 2.02% to reflect our percentage share. This would bring the total share for Mandated EBP to 6.52%. We understand this would require some of the non-mandated and/or gap grant funding share be decreased; however, as BART and AC Transit are required to provide the ADA service for the County, and the other is supplementary and optional, we believe the funding should reflect the proportional share of the responsibility.	Please see above regarding the Irvington BART station and the eligible use of those funds, if the project is funded with outside sources. The funding amount for paratransit include a 94% increase for BART.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Jack	O'Connor	We want to express my full support for funding the BART extension to Livermore. My wife [Pat] and I have owned a home in Livermore and have paid taxes into the system since 1969 and we say that it's about time to fulfill the promise of the past 42 years.	Comment noted.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Brian S.	O'Connor	As a home owner and tax payer in Livermore, I want to support the extension of BART to Livermore as your top priority.	Comment noted.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Carol	Ingram	I'd like to voice support for BART to Livermore. I live in Albany, at the other end of Alameda County, and commute daily to Livermore Lab to work. When I first started working here, I explored the possible alternatives to getting to work, considering cost, time, and environmental impact. I had hoped to take BART, but because BART didn't get me to the lab, my commute each way would have been two hours. There was also a possibility to participate in a car share program, but that was extremely expensive. I found the most cost-effective method was by vanpool. If BART went all the way to Livermore, I would ride it. Two benefits of BART to Livermore are: 1) It makes it easier for Livermore residents to travel to San Francisco and the East Bay locations for work, play, and shopping, reducing congestion. 2) It makes it easier for San Francisco and East Bay residents to travel to Livermore for work, play, and shopping, improving the economies of Livermore and the surrounding area. For those who oppose BART to Livermore because they want local buses and improved road maintenance, I'd like that where I live, too. If there's improved commerce and economic benefit across Alameda County, we would all see increased tax revenues, and opportunities for funding our local needs as well. Thanks for your attention.	Comment noted.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Peter	D'Souza	I understand there are some meetings about "BART to Livermore" happening right now. I am a resident of Livermore for the last 20 years. I strongly OPPOSE any plans to bring BART to Livermore. It will be a complete waste of public funds!!! And please do not even THINK about cramming a railway track onto the Median Strip on the 580 FWY thru Livermore, because there is absolutely NO ROOM for it!!!!!! We need every square inch of space on the 580 FWY for car traffic lanes..... which I use each and every single day. Just like 99% of Livermore residents, I will NEVER take the BART train EVER!!!!!! Thanks for helping us to make the right decision!!!	Comment noted.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Alan	Burnham	My work schedule does not allow me to take the time to come to a daytime meeting in Oakland, but I am keenly interested in the work of your committee. I strongly support the inclusion of at least \$400 million for an extension of BART to Livermore. Livermore residents have been paying taxes for decades under a promise of BART to Livermore. We have been repeatedly bypassed by those who have not paid in since the beginning. While I do not agree that our contributions warrant a \$4 billion project, we certainly do deserve the simplest and most cost effective extension to Isabel or slightly further. This interval covers one of the most congested freeways in the entire Bay area, and BART could significant improve that situation. If one considers the drop in pollution per dollar spent, the Isabel extension is an outstanding investment. I fly out of OAK 2-3 times a month, but BART is currently useless to me. By the time I get off the freeway and onto a train, I can almost be at the airport by driving. That is because the worst traffic is between Livermore and Pleasanton. If my wife could drop me off at a Livermore station without getting on the freeway, when combined with the new connector between the Coliseum and the airport, BART becomes a viable contender. After some contentious discussions, I think the vast majority of Livermore is behind an Isabel extension, given the hard financial reality that money does not grow on trees. If the Livermore extension is not included in the upcoming sales tax initiative, I suspect you will see a grass roots effort to defeat it.	Comment noted.

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Julia S.	Orvis, D.V.M.	<p>Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the meeting at the Alameda County Transportation Commission tomorrow. It is my understanding that there will be preliminary discussion regarding projects to be included in the Measure B3 project list. I would like to go on record as sharing my opinion.</p> <p>Regional public transportation is essential for a number of reasons, and it is time to fund phase 1 of BART to Livermore along Interstate 580. Livermore has been projected as a BART destination since 1962 when property owners were asked to tax themselves for this service. Livermore has stepped up to the plate for over 49 years and helped to pay for BART without any direct services. Not only is a vote on Measure B3 approaching, but BART also is planning to ask the taxpayers to fund new BART cars in the next few years. It is important to assure voters that the commitment to extend BART to Livermore will be met before you ask for more tax money if you want a positive outcome.</p> <p>Data shows that Livermore is in a position to generate over 20,000 new BART riders, which will significantly impact the environment. There will be a reduction of over 400,000 vehicle miles, over 260,000 lbs/day of greenhouse gasses and over 400 billion BTUs/year of energy consumption. BART to Livermore is recommended in the MTC's 2007 Regional Rail Plan. It is time to include a Phase 1 station to Livermore in the current plans for improved regional transit. The Interstate 580 corridor is one of the most impacted transportation corridors in the Bay Area. You can't take private cars off the road unless you offer people a reasonable alternative. Phase 1 BART to Livermore will offer that alternative for many. It will also demonstrate good faith in the promises made to Livermore citizens as future tax funding for BART is pursued. Thank you.</p>	Comment noted.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Joanne	Moody	As a Livermore resident since 1981, I fully supported Bart going to Livermore. I have been waiting a long time for this project. BART is essential to reducing traffic congestion, pollution, and creating jobs. I am opposed to having funds converted to other types of transportation projects.	Comment noted.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Ron	Geren	Livermore deserves a BART connection on I-580 as quickly as possible. Livermore residents have been paying for BART for 49 years and have yet to enjoy its service. This community has not yet had the opportunity to utilize BART convenience, get thousands of vehicles off the freeway, nor significantly reduce pollutants generated by those vehicles. On the heels of a community decision to keep BART on the freeway versus downtown and with a vote from our city council to run BART on the freeway, it is imperative that all agencies move aggressively forward, as our city planners have in the last several weeks, to secure funding and advance an effective plan to bring BART to Livermore on I-580. I also strongly urge that the appropriate agencies acknowledge and utilize only accurate and up to date data and cost information related directly to a freeway route versus the unapproved downtown data. I have learned that at least one advocacy group, opposed to a route to Livermore, may be advancing and quoting outdated and irrelevant downtown cost data in order to persuade your agency to deny Livermore a route. I implore you to carefully examine the motivations of any group that would deny BART to Livermore, which we have waited for the past 49 years, and reject erroneous information meant to influence your decisions.	Comment noted.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	G.	Cauthen	Please do NOT acquiesce to demands that ACTC jump on the BART/Livermore bandwagon. BART provides a useful service but not the only service. Moreover it is vastly more expensive to build than virtually any of the other transit modes. More discussion about Alameda County's transportation needs should occur before any Measure B decisions are made.	Comment noted. Discussions continue on the development of a final TEP.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Ana Maria	Osorio	I live in this beautiful Town (Livermore) for the past 40 years and ever since like others were and still contributing Taxes deduction for this Rail Transportation, when is going to be a REALITY?. I would like to support 100% for any opposing funds, Livermore Residents and vicinity Towns need this rail ASAP. PLEASE! Help for this necessity of Transportation.	Comment noted.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Robert	Robb	<p>I cannot attend the meeting today, but wanted to voice my support for BART to Livermore.</p> <p>I have worked at the lab in Livermore since 2007 after graduating from college. For about two years, I was riding an AC Transit bus from my apartment in Oakland's Diamond District down to the Fruitvale BART, riding BART out to the end of the line in Dublin/Pleasanton, and then driving my car the rest of the way from there. The bus from D/P is so slow and inconvenient to get all the way to the lab that I couldn't imagine taking public transit the entire way. But, then I had a child and wanted to spend more time at home. Driving straight from home cuts a 1.5hr commute down to 45 minutes. If BART came all the way to Livermore, I think it would be worth riding BART again, because then I wouldn't have to get off and transfer to my personal car and then drive frontage roads to finally get to the freeway. I could just drive straight to work from wherever the station is in Livermore (hopefully near Greenville Rd). Also, if there were a BART extension to Livermore, that would greatly influence my next housing decision a couple years from now. If I knew I could ride BART to Livermore, I would buy a home within walking or biking distance of the BART (probably around San Leandro or Castro Valley) and basically cut my car out of my daily commute all together while getting some extra exercise.</p>	Comment noted.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	JoAnne	Eteve	<p>BART to Livermore is a project long overdue. The city of Livermore has been part of the BART plans since 1962 and for 49 years, the citizens of Livermore have been paying for BART. In 1962, planners knew that a BART to Livermore would offer the ability for residents of Alameda County to have easy public transit access to large employers like Sandia and Livermore Lab. Planning for a BART to Livermore now will provide better public transit access to employment opportunities at the I-Hub and educational opportunities at Las Positas Community College for all residents of Alameda County.</p> <p>It would be interesting to speculate if BART had been built 30 or 40 years ago, the influence of a viable public transit on housing, commuters, and the environment. While funding for BART was successfully collected, BART coming to Livermore did not happen and our community and our highways grew to accommodate cars. It is time to realize that this lack of action to the Livermore corner of Alameda has created increase pollution, increase roadway usage, and a generation of workers who saw cars as the only way to commute. The time, 49 years later, has come for BART to be built to Livermore....it was insightful then and remains a highly important part of the plan.</p> <p>One of the benefits of a BART to Livermore for all Alameda residents is that it will help remove cars from the highway. Even if residents of Berkley, Oakland, and other Alameda cities would not use the BART to Livermore extension, they will benefit from an environment where there is a predicted reduction of over 400 billion BTUs/ year of energy consumption and a reduction of over 400,000 vehicle miles traveled. BART to Livermore's reduction of vehicle miles travel implies less use of the roadways, which would preserve the roadways and allow pedestrians and bikers to access streets and crosswalks that are safer due to less commuter congestion. By once again delaying BART to Livermore, commuter cars will create congestion on the roadways, which will perpetuate the current situation of congested streets requiring more repairs, and the crowded streets and unsafe crosswalks discouraging pedestrians and bikers.</p>	Comment noted.

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Ann	Pfaff-Doss	<p>I was unable to attend today's meeting, but I wanted to add my support to the long-awaited and much-needed extension of BART to Livermore. Now, that it has been settled that the original, and less expensive, route along the freeway is what people want, it is time to get this project underway.</p> <p>A bus link to a nearby station is not a feasible solution. I have first-hand experience with this, having tried to use the BART buses to Bay Fair before the Dublin/Pleasanton station was built. In fact, I've been riding BART since 1972 and find it hard to believe that Livermore has been without a station for so long.</p> <p>Once Dublin/Pleasanton was opened, the ridership was much larger than anyone predicted. I expect that it will be the same for Livermore. In fact, with the new retail and office developments under construction in Livermore, the ridership could even be greater than at the opening of Dublin/Pleasanton.</p> <p>Public transportation needs to be efficient and available to fulfill its job of getting people out of their private cars. Distractions like proposed bus bridges do nothing but discourage potential riders. BART needs a direct route to customers and there are plenty of them in Livermore and beyond.</p>	Comment noted.
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Jean	King	<p>I was unable to attend today's meeting but support funding for BART to Livermore in Measure B3.</p> <p>Please extend the existing half cent countywide sales tax for transportation and allocate \$400 million for the Phase 1 of Livermore BART.</p> <p>I am a member of TRANSFORM and support their goal of increasing public transportation and the Livermore BART will do that. It is expected to generate 20,000 new BART riders and reduce vehicle miles travelled by over 400,000 and reduce greenhouse gasses by 260,000 lbs/day which supports AB32 and SB375.</p> <p>Please support the \$400 million funding for Livermore BART in Measure B3. Thank you.</p>	Comment noted.
			Keith	Carson	<p><i>The ten people who submitted the letter expressed the following concerns regarding the TEP process :</i></p> <p>- As detailed in our 11/14/11 letter to Executive Director Art Dao (attached), we have significant concerns about the development process for the proposed Measure B reauthorization (B3) expenditure plan (TEP). It should not be rushed, as it is being now.</p>	See Attachment A for a response to the Community Vision Platform submitted to the Alameda CTC Steering Committee.
			Ruth	Atkin	<p>- To ensure that B3 is successful it must equitably invest in sustaining our existing transportation system and not increase the share of tax dollars being funneled to costly, low benefit expansion projects. The TEP needs to directly address the threat of climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), as mandated by AB32 and SB375, and improve mobility and health for all. A failure to do so will result in a failure at the ballot box.</p> <p>- Many of us were involved in defeating the failed 1998 Alameda County transportation tax and the creation and passage of the successful 2000 Measure B. We want to develop a popular and pragmatic TEP and then help pass the reauthorization.</p>	
			Dave	Campbell	<p>- We respectfully submit this Community Vision Platform, which outlines an expenditure plan that is directly aligned with the input that ACTC collected during the past three months, [focusing on] shoring up our existing transportation system and investing only in new projects and programs that cost-effectively increase the mobility of residents, particularly those with fewest transportation choices today, while encouraging transit use, bicycling and walking as alternatives to driving.</p>	
			Manolo	Gonzalez-Estay	<p>- ...we are also asking that BART to Livermore be removed from the TEP.</p> <p>- We ask you to step back, see that the process is headed in the wrong direction, and change course before its too late.</p>	
			Lindsay	Imai	<p>COMMUNITY VISION PLATFORM</p> <p>- The plan must maintain our existing transportation infrastructure and restore our transit system before considering any expansions. Additional projects must clearly advance environmental, social equity, and public health goals.</p> <p>- This 30-year plan must therefore prioritize those investments that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through increases in transit use, walking, and biking and not invest in projects that will increase greenhouse gas emissions or VMT.</p>	
			Connie Galambos	Malloy	<p>- Alameda County has done an admirable job of creating Community Based Transportation Plans to target investments in Communities of Concern; now we must fund the implementation of those plans. We must also significantly reduce the disproportionate health impacts of freight movement on many of these same communities.</p>	
			Michele	Jordan	<p>- Achieve Geographic Equity: The measure will likely commit our region to several long-term projects without providing full funding to complete them. Not only should Measure B funds be distributed fairly, on a population basis, but the total costs of projects funded by the measure should reflect the population of the county as well.</p> <p>- We expect that Alameda CTC will comply with Title VI and Environmental Justice guidelines, provide transparency to the public and voters as to exactly what Measure B will pay for, and will listen to the voices of the public, particularly those historically least well-served by our transportation system.</p>	
			Mahsin	Abdul Salaam	<p>- Provide Project Cost Protection: The last funding measure saw project costs increase by 244% over what voters were promised...This measure must include a provision for the Independent Watchdog Committee to provide feedback on whether to continue to support projects that see their cost projections increase substantially and provide safeguards against repeated extensions of the deadlines for project funding and environmental clearance.</p>	
			John	Knox White	<p>TEP should fund the following programs: Transit (25.25%); LSR (23%) as pass-through funding to cities; Eco Student Bus Pass (9%); Paratransit (10%); Bike/Ped (8.25%); TOD (3%); Freight & Economic Development (.5%); TDM (1%) bringing the program total to 80%.</p> <p>TEP should fund the following projects: Community-based Transportation Plans - \$100M (1.3%); TOD - \$300M (3.9%); Bike/Ped Projects \$300M (3.9%); Bus System</p>	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
			Matt	Vander Sluis	Enhancement/Efficiency Projects - \$58M (.76%); BART System Enhancement/Efficiency Projects - \$294.7M (3.8%); Safety Projects - \$40M (.5%) bringing projects to a total of 20%. Do NOT fund the following: - BART to Livermore and other low benefit/high costs massive transit capital projects	
			Mary V.	King	AC Transit's Board of Directors made the following recommendations concerning the extension and augmentation of the transportation sales tax in Alameda County: 1. That not less than 70% of revenues generated under the TEP be dedicated to spending on programs (e.g. transit operations, paratransit operations, LSR allocations, Bike/Ped allocations, sustainable transportation linkages program, freight and economic development program and technology, innovation and development program), as defined in the initial Alameda CTC staff proposal. 2. Following percentage of revenue generated under the TEP be devoted to transit and paratransit: a) all transit operating (22%); AC Transit operating (portion of a) (17.3%); all paratransit (10.5%); AC Transit paratransit (portion of c) (4.5%) 3. Any revenue used to support free or reduced cost youth bus pass programs not be considered part of the transit operating program or reduce funds for transit programs or projects - instead be funded through a separate line item. 4. All transit operating funds be distributed via pass-through rather than competitive grant basis to eligible agencies, and that competitive grant funding for transit projects be included in the Sustainable Transportation and Local Land Use Linkages Program and/or the Technology Innovation and Development Program. 5. If tax revenues fall short of projections during a given fiscal year, funding amounts for projects and programs should be reduced proportionately. 6. That District High Priority Projects as established by the Regional Transit Plan and the Short Range Transit Plan are included in the TEP as high priority projects. These High Priority project are: East Bay Bus Rapid Transit; College-Broadway corridor improvements; and Grand-MacArthur BRT.	AC Transit has received the highest funding level of any transit operator representing an over 94% increase for transit operations and over 100% increase in paratransit funding. The TEP includes 16% for transit operations and meets the request of 4.5% for paratransit services. The Innovative Grants program under the Transit category is a discretionary funding source and allocation of the funds will be determined by the Alameda CTC Board. The Youth Transit pass program is an eligible expenditure under the Innovative Grants program.
		BART to Livermore	Daniel	Tet	Please accept the following comments from a Livermore resident for over 12 years: - I can not emphasize it strongly enough how important Bart is to Livermore. It will remove so many cars off the 580 freeway, make it easier for Livermore and Tracy residents to get to San Francisco and other jobs, will be good for the environment, etc... The 580 corridor is one of the most congested freeways and has become more so in the last 10 years. - We in Livermore feel like a station is owed to this town for participating and paying into the BART system for over 40 years. It is unacceptable that money has been used everywhere else to build other stations while Livermore, which is just a short skip from Pleasanton/Dublin, still waits to even decide on a plan. - Between all the confusion about routes between the city, other agencies and other funding sources or funding schemes the work of bringing BART to Livermore is not getting done. Most of the city of Livermore understands that putting BART down the 580 median or somehow parallel to the freeway by the cheapest, fastest, most efficient question is the most desirable option. - Please, I urge you, the BART board and all concerned parties who are in power to decide on how to best bring BART to Livermore to at as expeditiously as possible. We, in Livermore, are tired of discussions, delays, reviews, expenses that do not bring BART to Livermore.	Comment noted.
1, 3 & 4			Lindsay	Imai	<i>The following are specific components of the TEP language that I most appreciate:</i> 1) Clarity about how amendments are made to the TEP; 2) Clarity about reporting requirements, by project and program administrators; 3) The empowerment of the Independent Watchdog Committee to monitor and report back on use of funds; 4) The inclusion of administrative and cost caps – though, I have some questions below about what these entail; 5) A clear commitment to upholding Title VI, CEQA and, by reference, to the Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898, all which help ensure equitable social, environmental, health and economic project impacts by race and income; 6) A clear commitment to local hire and the development of local hire policies; and 7) Other critical standards of project readiness, like demonstration of funding for both project completion and project operation.	These are all included in the TEP.
1	2 & 3	Background and Summary	Lindsay	Imai	In the section entitled: WHY EXTEND AND AUGMENT THE SALES TAX MEASURE NOW? make clear what the TEP will achieve, in terms of outcomes/outputs in more specific terms. Specifically, how much of the bike/ped plan will be funded and completed via the TEP? How much new funding will AC Transit receive to restore lost service and how much of that service can we expect it to restore? To what level will the local streets and roads be maintained with this funding? To the degree possible, this should be quantified.	These are included in Chapter 2 and will be further refined in information materials developed for education around the TEP.
1	3	Background and Summary	Lindsay	Imai	A sentence reads: “Thousands of Alameda County residents participated through public workshops and facilitated small group dialogues; a website allowed for online questionnaires, access to all project information, and submittal of comments;...” I want to note that the project level info has still not been made available (this should only be reflected in the TEP language to the degree it has happened).	Project level information is on the Alameda CTC website.
3	7	Governing Board and Organizational Structure	Lindsay	Imai	The TEP says the following about the funding caps on administration and salaries: “The total cost of administration of this tax, including all rent, supplies, consulting services and other overhead costs, will not exceed 5% of the proceeds of the tax. In addition, \$XXX has been budgeted to repay a loan from the Alameda CTC for the election costs of the Measure.” I have the following questions that you may want to answer in the TEP are: 1) Does the 5% include the loan for the elections? And if the measure doesn’t pass, who pays for the election costs and from what source of funding? 2) Does the 5% include interest payments on bonding for expediting projects? If not, from what source are these payments? (I didn’t see them listed on page 13, section 21 of Chapter 4 as an eligible project cost.) And what percentage of the current Measure B currently goes to paying interest on bonds? Finally, it is my understanding that Measure B funds cannot be used by fund recipients for project administration. This seems like it could make project completion more difficult than it needs to be. I would suggest reconsidering this outright ban for guidelines that allow a small portion of the funds received to be used for project administration.	The total Alameda CTC administration has been reduced to 4% with a 1% cap on administrative staff costs. The current Measure does not have any bonds currently. If bonding occurs, those costs are borne by the capital projects, as noted on page 4-3, under item 25. Direct staff and consultant costs are eligible costs in the to administer projects and programs.
3	7	Governing Board and Organizational Structure	Lindsay	Imai	Listed Projects Only. In the beginning of Chapter 3, it states that: “Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP). Funds collected for this tax may be spent only for the purposes identified in the TEP, or as amended. Under no circumstances may the proceeds of this transportation sales tax be applied to any purpose other than for transportation improvements benefitting Alameda County.” Please explain how this important guideline relates to the draft expenditure plan for the projects in the Major Commute Corridors, Local Bridge Seismic Safety (10.4%), Highway Efficiency and Freight (8.8%) and the PDA/TOD Infrastructure Investments (3.9%), which all have a footnote that funding in this category may also be used for other similar “projects of significance.” This seems like too much wiggle room for such an enormous amount of funding - together these categories make up 23% of the total TEP funding. Given the enormous operations and maintenance deficit that our existing transportation system has, it would be prudent to shift funding freed up by those listed projects that don’t meet the critical standards set for project readiness to the programs focused on maintenance and operations, ie: Mass Transit Operations, Maintenance and Safety and Local Streets and Roads.	The statement is included to clarify that only transportation projects and programs may be paid for with the sales tax dollars. Funding for the Major Commute Corridors and TOD/PDA capital category will be allocated through the Alameda CTC Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which is a five-year document, updated every two years and will focus on project readiness and immediate allocation of funds to move projects in both categories forward for immediate benefits to the public. A provision for geographic equity will be included in the CIP process.

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
3	7 & 8	Governing Board and Organizational Structure	Lindsay	Imai	Independent Watchdog Committee. Similar to the CAWG, there should be a seat for an EJ or Civil Rights/Social Justice group, specifically one that works directly with low-income communities and communities of color. The inclusion of such an organization would help achieve the important diversity goals of the IWC, as stated on page 8 as follows: <i>"The members of the IWC are expected to provide a balance of viewpoints, geography, age, gender, ethnicity and income status, to represent the different perspectives of the residents of the county."</i> Also, thank you for renaming the committee so as to drop the word "citizen," as it is a non-inclusive term.	The structure of the CWC is under consideration, including this comment.
3	7 & 8	Governing Board and Organizational Structure	Lindsay	Imai	Independent Watchdog Committee. Also, there should be specific responsibility given to the IWC to review projects for cost-overruns, with the ability to recommend reconsideration of a project if its costs increase dramatically. (See my comments on project extensions below and also refer to the recommendation made in the Community Vision Platform on the issue of project cost overruns.)	If the TEP is approved by voters, the Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC) will receive updates on project and program progress, will review project and program expenditures and audits, and will be able to call any project or program sponsor in for a presentation to address fiduciary or TEP timeline deadlines concerns the IWC has per it's issues identification process
3	9 & 10	Governing Board and Organizational Structure	Lindsay	Imai	Updating the Expenditure Plan. "A recommendation for the adoption of an updated expenditure plan shall require a two-thirds vote of the Alameda CTC Board of Directors and shall be referred to the cities and to Alameda County to be placed on the ballot." Please explain what this means. Will the cities also need to vote to approve? At what margin?	The cities will not have to vote, but they have the ability to comment on any proposed amendment.
4	12	Implementing Guidelines	Lindsay	Imai	Project Guidelines. As part of the one-year extension reviews, the following should be considered: 1) an update of the costs and whether the project has significantly increased in cost and 2) an update on number of people served and any changes to the project benefits and any project adverse impacts (on people and the environment) since the project was first submitted. (If such considerations are already part of the review, then this should be clarified in this section.)	These are under consideration. The procedures for the one-year extensions will be developed if the TEP is passed by the voters.
4	12	Implementing Guidelines	Lindsay	Imai	Timely Use of Funds. What is reported out on their use and the overall program impact/outcome?	This is now included in the update to the current Measure B funding agreements which are expected to be approved by the Commission in December and each jurisdiction will be required to report on this through the annual program compliance reports submitted at the end of each December.
4	13	Implementing Guidelines	Lindsay	Imai	Complete Streets. We support the requirement of applying Complete Streets guidelines on the use of all LS&R funding. However, we believe the language could be strengthened from "consider all modes" to "serve all users" including pedestrians, bicyclists, cars and transit. We also would like to see the Complete Streets guidance incorporate the issue of diesel truck routing. It should seek to improve truck routing to minimize human exposure to harmful diesel pollution and the other health hazards of freight truck traffic.	The current TEP language includes consideration of all modes, which addresses all users. The Alameda CTC will begin development of a goods movement plan in 2012 which will address these issues; complete streets guidelines will also be prepared in 2012.
4	13	Implementing Guidelines	Lindsay	Imai	Conditions on PDA/TOD Infrastructure funding. Similar to Complete Streets, we'd like to see ACTC require that cities who receive PDA/TOD infrastructure funding (both Linkages program and project funds) have in place anti-displacement policies to protect existing low-income renters and residents from displacement, either direct or indirect (via market forces). These policies could include: Just Cause Eviction provisions, Rent Control, limits on condo conversions, inclusionary zoning etc.	These could be included in the TOD/PDA guidelines that Alameda CTC will begin developing in 2012.
4	13	Implementing Guidelines	Lindsay	Imai	Agency Commitments: This section currently reads "To ensure the long-term success of the TEP, all recipients of funds for capital projects will be required to show the capacity to maintain and operate any capital investment prior to receiving final approval of funding." This is great, but should be strengthened to require that, in the case of transit projects, the sponsoring agency demonstrate that the funding of the project and its operations/maintenance, does not jeopardize the maintenance or operations of the rest of that agency's transit system or that of another transit agency's system.	Agencies will need to address how the project will affect their system and their ability to sustain the project or program.
4	13	Implementing Guidelines	Lindsay	Imai	Annual Fund Programming This section currently states: "Actual revenues may, at times, be higher than expected in this plan due to changes in receipts, or lower than expected due to lower project costs and/or due to leveraging outside funds. Estimates of actual revenue will be programmed annually by the Alameda CTC during its annual budget process. Any excess revenue will be programmed in a manner that will accelerate the implementation of the projects and programs described in this plan, at the direction of the Alameda CTC Board of Directors." This should be done in an equitable manner such that the programs should receive an equal proportion (equivalent to their share of the TEP) of these additional funds.	This is currently done in an equitable manner and will be done so in the future. Any revenues beyond the anticipated projected revenues in each fiscal year are allocated according to the plan percentages.
			Jim	Townsend	We'd suggest that language be inserted allowing funding from the Gap Closure on Three Major Trails (\$264 million) to be applied to local connectors and access routes to the IHT, the Bay Trail and the East Bay Greenway, as well as the spine routes for those trails. We also think \$264 million is a LOT of money for those three projects, and that some portion of those dollars could go to maintenance instead.	This has been incorporated. The cost estimates submitted to Alameda CTC for completion of these trails is over \$400 M. Maintenance funds are included in the bike/ped discretionary program.
			Jim	Townsend	We'd also suggest that maintenance and rehabilitation of existing paved non-motorized transportation corridors be separated out from the program for regional projects. Maintaining a state of good repair for existing infrastructure does not have the same "cachet" as new projects. But funding for maintenance is critical to maintaining safety, and we'd prefer to not put decision makers (who almost always rank new projects over maintenance) in the position of making those calls.	1% of funding is dedicated to trails maintenance from the bike/ped discretionary program.
			Jim	Townsend	We have been preoccupied with moving the TIGER projects forward, and regret not having the capacity for greater involvement in this process. You're doing a great job with this effort, and we appreciate your support of walking and biking, especially our regional trails.	Comment noted.
			Scott	Raty	I went to the steering committee meeting last week, filled out a card for public comment - but I don't think it was forwarded to Mayor Green as he blew right through saying no cards from the public, and moved on to the agenda - On behalf of our Board of Directors, and approximately 800 member firms that employ more than 15,000 area residents, I wish to congratulate ACTC for doing things right these many years...you have consistently brought projects in on-time and budget, or ahead of schedule and under budget. ...we believe voters are likely to continue supporting the additional half-cent sales tax for transportation improvements when you return to the ballot next year. ...our priorities to your committee for purposes of inclusion in the plan: - Our top regional highway improvement priority is a full 4-lanes on SR 84 from I-680 to Vineyard Ave at Ruby Hill. This project is needed to provide relief to the I-580/I-680 IC, thereby reducing the number of commuters who cut through Pleasanton during peak hours. - Our top arterial improvement priority is to see El Charro Rd extended south to Stanley Blvd. Now that completion of Stoneridge Drive to El Charro Road is within sight, linking with Livermore's Jack London Blvd to the east, and Dublin's Fallon Rd and Dublin Blvd to the north, the extension of El Charro Rd will provide great circulation benefit to all three	The top priority projects are edible under the Major Commute Route corridor category.

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
			Vitaly B.	Troyan, PE	<p>First, we want to thank you for the diligent work of your staff and consultants in preparing both the draft CWTP and the draft Measure B TEP under a very challenging schedule.</p> <p>Fix what we have first Our main criticism is that the TEP doesn't adequately address the need to maintain existing infrastructure. Oakland's current need to keep our streets in their current "fair" condition is \$28M/year. We will have approx. \$5M/year available in future years. Repairing existing streets was identified as our primary funding need in all of our submittals to Alameda CTC. Repairing existing streets had been a recurring priority of your TAWG and was one of the highest needs identified in voter polls. Yet the TEP reduces the allocation to LSR from the current 22.34% to a proposed 20%, and contains similar cuts to transit. Do we really need to divert 5% of funds from LSR and from transit to new programs such as Sustainable Transportation, Technology, new ferries, etc., while our core infrastructure is crumbling?</p>	The TEP includes 30% of funding for roads. For direction subventions to local jurisdictions, there is a combined amount of 21.5% from both the TEP and the VRF funds. The new funding categories have been established to help meet the mandates of SB 375 and to address freight planning and priorities in the County.
			Vitaly B.	Troyan, PE	<p>Increase use of pass-through funding We strongly recommend increasing the program/project split to 70/30 in order to fund larger pass-through for LSR. We also believe that additional pass-through are needed for transit in order to <i>at least</i> bring back AC Transit service to 2009 levels. We believe that this would recognize the transportation needs of a maturing region in which operations and maintenance of the existing system is the single highest priority. In our preferred scenario, LSR and transit split the increase - LSR would increase to 27.5% of all funds, and Oakland would receive an additional \$3M/year in LSR funding.</p>	Please see above regarding streets and roads. AC Transit is the highest transit operator recipient in the plan for operational dollars, representing a 94% increase over the current plan.
			Vitaly B.	Troyan, PE	<p>Reduce administrative requirements and costs Pass-through funds should be used wherever possible - they minimize administrative costs. On the other hand, grant programs require municipalities to hire grant administrators to prepare applications, monitor grant conditions, report on each grant, and negotiate differences of opinion with Alameda CTC. Since many grants are unsuccessful, a large amount of this staff time is wasted. Alameda CTC has to hire staff to review, approve or disapprove and monitor grants. These activities divert scarce transportation funds to bureaucracy instead of infrastructure.</p> <p>With total sales tax income doubling, we don't understand why Alameda CTC needs to more than double funding for admin costs (from 4.5% of \$100M/year to 5% of \$200M/year). Writing bigger checks doesn't require doubling staff. A decrease to 3% would still represent 33% growth in actual funds for admin, but would save approx. \$150M over the 30 year TEP. This money could be reallocated to LSR.</p>	Administrative costs have been reduced to 4%, with administrative staff costs capped at 1%.
		Central Ave Overpass (21103)	John	Becker	List Central Ave Overpass (21103) as a potential project in the Major Commute Corridors category under the LSR mode.	This will be incorporated.
		Thornton Ave Widening (240272)	John	Becker	List Thornton Ave Widening (240272) as a potential project in the Major Commute Corridors category under the LSR mode.	This will be incorporated.
		Newark LSR (240285)	John	Becker	List Newark LSR (240285) as a potential project in the Major Commute Corridors category under the LSR mode.	This will be incorporated.
			John	Becker	Add a provision guaranteeing equity based on local government jurisdictions, not Planning Areas.	Geographic equity provisions will be included in the CIP allocation process based on planning area, and the direct subventions to jurisdictions are based on specific city population or road miles
	2 thru 16	Project H	Don	Frascinella	Project H is the Industrial <u>Parkway</u> Interchange Improvements.	STAFF IS WORKING ON RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FOR ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THIS POINT ONWARD
	2 thru 17		Don	Frascinella	Under the I-880 Corridor Investments from Oakland to Union City the description should be revised as follows: "...to the Whipple/Industrial <u>Parkway Southwest</u> interchange in Hayward and to the County Line."	
	A-3		Don	Frascinella	Under I-880 Improvements, the 3rd project should read Whipple Road/ <u>Industrial Parkway Southwest</u> interchange improvements.	
	A-3		Don	Frascinella	Under I-880 Improvements. 4th project should read I-880 <u>Industrial Parkway</u> interchange improvements.	
			Mike	Tassano	<p>It appears that the description of SR84 improvements has been changed to limit the scope of work that is envisioned. There is also a new map included that shows a gap.</p> <p>To be specific, page 43 of today's packet shows SR84 and describes improvements to be completed "at the interchange" including "widening in the vicinity". The map that is attached very clearly shows a gap between the interchange and the highlighted widening?</p> <p>Can you explain the change in language and intent? I am really concerned about this.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Ann	Pfaff-Doss	<p>BART to Livermore is a project long overdue. The continued growth in the area has made all the other Valley stations hugely successful. Livermore will be the same. Build it and they will come.</p> <p>The route has been chosen, monies have been set aside and there is an appetite in the area for supporting additional funding.</p> <p>BART to Livermore - YES.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Joanne	Moody	The Livermore BART plan must be completed and has been supported by the city since 1962. Livermore has been paying taxes for 49 years and still does not have direct BART service. What is wrong here? This project has been supported by the city and it shows significant and measurable environmental benefits. MTC is taking advantage of Livermore, basically stealing the funds. Livermore is creatively finding ways to reduce the BART costs. MTC is faking the data. They are misquoting cost estimates. We need jobs in Alameda and this BART project supports this need. Listen to the people of Livermore who have financially supported BART. Thank you for your support.	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		BART to Livermore	Loma	Naugle	<p>Please support the expansion of BART to Livermore.</p> <p>Our nation's infrastructure is in need of updating. Roads are not maintained and the number of single commuters driving to work is appalling. BART has been an asset to the local community and businesses throughout the Bay Area. Livermore freeways back up during commuter hours and I dread traveling to work using these roads.</p> <p>We are a fortunate nation where many of the citizens do not wish to pay for services. These individuals are benefiting from the sacrifices made in the past and are unwilling to support the future. I assume these people invest in their vehicles and homes—why not invest in transportation? BART is my primary transportation when going to San Francisco, the airports and visiting friends and family. Please support the expansion of BART to Livermore.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Barbara	Herron	<p>Having Bart in Livermore is of utmost importance to the people of Livermore and the Bay Area. With a major employer of around 7000 people in East Livermore, and with highway 580 so heavily trafficked, a Bart addition to Livermore makes environmental sense. In taking cars off the highway, Bart in Livermore will improve the air quality, and with the added public transportation will further add to the quality of life in Livermore. Rather than encourage more auto traffic on highway 84, it makes more sense to encourage more and better public transportation with Bart to Livermore. As a Livermore taxpayer of more than 35 years, and an Alameda tax payer of even more years, Livermore deserves to have Bart.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Alan	Burnham	<p>I am concerned that the Community Vision Platform group does not have any understanding of the transportation needs and costs for the tri-valley area. Specifically, I-580 between Pleasanton and Livermore is one of the most crowded in the bay area. Extension of BART to Livermore and upgrades to SR-84 are needed desperately. The proposed single station at Isabel is the most cost effective way to deliver on a 50-year promise to taxpayers in Livermore.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Sierra Club		<p>The Tri-Valley group of the Sierra Club supports the building of a BART extension to Livermore. Preference is for a station at Vasco Rd & Patterson Pass.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Janis	Turner	<p>I support the extension of BART to a station at Vasco Rd in Livermore.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Genoveva	Torres	<p>We really need the Bart at Livermore city, we are business people so for our work activities the BART is very important.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Doris	Arterbum	<p>I am shocked to hear that there is a possibility that the BART extension may not be coming to Livermore because of some conflicts with the County wide Transportation Plan. Livermore residents have been paying for BART long before many of the other stations in other cities were approved. Point in question...a second station in Pleasanton prior to completing the route to Livermore. The traffic on 580 is at a stand still coming into the 580/680 interchange and only promises to get worse. The completion of the Livermore extension will do a great deal to keep the cars off the freeways and people on to rapid transit where they really belong. We need to be conserving gas as well as promoting cleaner air in our communities and Livermore Valley.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Corey	Bennett	<p>I'm a strong supporter of BART to Livermore, ultimately with stations on both sides of town. I've lived in Livermore for 15 yrs and seen strong business and residential growth in the region. It needs BART expansion to reduce traffic and pollution from 580. Livermore has been paying for this for 49yr and all the others in the original 1962 plan have BART. It's time for BART to Livermore.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Raymond M.	Fischer	<p>Please go ahead with BART on I580 and not through downtown Livermore. Additional funding must come from stopping the boon doggle super rail project in California. Super rail is a super waste of funds, will operate at big deficit and only serve a small minority of the population. BART needs to circle the Bay and connect Marin, Sacramento and Solano Counties to the system.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Konstantine	Demiris	<p>I am writing to voice my support of BART to Livermore. As a citizen of Livermore, I feel it is important that BART is brought to Livermore to help reduce congestion on the freeways and provide a green alternative to driving. Also, Livermore taxpayers have paid a special tax to fund BART to Livermore. Although there may be opposition to this movement - their fears are unfounded and based upon racial bias and fears that lower income folk will flood the area reducing home values. This is simply not the case as the Lamorinda areas have BART and continue to thrive.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Niki	Demiris	<p>I am writing to voice my support of BART to Livermore. As a citizen of Livermore, I feel it is important that BART is brought to Livermore to help reduce congestion on the freeways and provide a green alternative to driving. Also, Livermore taxpayers have paid a special tax to fund BART to Livermore. Although there may be opposition to this movement - their fears are unfounded and based upon racial bias and fears that lower income folk will flood the area reducing home values. This is simply not the case as the Lamorinda areas have BART and continue to thrive.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Peter	Demiris	<p>I am writing to voice my support of BART to Livermore. As a citizen of Livermore, I feel it is important that BART is brought to Livermore to help reduce congestion on the freeways and provide a green alternative to driving. Also, Livermore taxpayers have paid a special tax to fund BART to Livermore. Although there may be opposition to this movement - their fears are unfounded and based upon racial bias and fears that lower income folk will flood the area reducing home values. This is simply not the case as the Lamorinda areas have BART and continue to thrive.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Can	Cabral	<p>I am a resident of Livermore and fully support the Bart to Livermore plan. I have been a resident of Alameda County for 50 years and have lived in Livermore for 8 years. I am a deputy district attorney in Contra Costa County and fight the traffic when travelling to and from work everyday. It is atrocious that funds have been set aside for this project for so many years; yet we are met by opposition by an organization that has grossly mischaracterized the facts of the plan.</p> <p>It is astounding that Dublin has two stations and we have none when the greatest amount of traffic is in the Livermore area due to commuters from the South Bay, East Bay and San Joaquin Valley. Thank you</p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Julia S.	Orvis, D.V.M.	<p>While I am unable to attend the Measure B3 Steering Committee meeting on December 1, I would like to submit my comments. I am a resident of Livermore and believe strongly, as do most Livermore residents, that it is time for the promised BART extension to Livermore to become a reality. Voters in Livermore have continued to support BART with tax dollars for 49 years because they have been promised that a BART extension was in the plans.</p> <p>This Phase 1 project has scored a 5.5 target score in the MTC Project Performance Assessment - placing this project in the top one third of the 76 projects scored. It also has a respectable cost to benefit ratio of 1.0. With \$400 million of Measure B3 funding and over \$100 million in bridge toll revenues, approximately 50% of the needed funding (\$1.2 billion or less) to bring a Phase 1 BART extension to Livermore will have been identified. This will make the BART to Livermore project a viable one for additional federal funding. It is important that this level of viability is recognized in the face of misinformation being offered by competing groups.</p> <p>Not only will this project reduce over 260,000 lbs/day of greenhouse gasses and over 400 billion BTUs/year of energy consumption, but it will cut over 400,000 vehicle miles and generate a significant number of much needed jobs for this region of Alameda County.</p> <p>BART to Livermore is the only extension in the 1962 BART Composite Report that has not been completed. Livermore has supported BART for decades. With BART planning to ask for additional funds from Livermore residents for operation, as well as new cars, it is time for transportation funding to be targeted to Livermore in this Phase 1 project. Please make this a priority in the projects to be funded by Measure B3. Thank you.</p>	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		Bart to Livermore Extension	John	Lawrence	<p>Dear Chair Green and members of the Alameda County Transportation Commission,</p> <p>It was very disheartening to read the November 17, 2011 letter to you from Keith Carson, Ruth Atkin and several others. Their self-serving attempt to prevent BART to Livermore is just one more in a very long string of actions to keep Alameda County's public fund expenditures from supporting residents in the less populated eastern section of the County. They obviously have no problem saddling the eastern county residents with highly congested and polluting highways that stream people into the more populated areas.</p> <p>If the people who signed the November 17th letter were actually interested in the short and long-term economic, environmental, and social vitality of Alameda County ...for ALL of Alameda County, they would recognize that the tremendous potential for improvement is in the Livermore and eastern portion of the County. The City of Livermore has done an outstanding job of planning and designing a future that will be economically, environmentally and socially successful. With an incredible scientific center, popular viticulture and entertainment venues and the soon to be upscale shopping, Livermore really does present a bright future for the County. BART to Livermore is an important part of the future.</p> <p>The BART to Livermore issue has been studied, re-studied and studied again, but the results just don't suit some people, so they want it studied some more. This approach might eventually be successful for them, but at what cost. These extra studies, delays and lost opportunities are just too big a price to keep paying just because some people didn't get their way.</p> <p>Please don't delay another day, the residents in this part of the County are very supportive of BART to Livermore and look forward to any effort that will help reduce the congestion and pollution from the highways.</p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Ron	Geren	<p>BART needs to come to Livermore via active support from ACTC and Measure B. After paying for BART for the past 49 years, Livermore residents still do not have a BART connection.</p> <p>The Community Vision Platform, which objects to a Livermore extension, has overlooked or presented erroneous information. It cites the need to focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions and Vehicle Miles Traveled. The Livermore freeway plan does precisely that, adding 20,000 new BART riders, reducing over 400,000 VMT, reducing over 260,000 lbs/day of greenhouse gases, and reducing over 400 billion BTUs per year of energy consumption.</p> <p>The Platform cites a cost of "\$4 billion for the BART to Livermore project...leaving over 85% of it unfunded". On the contrary, the cost of the Phase 1 project is about \$1.2 billion. With \$400 million from Measure B and \$100 million from bridge toll revenues slated for Livermore, the funding dollars come to nearly 50% funding, not the 85% unfunded liability cited by the Platform.</p> <p>BART to Livermore meets critical transportation, environmental, and community needs of commuters in the I-580 corridor. THE EXTENSION TO LIVERMORE NEEDS TO HAPPEN ASAP. I implore the ACTC to support the required funding in Measure B.</p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Linda Jeffery	Sailors	<p>I will not be able to come tomorrow due to a prior commitment. I would like to board to know that BART to Livermore is not only a valid project and should be builtNOW.....but it is a fairness issue. We have been continually passed over for the pet projects of others. Two BART extensions have been built outside of the original BART district, and still no progress on Livermore. Livermore is the gateway to Alameda County and I580 supports the whole county. Putting BART to Livermore will help to alleviate the I580 congestion and the bad air that it produces. The bad air doesn't just stay in Livermore. People who work in the Bay Area must use I580 because the BART alternative is not available to them. It is our turn. Approve the BART to Livermore project. re B.</p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Maureen Gandara	Swinbank, M.S.W.	<p>I believe that BART did a disservice to us by expanding into areas that were not in the original plans. I do not understand this. Our population has grown immensely and so has the traffic coming in from the Central Valley. This is also a major artery to the Central Valley cities and Interstate 5.</p> <p>The obvious traffic jams and the full parking lot the first week the Pleasanton/Dublin station opened should not have been a surprise. Why should Livermore residents have to drive to Pleasanton for BART? The Rapid is very nice as long as you can access it in a timely manner and on weekdays. I am fortunate that I can walk the mile from my house to the Rapid stop on Stanley going out of town. As the freeway has become so crowded, more and more of the Livermore population use Stanley to avoid the freeway. Pleasanton is not happy with this, but I take Stanley to Bernal, etc. to go to BART most of the time. Every time I hear of an accident on the 580 in the morning or afternoon I can see the traffic flowing through Livermore surface streets on my way to or from work. As our local tax dollars shrink for street repairs, BART would be another way to help reduce the street traffic and maybe street repairs on the major thoroughfares.</p> <p>The long way to the short answer is: I support the City of Livermore's efforts. BART is needed to support the workforce who commute and the many tourists who would like to visit our area and to support those of us who are trying to use public transit to lessen the carbon footprint. I use BART for all my personal trips to San Francisco. LARPD uses BART for many trips to San Francisco for our senior trip program. It would be easier to encourage people to use BART if there was a station in Livermore.</p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Valerie	Raymond	<p>I am writing in support of including the proposed BART to Livermore extension in the Alameda County Countywide Transportation Plan.</p> <p>An extension to Livermore is part of the original system that was promised back in the 1960's when BART was approved by voters. However, it is now the only part of the original promised system that has not been built or even started, leaving Livermore without a BART station in reasonable proximity.</p> <p>Promises are important and need to be kept. It is hard to see how the public can have faith in a system that does not honor its previous commitments. There are many worthwhile projects included in the Plan. BART to Livermore to Livermore is a competitive and worthwhile project that deserves to be one of them.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Daniel	Tet	<p>Unfortunately I can not make it tomorrow due to work commitments but will send the info to any friends. Please represent my unconditional support for Bart to Livermore and the need to ignore groups from Berkeley and other areas who have no idea what it is to be on the 580 freeway every day. I also think that the Isabel and 580 option is the best and should be pursued with most expedience.</p> <p>Thank you again.</p>	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		Bart to Livermore Extension	John	Pizer	<p>As a business professional working in the South Bay but living with my family in Livermore, it is understandably difficult for me to make these meetings in Alameda during the course of the business day.</p> <p>However, that is not so say that my desire to see BART come to Livermore is diminished. When we first moved to Livermore, I recall "BART to Livermore" was a hot issue at the time and that it extended back some 30 years. Now with 10 years in Livermore behind us, my wife, family and friends have yet to see, or been able to bring, BART to Livermore.</p> <p>For meetings in Livermore, I do always try to ensure that I am in attendance. If you have a method to help others attend these county meetings (perhaps via live feed from Livermore) I would gladly do it.</p> <p>Additionally, it seems to me that Livermore has paid its due when it comes to this expansion, it would mean the end of hundreds of thousands of carbon emissions coming from the gridlock on the 580 corridor and I question why Dublin, a city with already one BART station, was able to approve a second when the Livermore station has been on the books for more than 40 years.</p> <p>Perhaps it is time for a lawsuit. It seems that may be the only recourse for a community that has enjoyed their BART updates and expansions at the expense of others who having paying for a promise never fulfilled.</p> <p>As a still young resident of Livermore of only 37 years of age, I am sad to say I seem to be carrying on the grand Livermore pastime and tradition; bemoaning the lack of BART support for our community.</p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	James L.	Arnold	<p>As a 23 year resident of Livermore I am confounded as to how we could have paid so much in taxes over the many years and not have gotten anywhere to get BART to Livermore. I understand that these other factions are stealing our money to further their own causes and projects. But come on folks, it is time to fulfill the promise that was made many years ago and give us what we have paid into. I assume that the lobbying will continue and once more we will get the messy end of the stick. Lobbyists are masterful in using untruths to gain control of funding.</p> <p>In attending meetings I and being vocal in support of BART along 580 and not downtown I am not surprised that now this new rail block is popping up. If not now, when? The results of the lobbying efforts will soon come out and as many times before Livermore will not get the BART money, someone else will. I guess that I am becoming more cynical in my frustration about this inequity.</p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Moiz		Bart to Livermore.....we support it.	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Peter	Kachel	<p>I would really appreciate your forwarding my comments below to the meeting as I will again not be able to attend because of doctor appointments for my wife.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Why should any group or community get funding for BART that has not paid into it for 49 years like Livermore has? 2.) Why should areas outside the Bart district get services prior to those like Livermore that is in the Bart district?: 3.) Why are people using Global Warming as justification when Global Warming has never been debated or proven as a concern? 4.) Letting areas outside of the BART district, that did not pay taxes for BART, get consideration prior to those who have paid dearly for many years is criminal. 5.) If Livermore is not to get BART prior to those that haven't paid for BART, refund Livermore all taxes paid for BART with interest now! <p>Thank you.</p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Chuck	Weir	I support BART to Livermore but only if it stays within the 580 corridor. Any attempt to take it downtown, which drastically increases the price, and I will oppose it vigorously.	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Linda	Ryan	<p>I am so sorry that I can't make this meeting! I am writing this in the hope that this can be given to the BART officials in lieu of my presence.</p> <p>I think BART coming to Livermore is extremely important to our community, and I know that almost all of the people I interact with on a daily basis do as well. I spoke to hundreds and hundreds of people about BART prior to the elections while working in election booths and talking with people up and down the sidewalks in downtown, and only one person was against BART coming to Livermore, raising Richmond and San Leandro's deterioration as a main point. This seems odd to me, considering that the deterioration and crime levels in those communities was already well established, and in my direct experience, San Leandro's proximity to Oakland was the problem there. Oakland was already making its way down East 14th Street.</p> <p>I lived in Fremont when BART came to Fremont (OK, I was really young, so it probably doesn't count), my grandparents lived in San Leandro and we spent a lot of time there while BART was coming in – and I moved there afterwards, and lived in Walnut Creek when BART helped to turn Walnut Creek's downtown into a thriving center for business. BART was only a positive. It hasn't affected Orinda or Lafayette badly. You can't compare Livermore to San Leandro or Richmond. That is an argument, or fear, without basis.</p> <p>I have a hard time understanding, with our clogged freeways and huge need for mass transit, that the loud voices of a handful could outweigh the wishes of the many.</p> <p>Please bring BART to Livermore. Not only have we been paying for it for all of these years – we need it.</p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Steve	Mattos	We need to move forward with BART to Livermore. Enough time has been wasted debating this issue. Special interests that want to fund their local mass transit agencies by appropriating BART to Livermore funds are acting unethically and unfairly. Livermore has paid its fair share to keep BART running. Additional research is not needed to see why BART needs to move closer to the central valley via a Livermore station. The public is angry by the perpetual delays and misrepresentation. The "Vision" group is a special interest lobby and should be viewed as such. Refined presentations and demand letters that are drafted by Vision lawyers do not obfuscate the need to balance public input. This issue will take on a life of its own if the overall strategy is not locked and publicized in the near future. We are now at an inflection point...it is time to commit. In summary, BART to Livermore is long overdue. Thank you.	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	No Name		Your in the process of recommendations on transportation needs. I would like to see funding for an extension of BART to Livermore. It is needed to help with commuting of Livermore residents and help reduce traffic on the freeway through the valley. The residents have been paying for BART for over forty years and see no results for Livermore. It is time that Livermore is no longer ignored.	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
			Jerry	Cauthen	<p>Your new agency suffers from the chronic and continuing lack of legitimate East Bay improvement proposals. The cities and transit properties of the East Bay (with the exception of BART) simply do not very often come up with viable proposals. This has caused some East Bay cities to fall far behind their West Bay and South Bay counterparts when it comes to attracting State and federal grants. To some extent this dearth of good projects appears to have caused the ACTC to fall back on the tried and true ways of using up new money; namely, restoring lost AC Transit service, helping to launch another expensive BART extension, spreading money to the pressure groups, and acquiescing to Caltrans' single-minded commitment to indefinitely expand its system. Here are a few examples, mostly in Oakland, of what could be:</p> <p>a) The Main Line could be depressed between Oakland's Fallon Street and the UP Yard. This would help UP, Amtrak, Port of Oakland and City of Oakland. If this action were combined with other steps designed to improve the freight-rail connection between the Port of Oakland and the Central Valley, it would also ease the trucking pressures on Bay Area highways.</p> <p>b) A light rail line could extend within the medians of Telegraph and Broadway between Sather Gate and Jack London Square. Such a line would serve UC Berkeley, three major hospitals, three BART stations, Uptown, Kaiser Center, Civic Center, Old Oakland, Chinatown, Amtrak and JLS. It would also connect to 22 AC bus lines.</p> <p>c) Rationalization of AC's transbay service would lead to shorter waits, increased ridership and lower operating costs.</p> <p>d) A BART/Amtrak connecting station in West Oakland would cut the passenger rail trip time from points along the I-80 Corridor to San Francisco by 20 minutes, and the time into downtown Oakland by at least 12 minutes. Since this would likely put more riders on BART's transbay section it would make the early extension of commuter rail service across the Dumbarton Bridge all that more important. The Dumbarton Rail connection is one of the Bay Area's most critical transportation needs, and should consequently be receiving a much higher priority than it has been getting.</p> <p>e) Because of arbitrary jurisdictional boundaries, there is still no fast and efficient bus service linking points along I-680 (beginning in Martinez) to cities like Pleasanton and Livermore. This is unconscionable. The need for a regional bus service has been discussed at MTC since circa 1975....and still no action.</p> <p>f) The overflow from I-80 often turns San Pablo Boulevard into a parking lot. This has caused the so-called rapid bus service along San Pablo to fail. No steps to rectify this abysmal problem are as yet in progress.</p>	
			Jerry	Cauthen	Getting the 2/3rds majority needed to pass the measure is no shoo-in. Essential will be a fair and well-understood distribution of the sales tax revenues.	
			Jerry	Cauthen	The huge proposed BART allocation causes the measure to appear off-kilter. Livermore, population 81,000, has a few aggressive and well-placed advocates. North and northwestern San Francisco is home to at least 350,000 residents, and yet no one in these area is demanding that San Francisco County divert billions from other needed projects so he or she can have their own BART line. The low density, outlying parts of Alameda County deserve excellent bus service, but not ultra-expensive BART lines.	
			Jerry	Cauthen	You have emphasized that Measure B seeks to conform to the objectives of AB 32 and SB 375, which is good. Yet major highway expansion remains in the program. Many of us are particularly outraged by MTC's HOT lane project with its 300 lane miles of new Bay Area freeway. There is absolutely no way of meeting the objectives of AB 32 if we continue to encourage an ever greater amount of driving. Something needs to change, and if Measure B is not the vehicle for this change, what is?	
			Jerry	Cauthen	You are proposing that a substantial portion of the revenues raised by Measure B be handed to the various transit properties in the form of subsidies. This is dangerous. As a minimum your subsidies should have strings. Otherwise the money will in all likelihood be used in ways that are at variance with the objectives of the ballot measure. BART has a history of deferring its maintenance needs while it focuses on high-cost expansion projects. Providing BART with County funds earmarked for maintenance could easily lead to more such flights of BART fancy. AC Transit is problem of a different sort. What AC needs most of all is an objective outside analysis of its routes and service levels....an evaluation that in its 55 year history the District has never seen fit to undertake in a serious way. All one has to do to recognize the need for such a study is to observe the thousands of virtually empty AC buses running daily through the streets of the East Bay and across the Bay Bridge. AC needs fixing, and it will take a highly-experienced outside team to do it.	
			Jerry	Cauthen	The draft devotes only 1% to freight and economic development. This is low. There are currently too many large trucks on Bay Area highways. To ease the pressures on the highways it will be necessary to improve the freight-rail connections between the Central Valley and the Port of Oakland, and this will take investment. Measure B should provide an incentive to the freight-rail companies, Port of Oakland, shippers and affected cities to come up with a reasonable plan.	
			Jerry	Cauthen	Bicycle travel should be encouraged. However allocating 8% of Measure B to bike/pedestrian is out of all proportion to the number of bicycle trips projected and the distance traveled by bicyclists. Is this figure based on logic, or political pressure?	
			Jerry	Cauthen	The 10% allocation to paratransit also seems high. Is this figure based on logic, or political pressure?	
			Jerry	Cauthen	The draft devotes only 1% to freight and economic development. This is low. There are currently too many large trucks on Bay Area highways. To ease the pressures on the highways it will be necessary to improve the freight-rail connections between the Central Valley and the Port of Oakland, and this will take investment. Measure B should provide an incentive to the freight-rail companies, Port of Oakland, shippers and affected cities to come up with a reasonable plan.	
			Jerry	Cauthen	<p>With the exception of the items mentioned above, you and Art appear to have things moving pretty well in the right direction, and this is much appreciated. People are very worried however about what will happen to Measure B when the change proposals start flowing in from the elected politicians and public agencies with their own agendas. A ballot measure should deliver what the voters vote for. In California, that hardly ever happens....which is why so many people no longer support ballot measures of any kind. This is a huge problem in need of attention. I think we can help...if you let us.</p> <p>Needless to add, I would welcome an opportunity to discuss this with you and Art.</p>	
			Jerry	Cauthen	One other point - isn't it true that when faced with a choice, transit riders invariably chose faster, safer, more comfortable, more frequent and more reliable service over fare reduction? If so, shouldn't you be pushing for better service rather than yielding to demands for free services to youth? I have a youth...a 16 year old. Do you think his mother would let him travel on East Bay buses? Not on your life! The mothers of many of his friends adopt the same attitude. It has nothing to do with cost and everything to do with safety.	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Doug	Mann	<p>Dear Esteemed CTC Members:</p> <p>Please reconsider the timeline for any vote on Measure B3 funding. This process seems to have taken many of us in Livermore by surprise and I believe that rushing things with a December 16th vote will not be acceptable. Your outreach efforts may have seemed well executed from your point of view, but I can assure you that many of us in Livermore are shocked that things have progressed this far without being noticed by so many. Because of this issue, groups who were at each other's throats 3 weeks ago in our Council election have now joined hands like kissing cousins with a unified voice of protest. That should be evidence enough. I respectfully request that you draft the December 16th agenda to initiate expanded outreach and more Commission meetings in advance of setting a new final vote date.</p> <p>Livermore must be presented with a satisfactory outcome from this process. Success may not necessarily center upon building "BART to Livermore", but it most certainly does require full respect for Livermore's portion of sales tax we have paid over the last 49 years, as well as iron clad guarantees of a more equitably distributed share from any new sales tax measure. Such planning will require more time than December 16th will allow. If you hear nothing else, please hear this; activists in Livermore alone can see to it that this countywide measure fails at the polls, and we have proven this in the past. We will do it if necessary. I don't want this process lead to such an unproductive result.</p> <p>I believe this Commission needs better options to satisfy Livermore than those that have surfaced so far.</p> <p><i>(cont'd below)</i></p>	
		Bart to Livermore Extension	Doug	Mann	<p>There are many sincere folks with the best intentions rallying for BART. I like BART, and I don't want anyone to think I am against it. There are many other things I like that I cannot afford. To many of us, four thousand million dollars for 2 train stations in Livermore simply does not look like an appropriate use of tax dollars anymore. I believe that even one thousand million dollars for a single station cannot be justified. I don't need to belabor the issue of the BART system being inherently too expensive to design, too expensive to build and too expensive to operate. You already know about that. Let's use BART where appropriate, but not expand it any more than necessary.</p> <p>It's not hard to find better transit solutions. The amazing work done by Supervisor Haggerty brought us the ACE train. If you haven't ridden it, let me tell you it's a fabulous ride. In that spirit, there may be another new opportunity upon us.</p> <p>The south bay High Speed Rail EIR process was recently halted by the courts. HSR has real problems on a number of fronts, including funding, but it might not be doomed altogether. I suggest we should take this opportunity to beseech the Authority to consider eliminating the South Bay route all together, and replace it with a route coming from the planned highway 99 route to Sacramento, directly to Dublin along 580. This would save the Authority billions, give everyone near a BART train access to HSR, provide a pathway nearly devoid of environmental impacts, give Dublin another big city project (they always seem to like that sort of thing), and put a valuable transportation option in Livermore's neighborhood. That is how you properly leverage the BART asset; stop it, and bring smarter transportation to it.</p> <p>Another option also deserves a good strong look. Give Livermore our money back. It's the fair thing to do. This could be done over time, in exchange for the promised BART extension that we paid for but which may be impractical to actually build. For Livermore's share of any new B3 taxes, I also deem it appropriate this time to put Livermore's annual contribution in an interest bearing account under direct control of an agency we trust. We can't risk another 49 years of pain without gain. This arrangement is sometimes done with mitigation fees and other funding procedures.</p> <p>In conclusion, I know the opportunity exists to give the folks in the Near-East Bay what they want, and also make the Far-East Bay people happy. But, you'll get none of it on December 16th</p>	
Chapter 2	6	3rd Bullet	Obaid	Khan	"The Alameda to Fruitvale BART BRT..." the project that we submitted is calling it a RBS (Rapid Bus Service) and not BRT. I will leave it to you if BRT is considered same as RBS.	
Chapter 2	17	Last paragraph on Broadway/Jackson Project	Obaid	Khan	Regarding the last paragraph on Broadway/Jackson Project - please include the following to make sure that this project covers a BRT and local street improvements: <i>Adds a BRT facility from Alameda Naval Station PDA to 12 street BART with a goal to provide 15 minute headways, and improves local circulation for bicyclists and pedestrians.</i>	
Chapter 2	12		Obaid	Khan	Do you have a full list of projects that are included under the \$800 million on page 2-12 under the Major Commute Corridors..... Currently it indicates some example corridors. I am more curious about our programming request for LSR project 240187.	
			Obaid	Khan	Similarly, can we find out about the 240191 bike and ped project?	
Figure 7		Share of total new funding by Planning Area	Keith	Cooke	The graph clearly shows that the Central Planning Area does not receive its fair share of the funding. Using the Central Planning Area's County Population share at 24% would give a distribution of \$1378M or approximately \$383M in additional funds. This would be approximately an additional \$100M; an amount that would allow the City to eliminate or nearly eliminate our street pavement rehabilitation backlog.	
Figure 5		Summary of new measure funding (2013-42) - Bike/Ped, Land Use and Technology	Keith	Cooke	San Leandro staff recommends reducing the Bike and Pedestrian grant program for regional projects and trail maintenance to 1% and transferring the funds to the Local Streets and Roads (LSR) category. Maintenance cost for bicycle trails are much lower than roadways and the estimate for this item in our opinion is too high and needs verification. Since every trip starts on a local road, San Leandro contends that the needs of bicycle commuter would be better met by maintaining our local streets.	
Figure 5		Summary of new measure funding (2013-42) - Bike/Ped, Land Use and Technology	Keith	Cooke	San Leandro staff recommends that the Sustainable Transportation Linkage Program be reduced from 3% of total fund to 1% of Total Funds and the funds transferred to the LSR category. This would get the LSR program closer to its needed funding level for yearly maintenance. The San Leandro needs approximately \$6M/YR just to maintain its streets at their current PCI. San Leandro's Staff's opinion is that ACTC should try to minimize grant-oriented programs and distribute the funds to the local jurisdiction based upon their population as much as possible.	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		BART	Dan	Brenner	<p>Given that Pittsburg/Bay Point's BART line will now be extended to Antioch, in the near vicinity of the Hwy 160 bridge which has the ability to connect with Hwy 12 and Sacramento County; given while the High Speed Rail down the I-5 corridor (essentially) suffered a set back recently, though there were comments made by those in favor of it to keep banging with another game plan; given in the near future (5-10 years) a BART station at Livermore's Vasco ACE Commuter rail will be constructed, thereby allowing greater connectivity; given there is already commuter bus service from Modesto (MAX) to the Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station (I rode it in 2003 and it was very luxurious and took me to downtown Modesto where I worked on a USDA task force), how unlikely would it be to see a scenario like this:</p> <p>From what I can remember there have been mumblings and rumblings from Oakley and Brentwood (more so Brentwood, who wanted to think they were the center of the world and should have had everything coming to them for some reason or other, at least this was in the early 2000s when I was in touch more with the Contra Costa County planning scene). There are already Southern Pacific/Union Pacific Rail lines that go from Antioch to Oakley to at least Brentwood, and from Brentwood east to Stockton where the High Speed Rail would stop in Stockton, which is also a main stop on the ACE Commuter Rail. There is something similar to the southeast between Brentwood and Tracy. The High Speed Rail would probably stop in Lathrop/Manteca, whichever is closest to it.</p> <p>Why not extend BART from Antioch to Oakley and Brentwood (once the Antioch and/or Livermore stations are built, maybe even sooner if it is politically/economically feasible)? Why not extend BART initially either from Brentwood east to Stockton or southeast to Tracy (as I remember Tracy is also a stop on the ACE line as well)? Why not orient the High Speed Rail so that it connects with Stockton and/or Lathrop/Manteca and/or Modesto? (Ok maybe this doesn't make it so High Speed but still this is something to think about).</p> <p>In a more far off sense, though 160 goes over a bridge and comes into Antioch where it could be close to the Antioch BART station, 160 going northeast to Rio Vista isn't much of a connector route into Sacramento County, 160 does connect with Highway 12 and then ostensibly not radically far from Fairfield. YES its a stretch, BUT at the same time, mildly similar to Brentwood, Solano County has mumbled about a commuter rail or to make life better (read certain transit oriented newsletters). Why not have a commuter bus that would go along 12 to 160 and then connect at the Antioch BART? Or have a commuter bus route that connects 12 with 80/Amtrak/Commuter routes to Sacramento???</p> <p>The main reason I mention the "givens" is that these are credible examples (heck, throw in SMART and the San Jose BART extension, or even the West Dublin/Pleasanton extension) of getting transportation infrastructures extended to meet the needs of a growing commuter population.</p> <p>I know that a couple realities that might come about are that rail lines from the east going to the SF Bay Area core will have to run at higher efficiencies than the current lines operate (possibly fewer stops, possibly not as frequent but frequent enough departures/arrivals). There is also the bigger question to be asked which is whether any of these either proposed or existing situations might lead to further population growth/development? Sure there are a lot of vulnerable points that you can see, sure there are things that don't totally add up, but just have a little fun with me and play "Hot Wheels" (connect the tracks through some of the "hottest" areas around in more than one way).</p>	
			Omar	Benjamin	<p>Earlier this year the Port submitted the following project funding requests for the CWTP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7th Street Grade Separation and Roadway Improvement Project (22082) • Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminal (22760) • Wharf Replacement and Berth Deepening at Berths 60-63 (240317) • Shore Power for Ships at the Port of Oakland (240190) <p>The Port appreciates the recognition the TEP places in funding effective goods movement projects in the region. We are particularly pleased by the inclusion of the \$156M for the 7th Street and OHIT projects, plus \$115M for the Oakland Army Base Transportation Infrastructure Improvements project by the City of Oakland. These 3 projects will help transform the former Oakland Army Base into a world-class trade and logistics center that will create nearly 20,000 construction and construction-related near-term jobs and support tens of thousands of jobs in the long-term.</p> <p>Alameda County's TEP investment will leverage local, state, federal and private investment in the project, with \$1.39 for every TEP dollar invested.</p> <p>We strongly encourage the Alameda CTC Board to accept your staff's recommendation to fund the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$46M for the Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminal • \$110M for the 7th Street Grade Separation and Roadway Improvement Project (22082) • \$115M for Transportation Infrastructure Projects on the former Oakland Army Base <p>The Port also supports the funding devoted to the BART-Oakland International Airport Connector. This project will help reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality and provide our customers with a more convenient and efficient mode of transportation to the only commercial Airport in the East Bay. We encourage the Alameda CTC Board to continue to fund this project at the committed amount.</p> <p>While the Ports disappointed the our Shore Power for Ships and Wharf Deepening were not included in the TEP, we understand the oversubscription of funds the staff is facing. In the event additional funds are identified in the future, we are hopeful that these unfunded Port projects will receive your Commission's serious consideration and we will continue to work with Alameda CTC staff to explore these opportunities.</p>	
			Gangadhar R.	Lakamsani	<p>Country is developing. County is developing. Our future vision and goals should be very high for further progress and development. BART to LIVERMORE is very important and urgent necessity in that direction.</p>	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
			Roy	Nakadegawa, PE	<p>I believe the County does not fully consider the full potential benefits of future land development when placing transit projects on our County's future project list. The State requires the Sustainable Community Standards (SCS) on land use is integrated to transportation investments with long-term land use plans meeting GHG reduction targets. Then ARB will review the SCS, and verify whether or not that it meets the targets. Also these projects in order to receive federal and state funds, requires that the SCS supports the land use pattern identified with the project.</p> <p>By routing BART to Livermore's City Center, its future conforming to the SCS will very likely be positive and its potential benefits in urban land development is far greater than extending BART along a freeway. With LAVTA, ACE and BART, serving city center, the combined services will attract more urban development and aid in Livermore's City Center becoming an active urban center. It will have less parking due to convergence of existing transit service and its parking can be coordinated with other users as well as with car-sharing. This alternative will increase non-motorized access from existing less sprawled density and attract additional future urban infill type development. In contrast, a Station located along I-580 with less development will produce less dense development and do little towards reducing non-motorized travel and whether future development will conform to SCS is dubious.</p> <p>Therefore the BART Livermore project should be deleted until a alternative which will likely meet SCS is chosen.</p>	
Chapter 4			Don	Frascinella	<p>City of Hayward staff continues to have a significant concern over the geographic equity in the Transportation Expenditure Plan. We propose that Chapter 4 include a specific policy statement such as the following:</p> <p>"it is the intent of the plan to maintain planning area funding distribution by population and to insure that is accomplished especially as projects are developed in the areas of programmatic funding and that the Board will review the plan every five years to evaluate the funding equity by area, and, if needed, to take steps to ensure that the plan moves towards this equity".</p>	
			Jim	Pierson	<p>1) I am interested in knowing how the over \$1.2 Billion of AC Transit funding will be allocated between AC Transit District 2 (Fremont and Newark) and District 1 (everything else in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties). It is my understanding from AC Transit that there was a specific split of funding between the two Districts in the 2002 Measure legislation. My questions are:</p> <p>a) Can you tell me what the legislation says about the split between districts in the current Measure B? Or send me the legislation and I'll find it)</p> <p>b) Can you tell me how that split was determined (we currently receive about 7.4% of the Measure B funding for District 2 even though we are about 17% of the population)</p> <p>c) Has a funding split for the new Measure been established yet or one requested by AC Transit?</p> <p>As you may or may not know, Fremont and Newark have been in a battle with AC Transit since the beginning over the fact we do not receive our fair share of funding from them even though our Annexation agreement says we are supposed to. They confuse the issue by not being able to produce audited financial reports year after year. We do NOT want the distribution of Measure B funds to be left up to the AC Transit Board. Our Annexation Agreement into AC Transit says we are supposed to receive the level of service based on the proportion of revenue we generate. Therefore, we request that the Measure B funds be allocated between District 1 and 2 based upon the share of sales tax revenue each District generates.</p>	
Chapter 2	20	Page 92 of 12/8/11 TAWG packet	Jim	Pierson	<p>2) Regarding the East Bay Greenway Project, why isn't Fremont's Rails to Trails TEP Project included in this? Our project does the same thing (uses UPRR and excess BART right-of-way) to extend a bikeway from approximately the southern end of the East Bay Greenway to almost the Santa Clara County line. Plus, our project is further along. We are already in construction on a portion of this pathway between our Central Park and the future Irvington BART Station. We have commitments from BART to use their excess right of way between the Irvington BART station and Auto Mall Parkway once WSX construction is completed, and we are close to purchasing the excess right of way from UPRR between Central Park and the Niles junction, close to the southern East Bay Greenway terminus. We think the definition of the EB Greenway should be revised to include this further eastern extension. It certainly is a better project for ACTC (having it continue down to the County line) and the added costs are very small in comparison to having to buy the entire Oakland Subdivision from UPRR for the current project. ACTC could take some quick credit for this portion if it is added in.</p>	
		Page 111 of the 12/8/11 TAWG packet - page 3 of 9 of the comments	Jim	Pierson	<p>3) I noticed yesterday that the question came up from Pat Pirus about the note in the draft of the TEP about the Irvington Station money going to BART. It was explained that this note will be coming out per the Steering Committee direction. I wanted to let you know that this issue shows up in three places: 1) on page 2-8 of the expenditure plan at the bottom of the page; 2) on page A-1 of the Plan as a footnote at the bottom (plus you need to remove the \$120 M from BART in the table); and 3) in your response to Carter Mau's comment about BART Station improvement funding at the bottom of page 111 of the TAWG packet or page 3 of 9 of the comments).</p>	
Chapter 2	3	Dumbarton Rail Implementation	Jim	Pierson	<p>PRIOR COMMENTS FROM 12/2/11:</p> <p>The write up says \$120 million is for Dumbarton, but the text goes on to say in the last paragraph "the project includes \$75 M for the development of a new multimodal rail station in Union City..." I think this is confusing. It could make one believe that this \$75 million is part of the \$120 M, when I believe the \$75 M is in addition to the \$120 M and is shown separately elsewhere in the TEP.</p> <p>FYI - one concern I am starting to hear from my Council is that this \$120 M for Dumbarton Rail is misleading because it isn't really a Dumbarton Rail project, but instead it is a Union City Multimodal station and Capitol Corridor Project since the end result is likely to be Capitol Corridor trains running on the Oakland subdivision tracks with no Dumbarton Rail service across the bay. They think it should be tied to Union City Station more than Dumbarton Rail because if you were trying to advance Dumbarton Rail you would certainly start at the west end and work your way east, at least into Newark. The east end would be the last thing you would do if you want to run Dumbarton rail service. Maybe split out the additional Dumbarton bus component from the Oakland subdivision component?</p> <p>Further to the comment above, on the map on page 2-11 where it shows Phase I of the Dumbarton Rail Corridor, in reality, the only service Phase I funds is bus service across the bay and this should be shown on the Dumbarton vehicle bridge, not on the alignment over the future rail bridge that will remain unfunded.</p>	
Chapter 2	20	East Bay Greenway	Jim	Pierson	<p>PRIOR COMMENTS FROM 12/2/11:</p> <p>The map talks about the East Bay Greenway from Oakland to Fremont. How can there be a Greenway into Fremont? Doesn't the Greenway intend to use the Oakland subdivision? If so, isn't this right of way fully utilized by the Capitol Corridor trains that will run on this alignment? Doesn't the Greenway stop in Hayward where the Capitol Corridor trains would start using this space? It would be great if there is also space for a bike/ped path next to the trains tracks in Union City and Fremont.</p>	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
	A-3		Jim	Pierson	<p>PRIOR COMMENTS FROM 12/2/11: Under the I-680 improvements it only lists the Express Lane from Route 84 to Alcosta. Is there no funding for the segment between SR 237 and Route 84? I spoke to Art about this previously and I thought he said that was a typo and that it should be 237 to Alcosta.</p>	
			Paul	Matsuoka	<p>Because of the current and draft future distribution for Measure B funding and our lack of recognition as a mandated program, I believe that East County and LAVTA do not receive an equitable amount of funding for specialized transit services.</p> <p>Currently East Bay Paratransit (EBPT) receives 100% of all Mandated funds, which represent 54% of all dollars for specialized transit and 57% if the Measure B augment and extend passes in November 2012. EBPT does not serve East County except for occasional transfer trips which meet our paratransit service at the Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station. Of the 31% of funding available to Non-Mandated Programs under the augment and extend scenario, North, central and South counties receive 92% of the total dollars available in this category.</p> <p>Combining the Mandated and Non-Mandated programs under the draft Transportation Expenditure Plan, North, Central and South counties will receive fully 85% of total Measure B dollars set aside for paratransit if the augment and extend passes leaving only 3% of funds available for East County. The remaining 12% is designate for Coordination and Gap Grants. (see table in original letter at R:\CWTP 2012\Project Files\CWTP-TEP PROJECT DOCUMENTS\Contract Tasks Deliverables\9-Draft TEP\9C-Draft TEP\Comments on Prelim Draft TEP\TEP Comments\TEP_Comments_from_LAVTA_PaulMatsuoka_121211.pdf)</p> <p>North, Central and South counties are given separate guaranteed funding for their mandated program, EBPT, and individual funding for each city. East County is noticeably left out of this arrangement. LAVTA only receives funding for service in Dublin and Livermore. If these cities decided to operate their own programs like all other jurisdictions in our County, then East County's mandated operator, LAVTA, would be without County Support.</p> <p>East County is now home to over 11% of County residents over 70-years-old according to the 2010 Census. Clearly 3% of funding for specialized transit is inequitable for our service area.</p> <p>With geographic equity as one of the key hallmarks of the Measure B reauthorization, we ask the Alameda CTC to reassess the distribution of specialized transportation funding and consider assigning LAVTA a fixed percentage in recognition of our mandated program.</p>	
		BART to Livermore - a response to the <i>Community Vision Platform</i>	John	Marchand	<p>On November 17, 2011, a coalition of individuals and organization, which primarily serve Alameda County Supervisorial District 5 and Alameda County Transportation Commission Planning Area 1, submitted the Community Vision Platform ("Platform") to the Alameda CTC Commission and Steering Committee. The Platform states that the two primary projects proposed in Planning Area 4 to benefit East County, which are BART to Livermore Phase 1 and improvements to SR84, should not be funded in the proposed Measure B3 (MB3) TEP. The Platform is false and misleading in a number of key areas regarding these projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Platform falsely states the proposed TEP proposes to give \$400M to the \$4B BART to Livermore project. The TEP is only proposing funding for BART to Livermore Phase 1, which is est. to cost \$1.2B. Livermore and BART are working to find ways to reduce the cost of the project even further. - The Platform falsely states that w/MB funding, the BART to Livermore project will still be 85% unfunded. MTC has programmed over \$100M to this project, and with the proposed MB3, Phase 1 will be nearly 50% funded and potentially more if we are successful in reducing costs. A 50% local funding committeemen will go a long way to leverage additional state and federal funding. - The Platform falsely states that BART to Livermore has one of the lowest project ratings by MTC, the 13th worse. The project, in fact, scores in the top third of all projects analyzed for MTC's overall targets score, and its cost benefit ratio is 1.19, not the 0.4 represented in the Platform. MTC ranked BART to Livermore Phase 1 cost benefit ratio slightly higher than AC Transit Service Frequency Improvement, a project supported by the Platform. - The Platform falsely states that the Alameda CTC phone survey respondents found the BART to Livermore project to be one of low importance. In fact, the most recent poll rated it the highest of all projects and programs in the East County, and 4th highest rated countywide. <p>Stripping East County of these important projects is inconsistent with their stated goals of meeting state and regional climate change targets; improving mobility and health for all communities and achieving geographic equity. A BART to Livermore extension has been shown to have significant reduction in vehicle miles travelled throughout the entire BART District and the Livermore Extension Phase 1 would generate over 20,000 new BART riders per day, resulting in a significant mode shift, reducing GHG emissions, air pollutants and energy usage.</p> <p>The TEP has elements that benefit all areas of the County. I urge the Steering Committee recommend the proposed TEP to the full Commission.</p>	
			Jon	Spangler	<p>I strongly support the recommendations and positions of Transform, the Greenbelt Alliance, the EBBC, Alameda Transit Advocates and others who have presented environmentally and economically sustainable alternatives to the TEP and CWTP recommendations.</p> <p>I am concerned that the first draft of the TEP and CWTP has been tainted by behind-the-scenes lobbying. Pro-construction lobbyists seem to have influenced the Alameda CTC to abandon clearly-expressed public input and voter priorities favoring restoration of transit service and local roadways countywide, as well as other sustainable initiatives in order to recommend costly projects with predictable budget overruns and very limited public benefits.</p> <p>Alameda CTC's lack of transparency (unwillingness to release agency emails and draft TEP and CWTP recommendations - all public documents under the CA Public Records Act and court precedents) points to the possibility that individuals and organizations have improperly lobbied behind the scenes for capital projects over more sustainable and affordable transportation solutions. This is the reluctant conclusion I reach when many expensive and overrun-prone projects are emphasized at the expense of maintaining our existing infrastructure and restoring our regional transit system, contrary to the expressed desires of Alameda County voters like myself.</p> <p>In these economically uncertain times, we cannot afford to undertake capital-intensive projects without first restoring the transportation infrastructure that we already have. Big projects like BART to Livermore are quite likely to exceed estimated costs by up to 244%.</p>	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		BART to Livermore	Barbara	Herron	<p>m not able to attend the Alameda CTC Board Retreat this Friday, so am writing with my feedback/input.</p> <p>As a citizen of Livermore since 1980, and a citizen of Alameda County since 1966, I've been paying taxes to support BART since the inception of BART. For this entire time, we've been promised that BART will be extended to Livermore. It is past time to make that a reality, and this project deserves prompt attention and funding.</p> <p>The 580 freeway has become a congested mess in the tri-valley area, and bringing BART to Livermore will aid that mess by providing much needed public transportation. It will also improve the poor air quality in Livermore and Alameda County by providing more public transportation so we will have fewer cars on the over-used freeway.</p> <p>I believe since Alameda County has been paying taxes for BART since BART's inception, with the promise of BART to Livermore, that this project should be a first priority for Alameda County and BART, and should continue to be a major part of the new Alameda County Measure B Sales Tax Program and any other supported areas where money is available for county-wide transportation (Measure B3 and Transportation Expenditure Plan, TEP).</p> <p>I'm begging you to please, make BART to Livermore a priority and fund it from whatever monies are available. Thank you.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Joanne	Moody	We need BART to come to Livermore. I have lived here since 1981, paying taxes to support BART. It is needed to reduce traffic and pollution. Please support us as we have supported BART.	
		BART to Livermore	Donna	Lee	<p>Regarding the latest version of the TEP Project List:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could BART be specifically mentioned as an eligible recipient of PDA/TOD funds. • Could BART or Transit be clearly identified as an eligible recipient for one of the categories of Bike/Ped. (It is not clear that Transit is an eligible recipient). • Could the location of the Bay Fair Project be located correctly on the map (it is currently showing location at the San Leandro BART Station, not the Bay Fair Station) 	
			Dianne	Shaw	<p>The plan should be more focused on shoring up our existing transportation system and investing only in projects that increase the mobility options which encourage alternatives to driving. The existing plan has about 60% focused on programs and I believe it should be closer to 80% with the remaining funding focused on projects that encourage alternatives to driving. I believe that there is a misconception about what programs vs. projects really mean and that a lot of people including the union people think that projects are the only thing that creates jobs. There are many significant job opportunities within the program area which also include "projects" of their own and this is something that needs to be communicated so that the voters are also aware of this.</p> <p>We need to decrease VMT and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and this plan does not do enough of that. Several of the projects are increasing VMT's and putting more money into new and expanded roadways that should not be part of this plan. It is estimated that almost 30% of the transportation in Alameda County is pass through traffic. I do not believe we've put enough emphasis on identifying transit initiatives on a regional perspective and not just within the county. We still seem to be focused on initiatives that allow these regional travelers to get through our county faster with cars which could raise our VMT's even more. Somehow there needs to be more of a regional perspective included in this plan and something that supports our residents in getting their regional transit needs met as well. Being a long term plan, we cannot afford to wait for the next plan to start to decrease VMT's and make our emission goals.</p>	
			Matt	Williams	I was told that at the last Steering Committee there was a remark that the Sierra Club was supportive of reauthorizing Measure B at next year's general election. The Sierra Club has not reached a decision on whether to support the proposed extension and augmentation. My goal is to provide you with more information within the next several weeks.	
		BART	Thomas	Blalock, PE	<p>I would like to see BART as a recipient under the Operations Maintenance & Safety Program. I recommend that BART receive 6% of the total new 1/2-cent funding, which equates to roughly \$467M in Operations, Maintenance & Safety Program funds. This does not disrupt the flow of the existing 1/2-cent to AC Transit and other transit agencies.</p> <p>BART is the Bay Area's largest transit agency averaging weekday ridership of 370,000 passenger trips, with Alameda County accounting for roughly 40% of this total ridership - 148,000 passengers, and growing. BART is also one of the greenest forms of transportation in the Bay Area, emitting no GHGs. Alameda County has provided increases to other transit programs, but has not helped BART to meet its maintenance shortfalls. Measure B3 will be the only guaranteed funding source in Alameda County for the foreseeable future, and BART should receive a portion of this funding stream. With the current proposed increases in Operations, Maintenance & Safety Program funding, new funding to AC Transit is a 94% increase over the current Measure B. BART doesn't receive any operations funds from the existing 1/2-cent Measure B.</p> <p>The demands of multiple future extensions (e.g. Warm Springs, Oakland Airport Connector and the proposed Livermore stations) will place a serious drain on BART operating funds with the potential to erode BART's 96% on-time performance, which makes it the most reliable transportation alternative in the Bay Area. Designated Program funds could help to offset the potential fare box erosion as the new BART extensions come on line.</p> <p>We want to keep BART affordable, and we want to restore service that we have been forced to cut. BART's fleet of rail cars is one of the oldest in the nation and needs replacement if BART is to continue to provide reliable service to Alameda County. In contract, within the last 8 years, AC Transit has retired its fleet, replacing it with new European-styled buses. Rail car replacement is a high priority for BART riders (base on recent BART poll).</p> <p>Contra Costa and San Francisco counties are watching Alameda County to see how Alameda handles BART needs, including the need for rail car funding. If BART is successful in securing Operating Funds through Measure B3, this could help us work with San Francisco and Contra Costa counties to discuss strategies for all 3 counties to contribute to the shared BART maintenance and operations programs, including rail replacement.</p> <p>Important to note - BART will not receive any significant allocations from the County VRF funding. Although a small funding source, it is a constant stream being allocated to other agencies.</p> <p>We respectfully request that BART be allocated 67% of the Mass Transit Operations, Maintenance & Safety Program funds - roughly \$476M in pass-through funding over 30 years. BART requests flexibility in use of these funds to allow for operations and maintenance costs, as well as much needed maintenance and replacement of capital needs, such as rail car replacement.</p> <p>BART is the region's transportation backbone and in serious need of reinvestment. Like the dentists say, "Ignore your teeth and they'll go away!"</p>	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
			Tom	Bates	To date I have not had an opportunity to review the details of the TEP, however, I want to share my thoughts on the principles that I believe must be considered in any new sales tax proposal: 1) Fairness in allocating funds in both the CWTP and any new sales tax proposal -this means that funding be allocated by proportionate share to the 4 geographic sub-regions: North, Central, South and East as it has been done in the current Measure B. 2) Transparency to enable residents to see how funds are allocated - there should also be an annual accounting showing where funds have been allocated. 3) A "Fix It First" policy focusing on reducing GHG emissions by restoring transit service, its infrastructure and capital replacement needs, prior to any new projects being constructed. 4) GHG Emissions Reductions - all new capital projects must substantially reduce GHG emissions and be consistent with the SCSs and PDAs. 5) The Civil Rights Act of 1964 - both the CWTP and TEP must comply with Federal Title VI requirements.	
		Comment on the 1st draft of the TEP	Nick	Pilch	Albany Strollers and Rollers (AS&R) is a local non-motorized transportation advocacy and service group with approximately 400 member households. After reviewing the draft TEP, AS&R requests increasing the cycling and walking set aside and the portion of that set aside for the North Planning area. The draft TEP proposes 8% for cycling and walking programs and projects. San Francisco's 2003 Measure K set aside 9%. Marin's 2004 Measure A set aside about 10%. The Alameda County existing conditions report shows that 13% of the trips in the County were completed by cycling or walking in 2000, and notes that data from the US Census indicate this mode share has since increased. This information, along with the need for reducing climate change and improving public health, argue for more funding for cycling and walking. Consequently, AS&R supports the Community Vision Platform and its request for a 12% set aside. The existing conditions report relays that 63% of walking and 75% of cycling trips occurred in the North County planning area in 2000. Due to its population density, this area also has the highest potential for increased cycling and walking at the best cost-benefit. Yet only a third or less of the specified cycling and walking project expenditures is in the North Planning area. The majority of the unfunded East Bay Greenway and all the significant unfunded Bay Trail gaps are outside this planning area, as are the Iron Horse Trail gaps. So the current proposal would result in a North area share even less than its 41% population share, and even less relative to its cycling and walking share. This does not make sense. AS&R requests dedication of 55% of cycling and walking funding to the North area. Without significant progress on these requests, AS&R will be hard pressed to support the measure. Thank you for your consideration.	
		BART to Livermore	Julie	Garcia	We have paid taxes for over 40 years and it is essential that BART stations are built in Livermore. We have the top traffic congestion due to folks traveling from Mountain House and other areas. An initial station at Isabel or Greenville Road will reduce some of this air pollution. A BART station in Livermore will be over utilized the first day it is built. I see so much traffic each day on my way to work. I would use BART if it were in Livermore. It takes me longer to drive to Pleasanton than from Pleasanton to San Leandro. A station in Livermore is long overdue and will be such a gift to all of the residents of the Tri-Valley. It is a must to built stations in Livermore and will contribute to reducing air pollution, traffic and enhancing the Bay Area. Julie & Andy Garcia.	
		BART to Livermore	Vamsee	Lakamsani	I'm a Livermore home owner writing to express my strong support for including BART to Livermore on the TEP for Measure B3 on the 11/2012 ballot. If it is not on the ballot I won't [vote] for the sales tax increase or extension.	
		BART to Livermore	Susan	Contreras	When BART was first being built, Livermore residents began to pay tax to support the system. At that time, Livermore residents were promised BART service. They continue to pay, with no service. Livermore residents have been ripped off and it looks like people are still trying to justify taking money from the East county to fund Bart and not give service to Livermore. Bring BART to Livermore on 580. Promises should be kept to the East County which is still paying more than its fair share of taxes to support a system which has defrauded the East County residents.	
		BART to Livermore	Rena	Leibovitch	Commuters, tourists, residents, business and social visitors need public transportation at least as far as Livermore. Major cities and governments throughout the world consider this a priority and we should also. We are lucky and thankful that the basic structure was developed for the Bay Area, but it needs to be expanded to include us all.	
			John	Know White	On November 17, 2011, we presented the Board with a Community Vision Platform ("Platform") to serve as a roadmap for this new measure. We appreciate the Alameda CTC Measure B Reauthorization Steering Committee for establishing an ad-hoc negotiating team to work with us to integrate this platform into the sales tax measure. Since the ad-hoc team is not scheduled to meet with us until January 3rd, we strongly encourage the Board to not vote on the draft TEP at the Dec. 16 Board Retreat. To vote before the ad-hoc negotiating team has convened would not represent a good faith effort to address the concerns raised by the non-profit community and would undermine opportunities for consensus, thus endangering Alameda CTC's ability to secure sufficient voter support for a ballot measure in November 2012. Instead, the Board should request that Alameda CTC staff provide several alternative packages for consideration at the retreat and use the retreat to compare how these alternative would affect Alameda County. Comparison of alternatives should focus on how well they achieve the outcomes delineated in the Measure B Reauthorization Vision Statement and the Community Vision Platform, and how well they meet the priorities expressed by the public over the last year of public outreach. (e.g. the technical analysis of the draft CWTP show that implementation of the plan would not perceptibly reduce GHG emissions. An Alternative TEP should be provided to the Board that significantly reduces GHG emissions to help meet California's climate change laws and fulfill local GHG emission reduction pledges.) The Board and the public deserve the opportunity to consider the trade-offs presented by alternative funding approaches. This is your chance to secure the information needed to make an informed choice. We look forward to working with the Alameda CTC Board, staff and ad-hoc negotiating team to develop a measure that puts alameda County on the right path.	
			Dave	Campbell		
			Michele	Jordan		
			Mahasin	Abdul Salaam		
			Matt	Vander Sluis		
			Manolo	Gonzalez-Estay		
			Lindsay	Imai		

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
			Joni	Pattillo	Dublin City Council at its regularly held meeting on December 6, 2011, reviewed the draft list of projects and programs contained in the first Draft TEP and unanimously supports the projects and programs included for funding under the Plan...there is no better time to extend and augment the existing 1/2-cent sales tax for transportation purposes. The City Council felt that the proposed TEP strikes a balance among investments for each mode of transportation, with a majority of the funds (45%) directly benefiting our transit systems... The Plan not only helps to address existing deficiencies but also looks to the future...it provide[s] significant funding for all users of the transportation system, which would be distributed equitably. With a need for 2/3 voter approval, equity is paramount. I would like to recognize you and your staff for all of the hard work that has gone into the preparation of a TEP for the proposed November 2012 ballot measure.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	Item #21 in the Implementing Guidelines (IG) and the footnotes for Appendix A of the TEP indicate that the CIP "will include provisions for geographic equity." This should be changed to "guarantees."	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	Please provide a list of projects that are considered to be "multi-area" or "countywide" in the TEP, and for what amounts.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	Please provide a more thorough explanation than was given at the joint CAWG-TAWG meeting for the projected decrease in BART ridership in the Tier 2/Vision scenario, after such massive capital investment. Potential AC Transit ridership increases have no discernible impact on presumed benefits from a BART extension in East County. And how does this square with the language on page 1-1 that "The expenditure plan funds critical improvements to the county's transit network, including ... expanding the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system within Alameda County to move more people on transit."?	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	The overall GHG reductions shown in the modeling results for the CWTP are, at best, pitiful. They cannot justify the massive capital investments for such little positive result. Some robust alternatives need to be examined (beyond the CVP proposal).	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	The proposed projects of an Alameda to Fruitvale BRT-or-Rapid (still inconsistently labeled), plus a Broadway Streetcar are unacceptable without identification of sources and amounts of adequate operating funds. In no way should they be allowed to detract from AC Transit's funding or operations.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	National Sierra Club policy opposes any new freeway lanes. Although the projects that cause this result are relatively few in the TEP, this will make it difficult to obtain support for the measure.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	Please provide assurances that the proposed Dumbarton Rail project and its related proposed TOD/PDA will not impinge upon, or interfere with expansion plans for, the Don Edwards Wildlife Refuge.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	The "bike/ped" category should contain protections and guaranteed levels of investment in pedestrian-oriented projects and facilities. Pedestrian and disability interests are a numerous and diverse population who deserve at least equitable treatment with those who have a professional single-issue advocate. And remember, that this may also include several civil rights issues, so please be careful. Also, in several places, pedestrian travel is referred to as being "on foot." Other phrasing, more disability-aware, should be considered.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	References to social equity reviews and civil rights (e.g., IG #16) should not be limited to, or constrained by, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Projects funded in whole or part by local and/or state funds are also subject to compliance under Government Code 11135. Environmental Justice is also an important consideration.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	In addition to improved cost-effectiveness reviews, city-based paratransit programs must be required to comply with all civil rights requirements including those based on racial and ethnicity non-discrimination, availability to low-income persons, and ADA. Any taxi-based programs must have an equivalent accessibility component.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	Item #22(Fund Allocations) indicates that if a project "becomes unfeasible or unfundable," its funding will remain "within" its category for reallocation. The large category of Transit has several subcategories. What firewalls are anticipated (or not) should such an event occur – e.g. could "Regional Rail" funding be transferred to BART or Bus, or only within the original "sub-group"?	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	The term "jurisdiction" appears to be generally used to refer to cities and the County, although it is also used with regard to transit operations funding in IG #14. Therefore, with regard to the TEP "update" procedure, it should be clarified that the transit agencies will be included in the opportunity for "review and comment." Similarly, the term "jurisdictions" is used regarding the 2% "regional" grant funds under bike/ped. Please clarify that these funds can be eligible to transit agencies for pedestrian and/or bike access improvements to transit, where desirable.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	Item #9 Regarding the update procedure in IG #9, the Plan Update Advisory Committee references representation by "residents and businesses." It would be helpful to also include "community organizations."	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	What new operations costs are expected to be associated with the "Bayfair Connector" project? Does BART plan to add a new "line" directly connecting Planning Areas 3 and 4 to take advantage of this investment? Will any existing service be reduced or otherwise changed as a result of the project implementation?	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	What cost projections has BART provided (both per passenger and per new rider) for the Livermore extension? Please clarify each with regard to both Phase 1 and Phase 2.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	It has been stated verbally that funding from the category of "Specialized Transportation" for Seniors and People with Disabilities can be used for accessibility improvements to fixed-route transit. Please confirm.	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	Item #17 - The language regarding "Complete Streets " (IG #17) continues to improve. Thank you. Just one more suggestion – how about substituting "provide for" rather than "consider"? This is the approach that Caltrans uses in DD64-r1. So, the proposed language could then read: It is the policy of the Alameda CTC that all transportation investments shall consider <i>provide for</i> the needs of all modes and all users. All investments will conform to Complete Streets requirements and Alameda County guidelines to ensure that all modes and all users are considered-in-provided safety, access, and mobility from the expenditure of funds. This would be more proactive as well as taking into account State policy, and helps to avoid some of the freight-route concerns previously discussed. And, as previously mentioned, the broad use and applicability of this policy benefits all users and modes, and can help with cost controls for ADA-mandated paratransit.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	Projects in the Streets & Roads category, including local pass-through to jurisdictions, should require a priority, perhaps even an incentive, for routes that are served by transit and perhaps also those that are legally used by freight.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	Item #13 references one-year time extensions for projects that exceed the seven-year norm. These should be limited to no more than 2 such extensions.	
		Implementing Guidelines	Pat	Piras	Continue to support full implementation of the Student Bus Pass program as originally proposed. It will be important to ensure that costs attributed to each transit system are reasonable and equitable. Please ensure that the "stakeholder" group for design, implementation, and oversight includes groups such as the Sierra Club and the League of Women Voters who have been long-time supporters of this important project to shape behavior and reduce GHGs.	
		BART to Livermore	Roy	Nakadegawa, PE	I was the one who estimated the cost per trip of the Livermore Extension would be \$35 per trip. I based this cost using the PEIR Preferred Alternative that was a subway from I-80 to Livermore's Downtown. Its estimated construction cost was around \$3.4 Billion and I also added its Operating cost. When comparing alternatives, most people only consider operation cost's to its ridership, however one needs to consider not only this cost but, the Capital Cost as well and importantly, they should consider how BART will attract riders without adding auto access by its future land development. The Livermore Downtown Alternative will accomplish this to a greater degree far more than the I-580 Alternative because it has greater potential of attracting mixed use urban high density. It is true that the construction costs for the Livermore I-80 Alternative will be far less because most of the line will be at grade and the R/W cost will be far less. However, the claim as being cost neutral must be based only on its Operating Costs. To determine its overall cost, one should include its Capital Cost as well. Therefore, by including its construction cost I will question whether the I-580 Alternative would be revenue neutral. To my knowledge of over 32 years involved as a Transit Board Member, there is no Transit System in the US which I am aware of that operates revenue neutral. They all require operational subsidies. Even most Foreign Countries' urban heavy rail systems require some operational subsidies. For BART its highest fare recovery is around 60% and most of the required subsidy is paid for from the half-cent sales tax that the three counties pay. Where will be added subsidy for the Livermore Extension come from? In addition, BART needs to consider the effect of the Livermore Extension's additional riders will have to its present operation. BART currently is operating at near capacity where there are standees riding to/from SF. In addition, BART is facing the need to replace the cars and rehab of the system, which I believe is estimated to cost around \$7 Billion! And BART is even considering a second tube across the bay to accommodate the growing ridership but where will all this cost come from? There is another point we need to be concerned with, Climate Change and the need to reduce the use of automobile because they are producing ~ 40% of GHG in our region. The I-80 Extension stations will require 4,000+ parking spaces to generate its ridership making it a definitely an auto oriented station. How will this Alternative meet the Sustainable Community Standards? The State requires the SCS on land use be integrated to transportation investments with long-term land use plans which meet GHG reduction targets. ARB will then review the SCS, and verify whether or not that it meets the targets. Also these projects in order to receive federal and state funds, requires that its SCS supports the land use pattern that will reduce GHG. <i>(continued below)</i>	
		BART to Livermore	Roy	Nakadegawa, PE	For example; existing BART Stations located along freeways over the years have shown the lack of any decent non-motorized access development such as Transit Oriented Developments as evidenced with existing BART Stations; Pittsburg/Bay Point, and Dublin/Pleasanton but they still have large parking demands. In contrast, BART stations; Daly City, Union City, Fremont, Hayward, Fruitvale and Richmond all have developed extensive dense urban development around and near these stations, that have promoted BART use without the use of the auto. Also, extending BART along I-580 may foster a future BART extension which a politician can promote by encouraging the public support, as was the case with the S.J. BART Extension. S.J. BART has a Benefit/Cost ratio of a low \$5 to \$1, where MTC considers a project with a Benefit/Cost of \$7 to \$1 and higher a worthy project. This Extension did not arise through a rational regional planning process but evolved from the passage by voters. In addition, S.J. realizing this Extension will require an additional operating subsidy, they have already voted and passed an additional sales tax subsidy. Where will Livermore Extension generate its additional needed subsidy? The Benefit/Cost ratio of the Livermore Extension is \$1 to \$1, which is in the lowest category along with several other projects. MTC's highest rated project at \$60 to \$1 is BART's plan to run express trains and more trains that are frequent. In Summary, the City Center BART alternate has the potential to meet the SCS and reduce GHG far more than the I-80 Alternative which could actually even increase GHG emissions by attracting low density sprawl type developments.	
		BART to Livermore	No Name		I am a Fifty plus year resident of Livermore and in favor of BART coming to Livermore. However it NEEDS TO STAY ON I-580 !!! Please support the efforts of funding to bring BART to Livermore and STAY ON I-580 !	

TEP Comments

Chapter/ Figure	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Comment	Response
		BART to Livermore	Maxine	Brookner	<p>I am sorry that I cannot attend the meeting that will discuss BART to Livermore. The people of this area have paid taxes for more than 40 years to have BART come to this area. Every time I turn around there is some reason being brought up on why it cannot come here. My tax dollars are as important as anyone else's and I deserve the benefit of those tax dollars.</p> <p>All studies indicate that there will be no revenue impact to BART for the operating expenses of the Livermore extension. Additionally the extension provides a vital link to hooking up the Bay Area and the central Valley so that we are less auto dependent.</p> <p>BART should come to Livermore on 580.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Julia S.	Stephens Orvis, D.V.M.	<p>I am writing in support of making the BART to Livermore Phase I project a high priority as you move forward with recommended projects to be funded. I-580 thru this valley is one of the most congested routes in the are - tonight is a no burn night due to pollution. You need to give local freeway commuters another option that will improve the local air quality. You need to make good on the plan to bring BART to Livermore after the local population has supported BART taxes for decades - especially considering that BART will be coming back to Livermore citizens to ask for extended taxes as well as additional funds for newer cars. Please do the right thing and help make the BART to Livermore Phase 1 project a reality. Thank you.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Penrose C.	Albright, Lawrence Livermore Labs	<p>I am writing to request your support for funding the extension of BART to the City of Livermore.</p> <p>At Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) we have begun the development of a new 100-acre "open campus"...that will create new jobs and enhance U.S. economic competitiveness. BART to Livermore is vitally important to making our future plans a success not only for the Lab, but also for the East Bay region and the nation.</p> <p>We are currently in negotiations to partner with several Fortune 100 companies and concerns pertaining to the lack of BART access are expected to affect their decision-making. LLNL is already a major employer of more than 6,500 personnel, many of whom could benefit from and extension of BART to Livermore. We hope the Commission will work to ensure that funding for a future BART station is a part of Measure B.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Luis	Freitas	<p>I want to thank each of you and Alameda CTC staff for all of the work to date on the Countywide Transportation Plan and on the Transportation Expenditure Plan for the proposed extension and augmentation of Measure B. Development of these plans is a very complicated process subject to a wide variety of interests and a tremendous amount of work has been completed in a short period of time.</p> <p>The City of Newark remains very concerned regarding the proposed allocation of funding to local jurisdictions in both the TEP and CWTP. A minimum equity guarantee is critical to strengthen support from policy makers and the voters. Therefore, the plans should include the following provisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For the TEP, geographic equity for all funds distributed through the Local Streets & Roads, Bicycle & Pedestrian, and Sustainable Land Use & Transportation modes shall be guaranteed for each jurisdiction at not less than 75% of its per capita share. 2. For the CWTP, geographic equity for proposed funding for Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects needs to be guaranteed for each jurisdiction at not less than 75% of its per capita share. <p>I strongly encourage Alameda CTC staff to continue to work with local jurisdictions to resolve remaining concerns regarding the equitable distribution of funding.</p>	
		BART to Livermore	Andrew	McIlroy, PhD, Sandia Labs	<p>I am writing to express support for the extension of BART to the City of Livermore. Livermore is home to two of the leading economic drivers in science and technology in the East Bay - Sandia and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory - working to expand and create the Livermore Valley "open campus" which has improved Sandia's ability to collaborate on R&D in science, technology and engineering. In particular, Sandia has been successful in pursuing relationships to bring partners from the East Bay, san Francisco, the Silicon Valley and beyond to the Tri-Valley area for collaborations in cybersecurity, biological sciences, energy research and climate change.</p> <p>BART to Livermore will provide a strong transportation backbone to support the development of these partnerships. In addition, a BART extension will help Sandia reach its goal of reducing vehicle miles traveled for visitors and our 1,000-person workforce.</p> <p>Thank you, Mayor Green, for your dedicated work as chairman of the Alameda CTC.</p>	