

Comments from CAWG/TAWG Joint Meeting Held on November 10, 2011

Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Commenter Organization	Date	Comment
Transit & Specialized Transit	Jeff	Flynn	LAVTA	11/14/2011	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.
Transit & Specialized Transit	Jeff	Flynn	LAVTA	11/14/2011	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 & Specialized Transit	Jeff	Flynn	LAVTA	11/14/2011	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.
N/A	Jeff	Flynn	LAVTA	11/14/2011	Is there language in the TEP that states that the allocation formulas will be reassessed on a periodic basis such as with the Census?
N/A	Bruce	Williams	Oakland PWA	11/14/2011	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?).
N/A	Bruce	Williams	Oakland PWA	11/14/2011	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.
Local Streets & Roads	Bruce	Williams	City of Oakland	11/14/2011	<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 throughs - 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.
Highways & Freight	Bruce	Williams	City of Oakland	11/14/2011	I-880 Improvements: Local Access and Safety Improvements – Is it determined how much of the \$85 million is devoted to Oakland projects?
Highways & Freight	Bruce	Williams	City of Oakland	11/14/2011	Freight and Economic Development – What are the assumptions about how this funding will be used? Would improvement of truck routes be an allowed use?
Bicycle and Pedestrian	Bruce	Williams	Oakland PWA	11/14/2011	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.
Sustainable Land Use & Transportation	Bruce	Williams	Oakland PWA	11/14/2011	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.
Sustainable Land Use & Transportation	Bruce	Williams	Oakland PWA	11/14/2011	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?
N/A	Bruce	Williams	Oakland PWA	11/14/2011	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.
Fulfilling the Promise to Voters, paragraph 2.	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	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...."

Comments from CAWG/TAWG Joint Meeting Held on November 10, 2011

Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Commenter Organization	Date	Comment
Governing Board, last paragraph	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	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%.
Plan Updates, paragraph 1	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	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.
Responsibility of Fund Recipients, paragraph 1	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	There is no mention of recipients signing a Master Funding Agreement. Recommendation : Include a requirement that recipients sign a Master Funding Agreement.
Administration of the Plan, bullet No. 3	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	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.
Administration of the Plan, bullet No. 5	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	I am unclear on how this will be enforced. Recommendation : Explain enforcement of this bullet item.
Plan Update Process, bullet No. 6	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	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.
Plan Update Process, bullet No. 6	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	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.
Taxpayer Safeguards and Audits, bullet No. 14	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	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.
Restrictions on Funds, bullet No. 15	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	I am unclear on how this will be enforced. Recommendation : Explain enforcement of this bullet item.
Restrictions on Funds, bullet No. 18	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	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.
Restrictions on Funds, bullet No. 19	Jo Ann	Lew	CAWG	11/14/2011	Is the policy a requirement? Recommendation : Change "will develop a policy" to "shall develop a policy."
N/A	Keith	Carson	Alameda County Supervisor, District 5	11/14/2011	<p><i>The eight people who submitted the letter requested the following TEP process improvements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - 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.
N/A	Dave	Campbell	EBBC	11/14/2011	
N/A	Manolo	Gonzalez-Estay	TransForm	11/14/2011	
N/A	Lindsay	Imai	Urban Habitat	11/14/2011	
N/A	Michele	Jordan	Genesis	11/14/2011	
N/A	Bette	Ingraham	Genesis	11/14/2011	
N/A	John	Knox White	TransForm	11/14/2011	
N/A	Matt	Vander Sluis	Greenbelt Alliance	11/14/2011	

Comments from CAWG/TAWG Joint Meeting Held on November 10, 2011

Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Commenter Organization	Date	Comment
	Pat	Piras		11/16/2011	What is the “logic pattern” for the project numbering? I can’t figure it out.
“Bayfair Connector” (Project #240180)	Pat	Piras		11/16/2011	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. Since this is included in the CWTP under “Vision projects”, on what basis is it included in the draft TEP? Also, what is the current estimate of the number of homes to be displaced by the project, and where are they located?
Alameda to Fruitvale BRT	Pat	Piras		11/16/2011	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 12 th Street BART. 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.
“Broadway Streetcar”	Pat	Piras		11/16/2011	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? Also, same questions about annual operating cost and fund source(s) as above.
BART to Livermore – Phase 1	Pat	Piras		11/16/2011	What is expected to be accomplished for the proposed \$400M investment? Also, what about requiring a “match” from San Joaquin County, since a large purpose for the project would be to serve them?
Highway Efficiency” Projects (Figure 4 in the draft TEP)	Pat	Piras		11/16/2011	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.
“Specialized Transit for Seniors and People with Disabilities”	Pat	Piras		11/16/2011	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. 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.
Complete Streets (Implementing Guideline #18)	Pat	Piras		11/16/2011	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</i> funds” (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.
	Joe	Spangler	Alameda Transit Advocates	11/10/2011	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.

Comments from CAWG/TAWG Joint Meeting Held on November 10, 2011

Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Commenter Organization	Date	Comment
Transportation Expenditure Program (TEP) Allocations	Joe	Spangler	Alameda Transit Advocates	11/10/2011	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transit Operations funding – 30% 2. Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety – 9% 3. Local Streets and Roads – 18%
Transportation Projects (CWTP and TEP):	Joe	Spangler	Alameda Transit Advocates	11/10/2011	<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>
AC Transit District Operations	Joe	Spangler	Alameda Transit Advocates	11/10/2011	<p>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.</p>
Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety (Facilities, Programs)	Joe	Spangler	Alameda Transit Advocates	11/10/2011	<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.
Local Streets and Road (Maintenance, Repair)	Joe	Spangler	Alameda Transit Advocates	11/10/2011	<p>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.</p>

Comments from CAWG/TAWG Joint Meeting Held on November 10, 2011

Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Commenter Organization	Date	Comment
ATA Opposition	Joe	Spangler	Alameda Transit Advocates	11/10/2011	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.
	Joe	Spangler	Alameda Transit Advocates	11/10/2011	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. 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.)
	Joe	Spangler	Alameda Transit Advocates	11/10/2011	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.
	Joe	Spangler	Alameda Transit Advocates	11/10/2011	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.
Station Modernization and Capacity Improvements	Carter	Mau	BART	11/16/2011	\$90M will begin to fund some of BART's station and capacity improvements; however, the need in Alameda County is much greater. Reinvestment in BART's 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 BART's 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.
Irvington Station Funding	Carter	Mau	BART	11/16/2011	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 BART's infrastructure needs, such as station modernization or the Hayward Maintenance Complex, rather than reverting back into the expenditure plan general fund for redistribution.

Comments from CAWG/TAWG Joint Meeting Held on November 10, 2011

Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Commenter Organization	Date	Comment
Hayward Maintenance Complex (HMC)	Carter	Mau	BART	11/16/2011	The HMC is critical to ensure that BART can provide reliable and efficient transit service in Alameda County. HMC supports the replacement of BART's railcar fleet. HMC facilities will improve BART's 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.
Transit Operating Funds	Carter	Mau	BART	11/16/2011	The draft TEP does not include any operational funding for BART. While BART's 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.
Consistency with Transit Sustainability Project (TSP)/Fare Transfer Barrier	Carter	Mau	BART	11/16/2011	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 needed) 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.
East Bay Paratransit (EBP) - BART funds	Carter	Mau	BART	11/16/2011	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.
Bart to Livermore Extension	Jack	O'Connor		11/16/2011	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.
Bart to Livermore Extension	Brian S.	O'Connor		11/16/2011	As a home owner and tax payer in Livermore, I want to support the extension of BART to Livermore as your top priority.

Comments from CAWG/TAWG Joint Meeting Held on November 10, 2011

Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Commenter Organization	Date	Comment
Bart to Livermore Extension	Carol	Ingram		11/17/2011	<p>I'd like to voice support for BART to Livermore.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Two benefits of BART to Livermore are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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.</p> <p>Thanks for your attention.</p>
Bart to Livermore Extension	Peter	D'Souza		11/16/2011	<p>I understand there are some meetings about "BART to Livermore" happening right now.</p> <p>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!!!!!!!</p> <p>Thanks for helping us to make the right decision!!!</p>
Bart to Livermore Extension	Alan	Burnham		11/16/2011	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Comments from CAWG/TAWG Joint Meeting Held on November 10, 2011

Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Commenter Organization	Date	Comment
Bart to Livermore Extension	Julia S.	Orvis, D.V.M.		11/16/2011	<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>
Bart to Livermore Extension	Joanne	Moody		11/16/2011	<p>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.</p>
Bart to Livermore Extension	Ron	Geren		11/16/2011	<p>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.</p> <p>BRING BART TO LIVERMORE ON I-580 ASAP. Thank you.</p>
Bart to Livermore Extension	G.	Cauthen		11/17/2011	<p>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.</p>
Bart to Livermore Extension	Ana Maria	Osorio		11/17/2011	<p>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.</p>

Comments from CAWG/TAWG Joint Meeting Held on November 10, 2011

Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Commenter Organization	Date	Comment
Bart to Livermore Extension	Robert	Robb		11/17/2011	<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 Dimond 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> <p>I hope that personal story shows that people really want BART to Livermore and that it would change our commutes and lifestyle for the better. It's really disappointing that it's taken so long when this extension was part of the original plan. Thanks.</p>

Comments from CAWG/TAWG Joint Meeting Held on November 10, 2011

Other Identifier	Commenter First Name	Commenter Last Name	Commenter Organization	Date	Comment
Bart to Livermore Extension	JoAnne	Eteve		11/17/2011	<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> <p>BART to Livermore provides the potential for over 20,000 riders a day to become part of the BART system. An important benefit of a Livermore station is that it is located within biking and walking distance to a vibrant community college that offers classes throughout the day, evening, and on weekends along with a variety of community events. This station will attract prime time commute riders and riders throughout the day, evening, and week, which suggests that BART trains to Livermore will be more cost efficient.</p> <p>The figure of 4 billion dollars for BART to Livermore has allowed some groups to label this project a boondoggle, but the boondoggle is the 4 billion dollars price tag. It is estimated that by placing BART on 580, the cost will be 1.1 billion dollars, and it is hoped that with increased innovations that the cost can be further reduced. Please evaluate the merit of the project by using actual cost, and not the scare price of 4 billion dollars.</p> <p>This council cannot replace the opportunities that the vibrant and reliable transportation system of BART cost the city of Livermore and the county of Alameda. Today there is an opportunity to recognize that BART to Livermore has significant benefits and savings for Alameda County, I urge you to support BART to Livermore. Sincerely,</p>