

November 17, 2011

Dear Chair Green and members of the Alameda County Transportation Commission,

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). The Measure B reauthorization will be the largest single source of transportation funding in the county and the most important work of the Alameda CTC for the next 30 years.¹ It should not be rushed, as it is being now.

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.

We are a diverse cross-section of community, environmental, and social justice organizations, stakeholders and groups that work with thousands of residents of Alameda County. 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. Like you, we are deeply invested in the future of Alameda County and are committed to its short and long-term economic, environmental, and social vitality. And like you, we recognize that our transportation system plays a fundamental role in shaping our economy, environment and the quality of life and opportunities for all the County's communities. We want to develop a popular and pragmatic TEP and then help pass the reauthorization.

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. Our plan focuses 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.

Because Alameda County voters can no longer afford to see their votes support expensive expansion projects, we are also asking that BART to Livermore be removed from the TEP. It's not just our groups that have a concern with this proposal, ACTC Telephone survey respondents found it to be one of the projects of lowest importance (in the bottom third of priorities) and MTC's recent project analysis ranked it the 13th worst benefit-cost project submitted for consideration in the Regional Transportation Plan. BART has many capital needs and we support those that strengthen the core-system without adding future operating liabilities. There is no broad support for this project and its inclusion will lead to its defeat.

In order to create a successful measure, the CWTP/TEP Steering Committee needs to focus on the County's greatest transportation needs and specifically the important goals the ACTC Board

¹ If voters approve the proposed 'extended and augmented' Measure "B" full-cent sales tax, then it will more than double the amount of discretionary funds available to the County for its transportation investments from \$6.865 billion to \$14.52 billion between 2012 and 2042.

adopted for the Countywide Transportation Plan. In order for this to occur, it is important that you immediately direct staff to significantly revise their proposal for the TEP to ensure that it is in line with the results of the myriad forms of public input that was gathered. It currently is not. The process needs to change course fast.

Once you get meaningful input from your two working groups and see the actual results from all the public input that was gathered, it will become clear that our attached platform is completely in-line with the interests and needs of Alameda County residents, agencies and municipalities.

It is not too late to rethink the direction of the current TEP proposal and develop a plan that we can all work together to pass. We ask you to step back, see that the process is headed in the wrong direction, and change course before its too late.

Respectfully,

Keith Carson
Alameda County Supervisor, Fifth District

Ruth Atkin
City Councilmember
City of Emeryville

John Knox White
Alameda Transit Advocates

Dave Campbell
Program Director
East Bay Bicycle Coalition

Michele Jordan and Mahasin Abdul Salaam
Transportation Taskforce Co-Chairs
Genesis

Matt Vander Sluis
East Bay Senior Field Representative
Greenbelt Alliance

Manolo González-Estay
Transportation Policy Director
TransForm

Connie Galambos Malloy, Director of Programs
Lindsay Imai, Transportation Justice Program Coordinator
Urban Habitat

Cc: Art Dao, Executive Director of the Alameda County Transportation Commission

The Community Vision Platform
for the Measure B reauthorization Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)
November 17, 2011

The proposed reauthorization of Measure B (B3) will be the single largest transportation funding source in Alameda County, extending a one cent sales tax in perpetuity with the next voter review scheduled for 2042. As such, it is our only meaningful opportunity to rebuild our deteriorating transportation system, restore transit service to acceptable levels, maintain transit affordability, increase safety for walking and biking, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and create thousands of transportation-related jobs. In short, because this measure will fundamentally shape the lives of Alameda County residents for decades to come, we must use this opportunity to put the County on the right path.

To be successful, the Measure B reauthorization must achieve the following objectives:

Fix it First: Alameda County's transportation systems are facing massive operating shortfalls *and* significant capital rehabilitation needs. Transit service in the County has been reduced 15-25% over the last three years. BART has a \$7-8 billion capital shortfall, without including costly new extensions. Our local streets and roads need a multi-billion dollar investment for basic maintenance. 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.

Help Meet State and Regional Climate Change Targets: AB32 and SB375 have set California on course to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 80% by 2050. As the second most populated county in the Bay Area, Alameda County needs to play a significant role in achieving this target. 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.

Improve Mobility and Health for All Communities: 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.

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. A failure to do so will result in an inequitable distribution of regional transportation funding within the County, as future funds are directed to complete these long-term projects.

Uphold High Standards for Planning: 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.

Provide Project Cost Protection: The last funding measure saw project costs increase by 244% over what voters were promised. This resulted in less money throughout the county for programs and important new projects and meant that we ended up funding projects with lower than expected benefits, relative to cost. 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.

The Expenditure Plan should fund the following Programs:

- **Transit: 25.25%** This should focus on maintaining the service that exists and restoring lost service back to 2008-9 levels of service. AC Transit, Alameda County's largest transit providers, should at a minimum receive 23% of all TEP funds. This amount of funding will help AC Transit restore the service cut in 2010.² The remaining funds should be focused on LAVTA, Union City Transit, and ACE, with each retaining their current percentage of Measure B, to help restore any lost transit service or maintain existing levels of service.
- **Local Streets & Roads: 23% as a direct pass-through to cities.** The plan should require that when cities use these funds, they comply with the Complete Streets policy to ensure the roadway is accessible for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, cars and transit and to improve truck routing to minimize human exposure to harmful diesel pollution and the other health hazards of freight truck traffic. In addition, there are many major arterial projects considered for this measure that are unnecessary, do not poll well, and should be redirected to funding road maintenance.
- **Eco Student Bus Pass: 9%**³ ACTC staff estimates that over 115,000 young people could benefit from a program that provides bus passes to middle and high school students, regardless of income or what kind of school they attend, good for 24/7 use on all three County bus operators. The program will be most successful if it can be implemented across the entire county, is inclusive of all students and is accompanied by a pro-transit, pro-environment curriculum and education program, as proposed by the program sponsor, the Alameda County Office of Education. This will develop a culture of transit use and will cut down on morning traffic, and related emissions (home to school trips make up an estimated 10% of all trips taken in the morning, Bay Area wide).
- **Paratransit: 10%** Meet transportation needs of seniors and people with disabilities in cost-effective and innovative ways.

² 23% of the B3 TEP would increase overall funding to AC Transit by roughly \$24 million per year between 2012-2022 and by another \$30.5 million per year between 2022-2042. This funding is absolutely necessary in restoring the 15% of service it lost in 2010 (200,000 daily hours of service). These service cuts amounted to \$21 million and AC is currently facing a \$10 million plus hole in Fiscal Year 2012-13 and 2013-14, so the \$30 million additional funds from Measure B will be what is needed to restore the lost service. See AC Transit's November 16, 2011 GM Memo on its First Quarter Budget Report and Biennial Budget: http://www.actransit.org/wp-content/uploads/board_memos/GM%2011-239%201st%20Qtr%20Financials.pdf.

³ The three bus operators estimate the program will cost between \$15 million and over \$20 million per year, so by setting aside about \$18 million per year for the program, we can be assured the program will have enough funding to be successful and fully accessible to all interested families.

- **Bicycle/Pedestrian: 8.25%** The ped/bike program should help fund the completion of the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. In addition, we recommend funding for a set of additional bike – ped projects listed in the “Projects” section below.
- **Transit Oriented Development: 3%** We support staff recommendation for a category of funding (“Sustainable Transportation Linkages”) that will support the development of transit villages and better connect transit, housing and jobs, as well as an additional 3.9% for specific TOD projects underway. However, it is critical that, similar to the Complete Streets requirement for LS&R, that there be clear and enforce conditions placed on the use of all TOD funding (program and projects) that ensure that local residents are protected against the direct and indirect displacement impacts of those investments and that Smart Growth best practices are adhered to.
- **Freight and Economic Development: 0.5%** We recommend that the draft plan set aside funding for freight movement and at least 0.5% of Measure B funds be used to mitigate the harmful impacts of freight movement and diesel trucks on communities’ health, particularly in CARE communities and other similar neighborhoods that suffer from highest cumulative effects of air and noise pollution and are most vulnerable to such hazards. We also recommend that the Port of Oakland and its clients be required to put up their share of funding for Port-related projects before Measure B funds are committed to freight transport.
- **Transportation Demand Management: 1%** We recommend that the “Technology, Innovation and Development” funding category focus on TDM to provide cities with guidance and funding needed to curb single-occupancy vehicle driving.

Program Total: 80%

The Expenditure Plan Should Fund the Following Projects, As its Highest Priorities:

- **Community Based Transportation Plans: \$100 million (1.3%)** North and Central County CBTPs at \$50 million each. CBTPs include critical transit and bike/ped projects that address transportation barriers or safety issues of the Counties’ lowest income communities.
- **Transit Oriented Development: \$300 million (3.9%)** Specific TOD/PDA projects that have been identified by jurisdictions, including, but not limited to, the Lake Merritt BART Station Area Plan. The same anti-displacement and Smart Growth conditions should be placed upon the use of these funds as on the TOD program.
- **Bike and Pedestrian Projects: \$300 million (3.9%)**
 - Various bike/ped bridges to close major bikeway gaps (\$77 million)
 - Bay Trail, Iron Horse Trail and East Bay Greenway projects (\$203 million)
 - Laurel District Safety and Access on MacArthur, from High Street to Seminary (LAMMPS) (\$20.3 million)
- **Bus System Enhancement/Efficiency Projects: \$58 million (.76%)**
 - International Blvd BRT - \$38 million
 - AC Transit Transit Priority Measures (College/Broadway Corridor - \$5.0 million, Foothill TSP - \$2.0 million and Grand/MacArthur Improvements \$4.0 million)
 - Rapid Bus from Alameda Point to Fruitvale BART \$9.0 million
- **BART System Enhancement/Efficiency Projects: \$294.7 million (3.8%)**
 - BART Station Modernization and Capacity Improvements \$294.7 million
- **Safety Projects \$40 million (.5%)**

- Alameda “lifeline” connection (Fruitvale Bridge) \$40 million

Project Total 20%⁴

The Expenditure Plan should NOT fund the following Projects:

- **BART to Livermore and other low benefit/high costs massive transit capital projects**
We are deeply concerned that the staff B3 TEP commits our region to billions in unsustainable expansion projects, by making small down payments on projects that even MTC has said have low benefit-cost values. Specifically, the proposed TEP proposes to give \$400 million to the \$4 billion **BART to Livermore** project, a project with one of the lowest project performance ratings by MTC, leaving over 85% of it unfunded.⁵ This puts taxpayers on the hook for large funding commitments down the line we simply can’t afford. This is a project that, as currently proposed, we cannot support. We believe there are lower-cost alternatives that will help connect the residents of the Tri-Valley to regional transit and are more than happy to explore these with ACTC staff and other interested stakeholders.
- **SR 84/I-680, new lanes for the HOT/HOV network, and any projects that add highway capacity**
We are deeply concerned by the investments in the staff proposed TEP that increase VMT and greenhouse gases through increases in highway capacity.⁶ At a time when we must work to avoid the disaster that global warming promises, it is critical that we use our limited transportation funds as cost-effectively as possible by investing in low-cost, high benefit transit, bicycle, pedestrian and transit-oriented development that will both support the travel of those with the least means as well as shift drivers into alternative, low-carbon modes of travel.

⁴ Our priority projects do not total up to 20%. We support geographic equity, based upon population, for the distribution of the project funds and our proposal allows flexibility to achieve this.

⁵ MTC’s DRAFT Project Performance Assessment Results, released 10/31/11, gave the BART to Livermore Extensions (Phases I and II) a Benefit/Cost ratio of 0.4, putting it among the 10 worst projects out of 76 projects analyzed.

⁶ MTC’s DRAFT Project Performance Assessment Results, released 10/31/11, estimate that the SR 84-I-680 interchanged and SR-84 Widening (Jack London to I-680) will result in an additional 16 million VMTs in the year 2040. The regional HOT lane proposal, minus those in Silicon Valley, but including Alameda County’s proposed lanes, will result in 235 million VMTs in 2040.