

Alameda County Transportation Commission Analysis and Response to the Community Vision Platform (CVP) for the Measure B reauthorization Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) submitted to Alameda CTC on November 17, 2011

The Alameda CTC responses to each of the CVP elements are noted below in italics. All other text that is not italicized is the CVP submitted language.

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.

The Alameda CTC is developing a new Transportation Expenditure Plan to address the transportation needs and funding challenges Alameda County faces as population and demands rise, and historic resources, such as state and federal funding, continue to decline. The development of the TEP is through a highly inclusive process with three separate committees representing diverse areas, organizations and interests (Steering Committee of elected officials, Technical Advisory Working Group, and Community Advisory Working Group). In addition, polling and extensive public outreach efforts have been implemented through a multi-faceted engagement process that was done in both spring and fall 2011. All three committees above developed the transportation vision for Alameda County for the plan and were engaged in the development of polling questions. Many members participated in the outreach efforts. The vision and goals established for the long range countywide transportation plan and the Transportation Expenditure Plan are as follows:

Vision:

*Alameda County will be served by a premier transportation system that **supports a vibrant and livable Alameda County** through a connected and integrated multimodal transportation system promoting sustainability, access, transit operations, public health and economic opportunities.*

Goals:

*Our vision recognizes the need to maintain and operate our existing transportation infrastructure and services while developing new investments that are targeted, effective, financially sound and supported by appropriate land uses. Mobility in Alameda County will be guided by **transparent decision making and measureable performance indicators and will be supported by these goals:***

Our transportation system will be:

- **Multimodal**
- **Accessible, Affordable and Equitable** for people of all ages, incomes, abilities and geographies
- **Integrated** with land use patterns and local decision making

- **Connected** across the county, within and across the network of streets, highways, transit, bicycle and pedestrian routes.
- **Reliable and Efficient**
- **Cost Effective**
- **Well Maintained**
- **Safe**
- **Supportive of a Healthy and Clean Environment**

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 1525% 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.

The Alameda CTC proposed TEP focuses investments that dramatically increase funding for basic maintenance and operations, supporting a “Fix it First” philosophy. Alameda CTC’s original proposal for Transit funding in October was for 18% of net revenues to support transit operations, and 9% for paratransit funding. In November, staff increased the amount to 20% for transit and 10% for paratransit. The current TEP includes 21% for transit and retains the 10% for paratransit, by reducing 1% out of administration costs. This provides a 90% overall increase in funding for transit, with a 94% increase specifically for AC Transit, and an 89% increase for paratransit services. Combined, this represents 31% of the net revenues going to transit operations in Alameda County. Proposed capital investments in transit support BART station modernization and capacity improvements at \$90 million for Alameda County BART stations. In addition, \$300 million is included in capital investments for Transit Oriented Development that supports station area development and access improvements. Further, the TEP also includes language that allows funding for the Irvington BART station to be used for BART operations or maintenance, if that project is fully funded with other outside funding. Overall, transit investments represent 45% of the TEP.

For roadway maintenance, 30% of net revenues are allocated to investments in roadway maintenance and efficiency. Of that amount, 20% goes directly back to local jurisdictions for local roadway investments, while the other 10% is retained at the County level to address countywide commute corridors, seismic retrofit of bridges and safety enhancements for either grade separations or at-grade railroad crossings. This represents an increase in local streets and roads funding from staff’s original proposal of 18% in October to the current 20% in the TEP. Further, the voter approved Vehicle Registration Fee (approved in November 2010) combined with the proposed TEP will provide overall 21.5% of revenues to local streets and roads.

The TEP vision and goals established both short term and long-term efforts addressing the “need to maintain and operate our existing transportation infrastructure and services while developing new investments that are targeted, effective, financially sound and supported by appropriate land uses.”

Therefore, operations and maintenance serve as major funding elements in the plan and are coupled with new investments that will support transportation choices to Alameda County residents and businesses that can accommodate the projected growth to 2 million people in the county over the plan horizon.

All projects in the expenditure plan that are also funded with federal funds are required to complete environmental clearance and comply with Title VI, addressing equity and environmental requirements, and to achieve a full funding plan within a strict deadline of 7 years.

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.

The proposed TEP provides significant funding for programs and capital investments that support the goals of AB 32 and SB 375, so that Alameda County will contribute to the region's effort and goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The TEP funds major transit operations and transit capital investments. Overall, more than 61% of the funds in the TEP directly support shifting out of cars and onto other modes (transit 45%, Bicycle and Pedestrian 8%, Sustainable Land Use and Transportation 7%, and Technology 1%). Moreover, improvements to the roads (30%) support each of the modes above, resulting in a plan that facilitates a major shift to non-auto travel.

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.

The proposed TEP provides significant funding for programs and capital investments that will support implementation of Community Based Transportation Plans, including over \$651 million for bicycle and pedestrian funds for projects and programs that will support elements of the community based transportation plans. Alameda CTC has included specific weighting in its bicycle and pedestrian grant program for projects or programs that support communities of concern. The Transit investments will provide dramatic funding increases that will support communities of concern, especially with the Title VI requirements in the plan. The funding for Priority Development Areas/Transit Oriented Development (PDA/TOD) capital as well as the discretionary program can support investments in Communities of Concern. The Freight and Economic Development discretionary program has been included into the plan to allow the Alameda CTC to do specific goods movement plans that will address freight issues and provides funding for freight improvements. The development of the Goods Movement Plan will include addressing health impacts in local 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.

The proposed TEP allocates funding for its pass-through programs (local streets and roads, bike/ped, paratransit) based upon formulas that include factors such as population and road miles specific to each jurisdiction, providing a geographically equitable distribution of those funds throughout the County. For the funding categories of Major Commute Corridors and PDA/TOD, funding allocations will be made through the Alameda CTC's Capital Improvement Program, which is for a five year period, updated every two years, and which will include provisions for geographic equity. For the Bike/Ped, Paratransit, Transit, Technology, Transportation and Land Use linkages, and the Freight and Economic Development discretionary programs, there will also be provisions for geographic equity, as there currently are in the sales tax measure we are implementing now.

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.

The proposed TEP includes the requirement to comply with Title VI, it also includes an Independent Watchdog Committee, annual agency audits of Alameda CTC as well as agencies receiving pass-through funds, and several community advisory committees that will provide direct recommendations to the Alameda CTC Board on funding and implementation. All Alameda CTC meetings are conducted according to the Brown Act, California's open meetings law. All of these elements support transparency and public engagement.

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 proposed TEP includes requirements for full funding plans and environmental clearance within 7 years of the initiation of sales tax collection for capital projects. 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.

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.

The proposed TEP includes 31% of funding for transit operations (21% transit and 10% paratransit), with AC Transit as the highest recipient. AC Transit's Board requested transit operations at 17.3% and 4.5% for paratransit. The proposed TEP includes 16% for AC Transit, representing a 94% increase over current revenues, and meets their request for 4.5% of the paratransit funds. The Alameda CTC staff reduced the amount of funds for its own administration by 1% and gave that amount directly to AC Transit. Each of the other transit operators noted above, as well as the Oakland Alameda ferry service operated by the Water Emergency Transit Authority, receive funding increases.

- **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.

The proposed TEP includes 30% of funding for roads, with 20% of the funding going directly to cities and the county to maintain their local roadways, and 10% retained at the county level to focus on major commute corridors, bridge seismic safety and grade separations. The roads that will be funded with the 10% of the funds include those on the Metropolitan Transportation System which carry the largest loads of traffic within Alameda County communities. The Major Commute Corridor funds will be used for maintenance and corridor efficiency projects. Projects to be funded by the Major Commute Corridor funds will be done so based upon project readiness and through the Alameda CTC's Capital Improvement Program as described above.

- **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).

The proposed TEP includes funding within the Transit category for an Innovative Grant Programs for \$230 million with the priority for funds going to student access to school programs. In addition, the Alameda CTC has performed national research on student transit pass programs and presented findings and recommendations to the Commission in September on how to craft a potential student transit pass program. The Commission directed staff to develop a scope for a pilot youth pass program that could be tested over a three year period. The purpose of a pilot program is to evaluate the effectiveness of the

program with regard to goals and evaluation tools established for the pilot. If a pilot proves feasible, funding from the TEP could be used to support the student pass program in partnership with other contributing agencies. Alameda CTC staff will begin developing the pilot program scope in January, working with partners interested in the program, with the aim of bringing a recommendation to the Commission on a pilot program scope and funding in spring 2012.

- **Paratransit: 10%** Meet transportation needs of seniors and people with disabilities in cost-effective and innovative ways.

The proposed TEP includes funding for paratransit at 10% of net revenues.

²23% 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.

The proposed TEP includes funding at 8.4%, with a portion of the funding going directly to local jurisdictions, a portion to a discretionary grant program, as well as funding to complete major bicycle and pedestrian trails in Alameda County.

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.

The proposed TEP includes 3% for Transit Oriented Development and the Complete Streets Policy in the TEP Implementing Guidelines is for all transportation investments in the plan.

- **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.

The proposed TEP includes 1% for Freight and Economic Development to address both planning and implementation needs in the county. The planning efforts for freight will address the health impacts of freight in local communities. The Port of Oakland will be a partner in the delivery of transportation investments included in the TEP and will be required to bring the additional funding needed to complete its projects in the TEP.

- **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.

The proposed TEP includes 1% for Technology, Innovation and Development that can address TDM. In addition, the 3% of funding included in the Sustainable Transportation and Local Land Use Linkages specifically states the eligible use of TDM.

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.

These amounts are included specifically in the Countywide Transportation Plan, and funding from the TEP as discussed above, may be used to implement portions of the CBTPs.

- **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.

The proposed TEP includes \$532 million, or 7% of net revenues, to support TOD/PDAs. These funds will be allocated through the Alameda CTC Capital Improvement Program, as described above, as well as through discretionary grants as approved by the Alameda CTC Board.

- **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)

The proposed TEP includes \$264 million for specific capital projects, including the Bay Trail, Iron Horse Trail and East Bay Greenway projects, as well as local connectors and access routes to these trails. An additional \$155 million is included in the TEP to be allocated for bicycle and pedestrian capital projects, plans, programs and maintenance through a discretionary program.

- **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

The proposed TEP includes \$26 million for AC Transit BRT projects and the College/Broadway Corridor improvements, and \$9 million for the Rapid Bus from Alameda Point to Fruitvale BART.

- **BART System Enhancement/Efficiency Projects: \$294.7 million (3.8%)**
 - BART Station Modernization and Capacity Improvements \$294.7 million

The proposed TEP includes \$90 million for BART Station Modernization and Capacity Improvements. It also includes \$120 for BART operation/maintenance, if the Irvington BART station is funded with outside funds.

- **Safety Projects \$40 million (.5%)** : Alameda “lifeline” connection (Fruitvale Bridge) \$40 million

The proposed TEP includes this project in the Major Commute Corridors category.

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.

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 travelled; reduce over 260,000 lbs/day of greenhouse gasses supporting the California climate protection legislation AB32 and SB375; and, reduce over 400 Billion BTUs/year of energy consumption.

- **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.

The proposed TEP includes funding for investments in freeway gap closures and for methods to increase the efficiencies of our current highway system. HOT/HOV lanes provide the opportunity to generate revenue and to implement congestion pricing on specific highway corridors in the County. The vision adopted for the TEP supports a multi-modal system in Alameda County. Freeways are a part of the transportation system in the county that play a major role in economic development (goods movement) and access to areas in which transit does not adequately serve. The majority of funding in the TEP supports transit, bike and pedestrian, TOD/PDA development, with only a small portion going to address the highway needs.

⁴Our 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. ⁵MTC'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. ⁶MTC'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.