

## Alameda CTC FASTER Bay Area Key Issues

### Background:

- The FASTER Bay Area coalition (Silicon Valley Leadership Group, Bay Area Council, SPUR) has presented to the Alameda County Transportation Commission and its members two times (Commission Retreat on May 30 and October 3 at a FASTER Transportation Town Hall at the Alameda CTC offices) and a summary of the FASTER Bay Area effort was presented by Alameda CTC staff to the PPLC meeting on October 14.
- The PPLC raised several issues and concerns and took action to develop key points to convey to the FASTER Coalition
  - PPLC action: Alameda CTC Chair appointed three-member committee (PPLC Chair Bauters, Commission Vice-Chair Cutter, and PPLC representative Commissioner Ortiz) to develop key points for consideration by the full Commission at its October 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. These points will be incorporated into a short letter to send to the FASTER Bay Area coalition. PPLC direction was to ensure that Alameda CTC keeps the “door open” for communications with the coalition, including setting up a meeting with them to discuss points that are important to Alameda CTC. Any letter distributed should include Alameda County’s state delegation members and the Senate and Assembly Transportation Committee Chairs

### PPLC Subcommittee Recommendations:

The PPLC subcommittee met on October 18, 2019 and developed the following recommendations for Commission consideration on process and key points.

*Process Recommendation:* Approve a short list of priority key points to incorporate into a letter to the FASTER Bay Area Coalition, including a request for a meeting with the Coalition to discuss the letter. The letter is intended to be short with the most pressing points described in a one-page letter. The detailed points discussed at PPLC (below) will be addressed during the meeting.

*Recommended key points for incorporation into a one-page letter:* The letter will include that Alameda CTC:

1. Appreciates that businesses are stepping up to the plate to try to do something about the transportation issues facing the region, yet believes businesses should contribute more due to impacts on the transportation system related to where jobs have been located
2. Is concerned about funding a large measure with a 1-cent sales tax, which limits local jurisdiction opportunities for raising local revenues, and recommends that a diverse funding mechanism be considered (i.e. a combination of vehicle registration fee, employer head tax and smaller size sales tax), particularly due to sales tax fatigue.
3. A sales tax of this magnitude and length affects low income community members and small local businesses
4. Is concerned about an imbalance of housing and jobs and that Alameda County has the most balanced jobs/housing ratio. If the tax passes, Alameda County residents would pay the second highest amount for projects in the Bay Area as the second largest sales tax generator in the region; therefore should receive a commensurate investment from the measure
5. This process appears to be moving too fast and being mostly business-led without enough public agency and public stakeholder engagement

The final closing paragraph should reiterate the structural concern with the funding source, which must be addressed prior to defining project lists or program categories.

### **Comments Raised at October 14 PPLC Meeting:**

The following summarizes points raised by the PPLC Committee members on October 14<sup>th</sup>:

Alameda CTC:

- Understands the importance of addressing pressing transportation issues and the need to develop a transportation system that supports current and future travel needs that is forward looking
- Appreciates that businesses are stepping up to the plate to try to do something about the transportation issues facing the region, while concerned about business impacts on the transportation system due to where jobs have been located
- Is concerned over the process moving too fast and being mostly business-led without enough local elected official engagement
- Is concerned about the four programmatic funding categories, accountability and that there are no specific projects listed
- Is concerned that the process could end up like the Regional Measure 3 process, which was difficult, divisive and initially not fair to Alameda County bridge toll payers and residents
- Is concerned over governance and that MTC, which may be expected to be the administering agency, has not had the opportunity to fully weigh in on the proposed approach, funding categories, governance and consistency with regional planning and priorities
- Is concerned about funding a large measure with a 1-cent sales tax, including the following:
  - Local jurisdictions are limited in what funds they can raise and this measure could impinge on local jurisdictions' abilities to raise revenue for local needs
  - A diverse funding mechanism should be considered (i.e. a combination of vehicle registration fee, employer head tax and smaller size sales tax)
  - There may be sales tax fatigue due to the current high rate and impact to low income communities
  - There may be a competing measure on the same ballot since AB 1487 was signed by the Governor to allow for a region-wide measure to be placed on the ballot to fund housing
  - There is an imbalance of housing and jobs creation and Alameda County has the most balanced jobs/housing ratio. If the tax passes, Alameda County residents would pay second highest amount for projects in the Bay Area as the second largest sales tax generator in the region.
- Would like to see equity considerations not only for low-income, but also geographic equity
- Would like to ensure that Core Capacity projects on the Bay Bridge, BART Transbay, transit operations, zero emissions bus and bus yards, first and last mile connections, and freight are addressed in any final FASTER Bay Area Program