

Programming and Allocations Committee

September 12, 2018

**Item 4b – Adoption of the 2019 TIP and Transportation-Air
Quality Conformity Analysis for the Amended Plan Bay Area
2040 and the 2019 TIP**

Appendix 1 – Comments Received

From: Bill Mayben [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 12:21 PM
To: MTC Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: MTC-TIP, 2019

Dear MTC Staff;

These amount to written comments to your Draft TIP 2019, as portrayed in your recent transmittal to me.

I appreciate the fact that you are allocating more money to public transportation. We cannot get enough of this.

It seems that efforts to “fix the commute”, or “resolve traffic congestion”; are doomed to failure. As you know, increasing roadway improvements to attempt to facilitate personal automobile commuting are self-defeating on several levels. For one, each incremental improvement may result, ultimately, in defeating efforts towards public transportation, air quality, and urban street traffic, urban parking

Issues. If average commute times were to improve; more cars would be joining the commute, setting the entire dynamic back once again. This has been going on since the early 60's. We apparently have not learned, yet.

If more of these vehicles are electric or hybrid, there would be some improvements in air quality, but this will happen anyway.

The money spent is essentially wasted. Improvements in the commute corridor will create problems at the receiving end; urban congestion, urban parking, urban air quality degradation. By virtue of this, it is only by ignoring these effects

that anyone could observe anything construed as “improvement”. Simply maintaining the existing infrastructure alone is not cost effective, all considered. We are, in effect, subsidizing private economic interests at public expense.

I see that the benefits of continuing “down the road” towards maintaining and enhancing automobile commute capabilities, simply accrue to established economic interests who do not care about the fallout. They sell cars, gas, tires, insurance, maintenance; repairs; not to mention the secondary recipients of government and quasi-governmental agencies who receive money through various auto related fees and taxes to perpetuate the illusion that this can work. I believe that these public roadway funds can be better spent in light of our long-range responsibilities. This is a defective economy at this point.

Looking through the lens of resilience; have we addressed the aspects of our transportation infrastructure that are going under water? Wouldn't it be a better long-term investment to incrementally deal with this coming liability, rather than wait until this issue reaches crisis proportions? This issue will be terribly expensive. Have you identified the progressive choke points created by king tides, then progressive sea level rise? What budgetary categories are established ; what allocations are being made under 2019 TIP to account for the preliminary project scoping, engineering, ect.; necessary to position ourselves as a culture for the inevitable?

If there is a major earthquake it is likely that our roadway system will be severely impacted. Remember what happened last time? What provisions are included to deal with the most vulnerable parts and pieces of our roadway structure as it sits today?

Is it true that both Bay Area Regional air terminals will be underwater, for instance? Does this include access? What will this do to our economy? What is your plan? When do you plan to get started? When roadways are inundated; how will you get to work? My instinctual impulse would be to make efforts to get to a ferry terminal or a BART station. Are they hardened? Are they accessible?

Several months ago a sleeping driver took out a Bay Bridge toll booth. Traffic was brought to a halt for over an hour and a half. IT was demonstrative of our vulnerability. Trains and Boats. Trains and boats. Helicopters?

Beyond this; I also believe it is not too soon to examine a decentralized strategy; rather than the model of bedroom communities feeding commercial cores.

I reiterate that your job as a transportation planner is to REMOVE commuters as the bigger picture of transportation planning. This is to improve Greater Bay Area resiliency; create higher air quality; improve community and family life; make the Bay Area more affordable; and create a more sustainable and cost-effective business environment. We are instead trying to put 10 pounds of sugar into a 5 pound bag.

I urge you to step back and examine your suppositions; your model for the future; the projected population you will be dealing with in 2040.

People are making their own decisions now, based on their reality on the ground. The majority of Bay Area residents want to leave, to move away, to stop participating in what has become a no win situation; a compounded, neurotic effort against impossible odds. The fact is that we have only one life to live, and you are losing some of the best and brightest citizens by your adherence to outdated solutions which do not, in fact, improve the lives of the extended community. Depending on their personal resources, they are moving to Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Colorado, and Texas. Unless you can come up with a more compelling vision, and salient solutions, I expect this trend to continue. I guess this is one way to remove cars from the commute!
I mean all of this in a constructive and fun way!

Very Truly Yours,

Bill Mayben

From: Sherman Lewis [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 8:57 PM
To: MTC Info <info@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: TIP

The TIP is presumably the federal TIP, and not the STIP or RTIP. If so, it should include the STIP, which includes the LATIP created by AB1386 and another LATIP under another statutes. Info is attached.

--

Sherman Lewis

[REDACTED]

From: Roland Lebrun [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2018 5:09 AM

To: MTC Info <info@bayareametro.gov>

Cc: Caltrain Board <board@caltrain.com>; CHSRA Board <boardmembers@hsr.ca.gov>

Subject: Programming and Allocations item 4b 2019 TIP

Dear Chair McKenzie and Commissioners,

Pursuant to Government Code §6250 et seq.

1) Please refer to the attached Draft 2019 Caltrain TIP and the new Hillsdale station (AKA "25th Avenue Grade Separation Project") Full Funding Agreement and provide an explanation as to why this project is not included in the TIP (the \$180M funding plan is located on page 29 of the agreement).

2) Please refer to page 14 (page 6 of Attachment D) of resolutions 4374 & 4375 and provide the following information:

- Updated copy of the Caltrain Electrification (SF-010028) funding plan reflecting the latest programming decisions
- Specific source(s) of the \$97M Local being swapped for 5307
- Specific source of the 5307
- Project(s) the \$97M Local is being reassigned to (if any)

I look forward to your response.

Roland Lebrun