

LIVERMORE AMADOR VALLEY TRANSIT AUTHORITY

CORRESPONDENCE

SUBJECT: Board of Directors Correspondence (February 7, 2022)

---

#	Date Rec'd	Sender	Subject
1	February 7, 2022	Steven Dunbar	Agenda Item 5E – Public Comment for 2022 Legislative Program

## Jennifer Suda

---

**To:** Michael Tree  
**Subject:** RE: Feedback re: LAVTA Legislative Priorities, Item 3E

**From:** Steven Dunbar <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 7, 2022 2:17 PM  
**To:** [rebonanno@cityoflivermore.net](mailto:rebonanno@cityoflivermore.net); Michael Tree <[mtree@lavta.org](mailto:mtree@lavta.org)>  
**Subject:** Feedback re: LAVTA Legislative Priorities, Item 3E

Hi Gina and Michael,

Regarding Item 3E on today's LAVTA agenda, I wrote the following thoughts and I hope they are helpful feedback. In particular the first two notes below under Regional Priorities around street expansion and bike/ped safety are very important to me and I hope the wording can be improved.

There are 3 segments: Federal, State, and Local.

Comments on the Federal Legislative Strategies:

- 1) Investigations into the Highway Trust Fund should prioritize the need for carbon reduction and air quality while being mindful of those who may be low-income and car dependent. Mass transit investments from gas taxes are statistically progressive in aggregate. Stable funding for the HTF should not be used for future highway widening, especially through low income neighborhoods who are negatively impacted by brake and tire wear regardless of car propulsion technology. This is why CEQA uses VMT analysis.
- 2) ValleyLink is great, but we should also advocate for better Bus Rapid Transit technical support, and AceForward as well. These are all complementary systems and each supports the other.

Regional/Local:

- 1) Improvements to local street networks is too broad of a strategy. A road widening that only marginally improves run times and induces additional VMT is not helpful for transit. If 90% of the money goes to improvements for drivers, then don't be surprised when people still don't take transit. Advocacy should focus on cost-benefit for low-emissions transportation more specifically. I encourage the commission to use more focused language here.
- 2) Enforcement of traffic laws protecting pedestrians and bicyclists is only one of the strategies used to reduce traffic injuries. Bike East Bay and the League of American Bicyclists have completely retooled their strategy and have notes regarding where enforcement is effective in changing results. It is often much more effective per dollar to re-engineer our streets. Please see the following resource: [Pedaling Toward a More Just BFA Program: Removing "Enforcement" from our Framework | League of American Bicyclists \(bikeleague.org\)](#)

Please reconsider how you support bike and pedestrian safety efforts. This should primarily physical improvements, including ensuring crosswalks exist near bus stops. I encourage the commission to use broader language in this regard.

- 3) Regarding TNCs, I have used this system in the TriValley a number of times. While it is better than nothing, which is what we currently have late at night, it's not a perfect replacement for transit, and has some limitations that could be considered.

If you want to continue to utilize TNCs as a gap filler, I recommend:

- a) Continuing to press TNC operators to integrate public feed data so the system shows combined routes. Our bus service has this, but it doesn't work with ACE or CCCTA, even though we are the administrator for GoSanRamon.

- b) Integration with transit systems should include better coordination for timing a BART transfer. It's difficult to actually schedule a transfer if you're coming from BART, and you end up waiting 25minutes at the station for a pickup in the cold.
  - c) The system should be more clear regarding ADA access.
  - d) The system should allow for bikes in some way. TNCs are no substitute for the bus if my bike gets left behind or I have to retrieve it the next day.
  - e) Advertise the TNC benefits to employers along with other transit benefits.
- 4) It's very awkward to say we should coordinate with other operators in eastern county, "if appropriate." We should always be coordinating. See issues with CCCTA 335 transfers to Wheelsbus last year.

What's missing:

- 1) Paratransit is not mentioned here. While I know there are initiatives and coordination going on with our pilot study and other great things, it should be mentioned here.
- 2) Micromobility coordination with transit. That could include bikeshare, safe routes to transit funding, bike lockers, bike rack availability tracking, etc.
- 3) AceForward / BRT / Amtrak coordination (i.e. advocate for ability to purchase bus-only Amtrak tickets to Stockton from Livermore)
- 4) Regarding transit reliability improvements: The Swiss saying is to make your system "as fast as necessary" not "as fast as possible." Figure out where transfers are not possible, and improve speeds until they are possible, then focus on other lines. I've continued to see people miss 10R to 30R (or vice versa) transfers in Livermore.

Finally, SAVs:

I know our mobility environment is likely to change significantly in the coming years, and I know Michael and the team are very interested in using this technology. I'd like it to be more clear in the priorities that this technology is used to supplement public transit, eliminate mobility gaps, while still reducing VMT. An explosion in VMT due to autonomous vehicles is a genie that cannot be put back in the bottle. I believe that the team knows this and supports this, I just want it to be a bit more clear.

Thanks very much,  
Steven