

July 20, 2011

California Delegation  
House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee  
2165 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear California Members of the House T & I Committee,

While we commend the Committee's efforts to get the long-stalled transportation bill moving we have serious concerns with the principles and details laid out in the transportation reauthorization proposal released on July 7<sup>th</sup>. We are encouraged by some of the Committee's proposals including the commitment to develop performance measures and expand the TIFIA program; however, overall the \$230 billion, six-year proposal would enact a 35 percent cut in spending with significant negative impacts on construction jobs, road and bridge repair projects, public transportation systems, safety for all road users, and our efforts to improve California's economy, air quality, and overall public health.

This bill clearly represents an opportunity to put Californians and Americans as a whole back to work, to rebuild our current infrastructure, invest in projects that are competitive and part of a strategic plan to improve communities, and provide more affordable travel options in the form of public transportation, van pools, and safer streets for bicyclists and pedestrians. We offer the following comments in the spirit of collaboration and hope to continue a dialogue with you and your staff. We understand the current fiscal climate and look forward to working to find ways to address these concerns.

**Performance Measures and Strategic Planning:** Congress has operated under a strategy of sending federal transportation dollars to the states without requiring any accountability or quantifiable measures of progress on key goals and objectives elucidated in SAFETEA-LU and the bills that preceded it. This method has not served us well, and is a contributing factor to the broken transportation system we face today. We are encouraged that the draft proposal the Committee is working on contains an emphasis on performance measures. We hope the measures in the proposal will consider broad factors beyond congestion, such as pollution, system condition, and accessibility to jobs. What gets measured matters, and we believe any measures must include economic development, environmental protection, and public health objectives. We also urge the Committee to incorporate these performance measures as part of a reformed transportation planning process that includes the use of scenario planning in order to promote greater transparency and accountability.

**State of Good Repair:** In the face of significant reductions in revenues, it is especially important that funds be directed towards repair and rehabilitation of the existing transportation network. Currently almost 12 percent of our bridges are in need of repair and close to 66 percent of our state's major highways and roads are rated in less than good condition – almost all of the top 100 most heavily-traveled structurally-deficient bridges in the country are in California. AASHTO found that \$1 in upfront repairs can save up to \$14 in repairs down the road, meanwhile poorly maintained roads cost each

California driver \$354 on average per year. It is unclear how the House proposal will promote accountability and ensure that our nation's growing highway and bridge repair needs are addressed.

**Dedicated Funding For Bicycling and Walking:** Another highly concerning element in the proposal is the move away from building a multimodal transportation system. Eliminating the few small, dedicated funding streams for bicycle and pedestrian projects, would absolve states of their responsibility to make federally funded roadways safe for all users. In the last decade more than 30,000 pedestrians and bicyclists were killed on federal-aid roadways – over 8,000 in California alone. Creating safe streets and first-class facilities for vulnerable users to safely walk, bike, or wait for a bus shouldn't be an "option" for states to consider. As gas prices continue to rise and our population ages, more people are relying on a broader range of transportation choices. We should not have to risk our lives for choosing to do so.

**Project Delivery:** The outline contains several provisions related to accelerating project delivery. The proposal focuses on reducing the environmental review process, without mentioning other stages in the process. While the process can certainly be improved, it is imperative that the integrity of environmental protection and public input is maintained. Additionally, approximately only 7 percent of projects go through a full environmental review process, suggesting other alternatives should be considered. For example, modified design standards, use of design-build procurement, and delegation of design exceptions to state engineers could all be modified to accelerate project delivery. Perhaps most concerning, the proposal allows states to acquire right of way and conduct design work on projects prior to completion of the environmental review process. This would seem to bias projects before any legitimate scoping process has been completed.

**Public Transportation:** With public transit ridership growing month after month, and service providers cutting routes and raising fares, now is the worst time to slash transit investments. A 35 percent cut in transit funding will simply push many urban, suburban and rural transit systems to the brink of collapse, just as people are relying on them more than ever to get to jobs, health care, and school – California faces cuts of \$468 million and 7,600 jobs per year under the proposal. Once again, we recognize and commend the Committee for the expansion of TIFIA, but the overall cuts to transit remain a direct threat to the economy and public health. And while we strongly support any additional investment in suburban and rural transit services, we urge that it not come at the expense of funding for urban transit systems who are struggling to cope with decades of deferred maintenance and face a staggering backlog of investment needs.

In order to increase the cost-effectiveness of new and existing transit services, we hope the Committee will seriously consider new incentives for the public sector to partner with both for-profit and non-profit developers on transit-oriented development projects. These types of projects help improve the efficiency of transit services and can help leverage private funds to support transportation. In addition, these developments can help provide low-and moderate-income families with access to affordable transportation options that are critical as the economy continues to suffer and the cost of gas rises.

In conclusion, we want to continue working with you on these issues, and will honor your request for ideas and comments on ways to improve the proposal. While it is critical that Congress pass a long-term transportation bill soon, we feel strongly that any comprehensive transportation authorization proposal contain both adequate funding and

a balanced set of policy reforms. We hope to work with you to address these concerns as you move forward.

Sincerely,  
Silicon Valley Leadership Group  
Jessica Zenk  
Director of Transportation Policy

Coalition for Clean Air  
Luis Cabrales  
Deputy Campaign Director

Sierra Business Council  
Nikki M. Streegan  
Communications Director

Safe Routes to School National Partnership  
Deb Hubsmith  
Director

California League of Conservation Voters  
Warner Chabot  
CEO

CALPIRG  
Emily Rusch  
California State Director

Central Valley Air Quality Coalition,  
Elizabeth Jonasson  
Land Use and Transportation Committee Chair

Natural Resources Defense Council  
Anne Notthoff  
California Advocacy Director

TransForm  
Stuart Cohen  
Executive Director

California Bicycle Coalition  
Dave Snyder  
Executive Director

California Walks  
Wendy Alfsen  
Executive Director

California Pan-Ethnic Health Network  
Cary Sanders  
Director Policy Analysis & Having Our Say

National Parks Conservation Association  
Ron Sundergill  
Senior Director, Pacific Region

Move LA  
Denny Zane  
Executive Director

Breathe LA  
Neal Richman  
Director of Programs and Advocacy

Fixing Angelenos Stuck in Traffic - FAST  
Hilary Norton  
Executive Director

City Car Share  
Rick Hutchinson  
CEO

Endangered Habitats League  
Michael Fitts  
Attorney

LA County Bicycle Coalition  
Jennifer Klausner  
Executive Director

Move San Diego  
Elyse Lowe  
Executive Director

Veritable Vegetable  
Peggy Da Silva  
Education & Training Manager

San Francisco Bicycle Coalition  
Andy Thornley  
Policy Director

Walk San Diego  
Jim Stone  
Executive Director

Walk Sacramento  
Terry Preston  
Executive Director

Policy in Motion  
Lauren Michele

Principal/Owner

Walk San Francisco  
Elizabeth Stampe  
Executive Director

Prevention Institute  
Manal Aboelata  
Program Director

Greenbelt Alliance  
Jeremy Madesn  
Executive Director

Ubuntu Green  
Charles L. Mason, Jr.  
President and CEO

East Bay Bicycle Coalition  
Dave Campbell  
Program Director

Train Riders Association of California  
Bart Reed  
Board Member

Catholic Charities, Diocese of Stockton  
Betsy Reifsnider  
Environmental Justice Coordinator

Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California  
Michael Lane  
Policy Director

Los Angeles Walks  
Deborah Murphy  
Founder

San Luis Obispo County Bicycle Coalition  
Dan Rivoire  
Executive Director

Walk and Roll Berkeley  
Wendy Alfsen  
Coordinator

Mobis Transportation Alternatives  
Andrea White-Kjoss  
President and COO

The Truckee Trails Foundation

Allison Pedley  
Executive Director

Marin County Bicycle Coalition  
Andy Peri  
Advocacy Director

Fehr and Peers  
Matt Henry  
President

Bike Sage  
Ron Milam  
Founder

The Transit Coalition  
Bart Reed  
Executive Director

San Francisco Walks and Rolls  
Wendy Alfsen  
Coordinator

San Francisco Bay Walks  
Rhianna Babka  
Network Coordinator