'A FRESH APPROACH'

District Begins Work on Reshaping Transit Program for New Bond Issue

Sometime within the next 12 months the Transit District expects to offer East Bay citizens a revised program to replace the area's deteriorating transit service with an up-to-date and progressive transportation system.

No sooner were returns of the recent transit bond election compiled than Robert K. Barber, district president, stated a revised bond measure should be submitted to the voters.

Results of the bond election confirmed that a majority of residents in Alameda County favor an improved transit service operating as a publicly-owned district, Barber said.

Despite a political climate in which few bond measures in the area were adopted, the $16,900,000 bond proposal received a 60 per cent favorable vote in Alameda County.

New Boundaries

In central Contra Costa County, only 39 per cent of those voting favored the proposal. As a result, directors of the District have indicated they favor the exclusion of central Contra Costa County from voting on a future bond election.

General Manager John R. Worthington has been instructed to begin studies leading towards the necessary legislative changes in the transit district law that would be required for this exclusion.

The district's basic transit plan, prepared by De Leuw, Cather & Company, will be revised to conform to new service boundaries.

In its revisions, the District will closely confer with civic, business, and industrial groups and municipal agencies to assure the transit program is in close harmony with the wishes of the people.

"Every effort should be made to bring into our planning the various citizens' groups that have shown their intense interest," Barber recently told the Board of Directors, "so that in the shaping of our program they will have a large part in forming a policy and program that would provide in their eyes the most benefit to our citizens and voters."

Objections Eliminated

Barber and other directors believe another bond issue should be approached on an "entirely fresh basis, eliminating any feature which might have been found objectionable."

Directors have authorized a public opinion poll to determine specific objections to the transit plan that influenced voters against approving the program by the necessary two-thirds vote.

The District plans to continue with its current condemnation suit against Key System, now before the State Public Utilities Commission. The PUC decision is expected to assure acceptable values so far as any purchases or contracts that might be made in connection with any of the company's properties.
An Editorial

**Election Analysis**

A significant factor in the recent defeat of the $16,900,000 transit bond issue was the re-election of incumbent transit directors by substantial margins.

This was an election year in which return of the incumbent was the exception—not the rule. Yet, these elected district officials, whose proposed bond issue was turned down by the voters, received an overwhelming vote of confidence.

An analysis of the election results strongly indicates that reasons for the defeat of the bond measure must therefore be found other than in general disapproval of the directors' transit program. First of all, a landslide re-election victory was accorded the directors who were responsible for the program; and, secondly, more than half of the voters in the District showed they favored the transit proposal.

Probably there are a number of reasons why the bond measure failed to receive the necessary two-thirds majority vote for passage. A public opinion poll to be conducted by the District should uncover some of these reasons. General reluctance to vote bonds, as evidenced by the defeat of most all bond measures in the two East Bay counties, undoubtedly was a large contributing factor.

To resolve objectionable features of the plan, the District is preparing to meet with numerous organizations in an endeavor to learn whether there may be possible revision that would better serve the individual cities and unincorporated areas of the District.

With greater community participation and more opportunity in which to acquaint the people with the revised transit program, directors of the District believe voters will favor a future bond issue with the necessary two-thirds vote.

The directors are satisfied, in view of the election, that to abandon their efforts to develop an adequate public transit system would amount to gross disregard of majority opinion and would serve only to compound the multiple transit problems of the growing East Bay area.

Progressive public transit—an essential ingredient to overall progress and development of the East Bay—is the goal district officials have in mind. They will need the assistance and thoughtful consideration of the entire citizenry of the District to accomplish this task.

**Board Adopts Outline For District Planning**

A committee report setting forth areas of study regarding a future course of action for the Transit District was adopted at the November meeting of the Board of Directors.

The report was submitted for approval by the Committee on Program Planning, headed by President Robert K. Barber. The need to re-evaluate the transit plan in order to give full recognition to the desires of all areas of the District as recently expressed by the voters on the bond issue was stressed by Barber in presenting the report.

While Contra Costa County voters as a whole rejected the plan, for example, the outcome in Alameda County was otherwise, with a 60 per cent favorable vote achieved, he noted.

The committee was unanimous in its opinion that the Alameda County vote implied strong support for the District's overall approach to the transit problem in the East Bay, and that the outcome could have been even more favorable had the election been held at another time when fewer measures were competing for the attention of the voters," Barber said.

The committee recommended the general manager should submit proposals along the following course of action:

"Possible amendments to the transit district law at the next session of the Legislature to conform with indicated desires of Contra Costa County;" "Proposals of the transit plan, including financing, to meet the desires of the East Bay area;" "Organization of citizen advisory groups to help shape district plans, and "Submission of a modified program and financing to the voters at the earliest practicable opportunity."

The report was prepared by Directors Wm. J. Bettencourt, Paul E. Deadrich and John L. McDonnell in addition to Barber.

**What the Editors Say About Transit**

Bond Defeat Considered Setback
To Needed Transit Improvements

Reprinted from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin:

One dead pigeon riddled by Tuesday's ballots is a corpse which concerns San Francisco, although San Franciscans didn't vote on it.

This is the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District bond issue of $16,900,000, which failed to gain a required two-thirds majority and on which hinged the development of the District as a going concern.

This not only is a setback for the development of adequate mass transit in the East Bay, but it may well prove to be at least a psychological obstacle in the way of bringing to reality the five-county San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District of which the District is a member.

And if a continued decline of East Bay transit facilities forces commuters in growing numbers to take to their autos, it will aggravate to a certain degree San Francisco's traffic problems.

The bay area district has a tough job on its hands at best, and the failure of the transit bonds has made it all the tougher.

**Another Copy?**

For another copy of Transit Times or to place your name on the mailing list if you are not already regularly receiving a copy of the monthly newsletter, just drop a line to the Transit District in Suite C at the Claremont Hotel, Berkeley. The District will be pleased to oblige.
Voters Return Transit Directors to Office

Transit district directors seeking re-election on the Nov. 4 ballot were returned to office by sizeable majorities.

In Ward 1 where no incumbent was running, Berkeley Attorney William H. Coburn, Jr., held a 900 vote lead in the complete unofficial tally. This ward represents El Cerrito, Kensington, and portions of Berkeley and central Contra Costa County.

Directors returned to office were:

Four-year Terms

Directors Copeland, McDonnell, Bettencourt and Deadrich, on the basis of vote cast, were elected to four-year terms. The other three directors received two-year terms.

The new board will be seated and its officers elected next January.

Director Clair W. MacLeod did not seek re-election, but retired from the board due to other public responsibilities. He currently is president of the five-county San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District.

Complete unofficial returns showed the following vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>William H. Coburn, Jr.</td>
<td>26,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard J. Mitchell</td>
<td>25,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas C. Paulson</td>
<td>6,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J. Howard Arnold</td>
<td>20,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neal Higgins</td>
<td>8,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>John McDonnell</td>
<td>40,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William S. Billings</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wm. J. Bettencourt</td>
<td>51,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John T. Muldowney</td>
<td>20,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paul E. Deadrich</td>
<td>40,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clyde W. O'Callaghan</td>
<td>15,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marvin T. Maynard</td>
<td>8,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another Special Lane for Buses Prove a Success

An experimental rushhour bus lane on a five-block section of a main thoroughfare in downtown Baltimore has become permanent. It was the sixth exclusive bus lane to be made permanent in the Maryland city.

Buses of the Baltimore Transit Company have been able to shave two minutes from their running time along the street because of the priority lane.

The lane has also expedited the flow of all other vehicles. The thoroughfare, Paca Street, is a one-way five-lane artery.