Special Transit Bond Election Voted

Board Approves November 3 Election Date; New Studies To Consider Future High-Speed Local Rail Transit

The intention to hold a special transit bond election in November has been voted by directors of the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District in a move to speed up development of a publicly owned transit system in the East Bay.

The board of directors, at its meeting this month, also decided to ask consulting engineers to study possible need for future rapid rail transit in the East Bay to be operated by the District.

The rail study was part of a new $25,000 contract agreement approved with De Leuw, Cather & Company, consulting engineers. Main part of the De Leuw study will be a major revision of the district's motor coach plan to serve as the basis for the November bond issue.

New Equipment Bonds

The engineers were instructed to consider an alternate bond proposal that would be used to buy entirely new operating equipment. In the preliminary plan, engineers recommended both the purchase of new "Transit Liner" motor coaches as well as some used buses from Key System Transit Lines.

Robert K. Barber, district president, said following approval of the contract:

"Our engineering studies, in addition to developing a final plan for motor coach operation, will also determine the future needs of high-speed local rapid transit that would be operated in the East Bay area by this District in addition to the regional lines operated by the five-county Bay Area Rapid Transit District.

"Rapid rail transit for local East Bay service is a phase of our long-range program that we are not directly confronted with today. But it should be given thorough consideration now so that we will be ready to proceed when local, high-speed rail transit can be economically justified in the near future."

Rail Transit Needed

John R. Worthington, general manager, said that unless the five-county rapid transit district makes "major changes in some of its routing, there are several areas of the East Bay where population density will both demand and justify additional high-speed local rail transit in the next five to 15 years."

The special bond election, tentatively scheduled for November 3, will be held in the District's new special operations zone. This zone includes most of Alameda County in the District, and El Cerrito and Kensington in Contra Costa County.

Several East Bay cities are considering special bond elections this fall, Worthington reported, including Oakland, Berkeley, Albany and El Cerrito.

"One or more of these issues could be consolidated with ours, representing not only a considerable saving to the taxpayer but at the same time helping to assure a larger voter turnout at the single election," he said.
**District Requests**

Supervisors of Alameda and Contra Costa counties have been asked by the Transit District to return nearly $34,000 the District paid the counties as a share of last November’s election costs.

Although bills from the counties were paid without protest earlier this year, it has since developed that two other special districts have not been paying for the same service.

John R. Worthington, district general manager, asked for cancellation of the charges and for refunds in letters to supervisors of both counties. Involved is $289,790 paid to Alameda County and $46,070 paid to Contra Costa County.

The District was billed and paid for a share of the costs of the November consolidated election at which transit directors were elected and a transit bond issue approved. The election provisions of the state laws under which the districts operate are essentially the same, according to Robert E. Nisbet, transit attorney.

Therefore, Worthington wrote, although the transit district board “sees no objection to the payment of a reasonable charge to the county for the handling of a consolidated election, it nevertheless must, in light of the circumstances” ask for a refund.

The request is presently pending before both boards of supervisors.

---

**Election Refund**

In letters to the supervisors, Worthington noted that both the East Bay Municipal Utility District and the East Bay Regional Park District have on numerous occasions consolidated their elections with the county and never paid for it.

Election provisions of the state laws under which the districts operate are essentially the same, according to Robert E. Nisbet, transit attorney.

Worthington wrote, although the transit district board “sees no objection to the payment of a reasonable charge to the county for the handling of a consolidated election, it nevertheless must, in light of the circumstances” ask for a refund.

The request is presently pending before both boards of supervisors.

---
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**Engineers Complete Study On Electric Trolley Coaches, Find Costs Excessive**

A special engineering study has found that electric trolley coach operation is more expensive than a similar service provided by diesel motor coach.

Consultants De Leuw, Cather & Company, at the conclusion of a $1,000 survey, reported:

“Our studies clearly show that there is no economy in the operation of trolley coaches under the conditions prevailing within the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District.

“The additional cost required to operate 16 lines with trolley coaches as opposed to diesel coaches is estimated at over $1,000,000 a year.”

The special study was requested by the Board of Directors following a suggestion several months ago by Director J. Howard Arnold that the District should convert and operate about 80 per cent of the route miles now covered by Key System Transit Lines with electric trolley coaches.

The DeLeuw study estimated that initial capital costs to operate 110 miles of trackless trolleys on the heavily used lines would require an additional $11,000,000 above the initial outlay required for a similar motor coach operation. Most of the additional expense was attributed to construction of the overhead wire system and substations.

Many cities are gradually replacing trolley coaches, and some have eliminated them entirely because of the heavier financial burden, the engineering report stated.

Findings of the report have been referred to the Committee on Program Planning for study and recommendation at a meeting of the Board of Directors June 17.

---

**Local Hayward Service To Be Doubled**

Twice the amount of existing local transit service is planned for the Hayward area by the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District.

George M. Taylor, district administrative officer, told a meeting of the Hayward Lion Club recently that district engineers have recommended four new local lines connecting surrounding residential area with the downtown Hayward business district.

Population in Hayward has increased more than 350 per cent in last eight years, Taylor reported. “Yet, despite this spectacular gain, no satisfactory local transit service exists in these many new residential districts.”

The new lines would provide direct service to the Alameda County office building on Winton Avenue, the site of the proposed Hayward City Hall and Auditorium, and Tennyson High School.

Additional new inter-city express lines would provide faster and more convenient service among the several Southern Alameda County communities.
PARKING YOUR EMPLOYEES TAKES MONEY AWAY FROM PROFITS

Workers Could Take Home $300
More A Year Riding Improved Public Transit In Place Of Autos

EMPLOYEE PARKING LOTS

Adequate Public Transit Could Reduce Financial Burden Of Free Auto Lots

A major consideration in the location of industry is plant accessibility to employees who daily must travel to and from their jobs.

Reprinted below, in part, is an address delivered recently by John R. Worthington, general manager of the Transit District, before the annual meeting of the Berkeley Manufacturers Association. Its title: "Industry Has A Big Stake in Transit."

I am sure that for most businessmen the kind and quality of transportation available to and used by your employees are your every-day concern.

It cannot be otherwise because the efficiency of your operations is so closely and so inseparably linked with employee transportation.

Tardiness, absenteeism, and low efficiency, all reflected on the wrong side of the profit and loss account, are an inevitable result of inadequate or the wrong kind of employee transportation.

A survey conducted among employees of several industrial firms in West Berkeley a number of months ago disclosed the rather startling fact that only three per cent of these wage earners traveled to work by public transportation. About 75 per cent drove their own cars and the remainder were members of car pools.

Wrong Kind Of Transportation

Driving to and from work in private automobiles is the wrong kind of transportation for many employees, who have convenient access to public transit facilities serving your business establishments or who would have convenient access to public transit if these facilities were provided.

Not only is driving to and from work a needless expense for employees, it also subjects them to the delays and hazards of the peak periods of street traffic congestion.

It's an economic waste of major proportions, both for them and for the general public, inasmuch as the average rate of occupancy is only 1.47 passengers per automobile at a time when street space for moving people is at a premium.

But that is only a part of the picture.

For employers, even those with relatively small payrolls, there is constantly increasing pressure for the establishment or expansion of free parking lots for employees. This applies not just for those who do not have convenient access to public transit, but also for those who could use transit facilities, but do not choose to do so.

A Heavy Cost Burden

Employee parking lots may be free for employees, but they are a heavy cost burden to management and stockholders who are attempting to earn a fair return on invested capital.

First of all, parking lots occupy real estate that otherwise would be available for productive operations. Of themselves, parking lots do not contribute measurably to plant productivity.

The major item of cost, of course, is the land, whether it is purchased specifically for parking purposes, or is taken from holdings acquired for future plant or office expansion. Other costs include grading, drainage, lighting, fencing, entrances and exits, signing and space markings. These costs may also include substantial payments in settlement of personal injury or personal property damage or lost claims.

Research indicates that land cost (or evaluation) for employees alone is disclosed by research studies. An employee, who uses public transit 250 days a year instead of driving to and from work, could have easy access to good public transit.

How economically wasteful it is for employees alone is disclosed by research studies. An employee, who uses public transit 250 days a year instead of driving to and from work, will save more than $300 in transportation costs, not including any expenditures for parking. This saving, compounded annually at three per cent, would total $11,000 in 25 years.

Public Transit Is Safer

Furthermore, driving to and from work in rush hours is not only much more hazardous than going by bus, it is also a most inefficient use of street space at the times when this space should be used at its maximum capacity.

Research data indicate that it is six times as safe to travel by bus as by private automobile during rush hour periods, and that buses are six to seven times as efficient in the use of street space.
The mass transportation problem is not limited to the railroads. A survey shows that 13 urban bus companies went out of business last year. They couldn’t compete with the comfort and convenience of the private car.

The auto not only takes passengers from the buses but its constantly increasing numbers, by creating still more congestion, make the buses less satisfactory for their remaining riders.

Metropolitan areas need both local mass transit and intercity railroad trains. Threatened loss of rail service has brought remedial action in some states, notably in New York. But comparatively little has been done about the deterioration of bus service.

To hold present riders and win back those who have wearied of the strain of driving twice a day through bumper-to-bumper traffic, bus movement must be speeded up. In Washington, for example, their average speed has been calculated at less than eight miles an hour, or about the speed at which horses and buggies moved a half century ago.

Several cities have tried to increase bus speed by reserving a lane for them in the direction of heaviest traffic flow. Where motorists are not penalized for encroaching on the bus lane, its usefulness has been limited. Where they are ticketed, it is reported to be working well.

Key Agrees On Part Of Track Removal

The remaining abandoned transbay train tracks will be removed from Oakland streets within two years, according to a recent agreement between Key System Transit Lines and the City of Oakland.

Discussions are still underway, however, on the removal of tracks in Berkeley.

First Oakland project will be on Grand Avenue between Telegraph and Rand Avenues, estimated to cost $100,000.

Other tracks remaining are on Lake Shore Avenue between Rand and Wesley Avenues, 12th Street between Poplar and Jefferson Streets, and portions of Piedmont Avenue, Claremont Avenue and 55th Street.

Tracks already have been removed on 12th Street between Oak and Jefferson Streets and a section of Grand Avenue.

A right-of-way trade between Key and the city led to the removal of tracks on 40th Street which is currently underway.

The entire removal program, which initially was estimated to cost a total of $750,000, is expected to be completed by April, 1961.

In Berkeley, the transit company has turned over $30,000 to pay the cost of removing tracks on Shattuck Avenue between University and Durant Avenues. But discussions are still underway for the remainder of the program on Shattuck Avenue between Rose and Ward Streets; Adeline Street south of Ashby Avenue, and Claremont Avenue between Ashby and College Avenues.

Estimated cost of the Berkeley project is $150,000.

Public Favorable To New Bus Stop Shelter

A newly designed bus stop shelter has been installed in the City of Beverly Hills as part of a program to increase the attractiveness of public transit riding.

The Beverly Hills model is one of several being studied by the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District for possible use in the East Bay area.

Designed as part of a city-sponsored contest by a University of Southern California student, the shelter is all-aluminum, and is approximately eight feet wide and twelve feet long. A ten-foot bench will comfortably seat six people.

A curved cantilevered roof protects waiting passengers from the weather, and an eight-foot-long fluorescent tube lights the shelter at night. Its open construction offers a minimum of obstruction to view in all directions.

Unique Bus Stop Shelter—A new bus stop shelter recently installed in Beverly Hills is one of several designs under consideration by Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District for use in East Bay area. The shelter is fabricated completely of aluminum and is illuminated at night. Its open construction offers a minimum of obstruction to view in all directions.
At an adjourned regular meeting May 28, 1959, the Board of Directors:

- Conducted a public hearing on formation of Special Transit Service District No. 1, and hearing no objections, voted to create the special district, on motion of Director Bettencourt.

* * *

At its regular meeting June 3, 1959, the Board of Directors:

- Heard a report from Attorney Nisbet that petitions were on file from Concord City Council and Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors, requesting exclusion from the District of the City of Concord and unincorporated area of Contra Costa County with the exception of Kensington. The attorney said the Walnut Creek City Council will conduct a public hearing on a similar petition June 10.

- Instructed the attorney to prepare a resolution approving contract with De Leuw, Cather & Company for engineering studies to cost no more than $25,000, on motion of Director Copeland. (Details, Page 1.)

- Adopted a report of the Committee on Public Information, Director Copeland chairman, recommending that a proposed series of public hearings be postponed until after the District's final transit plan is prepared, on motion of Director Copeland.

- Adopted a report of the Committee on Program Planning, Director Deadrich chairman, recommending that no action be taken on a proposed public opinion survey, and that the Board declare its intention to hold a special bond election November 3, 1959, on motion of Director Copeland.

- Approved a resolution of intent to hold special bond election in Special Transit Service District No. 1 next November 3, on motion of Director Bettencourt. (Details, Page 1.)

- Adjourned meeting to June 17 at 8 p.m. for purposes of setting a public hearing date to consider petitions filed by Concord City Council and Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors requesting withdrawal of area from Transit District, on motion of Director McDonnell.