

# Social Equity Opportunities

The development of transit infrastructure can increase accessibility to critical employment centers and social services for those who cannot afford the costs of car ownership. Despite that, transit infrastructure projects do not inherently improve social equity outcomes, and increased transit accessibility does not necessarily increase the job and educational opportunities available to low-income communities and communities of color. This section describes how social equity is considered in this report and presents the case for why a third crossing is not by itself adequate to effectively promote social equity. A summary of a process for governing bodies to co-produce knowledge with local communities is also included. This process is particularly important to help agencies evaluate and address the concerns of historically disadvantaged communities and develop alternate strategies to promote social equity. This section concludes with suggestions for social equity-oriented projects that could be pursued along with a third crossing.

## Approach

Assessing whether a transportation project is equitable requires grouping individuals by geographic location, socioeconomic status, travel mode, and other characteristics.<sup>111</sup> The question of how to fairly allocate transportation funding frequently concerns geographic equity, which focuses on whether costs and benefits are appropriately distributed between different geographic locations. What defines a “fair” distribution depends on the values of the stakeholders, some possibilities of which are detailed below.

- **Return to Source:** Transportation investment should be geographically distributed in proportion to the amount paid in taxes.
- **Equality of Spending:** Transportation investment should be spread evenly among geographic locations, regardless of the amount paid in taxes.
- **Equality of Results:** Transportation investment should produce equal levels of access and service across geographic locations, regardless of the amount paid in taxes or share of spending.<sup>112</sup>

These three conceptualizations of equity can also be applied to different socioeconomic and demographic groups (Taylor, 2004). For this report, our concept of social equity focuses on ensuring that historically disadvantaged communities benefit from equality in access and service from transportation investments, and not merely equality in spending. These communities have historically had their transportation needs neglected in favor of wealthier communities and at the same time been forced to shoulder a disproportionately high share of the negative impacts from that same infrastructure. It is therefore vital that future projects not only benefit these communities, but also begin to rectify past injustices.

---

<sup>111</sup> Transportation Research Board. (2011). *TRB Special Report 303: Equity of Evolving Transportation Finance Mechanisms*. Washington, D.C.: Transportation Research Board. Retrieved from <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/13240>

<sup>112</sup> Taylor, B. D. (2004). Chapter 1 The Geography of Urban Transportation Finance. *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, 294.

As described in the Key Considerations section, a social equity framework forms the basis for this entire report and at the same time is a specific problem to be address. This dual role is motivated by our understanding that implicit discrimination and inequity pervades all facets of the planning and decision-making process, perhaps especially in the field of transportation planning. Social equity cannot merely be a box to be checked, but rather must be fundamentally incorporated into every step of the process, particularly for a project of the financial and geographic scale of a third crossing.

## History of Equity and Transportation Infrastructure Projects

Low-income communities and communities of color have frequently been harmed by massive transportation infrastructure projects that resulted in displaced households and divided communities. Paradoxically, these transportation projects often actually reduced accessibility to employment, services, and recreational activities for these communities and were detrimental to health outcomes.<sup>113</sup> Much of the transportation infrastructure built in the Bay Area in the 20th century matched this pattern, including the construction of I-980 and BART in West Oakland. However, recent decades have seen somewhat of a shift in regional priorities, as projects like the redevelopment of Cypress Freeway in Oakland<sup>114</sup> and the development of the Fruitvale Transit Village<sup>115</sup> have worked to actively limit negative impacts to historically disadvantaged communities. These two projects involved community groups and advocates in the decision-making from the start and proactively addressed potential social equity issues throughout the entire process of financing, building, and operating the projects. See the Historical Context section for more information on the history of transportation infrastructure and social equity in transportation in the Bay Area and United States.

## Accessibility to Employment Opportunities

Public transit is a vital social service for those who, due to age, income, or disability, either cannot afford or do not have access to a private vehicle (Garrett & Taylor, 1999). Without the mobility that transit provides, these individuals would lack access to employment and social services and experience “social isolation and a lack of social capital.”<sup>116</sup> The Alameda County Public Health Department (2013) found that cuts to AC Transit left some bus riders experiencing more frequent stress and anxiety, in part due to the increased likelihood of arriving late to work and facing lost wages.<sup>117</sup> In addition to providing access to existing jobs, transit provision can create new jobs, including construction jobs and

---

<sup>113</sup> Deyaiyoti Deka. (2004). Social and Environmental Justice Issues in Urban Transportation. In *The Geography of Urban Transportation* (pp. 332–355).

<sup>114</sup> Cypress Freeway Replacement Project. (n.d.). Retrieved November 25, 2016, from [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental\\_justice/case\\_studies/case5.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental_justice/case_studies/case5.cfm)

<sup>115</sup> Shibley, R. (2005). Fruitvale Village Oakland, California Case Study. *Rudy Bruner Foundation*, 1–33.

<sup>116</sup> Transportation Research Board. (2011). *TRB Special Report 303: Equity of Evolving Transportation Finance Mechanisms*. Washington, D.C.: Transportation Research Board. Retrieved from <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/13240>

<sup>117</sup> Alameda County Public Health Department. (2013). *Getting on Board for Health - A Health Impact Assessment of Bus Funding and Access*. Alameda County Public Health Department. Retrieved from <http://www.acphd.org/media/308854/transithia.pdf>

jobs created as a result of economic development stemming from an expansion or improvement in service.<sup>118</sup>

Research conducted during the Dublin-Pleasanton and Castro Valley BART extensions found that low-income, black, and Latino individuals living in Oakland experienced reduced commuting travel time and cost to access employment centers in suburban, predominantly white areas after the new stations opened.<sup>119</sup> Despite these reductions, the study found that the accessibility impact varied by race. While there was an increase in Latino new-hires within 3 miles of the new BART stations after opening, the likelihood of a black new-hire in the immediate station area was unchanged. The results of this study illustrate that increasing accessibility does not necessarily increase opportunity for all groups. Planning for a third crossing must consider this context and ensure that the project increases accessibility for members of all historically disadvantaged groups. In order to achieve this goal, additional benefits must be included in each of the planning, building, operations and maintenance phases of the project.

It is also essential to provide and protect affordable housing near transit to ensure that low-income workers benefit from increased transit service. A report prepared for the Bay Area Regional Prosperity Plan Housing Working Group found that while San Francisco experienced a large growth in lower-wage jobs between 2008-2010 and 2011, it saw no net increase in affordable rental units during that time.<sup>120</sup> Likely due to this mismatch, San Francisco workers earning less than \$1,250 per month experienced the largest increase in commute distance of any wage group. A new low-wage worker in San Francisco had to travel an average of about four times further than a new high-wage worker. Even when there are increases in low-wage jobs in transit-rich places like San Francisco, access to these jobs may not improve if transit is not linked with affordable housing.

## Gentrification and Displacement

Chapple (2009) analyzed gentrification in the Bay Area between 1990 and 2000 and found that convenient access to transit for commuters was one of the most significant factors associated with whether a neighborhood experienced gentrification. Chapple (2009) defines gentrification as the process of a neighborhood experiencing increases in real estate investment, household income, and educational attainment. These increases can be seen as benefits to a neighborhood, but since most of the gains marked by gentrification are not experienced by existing residents of the neighborhood (Chapple, 2009), who experiences these benefits and who does not has social equity implications. Going further, since the most prominent negative impact associated with gentrification is indirect displacement (Zuk et al., 2015), the discussion becomes about who is displaced and who is not. Involuntary displacement disrupts lives as people are forced to move from their homes, but the potential negative impacts include diminished access to critical destinations after being displaced. Zuk et al. (2015) found that the trend of neighborhood change is toward increased economic segregation,

---

<sup>118</sup> American Public Transportation Association. (2016). Need for Investment. Retrieved December 10, 2016, from <http://www.publictransportation.org/benefits/needforinvestment/Pages/default.aspx>

<sup>119</sup> Holzer, H. J., Quigley, J. M., & Raphael, S. (2003). Public transit and the spatial distribution of minority employment: Evidence from a natural experiment. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 22(3), 415–441. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.10139>

<sup>120</sup> Karner, A., & Benner, C. (2015). *Job Growth, Housing Affordability, and Commuting in the Bay Area*. Bay Area Regional Prosperity Housing Working Group. Retrieved from [http://planbayarea.org/pdf/prosperity/research/Jobs-Housing\\_Report.pdf](http://planbayarea.org/pdf/prosperity/research/Jobs-Housing_Report.pdf)

which has led to “low-income and families of color [experiencing] limited access to affordable housing, high quality schools, and good-paying jobs.” Zuk et al. (2015) also found that while the emphasis of the literature is on the impact on residential property values, available studies have found that rail investments are associated with increases in commercial property values. This indicates that businesses and non-profits are also potentially vulnerable to displacement due to a new transbay crossing project.

The potential for gentrification, and ultimately for displacement, is particularly salient for discussions around an additional transbay crossing as the draft Preferred Scenario for Plan Bay Area 2040 is expected to increase the risk of displacement by 9% (6 Wins for Social Equity Network, 2016).<sup>121</sup>

## Policy Context

Legislation at the federal, regional and agency levels are in place to protect under-represented groups in the transportation field, including low-income, racial and ethnic minorities and disabled individuals. The proposed project alternative will need to satisfy a number of requirements at these various levels in order to receive funding and garner the support of jurisdictions.

At the federal level, the Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 significantly impacts the development of federally funded transportation infrastructure. Title VI states that “[n]o person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance” (42 U.S.C. §2000d). This act is authorized through the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Office of Civil Rights, which has a set of requirements that must be met in order for transportation projects to receive federal funding. These requirements prohibit services from being denied to protected classes, prohibit protected classes to be subject to separate treatment, and prohibit protected classes from being denied an opportunity to participate in a program through the provision of services (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2013). The FTA requires that the governing body submit a Title VI Analysis, including:

- 1)** All general requirements set out in most recent Title VI Circular;
- 2)** “A demographic profile of the metropolitan area that includes identification of the locations of minority populations”
- 3)** “A description of the procedures by which the mobility needs of minority populations are identified and considered within the planning process”
- 4)** “Demographic maps that overlay the percent minority and non-minority populations as identified by Census or ACS data ... and charts that analyze the impacts of the distribution of State and Federal funds in the aggregate for public transportation purposes”
- 5)** “An analysis of impacts identified in paragraph (4) that identifies any disparate impacts on the basis of race, color, or national origin, and, if so, determines whether there is a substantial legitimate justification for the policy that resulted in the disparate impacts, and if there are alternatives that could be employed that would have a less discriminatory impact” (FTA Circular 4702.1B, 2012, p. VI-1f; Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2013).

---

<sup>121</sup> 6 Wins for Social Equity Network. (2016, October 13). Plan Bay Area 2040 Preferred Scenario. Retrieved from <http://www.publicadvocates.org/uncategorized/6-wins-comment-letter-on-the-draft-preferred-scenario-for-plan-bay-area-2040/>

There are also a number of environmental justice acts that attempt to mitigate projects that disproportionately burden low-income neighborhoods and communities of color. These include Federal Action to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, which led to similar actions adopted by the US DOT and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (Deka, 2004).<sup>122</sup> In 2011 and 2012, the US DOT and FHWA order has been updated to increase the responsibility of the DOT to determine whether projects have disproportionate impacts on the health and environmental well-being of low-income and minority communities (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2013).

Regionally, MTC has adopted principles that align with Title VI and environmental justice requirements set out by federal agencies. MTC is responsible for ensuring that programs, policies and activities they fund comply with federal agency regulations, developing and implementing programs that work to protect the needs of low income individuals and communities of color, and producing regional Title VI compliance reports and environmental justice analyses (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2013).

Transit agencies, including BART and Caltrain, must comply with federal and regional policies that protect the health, safety and well-being of low-income riders and riders of color. For instance, BART's Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policy is used to determine when a major service change or fee change disproportionately impacts a specific group, and outlines how the agency should avoid these impacts (BART, 2013).

Many communities, transportation users and advocacy groups have pushed back against these regulations, arguing that the regulations are not stringent enough to protect the wellbeing of low-income communities and communities of color or that the regulations are not enforced properly (Golub, Marcantonio, & Sanchez, 2013). For instance, in 2005, a group of racial minority bus riders and advocacy organizations filed a federal civil rights lawsuit against MTC: Darensburg et al. v. Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The lawsuit was based on disparities in subsidies per bus rider compared to rail rider (about \$3 per trip for bus riders compared to between \$6 and \$14 per rail riders) and policies that promoted rail expansion over bus service expansion (Golub, Marcantonio, & Sanchez, 2013). This report takes the position that federal, regional and agency requirements must be met, and additional programs and processes should be adopted in order to protect the health and wellbeing of the Bay Area's low-income individuals and people of color.

## Making the Case for Active Equity

In light of these findings, and based off of past transportation infrastructure projects' propensity to disproportionately negatively affect low-income communities of color in the Bay Area, we reject the assumption that a new transbay crossing will inherently benefit the Bay Area's low-income communities and communities of color. Instead, we argue that social equity must be addressed at every stage of the planning, financing, building and operating phases of a third crossing, and the project must include a number of co-benefits that can offset some of the negative impacts the project could have on historically marginalized communities. This approach, which we call the "active-equity" approach, is

---

<sup>122</sup> Devajyoti Deka. (2004). Social and Environmental Justice Issues in Urban Transportation. In *The Geography of Urban Transportation* (pp. 332–355).



similar to perspectives that local equity organizations in the Bay Area and governmental bodies in other American cities have taken (Seattle Office of Planning & Community Development, 2016).<sup>123</sup>

While not all of the funds that would go to a multi-billion dollar transbay crossing project would be available for transportation projects in the Bay Area without the construction of a new crossing, investing in this megaproject does mean that taxpayer funds that would have gone to projects to improve the regional transportation network in other ways may not materialize. These are opportunity costs could have implications for social equity. See the Funding & Finance section for information and the Co-Benefits section below for possible projects that could be funded even in the absence of a transbay crossing project. Building off the case that a transit project is not necessarily the most effective form of promoting social equity, the next section describes a process for community involvement to utilize community members and their expertise on their neighborhoods to ensure an additional transbay crossing project effectively serves low-income communities and communities of color.

## Community Involvement

Based on academic research findings and best practices used in transportation infrastructure development in the Bay Area, the United States and internationally, the most equitable transportation infrastructure projects comprehensively involve impacted communities over and above what is legally required (Seattle Office of Planning & Community Development, 2016; “Cypress Freeway Replacement Project,” n.d.; “Community Advisory Committee,” 2016; Moore, Prakash, Garzon, Hernandez, McNeil, 2009; Costa, Palaniappan, & Wong, 2002).<sup>124</sup> Building from the active-equity approach this paper takes, communities impacted by the third crossing should be involved in all aspects of the planning, building, maintenance, and operations phases of the development, from setting project goals and timelines and collecting and analyzing baseline data, to developing ideas for community-relevant opportunity groups to incorporate into the larger project, and to building the infrastructure and being hired to operate transit that will use the infrastructure. We outline below how communities, advocates and governing bodies should be actively involved in the third crossing development to ensure that this project not only mitigates negative impacts on the Bay Area’s low-income communities of color, but also strategically works to bring political and economic power to these communities (Gomez, 2015).<sup>125</sup> These avenues include setting up an independent Community Advisory Board, developing and monitoring community metrics, and involving communities in building, operating and maintaining transit and infrastructure.

---

<sup>123</sup> Seattle Office of Planning & Community Development. (2016). *Equitable Development Implementation Plan*. Retrieved from <http://2035.seattle.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/EDI-Imp-Plan-042916-final.pdf>

<sup>124</sup> Seattle Office of Planning & Community Development. (2016). *Equitable Development Implementation Plan*. Retrieved from <http://2035.seattle.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/EDI-Imp-Plan-042916-final.pdf>; Cypress Freeway Replacement Project. (n.d.). Retrieved November 25, 2016, from [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental\\_justice/case\\_studies/case5.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental_justice/case_studies/case5.cfm); Community Advisory Committee. (2016). [page]. Retrieved November 26, 2016, from <http://www.morpc.org/transportation/public-involvement/community-advisory-committee/index>; Eli Moore, Swati Prakash, Catalina Garzon, Cristina Hernandez, Leonard McNeil. (2009). *Measuring What Matters*. Pacific Institute.; Costa, S., Palaniappan, M., & Wong, A. (2002). *Neighborhood Knowledge for Change*. Pacific Institute.

<sup>125</sup> Gomez, M. (2015). *Realizing Possibilities of the Connected Economy*. Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society. Retrieved from [http://haasinstitute.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/leapforward\\_connectedeconomy\\_publish\\_1\\_0.pdf](http://haasinstitute.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/leapforward_connectedeconomy_publish_1_0.pdf)

## Develop an Independent Community Advisory Board

In recently released reports on the potential new transbay crossing, agencies advocate for the need to develop a robust governance structure to oversee the crossing's development and implementation (SPUR, 2016; Bay Area Council, 2016). Similarly, all community groups, advocacy groups and elected officials representing the needs of low-income communities and communities of color should also be coordinated in order to ensure that impacted communities are involved and their needs are being taken into consideration at every aspect of the project (Caigns, Greig, & Wachs, 2003; TransForm, 2016).

To build on these recommendations, we propose that an independent Community Advisory Board (CAB) be created to represent and advocate for the needs of communities impacted by the project during all phases of the third crossing's development and implementation, including on-going project monitoring and evaluation. We recommend that the CAB be developed to ensure that impacted residents, employers and employees, and commuter groups are included in the project planning, financing, building, operations and maintenance processes. The committee should be primarily made up of individuals and groups who represent demographics that have traditionally been left out of transportation decisions, including individuals who are low-income, racial and ethnic minorities, immigrants or disabled (Simpson, 2009).<sup>126</sup> The CAB should also be comprised of elected officials and advocacy groups that represent the needs of these communities.

We recommend the CAB be involved in the following ("Community Advisory Committee," 2016)<sup>127</sup>:

- 1) Mediating between community groups
- 2) Coordinating community involvement in planning, building and operating processes
- 3) Monitoring the impacts the project has on communities using community metrics (as described below) and performance metrics (see Performance Metrics section)
- 4) Providing guidance on and reviewing planning, financing and construction proposals for the project
- 5) Overseeing key project processes, such as cost estimations for project capital, operations and maintenance, and revenue generation
- 6) Voting on revenue generation, funding decisions CAB members must be compensated for the time they put into being on this board.
- 7) Allocating community grant funding for project co-benefits (see Funding & Financing section)

Our proposed CAB builds off of the Community Advisory Committee Caltrans formed during the redevelopment of Cypress Freeway, which comprised of an existing Citizens Emergency Relief Team (CERT), West Oakland residents, commuter groups and West Oakland officials ("Cypress Freeway Replacement Project," n.d.).<sup>128</sup> We recommend a CAB be developed as soon as possible, similarly to the Cypress Community Advisory Committee, which was an extension of a group that formed within the first 72 hours of the 1989 earthquake with the goal of representing the needs of the West Oakland

---

<sup>126</sup> Simpson, J. (2009). *Everyone Belongs: A Toolkit for Applying Intersectionality*. Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.

<sup>127</sup> Community Advisory Committee. (2016). [page]. Retrieved November 26, 2016, from <http://www.morpc.org/transportation/public-involvement/community-advisory-committee/index>

<sup>128</sup> Cypress Freeway Replacement Project. (n.d.). Retrieved November 25, 2016, from [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental\\_justice/case\\_studies/case5.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental_justice/case_studies/case5.cfm)

community during the redevelopment (“Cypress Freeway Replacement Project,” n.d.).<sup>129</sup> For more information on the third crossing CAB, please look to the Project Governance section.

## Community Driven Metrics

As outlined as one of the tasks the CAB should be responsible for, we recommend a set of metrics that measure the impact the proposed project will have on under-represented communities in the Bay Area. We recommend that these metrics be developed and used by impacted communities throughout the multiple phases of the project. This recommendation is developed from the “Co-Production of Knowledge” approach, which integrates public health and city planning work to improve project outcomes, health and community wellbeing. This approach suggests that state and citizens have “different but complementary forms of knowledge” (Watson, 2014). By using approaches in which both of these kinds of knowledge are valued equally and state and citizen groups work to share their knowledge, projects often more effectively provide services to the communities they are located in and often also operate more cost-effectively (Watson, 2014).

### Process for developing community-driven equity metrics

We recommend that impacted communities develop a set of metrics to determine and monitor impacts, assets, liabilities and opportunities the transbay crossing will have on their neighborhoods (Moore, Prakash, Garzon, Hernandez, McNeil, 2009). We recommend that the Community Advisory Board (CAB) be responsible for overseeing the development of these metrics and follow the process outlined below. This process is based off the Pacific Institute’s *Measuring What Matters* report and The West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (examples from these projects are outlined in the textbox below).

#### Step 1: Engage Communities

The CAB should develop a set of criteria to define which communities are impacted during the building and operations phases of the project. Based on these criteria, the CAB should identify community leaders in impacted communities and work with these individuals to reach out to community-based organizations, parent groups, churches, neighborhood councils, elected officials and local businesses within impacted communities.

The CAB should then develop a steering committee of interested organizations that the CAB will work with more closely to develop metrics that address a variety of neighborhood assets, liabilities and opportunities. Examples of community metrics in Richmond and Oakland, CA are discussed below.

#### Step 2: Identify Metrics

The CAB and the metric steering committee should identify current community assets and issues as well as potential opportunities and liabilities that may arise due to the project development. The goal of this step is to develop metrics that meet the following criteria:

- a) Metrics that can be tracked over time by community groups
- b) Metrics that represent the wellbeing of the community
- c) Metrics that can be compared across communities

---

<sup>129</sup> Cypress Freeway Replacement Project. (n.d.). Retrieved November 25, 2016, from [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental\\_justice/case\\_studies/case5.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental_justice/case_studies/case5.cfm)



- d) Metrics that can provide quantitative and qualitative data

### **Step 3: Capacity Building and Data Collection**

Because the metrics are meant to be developed and monitored by communities, it is critical that the CAB work to build capacity of community groups in data collection and analysis related to the metrics. We recommend that the CAB hold workshops for community members and organizations to learn primary and secondary data collection and analysis. These workshops should include engaging community groups in:

- collecting baseline information for metrics
- identifying secondary information for metrics that already have data available at the neighborhood or census tract level
- collecting primary information for metrics that do not have data available

### **Step 4: Incorporate Metric Data into Decision-Making, Planning and Advocacy**

The ways in which the community metric data is incorporated into decision-making processes related to the project should be clearly outlined and publicly available. The data itself should also be available for community groups to use. For instance, the data should be publicly available at the disaggregate and aggregate level on an online platform and as fact sheets in multiple languages.

The CAB should also prepare impacted groups to use this data to advocate for the needs of their communities. The CAB should hold workshops for community members and leaders to develop ways in which to present metric data at community meetings and to governmental departments. These workshops should also prepare community organizations to integrate community-generated research into current and future organization, advocacy and planning work.'

### *Examples of Community Metrics used in Richmond and Oakland, CA*

## ***Community-Driven Metrics from West Oakland and Richmond***

### ***Freight Transport and Community Health***

The Richmond community identified diesel exhaust as a significant risk community members' health because of increased risk of cancer, asthma, heart disease, premature birth, and other health problems in individuals exposed to high levels of diesel exhaust. This metric measures the number and proportion of residents living within 1,000 feet of freight transport areas, examining these proportions by income and race (Moore, Prakash, Garzon, Hernandez, McNeil, 2009).<sup>130</sup>

### ***Employment of Formerly Incarcerated Residents***

The Richmond community also identified the lack of services and resources for formerly incarcerated members of the community as a significant issue the community currently faces. This metric measures the number of employers in the community that ask applicants whether they have been incarcerated and tracks this over time (Moore, Prakash, Garzon, Hernandez, McNeil, 2009).<sup>131</sup>

### ***Transit Mobility***

The West Oakland community identified transit accessibility from their neighborhood to employment, schools and services as a key issue, and chose to involve community members in tracking changes in the frequency and range of transit service available in the community. The metric measures AC Transit bus service by miles for routes that travel through West Oakland by weekday and month over a given time period. The community found that service frequency and range fell by 15% within a four year time period (Costa, Palaniappan, & Wong, 2002, p. 61).<sup>132</sup>

### ***Gentrification and Displacement: Community Stability & Market Trends***

The West Oakland community also identified gentrification and displacement as key issues their community is currently and will be facing in the near future. They measured community stability and market trends by monitoring "the percentage of parcels that are bought and sold over a 30-month period," analyzing the types of land uses of the parcels and turnover rates in West Oakland (Costa, Palaniappan, & Wong, 2002, p. 31). They then compared neighborhood-level data to citywide data.

## **Co-Benefits**

As discussed above, a project that involves expanding transit does not necessarily promote social equity. This section includes projects, called equity opportunity projects, that could be paired with the construction of a new transbay crossing to help ensure that (1) the potential improved access this project could provide to low-income communities and communities of color materializes, (2) potential harms are actively avoided, and (3) past impacts inflicted on these communities by similar transportation projects are acknowledged and addressed. In order for an opportunity project to be relevant for a particular community or geography, members of that community need to be a part of the selection of that project. This aligns with the objectives of Community-Based Participatory Research

<sup>130</sup> Eli Moore, Swati Prakash, Catalina Garzon, Cristina Hernandez, Leonard McNeil, Carla. (2009). *Measuring What Matters*. Pacific Institute.

<sup>131</sup> Eli Moore, Swati Prakash, Catalina Garzon, Cristina Hernandez, Leonard McNeil, Carla. (2009). *Measuring What Matters*. Pacific Institute.

<sup>132</sup> Costa, S., Palaniappan, M., & Wong, A. (2002). *Neighborhood Knowledge for Change*. Pacific Institute.

(CBPR), which aims to involve community members in all aspects of project planning, management, monitoring and output as a way of developing projects that fit with social contexts (Leung et al., 2003). MTC's Community-Based Transportation Plans, for which 30 low-income communities identified desired projects (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, n.d.),<sup>133</sup> provide a precedent for this type of community-developed projects in the region. Above recommendations are provided for a process that could help yield community-relevant opportunity projects. The opportunity projects that are described here are examples of what could potentially be considered appropriate, depending on the context.

As a multi-billion infrastructure project, constructing a new transbay crossing would present opportunities to receive additional funding for smaller, complementary projects that would maximize the benefits of the larger project for the region. For recommendations on how to acquire funding for these complementary opportunity projects, see the section on Funding & Financing.

## Improve Regional Accessibility

Constructing a new transbay crossing would add a major regional link to the Bay Area's transportation network. The following list includes example projects that could be paired with a new crossing to potentially increase the opportunities for low-income communities and communities of color to be more effectively served by the regional network.

- **Provide frequent bus service to rail from low-income communities during peak and off-peak hours** to increase access to the region's existing and new rail network
  - A recent project was programmed by MTC's Lifeline Transportation Program to preserve the existing frequency of seven County Connection bus lines that link residents in communities of concern in Contra Costa County to jobs, services, retail, schools, health care, and BART stations (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2016)<sup>134</sup>. In addition to preserving existing service, opportunity projects could include increasing service to the existing and new regional rail network for communities of concern. To adequately serve service sector employees, increases in bus service to rail would need to include increased service during the late night and early morning hours.
- **Guarantee that the new crossing will provide overnight transbay rail service**
- **Initiate regional transit fare structure** to simplify connections between modes, particularly for customers not using credit cards
  - (See Funding & Financing section for more information)
- **Provide discounts on regional fare structure** and create mechanisms for using a Medicare of Medicaid card as a fare loading card in order to reduce administrative barriers for eligible riders to use the discount.

---

<sup>133</sup> Metropolitan Transportation Commission. (n.d.). Community-Based Transportation Plans | Plans + Projects | Our Work. Retrieved December 4, 2016, from <http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/plans-projects/other-plans/community-based-transportation-plans>

<sup>134</sup> Metropolitan Transportation Commission. (2016, September 26). MTC's Lifeline Transportation Cycle 4 Program of Projects for FY 2014 through FY 2016. Retrieved from [http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/A-47\\_RES-4179\\_Lifeline\\_FY14\\_thru\\_FY16.pdf](http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/A-47_RES-4179_Lifeline_FY14_thru_FY16.pdf)

- (See Funding & Financing section for more information)
- **Provide discounted bridge tolls for low-income motorists** on all bridges across the Bay
  - Blumenberg & Pierce (2014)<sup>135</sup> found that low-income individuals were more likely to find employment when they had consistent access to an automobile than when they only had transit access, even in dense metropolitan areas. Therefore, providing discounted bridge tolls to low-income motorists could serve as an effective complement to increase employment access with this large transit investment.

## Housing, Gentrification and Indirect Residential Displacement

In light of SB 375's call to Metropolitan Planning Organizations to link transportation and land use in regional planning, an additional transbay crossing could reasonably be paired with a large investment in land development. This investment could go towards affordable housing, including protections to keep families in their existing homes and increases in the region's housing supply.

- **Provide incentives for cities with existing and new rail transit stations to adopt rent stabilization and just cause eviction ordinances.**
  - Rent stabilization, or rent control, ordinances protect tenants from excessive increases in rent (Zuk & Chapple, 2015).<sup>136</sup> As of 2015, only seven cities in the Bay Area had rent control ordinances, with only three of those cities, Berkeley, East Palo Alto, and San Francisco, having ordinances that are considered strict (Crispell, 2016).<sup>137</sup>
  - Just cause eviction ordinances limit the reasons for which tenants can be evicted (Zuk & Chapple, 2015).
- **Provide incentives to cities with existing and new rail transit stations to adopt policies that expedite the review process for housing development projections that include affordable housing.**
  - Reid et al. (2016)<sup>138</sup> argue that California could address the affordable housing supply shortage in jurisdictions that have not successfully zoned or planned for increases in affordable housing by adopting policies similar to The Massachusetts Comprehensive Permit Act. The laws included in this Massachusetts Act enable "qualified" developers to have an expedited review process for projects that include affordable housing units (Reid et al., 2016). Promoting these policies at the local level could present opportunities to increase the supply of affordable housing near existing and new rail

<sup>135</sup> Blumenberg, E., & Pierce, G. (2014). A Driving Factor in Mobility? Transportation's Role in Connecting Subsidized Housing and Employment Outcomes in the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) Program. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 80(1), 52–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2014.935267>

<sup>136</sup> Zuk, M., & Chapple, K. (2015). Urban Displacement Project. Retrieved December 10, 2016, from <http://www.urbandisplacement.org>

<sup>137</sup> Crispell, M. (2016, February). Rent Control Policy Brief. Urban Displacement Project. Retrieved from [http://www.urbandisplacement.org/sites/default/files/images/urbandisplacementproject\\_rentcontrolbrief\\_feb2016\\_revised.pdf](http://www.urbandisplacement.org/sites/default/files/images/urbandisplacementproject_rentcontrolbrief_feb2016_revised.pdf)

<sup>138</sup> Reid, C. K., Galante, C., & Weinstein-Carnes, A. (2016). *Borrowing Innovation, Achieving Affordability: What We Can Learn From Massachusetts Chapter 40B* (Policy Paper No. 1). Berkeley, CA: Turner Center for Housing Innovation. Retrieved from <http://turnercenter.berkeley.edu/california-40b>

stations in the Bay Area.

- **New public lands may be targeted for development as a result of an additional transbay crossing project. Establish a percentage of newly available land to be included in a community land trust.**
  - Community land trusts are non-profit organizations that work to provide affordable housing in perpetuity (Zuk & Chapple, 2015).
- **Provide incentives to cities with existing and new rail transit stations to adopt policies that support the development of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).**
  - ADUs are dwelling units that are on single-family properties that are independent of the primary dwelling unit (Sage Computing, Inc., 2008)<sup>139</sup>. They provide an inexpensive way for jurisdictions to increase their housing supply (Sage Computing, Inc., 2008).

## Social Services

Access to social services to those who are transit dependent could be increased by providing community-relevant services near new and existing rail transit stations. The Unity Council's community involvement led to the Fruitvale Village at the Fruitvale BART station including community-relevant education, health, and social services including a Head Start program, a high school, and a children's health clinic (The Unity Council, n.d.).<sup>140</sup> Community-relevant services at existing and new rail stations could include:

- **Child Respiratory Health Care Program**
- **Childcare services**
- **Ride-to-Health-Care-Provider Programs**

## Employment Opportunities

In addition to providing access to existing and new jobs through the expansion of the regional transportation network, a new transbay crossing project could also be paired with policies and projects that are specifically aimed at protecting or generating job opportunities for low-income communities, communities of color, and/or nonprofits and small businesses that serve these communities.

- **Hire locally and from Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Contractors for construction jobs** on an additional transbay crossing project.
- **Expand the new BART and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) programs that offer training for skilled and technical positions to other transit agencies in the region.**
  - BART and VTA received grants from the Federal Transit Administration's Innovative

---

<sup>139</sup> Sage Computing, Inc. (2008). *Accessory Dwelling Units: Case Study*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research.

<sup>140</sup> The Unity Council. (n.d.). Fruitvale Village – The Unity Council. Retrieved December 11, 2016, from <https://unitycouncil.org/property/fruitvale-village/>



Public Transportation Workforce Development Program to provide training for jobs within their agencies (Federal Transit Administration, 2015).<sup>141</sup>

- BART's program is called The Transit Career Ladders Training Program and is a partnership with community colleges and Regional Workforce Investment Boards (Bay Area Rapid Transit, 2016).<sup>142</sup> It aims to promote careers as an electrician in the transportation sector in low-income communities and among people of color, veterans, and women (Bay Area Rapid Transit, 2016).
- VTA's program is called Discover Opportunities - In Transit! (DO-IT!) and is offered to students in their late teens and early 20s with a focus on recruiting people of color, women, people with disabilities, and low-income and other underserved individuals (Childress, 2015).<sup>143</sup>
- **Establish “ban the box”/fair chance hiring policies for construction and permanent jobs created by an additional transbay crossing project.**
  - In its Economic Prosperity Strategy to improve economic opportunities for low- and moderate-wage workers in the Bay Area, SPUR et al. (2014) recommends eliminating the check box on job applications where prospective employees are asked if they have been arrested or convicted of or pled guilty to a crime. SPUR et al. (2014) argues that the use of this box can “turn even a minor offense into lifelong exclusion from many types of employment.”<sup>144</sup>
- **Establish affordable workspace on potentially newly available land due to a new transbay crossing project for work centers and industry guilds for low- and moderate-wage private sector jobs.**
  - SPUR et al. (2014) argues that work centers and industry guilds should be supported because employees that are organized are better equipped to work with employers to establish minimum wages and job standards.
- **Establish affordable workspace on potentially newly available land due to a new transbay crossing project for non-profits and small businesses** to help prevent displacement of community-run and community-serving organizations and businesses.

---

<sup>141</sup> Federal Transit Administration. (2015, October 26). Innovative Public Transportation Workforce Development Program (Ladders of Opportunity Initiative) Project Selections [Text]. Retrieved December 11, 2016, from <https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grants/innovative-public-transportation-workforce-development-program-ladders-opportunity>

<sup>142</sup> Bay Area Rapid Transit. (2016, April 8). Transit career program. Retrieved December 11, 2016, from <https://www.bart.gov/news/articles/2016/news20160408-0>

<sup>143</sup> Childress, B. (2015, September 25). VTA Receives Federal Grant to Develop Opportunities In Transit – DO IT! Retrieved December 11, 2016, from <http://www.vta.org/News-and-Media/Connect-with-VTA/VTA-Receives-Federal-Grant-to-Develop-Opportunities-In-Transit-DO-IT#.WEzGcb7UUgs>

<sup>144</sup> SPUR, Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy, San Mateo County Union Community Alliance, & Working Partnerships USA. (2014). *Economic Prosperity Strategy: Improving economic opportunity for the Bay Area's low- and moderate-wage workers*. The Bay Area Regional Prosperity Plan Steering Committee. Retrieved from <http://www.spur.org/publications/spur-report/2014-10-01/economic-prosperity-strategy>

DRAFT