December 14th, 2009

Economic and Allocation Advisory Committee  
California Environmental Protection Agency  
1001 I St.  
Sacramento, CA 95812


Dear Chairman Goulder and EAAC Members

The Bay Area Bicycle Coalition (BABC), the umbrella organization of bicycle advocacy groups in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, and the California Bicycle Coalition are writing to encourage the committee to set aside some of the allowance value for construction of non-motorized facilities.

Non-motorized transportation facilities are a cost-effective tool for reducing greenhouse gas emissions as they provide several economic co-benefits including:

1. **Public Health Benefits**  
The annual difference in medical expenses for someone sufficiently active (>30 mins of daily physical activity) and insufficiently active (<30 mins of daily physical activity) ranges from $20-$330 per person. Biking 5 miles or walking 2 miles can provide this.

2. **Reduced Congestion (VHD)**  
Bicycle infrastructure creates a modeshift out of cars and on to bikes, reducing Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD), which further reduces GHG emissions.

3. **Replacing Short Commutes**  
43% of trips in California are less than two miles in length, perfect for biking or walking. By providing safe and efficient infrastructure for people to bike and walk for these trips we can reduce the use of cars for these trips.

4. **Increasing Transit Modeshare for Long Commutes**  
Bicycling provides a consistent and efficient connection to transit,
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2 National Household Transportation Survey. 2001. (Data extracted by NHTS staff researcher, Nanda Srinivasa, April 2007.)

http://www.bts.gov/programs/national_household_travel_survey/
increasing the attractiveness of transit as an option for longer commutes.

5. **Fuel Savings**

   Every 20 miles biked saves the cost of 1 gallon of gas given an average car efficiency of 20mpg.³

6. **Reduced Bicycle Crash Rate**

   By investing in bicycle infrastructure, Portland was able to increase the number of cyclists by over 400% while reducing the crash rate by nearly 70%.

When all the economic co-benefits are considered, CO2 reductions pursued through investment in non-motorized infrastructure come at a net-savings per ton of CO2 reduced. The Rails-to-Trails Conservancy calculates that increased bicycling infrastructure in Portland creates a net economic benefit of $1.4 billion from fuel and health care cost savings, equivalent to a net savings of $1,664 per ton of CO2 reduced.⁴

A recent Lancet article found that “reduction in carbon dioxide emissions through an increase in active travel and less use of motor vehicles had larger health benefits per million population (7332 disability adjusted life years (DALYs) in London)⁵ A DALY is similar to a Quality Adjusted Life Year (QALY) with a valuation between $50,000 and $125,000 dollars, bringing the estimated annual health benefit to somewhere between $366 and $916 million dollars per million population annually.


⁴ Steve Winkelman, Allison Bishins, Chuck Kooshian, “Cost-Effective GHG Reductions Through Smart Growth and Improved Transportation Choices”, Center for Clean Air Policy, June 2009

Bike Infrastructure generates mode shift from driving to bicycling. Modeshift to bicycling is facilitated by increased bikeway miles. As more destinations are connected to a safe and efficient bicycle network, more people choose bikes for their trips. *Portland, Oregon invested substantially in both bicycling and data collection, and has documented GHG reduction benefits from these investments. Between 1992 and 2008, bicycling increased at an annual rate of 10 percent while the city constructed 300 miles of bikeways through a $57 million investment.*

Non-motorized infrastructure also addresses several issues facing disadvantaged communities, which are a focus of AB32 allowance investments. Bicycling provides increased access and mobility at low cost. Active transportation directly addresses many of the health problems that disadvantaged communities face. Providing non-motorized transportation options generates savings for households in disadvantaged communities by reducing fuel costs.

Funding Bicycle Infrastructure is consistent with the guidelines for allocating Cap-And-Trade allowances, which are directed to follow Strategic Growth Council (SGC) and Regional Targets Advisory Committee recommendations. SGC guidelines include “Non-motorized urban trails that provide safe routes for both recreation and travel between residences, workplaces, commercial centers, and schools.” - PRC 75129(b)(9). And RTAC recommendations recognize that “while many MPOs have put in place exemplary policies and visions to create additional transportation choices, significant portions of their operating budgets are committed to maintenance and operation of existing systems, and only a small percentage is typically available to create new transportation
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6 Winkelman, op cit.
options...These entities would benefit from additional funding, other mechanisms, and incentives to realize their visions for mixed use, walkable communities with transportation options.”

We applaud the EAAC’s inclusion of land use planning as a possible allowance investment., but planning is only the beginning of the process for creating sustainable communities. Non-motorized facilities provide significant economic co-benefits creating a net-savings for each ton of CO2 they reduce, but lack a consistent funding source for their construction. We encourage the EAAC to include non-motorized facility construction as one of the allowance investment options so that we can begin building the infrastructure we need for a sustainable future.

Sincerely,

Andrew Casteel  
Executive Director  
Bay Area Bicycle Coalition

David Hoffman  
Executive Director  
California Bicycle Coalition