

Student Transit Pass Program Process Timeline

	Meeting Date and Time	Outcomes
1	Student Transit Pass Program January 31, 2012 12 to 2 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of student transit pass programs and direction from Alameda CTC Board • Discussion of program work scope to define: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objectives ▪ Types of programs ▪ Potential partners ▪ Evaluation methods ▪ Program oversight and review of effectiveness
2	Student Transit Pass Program March 7, 2012 12 to 2 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of process timeline • Further discussion of program work scope: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objectives ▪ Types of programs (geographic differences, eligibility, hours of operation, technology, ability to leverage other programs) ▪ Potential partners (schools, transit, funding) ▪ Evaluation methods (performance measures) ▪ Program oversight and review of effectiveness (who will oversee, who will evaluate effectiveness, who will report to the public) ▪ Funding partners
3	Student Transit Pass Program April 4, 2012 12 to 2 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of and input on the Student Transit Pass Program working draft scope
4	<p>Student Transit Pass Program May 2, 2012 12 to 2 p.m.</p> <p>Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC) May 3, 2012 1:30 to 4 p.m.</p> <p>Steering Committee May 24, 2012 12 to 3 p.m.</p> <p>Alameda CTC Board May 24, 2012 3 to 5 p.m.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the Student Transit Pass Program draft scope of work • Update on the Draft Student Transit Pass Program work scope to advisory committees and the Commission

This page intentionally left blank



Student Transit Pass Program Development Meeting Minutes Wednesday, March 7, 2012, 12 p.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 220, Oakland

On March 7, 2012, the following participants and staff met to discuss the development of a scope of work for a student transit pass program for middle-school and high-school students.

Attendees: Mahasin Abdul-Salaam, Genesis; Kathy Brown, Hayward Unified School District (HUSD); Andrea Bustamante, Oakland Unified School District; John Claassen, Genesis; Rose DeLeon-Foote, Youth Uprising; Kelly Hubbard, HUSD; Lindsay Imai, Urban Habitat; Nathan Landau, AC Transit; Mary Lim-Lampe, Genesis; Kristen Mazur, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC); Jeffery Nazareno, MTC; Patrisha Piras, Sierra Club; Vie Rodrigues, Youth Uprising; Amy Shrago, Supervisor Carson's Office; Cyrus Sheik, Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA); Robert Wilkins, Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA); Julie Yemen, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)

Alameda CTC Staff/Consultants: Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Policy, Public Affairs and Legislation; Arun Goel, Safe Routes to School Project Manager; Saravana Suthanthira, Senior Transportation Planner; Angie Ayers, Public Meeting Coordinator

1. Welcome and Introductions

Tess Lengyel called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. The meeting began with introductions.

Tess stated that staff has scheduled a series of meetings at Alameda CTC for participants to discuss the development of a student transit pass program. The Alameda County Transportation Expenditure Plan for the new transportation sales tax measure sets aside funding to test different models of student transit pass programs. Alameda CTC is in the process of receiving endorsements from the cities on the Transportation Expenditure Plan, and seven cities have endorsed the plan so far. Alameda CTC is working with all cities, AC Transit, and BART regarding endorsement of the Transportation Expenditure Plan that would serve as the funding source for this program.

The purpose of the meeting is to continue the discussion about the scope of work for the student transit pass program. The aim is to develop a scope of work that identifies the parameters for model student transit pass programs so that a request for proposals can be released so a program can be developed, implemented, evaluated, and a final report can be prepared with recommendations on successful program elements that can be funded and implemented at schools throughout Alameda County.

2. Overview of the Process Timeline

Tess stated that the goal for participants is to develop a scope of work and bring it to the Steering Committee and the Commission for review and potential approval in May 2012. The process timeline in the packet is ambitious; however, the last meeting of the Steering Committee is in May, and the goal is to have members review the document by that time. If voters approve the transportation sales tax measure in November 2012, Alameda CTC could implement the model programs in the 2013-2014 school year. This will allow the Alameda CTC the opportunity to receive the funds in April 2013 and develop and implement model programs.

3. Recap of Previous Meeting

Tess Lengyel stated that the minutes from the last meeting are in the packet, and staff will also document this meeting. She reviewed the program scope discussion documented in the January 31, 2012 minutes. The technology being considered to allow entry on the transit systems is potentially a combination of the Clipper card and the student identification card.

A participant noted that none of Alameda County's small transit operators have Clipper. Another participant stated that for Alameda County transit operators, Clipper has a rollout schedule as follows:

- The LAVTA/WHEELS rollout date is to be determined.
- Union City Transit will roll out its program under AC Transit, and the rollout date is to be determined, as well as if Union City Transit will adopt AC Transit's fare structure.

4. Discussion of Program Scope

Participants discussed the program scope and continued their brainstorming session from the last meeting on objectives, types of programs, eligibility, and hours of operation. Additional discussion will continue at the next meeting on these and other program parameters. The participants brainstormed the information below on the following concepts at the March 7, 2012 meeting:

A. Objectives

- Don't fully require increases in high-school graduation rates as an eligibility requirement. Consider better attendance or better grades.
- Health benefits to students and local communities equal less greenhouse gas emissions and stress from congestion and cleaner transit use.
- Support positive youth development (for example, overall community support for students in Alameda County).
- Gather support from the larger community for student transit.
- Have transit systems that support student access and demand during certain times.

- Prevent a stigma for students with varying incomes who will receive free transit.

B. Types of Programs

➤ Geographic areas

- Will the program pay for transit in areas that do not currently have transit service or use existing services? Tess stated that if the measure passes, the Transportation Expenditure Plan includes \$15 million for the initial three years to test different models. Where will we focus this money? Do we want to test high-density areas at certain schools with a lot of transit access and at the same time test areas that do not have transit access?
- Include paratransit access for students?
- The transit systems must support student access.
- Consider capacity issues for buses during student travel times.
- Perhaps test in mid county transit timeliness issues, especially if it affects attendance rates.
- Offer bus and rail access.
- Ensure the metrics are realistic – High-school graduation rate increases and student achievements may be a challenge to meet.
- Choose dense locations and less-dense locations.
- In Central County (Hayward), consider that:
 - A low number of the population is using transit; many students are in after-school programs, and transit is not available.
 - If afternoon and weekend service was available, it would equate to more students being successful.
- Use a selection process by school, for example, at Castlemont High School in Oakland – If planning for a three-year program, we can leverage the student pass program with the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program and make sure to develop a model that can be implemented in middle schools then transition to high school so that students will learn early about transit and develop into new transit riders.
- Link middle-school transit service to high-school transit service, starting with a particular middle school.
- Test regular transit use versus dedicated school “trippers”; check the willingness of the parents to receive full buy-in, thereby meeting the program objectives.
- Focus on areas where access to school from an economic perspective is more difficult.
- Start with middle schools that offer trend lines for analysis:
 - Get commitment from transit operators to provide adequate service to support the program.
- Middle schools are different around the county.

- Start in multiple different areas; schools may help do self selection; this also offers testing different demographics and all students in participating schools. Considerations:
 - Need enough examples to get data in different demographic areas.
 - If the program doesn't allow all students in the selected schools, this may create a stigma.

➤ Eligibility

The goal is to provide all students in Alameda County access to the student transit pass; however, the program could start with the areas of greatest need:

- Homeless and drop-out students
- Students in communities of concern

Other ideas include:

- Focus the program (define the program in the areas that have been raised).
- Test different models to test if they create a stigma for students.
- Make the pass available to all students at select schools.
- Give youth centers access to the program.
- Set an age limit (if a student is in a program to receive his or her general educational development (GED), is that student eligible?).
- Provide passes for Alameda County students only (what about students who live in other counties and go to school in Alameda County or live in Alameda County and go to school outside the county?).
- Potentially offer the youth transit pass to after-school students (since it's not mandatory to attend every day in middle schools and high schools).

➤ Technology

- Use the Clipper card technology and place a student photo on the card.
- Use Lifetouch photos with the Clipper card to create a smart card.

➤ Leveraging other programs

- Safe Routes to School (SR2S)
- Provision 1 or Provision 2 Programs – If 80 percent of the children at any given school are enrolled in the free or reduced lunch (FRL) program, the federal government and state will pay schools for meals and other benefits; if the school is coded as provision 1 or 2, the entire school is

considered eligible. This program can determine eligibility criteria if all students are not able to use the student transit pass.

C. Potential Partners

Participants discussed the following partners and their roles:

- Alameda County Office of Education – Educate about using transit to protect the environment, and provide education on the program including transit etiquette (if students are eligible for FRL, the school district will administer this education).
- Alameda CTC – Provide program funding through the transportation sales tax measure
- Cities – Educate students about the program and hold fundraisers.
- MTC – Provide Clipper card technology and potentially provide funding.
- Office of Supervisor Carson – Provide awareness of the program
- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) – Provide education about the program.
- Schools and school districts – Participate in using the program.
- Transit Operators – Provide transit service.
- Youth centers, community centers, YMCA, congregations – Provide education about the program.

D. Evaluation Methods

These were not discussed at the meeting.

E. Program Oversight and Review of Effectiveness

These were not discussed at the meeting.

F. Funding Partners

- Air District (Transportation For Clean Air funding in response to greenhouse gas reduction)
- Climate Initiatives Program
- Federal Transportation Bill and federal education bills/appropriations
- Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC)
- Kaiser and other health organizations and foundations
- McKinney Vento Act (federal dollars) specifically for homeless students
- MTC Lifeline
- Provision 1 and Provision 2
- Safe Routes to Schools
- Traffic Impact Fees (longer impact)
- Transportation sales tax measure funding (Alameda CTC)
- Other funding (Alameda CTC)

G. How a Program Would Work

- Schools should verify criteria (eligibility, etc.).
 - Clipper – Need to determine the fees associated with loading cards.
- Alameda County Office of Education should administer the program.
- A third party could administer the program.
- AC Transit will work with the schools.
- The information process needs to be clear; the program must address Clipper card issues and define levels of responsibility.

5. Wrap Up and Next Steps

The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 4, 2012 from 12 to 2 p.m.



Student Transit Pass Program Development Meeting Minutes
Thursday, January 31, 2012, 12 p.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 220, Oakland

On January 31, 2012, the following participants and staff met to discuss the development of a scope of work for a student transit pass program for middle school and high school students.

Attendees: John Claassen, Genesis; Stan Dobbs, Hayward Unified School District (HUSD); Jeff Flynn, Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA); Unique Holland, Alameda County Office of Education; Brett Hondorp, Alta Planning & Design; Kelly Hubbard, HUSD; Lindsay Imai, Urban Habitat; Nathan Landau, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit); Sue Lee, AC Transit; Billy Martin, HUSD; John Mattos, New Haven Unified School District (NHUSD); Anne Richman, Metropolitan Transportation Commission; Amy Shrago, Supervisor Carson's Office; Blanca Snyder, NHUSD; Tina Spencer, AC Transit

Alameda CTC Staff/Consultants: Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Policy, Public Affairs and Legislation; Arun Goel, Safe Routes to School Project Manager; Saravana Suthanthira, Senior Transportation Planner; Angie Ayers, Public Meeting Coordinator

1. Welcome and Introductions

Tess Lengyel called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. The meeting began with introductions.

2. Purpose of Meeting

Tess Lengyel stated that during the development of the Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) and Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) both the public and many members of the Community Advisory Committee showed a lot of interest in the development of a student transit pass program. The Alameda CTC Board adopted the TEP on January 26, 2012, which includes \$15 million for to test different models and \$174 million in discretionary funds that can support successful programs.

Alameda CTC is initiating the development of a student transit pass program as directed by the Commission and will develop a scope of work and bring it back for the Commission's consideration. If the transportation sales tax measure on the November 2012 ballot does not pass, the Alameda CTC could move forward to test the program, if it can identify funding and partners. Currently, the Alameda CTC does not have funding for a student transit pass program.

3. Overview of Student Transit Pass Programs and Direction from Alameda CTC Board

Tess gave a presentation on the student transit pass program, which was also given at the September 22, 2011 Steering Committee meeting.

The presentation covered:

- Background and consideration of objectives and purpose for a program in Alameda County
- Background on student pass programs in the county and other regions
- Key issues to consider

The research covered:

- Review of 14 transit agencies from the Bay Area and across the country with youth and/or student fare reductions
- Review of academic research related to student passes, including study of the 2002 AC Transit pilot program
- Review of seven youth pass programs in the nation
- Review of 11 university student pass programs
- Review of the City of Berkeley employee pass program

The presentation and research covered existing conditions, and a review of peer youth programs, university programs, and an Alameda County employer-based program. Tess noted that few areas have free student passes. In the majority of the locations with student passes, students pay a nominal fee and the program supports both bus and rail transit use. New York City has the longest-standing student pass program, and its program eligibility is distance based and hours are only during school days.

4. Discussion of Program Scope

Participants discussed the program scope and brainstormed objectives, types of programs, eligibility and hours of operation. Additional discussion will continue at the next meeting on these and other program parameters. Below summarizes the brainstorming concepts.

A. Objectives

- Increase high-school graduation rates by a certain percentage
- Increase student ridership on transit
- Reduce car congestion around schools
- Reduce the cost of children getting to school by a certain percentage
- Build the “next generation of transit riders”
- Improve safety/access to schools (discussion involved different solutions for different schools; for example, one school may have car congestion; whereas, another school will have a different issue)

- Educational opportunity for students regarding traffic, emissions, and environment
- The program will serve 158,000 students in middle schools and high schools in Alameda County.
- Participants suggested we use the objectives listed in slide four of the presentation:
 - Increase transportation options for travel to school
 - Improve participation in after-school activities
 - Reduce the financial burden on families
 - Improve social equity
 - Improve school attendance
 - Improve academic performance
 - Reduce emissions and traffic congestion
 - Educate students about climate change

B. Types of Programs

➤ Geographic areas

East County –Potentially use the student identification (ID) card as a pass for all students who use WHEELS, similar to how it is done during certain times of the year; to track the usage, the bus driver will count student IDs using a manual counter since WHEELS doesn't have the clipper card technology; BART will not accept the IDs as passes. East County has a method of tracking the information; however it would need to be communicated more clearly to school districts.

- Participants discussed the possibility of a program that supports crossing guards in East County and participants noted that crossing guards may be more appropriate for grades K-5 and not necessarily for a middle and high school program.

South County – Currently, South County does not have a bus program. In this area of the county, middle schools and high schools are near AC Transit bus lines and Union City Transit in Union City.

AC Transit/BART

- Use the Clipper card for AC Transit services in combination with student IDs (if the student IDs are provided to students and have clipper card technology, they will allow entry on transit; however the tracking and administering processes will need to be defined).
- West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC) has a program that provides a student pass to low-income youth in West Contra Costa County; this program does not use Clipper because it requires a photo ID, and the schools are concerned about privacy.

Staff will contact WCCTAC for information on its student pass program.

- Lifetouch photo, which provides services to most schools for student IDs could potentially print the student IDs on a card Clipper technology. Parents and/or a program administrator could have the ability to activate the card: this method allows every student to have access to transit services.

➤ Times of use

- School year or based on engagement in year-round programs, such as enrichment, music, summer school, etc.
- School day: To/from school, after-school programs, homework assignments, tutoring programs, weekends, etc. (questions regarding morning/evening usage)
- Time restrictions do not make sense if the program is to support the needs of student transportation related to academic needs, which aren't only during school hours
- Time restrictions may be needed for program cost considerations
- Bell time and bus time coordination will be needed
- Focus on schools that may not have good school access to transit; identify how service could potentially be changed to accommodate more schools.

➤ Eligibility

- Currently, an AC Transit youth pass costs \$20 per month for 31 days of unlimited rides.
- Construct a student transit pass program that is free to students using the free and reduced lunch (FRL) program. Meeting participants suggested not combining the FRL program with the student transit pass because a social stigma is attached with any program associated with the FRL program as a qualification. If we use FRL, the program must protect privacy and not have a stigma attached to it.
 - Provision 1 and 2 Programs – If 80 percent of the children at any given school are enrolled in the FRL program, the federal government and state will pay schools for meals and other benefits; if the school is coded as provision 1 or 2, the entire school is considered eligible for FRL (the difference between provisions 1 or 2 is a percentage).
- Potentially construct a program for all students to use:
 - Alameda County has approximately 158,000 students, and it would initially cost about \$16 million to provide all students with a free transit pass and approximately \$8 million to provide service to low-income families.

- A program could be developed that allows all children to receive a student transit pass (which could be the student ID that has Clipper technology), and parents could activate the card for those that can afford it, and a program administrator(s) could activate and pay for the card usage for those who cannot afford it.

The following items will be discussed at the next meeting due to time constraints.

- Technology
- Leveraging with other programs

C. Potential Partners

D. Evaluation Methods

E. Program Oversight and Review of Effectiveness

F. Funding Partners

G. Other Discussion Points

Do we want restrictions on the pass for travel time/day? We must define the program before placing restrictions.

- How do you identify potential new riders? The best approach is to provide a pass for all students or low-income students.
- Some school districts may already provide a level of bus service. If this is the case, will we consider those areas?
- Public expectations must be considered if the transportation sales tax measure passes. How do we manage the expectations if the public considers paying for the service? We may need to consider different models in different areas of the County.
- How do we distribute the passes? Who will administer and keep the privacy? What roll will technology play? We need to integrate a fare structure and integrate it into the student transit pass program.
- Who will receive the pass? Should there be any other considerations for integration of other programs with this one? For example, students graduating from high school are not fully prepared for the workforce and need exposure to different working environments to better prepare them to more easily enter the workforce. Should the program be linked with Alameda County's Safe Routes to Schools Program? Should travel training be integrated into the program?
- What are the performance requirements for students to receive a free transit pass? What are the constraints? Discussion took place on using attendance

as a positive reinforcement to receive the pass. It was noted that homeless youth have the greatest need for the free transit pass and have a higher probability of not meeting certain attendance constraints due to their circumstances. The program should promote school attendance, and achievement; and tracking the information on student use of the program is different than limiting access.

5. Wrap Up and Next Steps

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m. Additional meetings were scheduled at Alameda CTC offices as follows:

- Wednesday, March 7, 2012 from 12 to 2 p.m.
- Wednesday, April 4, 2012 from 12 to 2 p.m.