



**Alameda CTC Community Advisory Working Group (CAWG)
and Technical Advisory Working Group (TAWG) Meeting Minutes
Thursday, November 10, 2011, 1:30 p.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland**

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

Members:

<u>A</u> Alex Amoroso	<u>P</u> Paul Keener	<u>P</u> Mike Tassano
<u>A</u> Aleida Andrino-Chavez	<u>P</u> Obaid Khan	<u>A</u> Lee Taubeneck
<u>A</u> Marisol Benard	<u>P</u> Donna Lee	<u>A</u> Andrew Thomas
<u>A</u> Kate Black	<u>A</u> Wilson Lee	<u>A</u> Jim Townsend
<u>A</u> Jeff Bond	<u>A</u> Tom Liao	<u>P</u> Bob Vinn
<u>P</u> Jaimee Bourgeois	<u>A</u> Albert Lopez	<u>A</u> Marine Waffle
<u>A</u> Charlie Bryant	<u>A</u> Joan Malloy	<u>A</u> Bruce Williams
<u>A</u> Ann Chaney	<u>P</u> Gregg Marrama	<u>A</u> Stephen Yokoi
<u>P</u> Mintze Cheng	<u>P</u> Val Menotti	<u>P</u> Karl Zabel
<u>P</u> Keith Cooke,	<u>P</u> Neena Murgai	<u>A</u> Farooq Azim (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Brian Dolan	<u>P</u> Matt Nichols	<u>A</u> Carmela Campbell (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Soren Fajeau	<u>P</u> Erik Pearson	<u>A</u> George Fink (Alternate)
<u>P</u> Jeff Flynn	<u>A</u> James Pierson	<u>A</u> Gary Huisingh (Alternate)
<u>P</u> Don Frascinella	<u>A</u> Jeri Ram	<u>P</u> Nathan Landau (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Susan Frost	<u>A</u> David Rizk	<u>A</u> Cory LaVigne (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Jim Gannon	<u>A</u> Mark Roberts	<u>A</u> Larry Lepore (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Robin Giffin	<u>P</u> Brian Schmidt	<u>A</u> Kate Miller (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Mike Gougherty	<u>P</u> Peter Schultze-Allen	<u>P</u> Bob Rosevear (Alternate)
<u>P</u> Terrence Grindall	<u>A</u> Jeff Schwob	
<u>P</u> Cindy Horvath	<u>P</u> Tina Spencer	
<u>P</u> Diana Keena	<u>A</u> Iris Starr	

Staff:

<u>P</u> Arthur L. Dao, Alameda CTC Executive Director	<u>P</u> Laurel Poeton, Assistant Transportation Planner
<u>P</u> Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Policy, Public Affairs and Legislation	<u>P</u> Diane Stark, Senior Transportation Planner
<u>P</u> Beth Walukas, Deputy Director of Planning	<u>P</u> Saravana Suthanthira, Senior Transportation Planner
<u>P</u> Bonnie Nelson, Nelson\Nygaard	<u>P</u> Angie Ayers, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc.

Guest(s): Please see the attached attendee list.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Tess Lengyel and Beth Walukas called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. The meeting began with introductions.

2. Public Comments

John Knox White, affiliated with Alameda Transit Advocates, raised an issue that came to his attention that affects the information the group received for agenda item 6. He stated that he sent a letter requesting the backup data that Alameda CTC used to create the summary recommendation for the TEP. He said it would be difficult for the committee and the public

to speak about the projects and programs listed because Alameda CTC did not release the detailed information. Staff acknowledged receipt of the letter.

3. Review of October 6, 2011 and October 13, 2011 Minutes

CAWG members reviewed the meeting minutes from October 6, 2011, and TAWG members reviewed the meeting minutes from October 13, 2011 and by consensus they approved them as written.

4. Update on CWTP-TEP Activities Since Last Meeting

Tess Lengyel gave an update on the Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) and Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) activities since the last meeting. She informed the committee that the outreach on the CWTP and TEP was completed on November 3, 2011, and Alameda CTC has initiated the second-round evaluation of the CWTP. Three chapters of the draft TEP are in the agenda packet.

5. Update on the Second Draft CWTP

Beth Walukas gave an update on the second draft of the CWTP. She stated that the list of projects in handout 05A is a constrained list of \$6.8 billion as provided by MTC and is based on estimated state and federal funds for the next 28 years and assumes an extension, not augmentation, of the sales tax; therefore, the CWTP and TEP budgets do not agree at this point in the process. Alameda CTC will align the CWTP and the TEP at a later point. Compared to the CWTP evaluation performed in the summer, staff revised the approach and inputs to perform the second performance evaluation of projects and programs. Beth stated that the next steps are:

- December 2011/January 2012 – Revise Chapter 6 of the CWTP and release the draft CWTP
- December 2011 – Send the draft CWTP priorities to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
- Spring 2012 – Refine the model results based on the final land-use scenario
- May/June 2012 – Adopt the final CWTP
- Fall 2012 – Potentially revise the CWTP to include additional funding based on the TEP outcome

Questions/feedback from the members:

- With regard to the revised demographic data, Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) staff indicated that the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) data shows less of a population growth than assumed for the last several years. What impact will this information have on Alameda County CWTP? Staff stated that when Alameda CTC models the final financial constrained set of projects, it will rely on the socio-economic data ABAG adopted. MTC will adopt the Preferred Scenario in May 2012. Alameda CTC is interested in the RHNA data, but it doesn't necessarily affect the CWTP. It will impact the jurisdictions.
- Is there some time between November 17 and December 1 for CAWG to discuss what members are learning along the way, considering that the Steering Committee will have had two meetings before CAWG and TAWG will meet again? Staff stated

that the December 8 meeting was added to loop back with CAWG and TAWG on the final documents. Given the timeline, Alameda CTC will be unable to schedule a meeting with CAWG/TAWG before December 8.

- Given the priority of transit improvements to the public and the limited amount of funds available, what are the operating shortfalls based on the level of service? Staff stated that AC Transit submitted a \$2.7 billion project to bring the level of service back to 2009 levels in Alameda County. Alameda CTC is waiting to see MTC's estimate for the operating shortfalls.

Public comments:

- *John Knox White, affiliated with Alameda Transit Advocates*, raised an issue regarding the CWTP project distribution. It's important to look at the full project cost. When he looked at the distribution of the projects in July, it appeared that 58 percent of all project funding would go to projects in South County. All the projects not in the TEP list will compete with the CWTP projects to get the money. When approving the CWTP, he recommends that Alameda CTC focus on future projects because it's difficult to remove projects from the list.
- *Lucy Gigli, affiliated with BikeAlameda*, stated that when she reviewed the TEP and the CWTP, she tried to understand the projects that will affect Alameda over the next 25 years. She doesn't see the details on the projects. She wants to know what this means for bicycle and pedestrian projects. As an advocate, it's difficult to decide if certain projects should receive bicycle and pedestrian funds.

6. Presentation and Discussion on Draft TEP Guidelines and Preliminary Lists of Projects and Programs

Tess Lengyel presented the draft TEP guidelines and preliminary lists of projects and programs to CAWG and TAWG. Staff informed the group that Alameda CTC will capture and share CAWG's and TAWG's comments with the Steering Committee at its meeting on November 17, including any comments submitted in writing by noon on November 16. (Refer to Attachment A for the detailed questions/feedback from the CAWG/TAWG members that staff shared with the Steering Committee on November 17.)

Public comments:

- *John Knox White, affiliated with Alameda Transit Advocates*, pointed out that the polling showed that the public wants maintenance and stability for transit. The allocation proposed for transit and Local Streets and Roads (LSR) is not enough. He said that the BART to Livermore project is something he can't support. There is a huge need to bring the transit service back to a level prior to 2009.
- *Dave Campbell, Program Director with EBBC*, stated that the allocation percent for transit operations, LSR, and bicycle and pedestrian projects is not enough. He said the last time the process was done, bicycle and pedestrian safety received 7 percent, and now it's 5 percent. There are many projects that we can get money from to fund better transit, better street conditions, and bicycle pedestrian projects. The voters are saying to maintain the existing systems.

- *Matt Vander Sluis, Senior Field Representative with Greenbelt Alliance*, stated that we are facing a transit crisis that the TEP does not adequately address. A great amount of data is necessary before we can make a decision on a draft plan. For those projects that performed poorly in the MTC project performance evaluation, he recommended Alameda CTC to compare the amount of funding those projects will receive through this allocation to how they performed at the MTC performance assessment. As we shift toward planning for growth in the right areas, such as Complete Streets and healthy transportation, we need to add more accountability as poll results suggested. He requested that Alameda CTC ensure that the jurisdictions have policies in place on how to spend the funds before distributing them.
- *Isaac Kos-Read, Director of Internal Affairs with the Port of Oakland*, stated that he is pleased to see freight as part of the plan. He will submit detailed comments in writing.
- *Lucy Gigli, affiliated with BikeAlameda*, stated that the public wants public transit and roads back. She wants to see higher allocations for maintenance, transit, and multi-modal projects.

Staff informed the public that any comments submitted in writing by noon on November 16, 2011 will be distributed to the Steering Committee at its meeting on November 17.

7. Presentation and Discussion on Public Outreach and Polling

Alex Evans with EMC Research, Inc. gave a presentation on the polling results. The poll was conducted from September 28 to October 9, 2011. He reviewed highlights of the polling results along with the following key findings:

According to the survey results, extending and augmenting the half-cent transportation sales tax is a viable option for the November 2012 ballot that Alameda CTC should pursue, and it is preferable to a new half-cent-only measure. The survey says:

- Voters support five key elements of an augmentation:
 - Local street maintenance/improvements
 - Mass transit programs that get people out of their cars
 - Highway maintenance/improvements
 - Critical road/transportation improvements
 - Complete/safer bike/pedestrian routes
- Voters support accountability measures like citizens' oversight, audits, and regular voter review of the expenditure plan.
- While there is some regional variance in support for various programs and projects, the top two are:
 - Ensure that public transit remains affordable and accessible to those who need it.
 - Ensure that seniors and people with disabilities can get where they need to go on public transit.

Questions/feedback from the members:

- A member stated that East County shows the countywide population is 13 percent and the poll sampled at 19 percent. Alex stated that EMC looked at the voter population distribution, which may be different than the U.S. Census data. EMC will check the data.
- Nathan Landau stated that Director Harper is looking for a cross tab of the poll showing the programs and projects favored by voters who support the TEP versus those favored by voters who did not support the TEP. Staff stated that Alameda CTC is working on this request.

Joan Chaplick with MIG provided an outreach update. She said overall, Alameda CTC had 1,600 participants through the online questionnaire, toolkits and workshop attendees.

8. SCS/RTP: Update on Countywide and Regional Processes

Staff omitted this agenda item due to time constraints and requested members read the information in the agenda packet.

9. Update: Steering Committee, CAWG, TAWG, and Other Items/Next Steps

Staff omitted this agenda item due to time constraints and stated there was nothing new to report.

10. Member Reports/Other Business

Staff stated that due to the amount of time needed for certain topics, they will extend the next meeting by one hour. The meeting will go from 1:30 to 5 p.m.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next Joint CAWG/TAWG meeting is on Thursday, December 8, 2011.

This page intentionally left blank.

**Community Advisory Working (CAWG)
and Technical Advisory Working Group (TAWG)
November 10, 2011 Meeting**

**Comments on Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) Preliminary Lists of
Projects and Programs**

On November 10, 2011, Alameda CTC presented the draft TEP guidelines and preliminary lists of projects and programs to CAWG and TAWG. Staff informed the group that Alameda CTC will capture and share CAWG's and TAWG's verbal comments with the Steering Committee at its meeting on November 17, including any comments submitted in writing by noon on November 16. The TEP will be a four-chapter document, three of which are in the agenda packet in draft form. Chapter 2 will be based on the preliminary lists of projects and program with comments from the public, CAWG, TAWG, and the Steering Committee incorporated and distributed at the December 1 meeting.

The current TEP timeline is:

- November 17 – Comments from CAWG/TAWG on the TEP package of projects and programs to the Steering Committee; receive input from the committee
- December 1 – First draft TEP to the Steering Committee
- December 8– First draft TEP to CAWG/TAWG
- December 16 – Final draft TEP to the Alameda CTC Board for adoption
- Beginning of 2012 – Final TEP to the City Councils

Questions/feedback from members:

- Overall, many of the members expressed concern with the Local Streets and Roads (LSR) allocation going from 22 percent to 20 percent in the new measure. Some of the members also requested the methodology staff used to determine the allocation split between programs.
- Several members requested that individual project costs be attached to the project groupings in Figure 3 Summary of New Measure Funding (2013-42), Local Streets and Roads.
- A comment was made at one of the community workshops about the lack of detail on projects. If Alameda CTC can provide the public with better and more easily understandable project definitions, it will help garner votes.

CAWG and TAWG Comments on Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

- The City of Oakland had two concerns about the programs: 1) Oakland submitted LSR as a top priority for the Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP). The poll results show LSR as one of the priority programs. The percent allocated to LSR in the current measure is 22 percent and is 20 percent with the new measure. The concern is the reduction of the LSR percentage in the new measure. Staff explained that the current measure for LSR goes until 2022, so if the new measure passes, every jurisdiction will receive an 88 percent increase for LSR. 2) Administrative costs have not been discussed, and the City of Oakland is in need of having its streets repaved. Staff explained that the administrative costs are 5 percent with a 1 percent cap on administrative staff costs.

A columnist wrote an article that if the half-cent sales tax extension passes, we may get four lanes from Fremont to Pleasanton. The commenter was not clear what project the article referred to, but the concern is that readers may have misinformation from the article. Staff explained that there will need to be a lot of outreach to help explain to the public what is in the TEP. All information on the TEP will continue to be made public and posted on the Alameda CTC website.

- The report states that Alameda CTC will go back to the voters every 20 years, and it says that the first time we will go to the voters is in 2042, which is in 30 years. Staff explained that the first time Alameda CTC will go back to the voters is no later than 2042 and every 20 years thereafter. The reasoning behind this is that Alameda CTC can only create a TEP that would program the funding until we go for another vote. All of the numbers shown in the charts and graphs for the proposed revenue and expenditures are for the first 30 years. The numbers in the back half of the packet show the revenue and expenditures on a year-to-year basis starting with 2013-2014, which is the first full year of tax collection.
- In the presentation, every major grouping has an asterisk that says “funds may also be spent on other similar improvements of countywide significance.” Staff stated that while we list projects and programs, there is a readiness factor that will be monitored. If projects are not able to meet the 7-year deadline for environmental clearance and can not demonstrate that they have a full funding plan, then that money will need to be distributed to other projects. The guidelines say that we are committed to a mode. For example, if we have funds available in transit, and a project is not ready in that category, the funds can go to another project in the transit category. For capital projects, we plan to keep funding in the capital projects category. This is written on page 41 in the packet, under implementing guideline 25.
- Members continued to advocate for a Complete Streets component for all projects although not all members agreed on how this would be implemented. Some suggested that it should be applied as broadly as possible. An added benefit of implementing complete streets is that it will make it easier for people with disabilities to get to/from bus stops, and it may help to reduce the need for the Americans with Disabilities Act

CAWG and TAWG Comments on Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

(ADA) paratransit services. Staff stated that Alameda CTC has added Complete Streets in the guidelines, even though it is not as broad as discussed in this meeting. Will Complete Streets cover improvements for sidewalks, gutters, pavements, etc.? A member cautioned Alameda CTC to not put restrictions on the funds allocated to Complete Streets to allow use of funds to cover a broad range of improvements. Include the word “transit” in the Complete Streets guidelines.

- Do rail projects include goods movement? Staff stated that goods movement focuses on highway investments, a program that incorporates studies and analysis, and the funding priorities that come out of that process. Rail projects as they are defined now are primarily focused on passenger rail. Do freight railroads carry passengers? Staff explained that most freight railways in Alameda County are privately operated. Some passenger trains do operate within freight railroad right of ways with special operating rights. The owner of the track gets to say how or when things are operating. To improve freight and passenger rail, Alameda CTC is working to develop a countywide rail plan that is based on the work already done in the regional rail plan done by MTC, and to allocate 1 percent of sales tax revenue toward this effort.
- Why is the East/West Connector still on the project list? Staff stated that it is common for large and more costly projects to take several cycles of funding to complete and that this project is not complete yet. For example, BART to Warm Springs is a project that was in the 1986 Measure B and it was funded and completed in the 2000 measure. So, the East/West Connector is following the same path. The projects in the Expenditure Plan are not fully funded with sales tax and that is true for other sales tax-funded projects across the state. In these cases, the sales tax dollars are often used to leverage state and federal funds as identified in the CWTP and RTP.
- It was unclear if funding is committed to specific projects in figures 2 and 4. For example, the BART to Livermore project is identified to receive \$400 million. Is that amount correct? Staff said yes and pointed out that the tables show a mix of programs and capital projects.
- How do we plan on handling geographic equity for the Sustainable Transportation Linkages Program? The amount of \$229.79 million is a separate allocation for a discretionary program. Clarify in the document that Alameda CTC will address geographic equity overall within the \$229.79 million. Staff said Alameda CTC will incorporate geographic equity as it develops specific programs for distributing the funds.
- The funding allocation for highway efficiency seems low.

CAWG and TAWG Comments on Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

- Have you identified areas other than Alameda for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)? Staff said money is allocated for AC Transit BRT in Alameda County. A member requested to add to the list Bus Rapid Transit for Fremont Boulevard. Staff stated that this project was not submitted as part of the Countywide Transportation Plan Call for Projects and Programs and therefore is not identified as a specific capital project; however, the TEP has flexibility in the transit category and some other categories to allow sponsors to develop additional projects in the future which could be funded out of discretionary funding components in the plan. This flexibility is built in because we cannot know all the projects we will need in the future and will need to be able to be responsive to unanticipated needs over the plan's funding horizon.
- A request was made for staff to explain the comment regarding the opportunity for the project on Fremont Boulevard in the program. Staff stated that there is a discretionary transit program (innovative grant fund) with funds and a BRT could be an eligible expense.
- How do you hold the environmental process requirement to the regular process? If we have a project in the TEP and the funding amount is small, how does it fit with the environmental process? Staff stated that on the capital project side, there is a great deal of scrutiny. The sales tax money will provide seed money to do the environmental clearance. A full funding plan would be expected at the end of the environment clearance.
- It would be useful to split out transit capital and transit operations from the transit category.
- Will land banking and development be eligible for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) funds? In the TOD category the focus is intended to be on constructing actual public facilities. Staff stated that land banking, as such, does not fit the TOD category and was intended to support project delivery. Alameda County has not done a lot of TODs, and in terms of TOD development, it's new for the county.
- A member requested that staff add the agency associated with each project to the charts. Staff stated that the agencies are listed on the CWTP, and staff will post the applications to the Alameda CTC website to provide the members with more information.
- A member requested staff provide the methodology they used to determine the allocation split for the mass transit category.

CAWG and TAWG Comments on Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

- Why is LAVTA excluded as a mandated program when LAVTA is a mandated service under the ADA? For the non-mandated programs, East County is short changed and it was requested Alameda CTC revisit this allocation. Staff stated the non-mandated funds are distributed for the over-70 population. Staff has not found a data source of non-age related data for people with disabilities, which will change the share going to East County.
- A member suggested separating transit by allocating 30 percent to operations and 14 percent to expansion of transit; for LSR, separate 30 percent for maintenance and 8 percent for maintenance.
- A member noted that the CWTP tables do not reflect the numbers on the Measure B tables. Staff stated that TEP funding amounts assume augmentation, and the CWTP funding amounts are based on estimated discretionary funds as developed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, which do not assume an augmentation. The documents will be realigned when Alameda CTC adopts the draft TEP.
- A member requested an additional column on page 19 of the CWTP projects and programs. The member would like to see the percentage of the proposed funding of the initial request through the call for projects.
- What are the sources that add up the multi-sources fund line? Add a note to the items included in the multi-source/area. For example, BART Modernization covers multiple areas.
- What are the definitions of the Sustainable Transportation Linkages Program? This program builds on the Transit Center Development program that is in the current measure and is intended to support projects and programs that promote the completion of PDAs and TODs.
- The Bicycle and Pedestrian Program does not reference the Countywide Bicycle Plan. A member requested that Alameda CTC show the regional side of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. Staff stated that Alameda CTC is still developing the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan; and that the reference will be added.
- Why are all the percent increases on figure 9 equal except the line for Alameda County? Staff stated that there is an adjustment factor for the way the funds are currently distributed to the County. Alameda CTC used the existing allocation methods.
- On the list of projects, I-880 and Industrial Parkway Interchange, and I-880/92, are shown as two different projects, and the member suggested that it's one project. Staff said they would follow up with the comment after the meeting.

CAWG and TAWG Comments on Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

- Did Alameda CTC look at the project fundability to determine if something will make it into the plan? No, we looked at the project application and the detail the project sponsor shared. It would be helpful to understand how the applicants determined the percentage of project cost.
- Did Alameda CTC look at the performance criteria on the projects that are in the TEP? Yes, in that all projects and program in the TEP are based on the CWTP. The performance criteria was applied to projects and scenarios in the CWTP.
- A member suggested the following:
 - In Figure 7, the distribution of funds and geographic equity shows an equity problem for Central County. Work needs to be done on getting the distribution to mimic the population. Speaking for San Leandro, the need for projects is not great; however, the need for street maintenance is great.
 - In Figure 5, why do we need 3 percent dedicated to the Sustainable Transportation Linkages program? The amount can be lower. If the funds are in LSR, the jurisdiction can apply for those funds for road rehabilitation. We do not need to put those funds in grant programs. The same thing applies to the bicycle and pedestrian grants. Trail maintenance is not a big issue because many of the routes will be maintained via LSR due to the Complete Street philosophy. The member suggested lowering the number dedicated to trail maintenance. It was stated that jurisdictions rarely use the bicycle and pedestrian money for trails maintenance.
 - The members suggested putting less funding into the grant programs and allocating more funding to the jurisdictions as pass through.
 - Figure 9 does not reflect the population. Staff stated that the formula is reflected in the footnotes. Alameda CTC can provide the jurisdictions with the raw data for road miles. Alameda CTC will recalibrate the formula when new data becomes available.
- A member shared disappointment with the way the plan is going. A lot of information was received from public outreach, but the TEP does not give a true picture of the public meetings and how they relate to the final plan. The top projects reflected from the poll results are related to public transit and ensuring that the transit system will work for everyone. The member stated the plan is not looking at reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The plan reflects a number of highway-widening projects. Concern was stated about the \$5 billion BART to Livermore project and how to fund the project, considering BART is suffering from an \$8 billion shortfall. It was mentioned that projects like the BART to Livermore project will use up all of the money in the transit category. We need to be concerned with restoring the services of AC Transit to pre-2009 levels.

CAWG and TAWG Comments on Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

- A member stated that it appears that only one bicycle and pedestrian project is listed, and it deals with transit. Staff explained that funds exist at the countywide level for bicycle and pedestrian programs. The TEP includes the three major trails for capital projects and the discretionary program can help to fund the capital projects. Other funding sources other than Measure B will help fund bicycle and pedestrian programs.

This page intentionally left blank.