



---

**Alameda CTC Community Advisory Working Group Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, July 7, 2011, 12 p.m., 1333 Broadway, Suite 300, Oakland**

---

Attendance Key (A = Absent, P = Present)

CAWG Members:

|                            |                           |                          |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <u>P</u> Joseph Cruz       | <u>P</u> JoAnn Lew        | <u>P</u> Anthony Rodgers |
| <u>A</u> Charissa Frank    | <u>A</u> Teresa McGill    | <u>A</u> Raj Salwan      |
| <u>A</u> Arthur Geen       | <u>P</u> Gabrielle Miller | <u>P</u> Diane Shaw      |
| <u>A</u> Chaka-Khan Gordon | <u>P</u> Betsy Morris     | <u>A</u> Sylvia Stadmire |
| <u>P</u> Earl Hamlin       | <u>P</u> Betty Mulholland | <u>P</u> Midori Tabata   |
| <u>P</u> Unique Holland    | <u>P</u> Eileen Ng        | <u>P</u> Pam Willow      |
| <u>P</u> Lindsay Imai Hong | <u>A</u> James Paxson     |                          |
| <u>P</u> Roop Jindal       | <u>P</u> Patrisha Piras   |                          |
| <u>A</u> David Kakishiba   | <u>P</u> Joel Ramos       |                          |

Staff:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <u>P</u> Tess Lengyel, Deputy Director of Policy,<br>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.       |

---

**Evaluation 101 Workshop**

**1. Evaluation 101 Workshop**

Stephen Decker and Jamey Dempster held a workshop that introduced CAWG members to the evaluation tools with an emphasis on modeling.

**Regular Meeting**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Tess Lengyel called the Community Advisory Working Group meeting to order at 1 p.m.

**Guests Present:** Dave Campbell, East Bay Bicycle Coalition; Stephen Decker, Cambridge Systematics; Jamey Dempster, Cambridge Systematics; Laurel Poeton, Alameda CTC; Cathleen Sullivan, Nelson\Nygaard; Nancy Whelan, Nancy Whelan Consulting

**2. Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

**3. Review of May 5, 2011 Meeting Minutes**

CAWG members reviewed the meeting minutes from May 5, 2011, and by consensus approved them as written.

#### **4. Update on CWTP-TEP Activities Since Last Meeting**

Tess Lengyel gave an update on the Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) activities since the last meeting. She informed the committee that Alameda CTC has done a great deal of technical analysis, and the group will hear an overview presentation about this work. Other activities since the last meeting include updating the *Transit Sustainability and Integration* and *Transportation Demand Management and Parking Management* issue papers based on the comments received from the Community Advisory Working Group (CAWG) and Technical Advisory Working Group (TAWG).

Tess stated that Alameda CTC staff had planned on reviewing the project evaluation results with the group; however, a great deal of data was generated for review and before releasing the information, staff wants to ensure that the data is accurate. Staff has scheduled a meeting on July 21 and will share a project evaluation outcomes report with CAWG and TAWG.

#### **5. Presentation on CWTP-TEP Planning Process**

Bonnie Nelson gave a presentation on the planning process for the CWTP, TEP, and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). She reiterated that the CWTP and the TEP will be produced together with the help of CAWG and TAWG, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) will produce the RTP. Bonnie stated that the CWTP is a gateway document because projects and programs must be in the CWTP to get into the TEP and the RTP. She stated that in September, the first draft of the CWTP will be ready for the group to review; discussion of projects and programs for the TEP will continue through the fall, as well as discussion on the upcoming outreach and polling.

##### *Questions/feedback from members:*

- When is the adoption timeline for both the CWTP and TEP? Tess stated that the adoption of the final drafts will be in December 2011 or January 2012. Once approved, the TEP will need endorsement from city councils and the Board of Supervisors.

#### **6. Presentations on CWTP Evaluation Outcomes**

Steve Decker gave a presentation describing the performance evaluation process Alameda CTC used to analyze the results of projects and programs. He stated that the vision, goals, and performance measures adopted by Alameda CTC guided the evaluation process. He reviewed each of the steps in the evaluation process and gave an example of outcomes of a project and program.

##### *Questions/feedback from the members:*

- When the base case scenarios are run, will they provide output on the future land use and transportation systems? Do you assume that all capital projects from the last CWTP are complete? Bonnie stated that the base case assumes the current transit levels, what is assumed in the current Countywide Transportation Plan and committed projects.

- What are the assumptions included in the base case? For example, how do you decide how many people bike or walk? Bonnie stated that these are not assumptions but are outputs. She stated that we do not make assumptions on mode choice. Bonnie said that we use the model to predict the shifts.
- What was the geographical information system (GIS)/map-based tool used for? The GIS shows a visual display of geographic areas. Alameda CTC also used it to support screening measures. Alameda CTC also used the GIS to determine accessibility to low-income housing in scenario analysis.
- How will the modeling influence green-house gas (GHG) emissions, considering the tools 10 years ago did not include GHG? The tools now will assess the impact of GHG on scenarios.
- The group noted that the map showing North County and North Central County is incorrect. Staff will correct it in the next document.
- How do you show surface streets improvements to transit operations? How do you reflect a mutual enhancement? Beth stated that a suite of programs and projects were evaluated together. Where will Transit Demand Management (TDM) fit in? Staff stated that it could be a separate strategy.
- Members requested to see a matrix in an easy-to-understand format that explains how and why the tools came up with these evaluations.
- Are there operating-fund commitments for committed projects? Bonnie stated that we made assumptions that if a project is implemented, it's operating. Where will the operating shortfall come from if it exists? We will have an operating plan.
- When it comes to economy, did you look at cost effectiveness? Is there more detail on economy? Beth stated that staff will provide more detail. Staff is still digesting the information from the evaluation outcomes and more will be presented at the July 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

CAWG members had many questions on the evaluation process/methodology and results in terms of the outcomes. Generally, the members did not agree with some of the results and requested more clarification of the explanations. The members were concerned with the input that Alameda CTC used to generate the results. Tess informed the group to submit comments in writing by August 5. She stated that staff will distribute the Evaluation Outcomes Report for the discussion at the July 21 meeting with CAWG and TAWG.

## **7. Breakout Discussions on Constraining the Lists**

Beth led the discussion on constraining the projects and programs lists and reviewed a number of other factors that the committee should consider in addition to the sustainability goals. She stated that between July and September, Alameda CTC must develop a financially constrained list. The first draft list would be available in September and needs to be finalized by December.

The CAWG members separated into groups to give input on criteria to use to start constraining the lists. At the end of the breakout session, each group gave a summary of the information it covered and input to the full CAWG group. See Attachment A.

## 8. Break

The group decided that a break was not necessary, and the meeting continued.

## 9. Presentations on TEP Financial Projections and Parameters

Bonnie and Nancy Whelan gave a presentation and led the discussion on the TEP financial projections and parameters. The presentation provided an overview of:

- Schedule for the TEP development
- TEP parameter survey results
- Financial parameters
  - Amount
  - Duration
  - Split/programs/projects
- Financial parameters and programs

### *Questions/feedback from members:*

- Will the distribution of money change for the jurisdictions regarding the rainy-day fund? Many jurisdictions are holding back and not spending the money they currently receive from Measure B. Tess said that the jurisdictions have clarified now they will spend down their existing reserves, especially when probed. An example of a rainy-day fund in the current plan is related to seniors and paratransit services, whereby grant funds have been used to stabilize the paratransit programs so they didn't have to cut services. This action by the Alameda CTC effectively used some of the existing grant funds as "rainy-day."
- A member suggested that the way things are presented to the public is important. The member also stated that Alameda CTC may need to have a message that the only people we can depend on are ourselves, and we must create jobs in the county. Bonnie stated that the reason Alameda CTC is doing three polls is in part to help in crafting the message.

Tess gave a presentation on sales tax measures around the state. The presentation provided a historical overview on the different measures in the state and how Alameda CTC is preparing for its third sales tax measure in Alameda County. The items covered in the presentation included the following:

- California Self-help Counties
- The evolution of transportation sales tax measures
- Funding volatility
- Transportation sales tax measures in the last decade
- Measures around the state that passed in the 21st Century
- Cumulative statewide investments
- The Alameda County sales tax evolution

**10. Breakout Discussions on TEP Financial Projections and Parameters**

The CAWG members separated into groups to discuss and give input on TEP financial projections and parameters.

At the end of the breakout session, each group gave a summary of the information covered in its individual group to the full CAWG group. See Attachment A.

**11. SCS/RTP: Update on Countywide and Regional Processes**

Beth stated on July 8, 2011, a joint MTC Planning and ABAG Administration committee meeting will take place. She gave highlights on the countywide and regional update processes as follows:

- Alameda CTC will receive the discretionary budgets at the end of July.
- There are no meetings in August.
- MTC released the descriptions of the proposed draft alternative land-use and transportation scenarios, which include five land-use options and two transportation options. MTC will prepare the details of those options in August.

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

Tess gave an update on the fall outreach approach. She mentioned that Alameda CTC will repeat the strategy for the first round of outreach in the fall as follows:

- Hold five community workshops around Alameda County.
- Provide the ability to perform outreach via the website.
- Administer an Outreach Toolkit at community events/meetings.

Tess stated that the results of the first outreach showed that the public participation from the Asian and Hispanic communities was low as compared to the relative percentage of the county population. She informed the group that there will be an increase in coordination and targeted outreach to Asian and Hispanic populations. Tess mentioned that staff will present the outreach approach and strategy for the fall to the Steering Committee at the July 28 meeting for approval. Tess requested input from CAWG for ideas on how to reach more people with the second round of outreach.

*Feedback from the members:*

- A member suggested that Alameda CTC advertise by placing posters on the bus.
- A member suggested that the City of Fremont will host an Asian and Indian fair and it would be helpful if Alameda CTC attended for the TEP.
- A member suggested that Alameda CTC should access places that are more demographically diverse.

**13. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## CAWG FLIP CHART NOTES July 7, 2011

### Group 1: Emphasis Areas for CWTP Lists

---

- Health
- Cost effectiveness
- “Active Transportation” – Physical Activity
- Safety (crime, lighting, sidewalks, quality of life)
- Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduction
- Local jobs/industry (economy)

### How to Constrain the CWTP Project Lists

---

- Projects that work well together, e.g. timing
- Supports SB375
  - Reduces VMT and promotes affordable housing
    - New and existing
- Contribute to public health
- Potential to leverage other funds
- Cost effective (bang for buck)
- Job creation
- Maintenance

### TEP Recommendations

---

- Yes – augment and extend the transportation sales tax to degree possible
  - Test messages
  - “self help” proactive county
- Study how sales tax impacts poor (regressive)
  - Affects messaging
  - Affects support for augmentation
- Develop better way of showing what we are getting for the tax dollars
- Split of Projects/Program
  - Increase programmatic funding
  - Maintain what we have before building more
- Performance Measures
  - Leverage is important e.g., Transit efficiency
- Questioning need for Project Development, Innovation and Technology (PDIT) category
  - Need for flexible dollars
  - 5% too small?
  - 15% too large?
  - If only have 5% for bike/ped why 15% for PDIT? Seems out of balance

- Important Projects and Programs
  - Eco student bus pass
  - Senior rides for free
  - Paratransit
  - Safe routes to transit
  - Safety of streets especially at bus stops/shelters
  - Travel training for all ages
  - Bike/Ped – completing local bike/ped plans
  - Better bus shelters
  - Truck lanes

#### Group 2: Emphasis Areas for CWTP Lists

---

- Lack definitions – need these first in order to comment
- Maintenance not just pavement, and include transit needs
- Need money to maintain transit capital
- Add cost effectiveness
- Affordability to low and middle income is important (is this under Equity?)
- Can't afford new capital
- Restore transit cuts
- What to include in “economy?”
- Why does bike/ped rate low in economically vibrant areas?
- Where is GHG included? Environment?
- Model already run, why define now?
- Need to represent seniors and kids
- How to identify cross tabs? More synergy

#### How to Constrain the CWTP Project Lists

---

- Synergy amongst projects and programs
- Ability to sustain or maintain
- Maintain and restore existing services
- Serve low income and communities of color
  - Improve social equity (e.g. student bus pass)
- Reduce VMT and GHG
- Benefit health
- Maintenance is key
  - Cost effective
- Identify what has worked
  - Benefits as promised
  - Within budget
  - Jobs created
- Need clear matrix and off model analysis



## TEP Recommendations

---

- Augment and extend transportation sales tax
  - ¼ cent seems easier - but may be tough now with the economy
  - ½ cent would be good if it would pass
    - Could we do it without new state bill?
    - Makes round number
    - Doubles current sales tax
  - What about AC Transit broken promises on their parcel tax?
  - What if MTC proposes gas tax at the same time? When will we know?
  - Show what we have accomplished
    - Not just same programs
- Project and Programs – what’s included will affect sales tax
  - Programs emphasis
  - All 3 categories: Projects, Programs, PDIT
- Maintain goals:
  - Why infill TOD such high emphasis? (de-emphasize)
  - Public health and safety is important (increase)
  - Reduce GHG emissions – help meet state regulations (emphasize)
  - Congestion relief – de-emphasize (except locally – couple with reducing GHG, livability, complete street)
  - Sustainability
- Expand Programs
  - Programs are most important
    - Sustainability
    - Support existing investments – what works e.g. transit operations and maintenance, good streets and roads
- Kids pass as a new program
  - Program does not (easily) fit under existing funding
  - Bike and Ped improvements
- Criteria
  - Do not easily fit under existing funding
  - Biggest best bang for buck within our goals

## Group 3: Emphasis Areas for CWTP Lists

---

- Cost effectiveness
  - With regards to reducing VMT
- Overall efficiency
  - Cost effective with better efficiency
- Strive for better performance
  - With regards to reducing VMT – do more with less
- Low income households transportation expenditure (burden) should be taken into account
- Conflict/ equity – nuance
  - Example: Improve areas around MacArthur BART – it will attract gentrification and push existing low-income residents out

## IN STRATEGIES AND EMPHASIS AREAS

- Environment
  - How do we reflect public health in the evaluation?
  - How do we reflect Goods Movement?
- Readiness and cost of delay could be new criteria
- A way to constrain is by how the projects and programs performed in evaluation

## TEP Recommendations

---

- No choice but to augment since existing money is committed
  - Considering current situation and public view of Government (funding) having a sunset date might help the measure pass
  - More focus on programs
    - Technology could be a small pie/possibly be leveraged
    - Implementation guideline necessary for new pot of money
  - Look at project outcome, not necessarily being shovel ready
  - Support or condition funding that encourages continued affordable housing in PDA areas
  - Develop implementing guidelines for funding that supports improvements without displacing low-income households
- Projects and Programs that show immediate results – should be priority
  - Implement smaller/small scale projects that will show immediate benefit
  - Reinstate transit
  - Projects, programs that are cost effective and serve low-income people
  - Cost-Effective
    - Politically feasible but visionary