



**Alameda CTC Technical Advisory Working Group Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 12, 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> Diana Keena	<u>A</u> Tina Spencer
<u>A</u> Aleida Andrino-Chavez	<u>P</u> Paul Keener	<u>A</u> Iris Starr
<u>A</u> Marisol Benard	<u>P</u> Obaid Khan (V. Patel attended)	<u>P</u> Mike Tassano
<u>A</u> Kate Black	<u>A</u> Wilson Lee	<u>A</u> Lee Taubeneck
<u>A</u> Jeff Bond	<u>A</u> Tom Liao	<u>A</u> Andrew Thomas
<u>A</u> Jaimee Bourgeois	<u>A</u> Albert Lopez	<u>A</u> Jim Townsend
<u>A</u> Charlie Bryant	<u>P</u> Joan Malloy	<u>A</u> Bob Vinn
<u>P</u> Ann Chaney	<u>A</u> Dan Marks	<u>P</u> Marine Waffle
<u>A</u> Mintze Cheng	<u>P</u> Gregg Marrama	<u>P</u> Bruce Williams
<u>P</u> Keith Cooke,	<u>P</u> Val Menotti	<u>P</u> Stephen Yokoi
<u>A</u> Brian Dolan	<u>P</u> Matt Nichols	<u>P</u> Karl Zabel
<u>A</u> Soren Fajeau	<u>A</u> Erik Pearson	<u>A</u> Farooq Azim (Alternate)
<u>P</u> Jeff Flynn	<u>A</u> James Pierson	<u>A</u> Carmela Campbell (Alternate)
<u>P</u> Don Frascinella	<u>A</u> Jeri Ram	<u>P</u> Gary Huisingh (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Susan Frost	<u>A</u> David Rizk	<u>P</u> Nathan Landau (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Jim Gannon	<u>A</u> Mark Roberts	<u>A</u> Cory LaVigne (Alternate)
<u>P</u> Robin Giffin	<u>P</u> Brian Schmidt	<u>A</u> Larry Lepore (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Mike Gougherty	<u>P</u> Peter Schultze-Allen	<u>A</u> Kate Miller (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Terrence Grindall	<u>P</u> Jeff Schwob	<u>P</u> Bob Rosevear (Alternate)
<u>A</u> Cindy Horvath		

Staff:

<u>A</u> Art Dao, Alameda CTC Executive Director	<u>P</u> Bonnie Nelson, Nelson\Nygaard
<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> Angie Ayers, Acumen Building Enterprise, Inc.

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

Guests Present: Gillian Adams, Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG); Joan Chaplick, MIG; Celia Chung, Alameda CTC; Stephen Decker, Cambridge Systematics; George Fink, Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) Rail; Sara LaBatt, EMC Research, Inc.; Betty Mulholland, Community Advisory Working Group (CAWG); Pat Piras, CAWG; Laurel Poeton, Alameda CTC; Michael Tanner, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART); Nancy Whelan, Nancy Whelan Consulting

2. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3. Approval of April 14, 2011 Minutes

TAWG members reviewed the meeting minutes from April 14, 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 the call for projects is done. Other activities since the last meeting include finalizing the issue papers and submitting them to all of the committees. Alameda CTC received comments on the issue papers and is in the process of addressing the comments. A final report is being prepared on the outreach/poll results, and the findings will help guide the outreach approach that Alameda CTC will develop for the fall outreach efforts. The Steering Committee approved the draft list of projects and programs at the April meeting and adopted the methods for packaging transportation projects and programs.

5. Report and Presentation on Outreach and Polling Results

Tess Lengyel introduced Joan Chaplick, MIG and Sara LaBatt, EMC Research to present the overall outcomes from the outreach and polling efforts and to highlight commonalities and differences in public perception and public responses for the two different methods of public feedback.

Commonalities in the outreach process and polls:

- Road quality and maintenance are crucial.
- Public transit is a high priority, including keeping it affordable and available for those who need it.
- Finding ways to reduce traffic/vehicle miles travelled is important.
- Air quality and public health improvements can come from transportation improvements.

Differences in the outreach process and polls:

- Eco-pass program
 - Outreach participants were vocal and clear about its importance.
 - Poll respondents placed a greater emphasis on keeping public transit affordable for those who need it.
- Maintenance versus expansion
 - Poll respondents placed almost equal priority on both road and transit maintenance, while transit expansion is farther down the list.
 - Online outreach participants placed a premium on expanding transit services.

Sara stated that the next steps will be to complete a final outreach report and conduct additional outreach and a poll in the fall of 2011. She stated that the first poll was to determine the project and programs the voters were interested in and if they were interested in the renewal of Measure B. The poll in the fall will focus on voters' support of the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP).

Questions/feedback from the members:

- On the trade-offs slide, how were the questions selected since the questions asked are “apples versus oranges” type? Tess stated that moving forward, the trade-offs listed will not exist. She mentioned that the outreach toolkit asked direct questions and during the polling, people were asked to rate the level of questions. Tess stated that the next round of outreach questions will be similar for the outreach and poll in how Alameda CTC asks the people to rate the questions.

6. Update on Title VI Requirements

Bonnie Nelson gave an update on the Title VI Requirements. She stated that Alameda CTC will look at Title VI on a countywide basis, not project-by-project; however, project sponsors will address the projects as they develop the individual projects.

Questions/feedback from the members:

- Why is Alameda CTC not doing a Title VI on the program as a whole? Bonnie stated that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) will do a Title VI on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); however, a Title VI analysis will not be done on the CWTP. Beth stated that Alameda CTC staff will speak with legal counsel to get their view on performing Title VI analysis and will bring it back to the committee.
- How is disparate impact to communities of concern looked at? It was responded that income quartile based analysis will help as a surrogate to identify impact on communities of concern.

7. Call for Projects and Programs Outcomes and Draft Lists and Next Steps

Beth mentioned that the list of projects and programs in the packet is the same list that Alameda CTC sent to the MTC on April 29th. She stated that the errata sheet handout shows the corrections made to the project and program lists in response to comments received. Beth gave a presentation on the call for projects and programs outcomes. She stated that the purpose of the presentation is to:

- Provide an overview of the RTP and relationship to the Countywide Planning processes.
- Summarize the call for projects and programs process and outcomes
- Receive approval on the projects and programs lists for both the RTP and CWTP
- Highlight the next steps

Questions/feedback from the members:

- TAWG members stated that the next time the jurisdictions have to complete applications for a call for projects, it would be great to have a simplified process.
- How did Alameda CTC come up with the distribution between projects and programs? Beth stated that Alameda CTC looked at the results of the poll and outreach efforts for input and then reviewed what funding was distributed historically for programs and doubled it, which amounted to about 60% of our target budget of \$12 Billion. The remainder was assigned to projects. When Alameda CTC reviewed the projects and programs on the submitted list, how did Alameda CTC determine which items fell into the program or project category? Beth stated that

this was based on MTC's definition of how projects should be submitted for their assessment purposes. Projects that are not large-scale and that cannot be modeled and did not have air quality impacts were included as programmatic projects and placed into a programs category. This does not mean that a programmatic project will not be included and evaluated in the CWTP process. It will, but just not in a transportation model.

- Has the MTC alternative scenarios timeline shifted and will it impact what Alameda CTC does? Beth stated that MTC will release the draft alternative scenarios in July and releasing results of their analysis in October. Concurrently, Alameda CTC is working with the planning directors over the Summer to prepare a Locally Preferred SCS Scenario that we will evaluate with the financially constrained CWTP project and program list anticipated to be approved by the Steering Committee in September. The evaluation assessment of the financially constrained list and the locally preferred land use scenario will be done in October and results presented to the Committees in November. These results will be used to inform the second draft of the CWTP and to inform MTC's alternative scenario results.
- Are "alternative" and "detailed" essentially the same? Yes.
- When will Alameda CTC introduce the financial constraints? Beth stated that a constrained number may be available in July.

Beth mentioned that the committed projects list for the 2012 CWTP/RTP on page 111 in the packet is being reviewed with MTC, and Alameda CTC will notify the group as it changes.

8. RTP/CWTP Land Use Discussion

Beth gave an update and led the discussion on Alameda County land use development for the CWTP/RTP process. She reiterated that MTC and ABAG released the Initial Vision Scenario (IVS) in March. She stated that ABAG and MTC are holding workshops in Alameda County on May 19th in Berkeley and on May 24th at the Metro Center. Beth mentioned that many of the jurisdictions are submitting comments on the IVS directly to MTC and ABAG. She requested input from the group on the draft letter from Alameda CTC to ABAG and MTC, on page 113 in the packet, which comments on the March 11, 2011 IVS. Beth encouraged the group to submit written comments on the letter by May 24. She informed the group that staff will submit the letter to the Steering Committee at the May meeting for review and approval.

Question/feedback from the members:

- Under the transit section on page 115, change "realistic" to "credible."
- If redevelopment agencies are eliminated, can jurisdictions call on the state legislation to help fix the problem? A component of the CWTP is to identify areas where we need to include policy and advocacy direction and advocacy for new funding sources for land use is something that will be recommended for future legislative programs. [
- Under the transit section, add "transit capacity" and the ability to recognize transit constraints. Currently, only land use change is being looked at.

- Need to add comments about the California Environmental Quality Act reform and the need to advance planning funding to address Priority Development Areas more effectively.

Beth reiterated that Alameda CTC must receive written comments from the group regarding the Alameda CTC's comment letter to MTC and ABAG on IVS by May 24.

Beth reviewed the handout (Attachment 08A), which provides an update on Alameda CTC's evaluation of the projects and programs. She discussed the three evaluation scenarios that Alameda CTC will conduct and the timeline for each.

Question/feedback from the members:

- What are the IVS numbers on housing units? Beth said 212,000 dwelling units and nearly 250,000 jobs. Gillian Adams with ABAG said that MTC will incorporate the amount of growth in the alternative scenarios. She stated that discussions are taking place with MTC and ABAG on housing targets.
- How will the census figures play in the revised scenarios? Gillian said that the census numbers show a general decrease. The process is asking for feedback from the jurisdictions about the numbers for the IVS. MTC will take the 2010 information and revise the numbers to include the 2010 census data.

9. TEP Financials and Strategic Parameters

Nancy Whelan gave a presentation on the TEP financial issues and strategies that provided an overview of the following:

- Current funding environment
 - How historical funding trends has led to the current funding environment
- Current funding need
 - Result of the call for projects outcomes
- Strategies for new/increased funding
 - Planning efforts
 - Potential scenarios for future funding opportunities
 - Making the measure dollars go further

Question/feedback from the members:

- It would be helpful to show on the Transit Sustainability Project that health care and pension costs are regulatory.
- On the chart that shows booms and busts, is the sales tax measure really staying current? Nancy said that the sales tax is declining. Tess noted that the scale on the slide is not clear.

Bonnie discussed the TEP strategic parameters and policies. She introduced some of the parameters that Alameda CTC will need to cover in the development of the TEP. Bonnie reviewed the development schedule for years 2011 and 2012 of the current TEP with the revenue split for capital projects and programs. In reviewing the TEP parameters, Bonnie discussed the issues and options/considerations for the following:

- The duration of the plan and its impacts on the sales tax
- The amount and configuration and how these will impact the sales tax
- The TEP goals and performance measures
- The project and program balance
- Ideas for new programs
- Issues for the current programs and capital projects
- Addressing revenue fluctuations

Bonnie informed the group that staff has set up a website to receive comments from CAWG and TAWG on the TEP Survey. The link to the survey is

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TEP_Parameters_Survey.

Question/feedback from the members:

- A member requested that Alameda CTC keep in mind the jurisdictions' ability to respond to requirements and projects delivery as Alameda CTC develops the TEP.
- Several members of the group suggested doing funds distribution by formula.
- Regarding Sales Tax decline, a comparison with other counties were requested.
- A member suggested that if things are bad, it is recommend that paving more streets be a higher priority than a rainy-day fund. Bonnie stated that one of the places where this came up is in paratransit. Tess said the current paratransit funds are allocated via formula, and we have gap funds. On the down years, we've used the funds to stabilize instead of cutting services.
- In the poll, it seemed it was okay to go longer or not have a sunset on the sales tax measure. Tess stated that some sales tax measures around the state have gone to 30 years and people have adjusted to the length.
- The state allows more bonding to shift the risk from the federal government to the local government. How will staff work with the Commission to make sure we do not have the same problems as the state by using bonds? Nancy stated that to be successful, we should only allow bonds with capital projects. Alameda CTC can have a debt policy to constrain the agency and not cause a problematic situation.

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

The members will independently review the information in the packet.

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

The members will independently review the information in the packet.

12. Member Reports/Other Business

None

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.