

RESP	Chap.	Pg.	Other Identifier	Commenter	Comment	Response
Cat	1	1-1	Introduction	TAWG	It seems strange that MTC is formulating the goals for the Bay Area. Somehow it should be written as reflecting the local jurisdictions goals for the area.	Addressed on p. 1-2 by inclusion of Alameda CWTP Vision and Goals.
Cat	1	1-2	1st Paragraph	TAWG	"highly competitive bidding environment which has brought costs down" This is a recent phenomena and could change.	True. Addressed on p. 1-2.
Cat	1	1-6	2nd Paragraph	TAWG	"Provide" spelled wrong in the last sentence of the second paragraph.	Addressed on p. 1-7.
Cat	1	1-6	7th Bullet	TAWG	7th bullet on page 1-6. "Berkeley and Fruitvale"- Mixed descriptions are used here.	We have verified that both Berkeley and Fruitvale have bicycle stations. No change necessary.
Cat	1	1-14	1st Paragraph	TAWG	1st paragraph "Legislative and countywide..." This is a pretty good way to describe the goals considering that they have not come directly from the Cities.	No action necessary.
Cat	1	1-14	3rd paragraph	TAWG	3rd paragraph: "MTC Resolution 3434 links the expenditure..." This is an important item and deserves highlighting as to its implications.	Full discussion of these policies is in Chapter 3. This reference is noted on p. 1-15.
CS	1	1-14	2nd column, 2nd paragraph	TAWG	2nd column. 2nd paragraph: "I-580 eastbound in the morning and westbound in the evening." Is this correct? Maybe we need to describe the location of where this occurs on I-580	We have corrected the reference on p. 1-15.
Cat	1	1-14	2nd column, 4th paragraph	TAWG	"Through reducing VMT" I'm not sure you can draw this conclusion that reducing congestion requires reducing VMT. I would think reducing VMT only relates to a reduction in greenhouse gas.	Addressed on p. 1-15.
Cat	1	1-21	2nd paragraph	TAWG	"very costly" is the text, commenter suggests: "... typically very costly." As an alternative way of communicating without trying to be definitive without any data.	Addressed on p. 1-15.
Cat	1	1-21	2nd column, 2nd paragraph	TAWG	"The ABAG projects show a trend towards..." Maybe projections is the wrong word as it assumes that existing data is used to extrapolate an answer. I would suggest "prediction" or some other word that provides more lead way as to what will happen in the future.	Projection is the technical process that ABAG undertakes.
Cat	1	1-22	2nd column, last paragraph	TAWG	"A full list of all projects..." Do we want to include any major projects that have not broken ground as of yet?	All projects from the past CWTP, regardless of stage of completion, are included in Appendix A.
Cat	1	1-2	General	CAWG	There seem to be a fair number of typos, missing words, etc. which deserve a careful edit.	Best effort was made to catch additional typos.
Cat	1	1-6		CAWG	Isn't Oakland Airport part of the Port of Oakland, not a separate entity?	Addressed on p. 1-7.

Cat	1	1-8		CAWG	"Hayward also has a Capitol Corridor stop and relatively good AC Transit coverage." Does not San Leandro have similar bus service? Also "the future of these (BART) stations looks very different" -- from what?	Addressed on p. 1-9.
Cat	1	1-10		CAWG	South County is the most racially diverse of the four planning areas. -- So what are we going to do about that?	Chapter 6 is expanded to include a section on Communities of Concern, which address transportation needs of ethnically diverse and low income populations.
Cat	1	1-21		CAWG	Seniors and people with disabilities are a sector of the population SOME OF WHOM have unique mobility needs. Do not over-exaggerate the facts. And not all seniors are "senior citizens."	Addressed on p. 1-22.
Cat	1	1-2	Introduction	TAWG	Introduction and p. 1-2 needs a discussion of what the CWTP is; when it was last updated; relationship to RTP and TEP, etc. There's very little discussion of the TEP overall.	Addressed on p. 1-2.
Cat	1	1-3		TAWG	"Alameda is often defined into four planning areas" Too general a statement. Should say more, "Historically, ACTC's planning efforts have been organized into 4 planning areas..."	Addressed on p. 1-4.
Cat	1	1-8		TAWG	Convoluting language; say it more clearly. "Unfortunately, collisions here are somewhat less proportionate..."	Addressed on p. 1-9.
Cat	1	1-19		TAWG	Define "self-help counties."	Addressed on p. 1-19.
Cat	1	1-21		TAWG	"About 1.5 million new automobile trips; 210,000 transit trips..." This is the key "needs" statement of the whole document. It shouldn't take 21+ pages to get to this concept.	Addressed on p. 1-2.
Cat	1	1-21		TAWG	define "ABAG projections"	Addressed on p. 1-22.
Cat	1	1-22		TAWG	This is an awkward placement of the Status of Projects. It seems like this should be a sidebar to a short section placed earlier on which defines what the CWTP is.	We have included a reference to this summary and the Appendix on p. 1-2, but have not moved the location of this section.
Cat	1	1-22		TAWG	Please add the opening of the Downtown Berkeley BART Bikestation to the list of Bicycle improvements.	Addressed on p. 1-23.
EL	1	1-6		TAWG	1-6 "...highest number of pedestrian collisions, has among the fewest collisions per 1,000 biking trips..." Is this accidentally conflating ped and bike data?	This is a typo, addressed on p. 1-7.
Cat	1	1-12		TAWG	1-12 – drivers less aware and cautions - cautious	Addressed on p. 1-13.

Cat	1	1-12		Steering Committee	a. Supervisor Haggerty objected to the reference on page 1-12 (and likely elsewhere) that East County is "geographically separated" from the rest of the county...because he perceived that as suggesting East County is somehow unimportant. Need to update the language to clarify that the presence of the East Bay hills create an additional challenge connecting East County to other parts of the County by limiting the number of routes that can make the connection. We also need to acknowledge the 580 corridor as a critical goods movement corridor.	Addressed on p. 1-13.
Cat	1	1-5		TAWG	P. 15 In addition to this map of the Planning Areas, please include a map showing the Planning Areas sized by population. This map implicitly gives greatest importance to East County, even though it has the smallest population.	We have added a statement that this map does not reflect population but merely geographical extent. We have also noted that population is shown in Chapter 2. Addressed on p. 1-4.
Cat	1	1-6		TAWG	P. 16 Area descriptions, starting here--It would be helpful to state when the initial/main period of development was for each area--North County in the late 19th/early 20th Century, Central County after World War 2 etc.	Addressed on pgs. 1-7, 1-9, and 1-11.
SB	1	1-7		TAWG	P. 17 and similar maps should include AC Transit's designated trunk lines, as well as the Rapids, to give a fuller picture of the transit system. There are only a few so it won't cause undue clutter.	Addressed on page 1-18 and 5-3.
Cat	1	1-2	2nd Paragraph	TAWG	"It is clear that an enhanced emphasis...autos will be important in both Plans." This statement may be too leading and may need to take a softer approach.	Addressed on p. 1-2.
Cat	1	1-16	2nd paragraph	TAWG	2nd paragraph "that is caused by people "cruising" in their search for on-street parking." -This is just one of the reasons for congestion.	Addressed on p. 1-17.
Cat	1	1-22	1st Paragraph	TAWG	"Of those that have not broken ground, not all funding has necessarily been identified to bring projects to completion." Is this true for all of the projects that have not broken ground or is it just one of many reasons for the project not to have broken ground?	This is only one of many reasons why a project has not broken ground.
RW	1 + 6	1-18		CAWG	Under ADA, fixed-route transit providers are required to provide demand-responsive, door-to-door service . . . NO!!! There is NO requirement for door-to-door; it is, at most "origin to destination." This non-binding "guidance" from a portion of DOT is currently under major regulatory review for clarification, and is not supported by court decisions. Further, the statement that "all public fixed-route operators . . . provide these services" is, as noted above, simply inaccurate.	We have replaced language with "origin to destination." on p. 1-19.
RW	1 + 6	1-19		CAWG	ADA paratransit is not limited to people with "mobility impairments. (same for page 6-1)." Overall, these are terrible descriptions. The consultants should know better.	Addressed on p. 1-20.

Cat	1	1-3		TAWG	Note that some households own a car, but have less than one car per adult, meaning that a car isn't available for all trips.	Addressed on p. 1-4.
Cat	1, 2	1-22 & 2-10		TAWG	p. iii – Figures 1-10 and Figure 2-10 are the same. Intentional?	Yes. Because the Introduction serves as an Executive Summary to the document, it includes maps and graphs that may also be included in other Chapters.
CS	2	2-16	Figure 2-18	TAWG	Figure 2-18: The 20-25% and >25% colors are virtually indistinguishable even in color, and will be completely useless if viewed in black and white.	We acknowledge the color choices are problematic, but maps could not be feasibly adjusted for the Briefing Book. Future documents will ensure that maps are readable in color and B/W.
CS	2		General	Verbal CAWG Comments	Two observations were made regarding trips not referenced in the presentation: (1) Are we tracking the number of people working at home? People working at home create more local trips. (2) What time of day do the trips occur?	Inserted a sentence regarding share of people working at home using data from the U.S. American Community Survey on p. 2-15.
SB	1	1-10		TAWG	P.21 South County Transportation Network--Show the Dumbarton Express bus and VTA's 181 bus from Fremont to San Jose because they are important inter-county connections. In general the text is very focused on travel within Alameda County, with little discussion of the many inter-county trips made by Alameda County residents and people coming into the county	The text has been updated to include the Dumbarton Express and VTA's 181 bus on page 1-10
SB	1	1-16		TAWG	P. 28 Please note that only 10-12% of AC Transit's ridership is in Contra Costa, the bulk is in Alameda County.	Noted in AC Transit description in Ch. 5 instead (see Pg. 5-8)
Cat	2	2-9		TAWG	P. 41--Population Growth and Density--It would be helpful to note, perhaps separately, the absolute population growth projected for each city	This is already shown in the map - indicated by green circles, the left side of the legend.
Cat	2	2-12 & 2-13		TAWG	P. 44/45--The different patterns of commuting--mode splits--to the different employment centers should be noted.	We are not presenting this level of detail in the Briefing Book. More information about travel demand patterns will be available with the modeling task.

CD&A	3	3-2		TAWG	P.54--It would be helpful to note the current percentage of county population in PDAs. The travel habits of current residents as well as new residents will need to change.	This data is not currently available, we should be able to estimate it as part of the land use scenario development as a part of this study.
CD&A	3		General	CAWG	Address the social equity challenges of transit-oriented development: Two major studies have been released in the past year and a half documenting and quantifying the link between robust transit and gentrification and displacement of low-income residents. Northeastern University's Stephanie Pollack published a report evaluating transit-rich neighborhoods across the country called Maintaining Diversity in America's Transit Rich Neighborhoods and UC Berkeley's Karen Chapple published Mapping Susceptibility to Gentrification: The Early Warning Toolkit which looks at neighborhood change within the Bay Area between 1990 and 2000 and what factors contributed to gentrification.	Text has been added to acknowledging policies, performance criteria, and a monitoring regimen that are being implemented to protect existing affordable housing from potential gentrification effects from infill development. Information regarding MTC's Better Access, Better Services Report is also provided. See page 3-4.
Cat	3		General	CAWG	While you begin to address the importance of housing affordability in Chapter 3, given the enormity of this challenge, it must be dealt with more head-on. As a start, would be acknowledging that the map of the PDAs in Alameda is nearly identical to the map of the county's low-income neighborhoods with lowest car-ownership. To both achieve our Climate change and mobility goals while at the same time promoting social and racial equity, it will be critical that we support proactive steps to protect low-income residents from being displaced by the rising property values that come with improved transit and amenities associated with transit-oriented development.	See response directly above. See page 3-4.
CD&A	3	3-4		TAWG	3-4 Consider inserting Figure on GHG from Transportation trends (See JPC slide 19: http://www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/Bay%20Area%20Regional%20Agencies%20Climate%20Protection%20Program_files/frame.htm)	A side bar (page 3-5) including references to existing GHG emission studies has been added that addresses this concern.
CD&A	3	3-15		TAWG	3-15 – 8 th and Pearl is an unremarkable example. Surely there are many equally good examples of mixed-use from the Bay Area, rather than Colorado.	The idea was to show a smaller-scale infill project, there are few good examples in the Bay Area.

CD&A	3	3-17		TAWG	3-17 – This is not a particularly illuminating or illustrative ‘best practice’. They’re in the midst of a sticky process, and so is Berkeley. Also the strange finding of the SCAG software potentially undercuts much of this document – does land use make a difference or doesn’t it?	We have removed this case study. The write up is not clear about the critique of the GHG model and the potential parallels to the situation in Alameda County. Additional information on this issue is not available from SCAG or Gateway Cities at this time. We will monitor this, and as appropriate bring it back into discussions of performance criteria and the definition of the land use and transportation scenarios for the CWTP.
CD&A	3	3-11		TAWG	3-11 – references to MTC Change in Motion Plan and Transportation 2035 Plan (also on 3-2). They’re the same thing, right?	We will change the way the report is referenced. All footnotes will remain as they are. First reference in text on page 3-1 will say “Change in Motion; Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area” and afterwards in text it will be called “Change in Motion”
CD&A	3	3-13		TAWG	3-13 – first reference to LID, but acronym is not explained until 3-16.	Description of the term has been moved to the first reference. Page 3-14.

Cat	3,5	General	CAWG	<p>5. What will it take to meet the climate change challenge? In order to get a better understanding of how our transportation and land-use contribute to Greenhouse Gas emissions, Chapter 3 can be enhanced to include data on: what percentage of GHG emissions come from various parts of our transportation sector, how much we'll need to reduce those emissions to meet both statutory as well as scientifically based reduction targets as well as what sorts of changes need to be made to our transportation and land-use to get us to those targets. You begin to tackle this in Chapter 3, but it could be more explicit.</p> <p>To this end, it seems that we should be focused on maximizing transit use, bicycle use, walking and other non-automotive and non-carbon fuel based modes. You do a good job addressing part of this equation- which is the coordination between land-use and transportation, the need for a better jobs/housing balance and the importance of housing affordability. However, the other part of the equation is the availability of sufficient transit (as not all trips can be made by walking or biking). What is the capacity of our existing transit system to carry more riders if it is given sufficient support? As you discuss To be able to do this, we need to know not just population growth numbers or transit expansion costs but also the costs to maximize transit use in the existing footprint (like increased car capacity on BART, increased bus frequency and reliability within AC Transit, Union City and WHEELS). Chapter 5 does a good job exploring the financial challenges facing transit operators but it doesn't discuss the potential of these systems, if given the</p>	<p>We summarized some of the scientific references that are out there which generally attribute GHG to different causes (they are mostly very interrelated). Also made it clear that how we get to the overall target is what all the on-going planning is about. We will also address this in the Transportation Issues Papers and this will be the subject of considerable additional analysis as the project progresses, through Spring 2011.</p>	
CS	4	General	T+E66AWG	<p>While there is a lot of discussion about ITS and emerging technology, there is nothing about safety improvements except for the low-cost improvements in Detroit and MD. Do we have higher cost improvements identified as a need? Our interchanges need upgrades and safety improvements, not just ITS installations. I did not see an element of collision removal but I am sure it is in there somewhere for our Freeway Service Patrol.</p>	<p>Safety is discussed in existing conditions under roadways (pg. 4-7 and 4-8), and the need for intersection improvements to improve safety is mentioned in the introduction to the TSM section (pg. 4-10). Finally, the summary of needs on pg. 4-19 includes a paragraph (3rd) regarding the importance of investing in road safety to reduce future collisions.</p>	
CS	4	4-4	Figure 4-2	TAWG	<p>Figure 4-2 = no key. Does line width represent hours of delay?</p>	<p>No – thicker lines occur where a segment is highlighted in both directions. In these cases a number appears on either side of the thick line indicating two segments are being highlighted.</p>
CS	4	4-7		TAWG	<p>4-7 – LS&R pavement condition needs a longer discussion, or at least a table showing pavement conditions and shortfall in each jurisdiction.</p>	<p>Inserted more detail on how PCI varies by jurisdiction (pg. 4-7).</p>

CS	4	4-19		TAWG	4-16 – 4-20 – Cut or move. Too much space on general gee-whiz TSM/ITS. Not clear how these best practices are immediately relevant to Alameda CWTP.	These examples are intended to help generate ideas for the CWTP and to illustrate innovative projects and programs being pursued by other agencies. We will keep this section but remove a few of the less relevant examples on p. 4-17.
SB	5	5-3		TAWG	5-3 – last sentence is misleading. Avg. weekday exists are not low compared with the rest of the BART system. They are only low compared to SF.	Addressed on Pg. 5-3
SB	5	5-10	2nd Line	TAWG	2nd line, Paratransit is spelled incorrectly	Addressed on Pg. 5-10
SB	5	5-10	1st paragraph	TAWG	"First paragraph seems to imply that Pleasanton Paratransit Service (PPS) provides daytime paratransit service to all three cities in East County. All daytime paratransit service in Dublin and Livermore as well as all intercity paratransit service in Pleasanton is provided by LAVTA.	Addressed on Pg. 5-10
SB	5	5-10	Paragraph 1, Line 7	TAWG	Paragraph 1, line 7, change to "1 interregional route 3 commuter shuttle routes..."	Addressed on Pg. 5-10
SB	5	5-10	Paragraph 2, Line 5	TAWG	Paragraph 2, line 5: LAVTA does not offer a discounted youth fare	Addressed on Pg. 5-10
SB	5	5-10	Paragraph 2, Line 6	TAWG	Paragraph 2, line 5: LAVTA does not offer a student monthly pass.	Addressed on Pg. 5-10
SB	5	5-10	Orange Box	TAWG	Orange Box: Change listing of routes to 3 commuter routes.	Addressed on Pg. 5-10
SB	5	5-10	Orange Box	TAWG	Orange Box: Operating cost in orange box does not match operating cost in last line of body text.	Addressed on Pg. 5-10
SB	5	5-10	Orange Box	TAWG	Orange Box: Annual ridership is too high.	Addressed on Pg. 5-10
SB	5	5-17		TAWG	Consider a new title for "NextBus" since it is a brand name. LAVTA has had real-time information available to the public since 2003 through a WebWatch program which is on the website and provides the same service as NextBus and also has over 60 real time signs at bus stops throughout our service area.	Addressed on Pg. 5-18
SB	5	5-19		CAWG	Update the ridership numbers on the Oakland Airport Connector Project which BART revised down from 10,000 to 3,450 daily riders by 2020 (See BART staff presentation to the Oakland City Council Public Works Committee in Dec. 2009)	Addressed on Pg. 5-19. Using slightly different set of figures from Ridership Update report on BART website: http://www.bart.gov/docs/oac/Final%20OAC%20Ridership%20Report%2005%2005%2009.pdf

SB	5		CAWG	Account for full cost per rider in the transit data. Given how expensive transit expansions can be, it is very important to consider both the cost of building as well as operating and maintaining service when we think about the cost/benefits of a new transit expansion project. Thus, I'd recommend in Chapter 5: a.) For each expansion project, include projected ridership and give cost per rider and cost per new rider and b) for each transit operator, include the capital costs (discounted over time) of construction and maintenance in the average cost per rider. For example, on page 5-4, you write that cost per rider for BART was \$4.45 per rider but that doesn't include the massive capital investment of nearly \$1.5 billion of the SFO extension that was completed in the early 2000s. The same calculation should be done for all transit operators, including the bus systems that tend to have relatively lower capital costs than rail operators.	This information is not known at present time for expansion projects as costs and cost indices have not yet been developed. As projects are submitted and evaluated, a much more comprehensive look at capital and operating costs will be included in the evaluation. No action needed
RW	5	5-3	TAWG	5-18 – Needs discussion of Lifeline transit needs, and the specific transit needs identified in Community Based Transportation Plans.	Chapter 6 will address needs from Lifeline study and CBTPs
SB	5		General Verbal CAWG Comments	Regarding rapid transit, making the trip faster does not equate to better service. It's more difficult for passengers because the service is poor due to AC Transit service cuts. Transit is losing continuity because passengers and drivers do not know where the lines are going. Alameda County needs reliability and continuity, and must make sure that the current service is maintained and serves the public.	No action necessary
SB	5		TAWG	This chapter has almost nothing to say about the context for transit in 2035, which is almost certain to be substantially different from today's conditions. We see a picture where the demand and need for transit then will be greater than now, due to a number of interacting factors. These in turn will shift behavior, and affect what is needed for transit. Some context-related, demand side based analysis should be included in this chapter. A preliminary take:	Added new section under Summary of Needs addressing these issues (see Pg. 5-29)
SB	5		TAWG	There will be a greater need for transit—Higher senior population	Added new section under Summary of Needs addressing these issues (see Pg. 5-29)
SB	5		TAWG	There will be greater push factors to use transit by 2035 Higher real gas price Higher real parking cost Possible reductions in parking supply or parking ratios, especially at job centers such as UC Berkeley and Downtown Oakland Possible congestion pricing especially into San Francisco Possibly more restrictive environmental rules affecting use of cars City policies support transit use	Added new section under Summary of Needs addressing these issues (see Pg. 5-29)

SB	5		TAWG	<p>Households will have a greater ability to use transit</p> <p>More people living in dense areas in all parts of the county, but especially in Oakland and Emeryville (those cities are projected to increase their share of their population). This means that more services (e.g. supermarkets) can be provided on relatively local scale. Cities seek to provide services within their PDAs.</p> <p>Perceived desirability of low density, suburban development is decreasing</p> <p>Fewer households with school age children at home, simplifying trip patterns</p>	Added new section under Summary of Needs addressing these issues (see Pg. 5-29)
SB	5		TAWG	<p>Reduced need to drive</p> <p>More retailing happening on-line, reducing need to drive to large shopping centers and big box stores. Some shopping centers are strong now, but some have already failed or are failing.</p> <p>Possibly more people working at home, though this has been incorrectly predicted before. These workers would still need to travel, but patterns would shift to more local and midday trips.</p>	Added new section under Summary of Needs addressing these issues (see Pg. 5-29)
SB	5			<p>Greater desire to use transit—The current “millennial” generation is widely cited as being less interested in cars, more interested in using other forms of transport</p>	Added new section under Summary of Needs addressing these issues (see Pg. 5-29)
SB	5		TAWG	<p>OUTCOME—Demand for transit is very likely to rise</p> <p>Demand for commute transit will rise, particularly with parking charges and limits</p> <p>Demand for non-commute, short distance transit likely to rise even more</p> <p>Car use shifts towards recreational, discretionary weekend and night trips.</p>	Added new section under Summary of Needs addressing these issues (see Pg. 5-29)
SB	5		TAWG	<p>TRANSIT SYSTEM NEEDS</p> <p>Robust local system—Grid pattern in urban Northern Alameda County, hub and spokes pattern in less dense areas</p> <p>Maintenance of commuter transit service, to serve proportionate increases in commuter travel</p> <p>Improvement of speed and travel time of non-BART transit, to improve its competitiveness</p>	Added new section under Summary of Needs addressing these issues (see Pg. 5-29)
SB	5	5-4	TAWG	<p>P.94--BART's ridership per capita is shown as 138. But with a total annual ridership of of some 115,000,000, this would mean their service area across 4 counties contained only 830,000 people. I don't think this is how BART or anyone else sees their service area.</p>	These figures are from MTC Statistical Summary of Bay Area Transit Operators, based on a 93 sq. mi. service area. It is unclear how that was defined (within X distance of lines or stations?). (See Pg. 5-4)

SB	5	5-8	TAWG	P. 98: insert "To improve reliability," prior to the sentence stating "Line 51 has since been split". It makes it sound like a less arbitrary action.	Addressed on Pg. 5-8
SB	5	5-9	TAWG	P. 99: you indicate for AC Transit an "average subsidy per passenger". Did you mean "cost per passenger" as you use for other operators? Using the word "subsidy" instead of cost is inconsistent with the language used for other operators.	Addressed on Pg. 5-9
SB	5	5-12	TAWG	Shuttles: P. 102 to 104: There doesn't seem to be consistent references to costs in the explanation of shuttles. Private shuttles do not need to disclose this information, but in many cases, the shuttle is being partially funded with public monies (air district, university funds, BIDs). As such, those costs must be publicly available and should be used. (P. 102 No cost information on the Free B line, such as Cost Per Boarding or annual operating cost? AND p. 103 No cost per boarding for the AirBART?)	Costs for shuttles are a range and are costed in a variety of ways (per mile, per hour, fixed, etc.) and not presented consistently like NTD data. Have added amount of BAAQMD grant that is primary funding source for B Line. However, this is a new service, so cost data is not yet publicly available. AirBART cost also not available. (Addressed on Pg. 5-12)
SB	5	5-19	TAWG	P. 109: BRT "However, there could be significant parking and traffic impacts, depending on the final configuration." This statement is a conjecture and should be removed. Lots of things "could happen" so stick to what you know and not what you don't know.	This is not conjecture - it's from the project EIR. No action necessary.
SB	5	5-24	TAWG	P. 114 Please remove this statement altogether for political reasons: "BRT has sometimes been referred to instead as "quality bus," and it might be helpful to think of the concept in those terms." The federal government recognizes BRT, but does not recognize Quality Bus. It only obfuscates the situation.	Addressed on Pg. 5-25
SB	5	5-25	TAWG	P. 115 What, no costs associated with Streetcars or BART metro even though you provide costs for BRT? Either remove the costs of BRT or add the costs of Streetcars and BART metro. (In 2008, construction for the Phase 1 and 2 Portland streetcar cost about \$57M for 2.4 miles—or about \$23.7 per mile—and they already have rail infrastructure for their maintenance yard. I suspect cost for the Broadway line would be significantly higher)	BRT costs for AC's project are known. Added approx. streetcar costs (\$50M/mi., based on Portland Loop and Tucson). BART Metro project has not been defined.

SB	5	5-28	TAWG	<p>P. 118: Expansion versus Enhancement</p> <p>It sounds like you set up a false dichotomy. Should it not be Expansion versus System Maintenance? BART has to replace their rail cars at a cost of \$3 to 5 billion—that’s not enhancement that’s general maintenance of the system. The real issue is should we continue to provide for expansion when the basic vehicle replacement needs are not being met? AC Transit has that issue, just like BART does but AC Transit has generally replaced vehicles in a timely way; now it’s BART’s turn.</p>	Addressed on Pg. 5-28
RW	6	6-2	TAWG	<p>P. 122</p> <p>“In addition to the substantial funding provided to city-based paratransit programs in the county, 22% of Measure B funding is allocated to AC Transit for transit operations. AC Transit provides accessible transit services for thousands of East Bay seniors and people with disabilities.”</p> <p>This should be changed to : “In addition to the substantial funding provided to city-based paratransit programs in the county, both BART and AC Transit provide federally mandated paratransit service through the East Bay Paratransit Consortium using BART’s and AC Transit’s general operating funds. About 22% of Measure B funding is allocated to AC Transit for general transit operations, but it is not directed specifically for paratransit service.”</p>	Addressed on page 6-3.
RW	6	6-11	TAWG	<p>P. 131</p> <p>“Strategies to Address Accessible Transportation Needs”</p> <p>Every other section only lists the Summary of Needs, except the Accessibility Programs. It seems inappropriate that the book provides “Strategies to Address Accessible Transportation Needs”, when no other set of needs (Transit, Highways Roadways and TSM, Pedestrian, Bike, Goods Movement) has strategies listed. This may be because you are actively involved in those associated programs. However, do not imply that those are the only strategies that exist or that you’ve made decisions about those programs outside the countywide plan development process. I think they should be stricken.</p>	Revised text re-emphasizes that these strategies are in no way exhaustive and were derived from the Service Delivery Analysis, which appropriately informs this Briefing Book.

RW	5, 2 and 6	General	CAWG	<p>Understanding the transportation needs of special populations All of Chapter 6 is dedicated to the needs of paratransit users – primarily the disabled and elderly. However, there are other transit-dependent populations (those with no access to an automobile or who are unable to drive) that deserve special attention as they are more vulnerable to changes made to our public transit. For that reason, in addition to the information available in Chapter 6 and in Chapter 2 on population, in Chapter 5, for each transit operator and, if possible, for each shuttle, F91also provide the number and percentage of riders that are transit-dependent. It would be further useful to understand, of its riders and of those who are transit dependent, which are students, elderly, disabled and/or low-income. In Alameda County, thousands of youth depend on our public transit system to get to school. On the average weekday, over 60,000 trips on AC Transit are made by students and based on LAVTA’s website, it appears that nearly half of its routes (15 out of 32) are school-service. 20% of Union City Transit’s riders are between the ages of 13 and 17 (and 31.5% of riders are students), which would suggest that another couple of hundred students depend on Union City Transit to get to school (Union City Transit provided 482,353 unlinked trips in FY 2008/09). The access and affordability of these transit systems for young people is more than a mobility issue, but also an issue of educational access and equity. Thus it is very troubling that AC Transit, as a way to provide itself more stable revenues, is proposing to over double the youth bus pass over the next 5 or so years, likely pricing many of its families out of transit and therefore non-neighborhood schools.</p>	We will add demographic information on transit riders to the extent possible. We are expanding Chapter 6 to include a section on community based plans, and other transit dependent populations.
SB & RW	5,6	General	CAWG	<p>Include results from the Community Based Transportation Plans in the book. At the end of Chapter 5, there is a candid discussion of some of the biggest policy questions facing Alameda County about how to meet its transportation needs in an era of tight financial restrictions. Chapter 6 is dedicated to the specific transit needs of the elderly and disabled communities in Alameda County and the programs designed to meet those needs. What is missing in these discussions and in the book overall, are the particular transportation needs of Alameda County's low-income residents. Specifically, the book should include the findings as well as at least the top-ranked needs and project proposals coming out of its five Community Based Transportation Plans, which involve hundreds of surveys residents in Alameda's lowest income and highest minority neighborhoods. These can be accessed on the former CMA: website: http://www.accma.ca.gov/pages/HomeCommBasedTransPlan.aspx</p>	We have enhanced Chapter 6 to include text about CBTPs, lifeline and other underserved populations.
RW	6	6-3	TAWG	<p>LAVTA's paratransit service area does not extend to Sunol. LAVTA only serves Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, and the immediately adjacent areas of Alameda County. Pleasanton Paratransit provides limited service to Sunol.</p>	Addressed on Pg. 5-14

RW	6	6-4	4th Paragraph	TAWG	4th Paragraph: LAVTA is not technically a "city based" service. It's an independent special district like AC Transit. LAVTA does NOT receive any general fund dollars. Pleasanton Paratransit is a city based program and does receive general fund support from Pleasanton.	Addressed in Chapter 5
RW	6	6-6		TAWG	LAVTA paratransit is available from approximately 4:30 AM to 1:30 AM. It's no longer 24/7.	Addressed in Chapter 5
RW	6	6-7		TAWG	The Wheels Para-Taxi Program should be moved under the LAVTA information. Service area is Livermore/Pleasanton/Dublin. LAVTA will reimburse 85% of the fare of a taxicab ride up to \$20 per ride with a monthly cap of \$200 per person. The service is 24/7.	Addressed in Chapter 5
RW	6	6-7		TAWG	Livermore also does not operate a specific program to my knowledge.	Addressed in Chapter 5
RW	6		General	CAWG	The number of "free" services described in Chapter 6 indicates discriminatory services available only to certain categories of residents -- is this fair? And do all of the "free" senior-based programs meet the requirements of CA PUC section 99155(b)?	Initial inquiry confirms that all free fare programs are for both seniors and people with disabilities (per PUC reference). Regarding fairness, questioning whether language for reduced fare implies that there are general fares that are higher, which is not the case in these programs. Researching implications of Older Americans Act funding requirement for donation only.
RW	6	6-8		TAWG	6-8 – Add City CarShare/City of Berkeley Accessmobile to Innovative Services. See 2008 MTC Doris Kahn Award.	Will include reference in Chapter 6
RW	6	6-12		TAWG	6-12 – Add accessible carsharing to list.	Will include reference in Chapter 6
Cat	7	7-9	Bicycle Parking, 1st Bullet	TAWG	Bicycle Parking, 1st bullet: Emeryville has a Bicycle Parking Ordinance.	Addressed on p. 7-9.
Cat	7	7-10	SRTS	TAWG	Safe Routes to School: Emeryville has not received a Safe Routes to School grant.	Addressed on p. 7-10.

Cat	7	7-11	Summary of Needs	TAWG	Summary of Needs: Not clear what survey Emeryville didn't respond to, but here's what we have: Our draft CIP, to be adopted this year for 2011-2015, has \$5 million of bicycle improvements. Our I-80 ped-bike bridge is in Caltrans' environmental review stage, and it will cost about \$10 million. The PDA survey I filled in for ABAG lists pedestrian-priority zone streetscape improvements at about \$1 million, and more-distant future ped-bike bridges for about \$13 million. That adds up to \$28 million. We're a small city, but we're at a crossroads requiring overcrossings to link regional ways.	Addressed on p. 7-11 and 8-10.
Cat	7+8			Steering Comm	b. The Briefing Book refers to the Bay Trail as a "premier recreational facility". We need to acknowledge that it is both a recreational and a commute facility. (no page reference).	Addressed on p. 1-6, 1-8, 1-10, 1-12, 8-7; already addressed on p. 7-3.
Whelan	11		General	CAWG	While Chapter 11 points out many valid restrictions on uses of various funds, it would be more accurate to note that there are also many ways to creatively work around these restrictions when the MPO choses to do so, as they do selectively.	A full picture of financial conditions will be presented at the CAWG and TAWG in April.
Cat	Apdx	A-1	Status of Projects	TAWG	#8 – Ed Roberts Campus – Closeout/Complete	Addressed on p. A-1.
Cat	Apdx	A-5	Status of Projects	TAWG	#60 – PE/Env phase. Comments/Notes: Downtown Berkeley BART Plaza and Transit Area - Phase 1 funded by \$2.25M (incl. \$1.8M TLC/CMAQ). BART & City seeking add'l funds for Phase 2 (BART entrance construction.)	Addressed on p. A-6.
Cat	Apdx	A-8	Status of Projects	TAWG	#89 – ACTC is now lead agency.	Addressed on p. A-8.
Cat	Apdx	A-8	Status of Projects	TAWG	#90 – Comments: Pedestrian Plan adopted, 2010. Approx. \$1.5M from Safe Routes to Schools & Safe Routes to Transit grants.	Addressed on p. A-8.
Cat	Apdx	A-8	Status of Projects	TAWG	#93 – PE phase. Received \$2.25M FHWA Value Pricing Pilot Program and \$2M CMAQ Climate Initiative grants.	Addressed on p. A-8.
SB & RW		General	Regarding All Statistics	TAWG	Regarding all statistics: What is the source? They seem to be off from what LAVTA has internally.	Have ensured that consistent figures are used (there were some conflicting figures from different sources); have added sources to agency-description pullboxes; have contacted LAVTA staff directly to clarify sources.

Cat		General	CAWG	Document seems to "use words merely for the sake of addition." At a minimum, the addition of an Executive Summary which lays out key points of the document and process, plus the list of acronyms, would be useful.	The Introduction serves as the Executive Summary for the document. No action necessary.
Cat	1	1-2	CAWG	Page 1-2 talks about being "fortunate to have both a sales tax and a VRF," but then says that "recession has resulted in revenues falling below initial projections." If this is true for the recently-passed VRF, how valid are projections coming out of the Alameda CTC? This should probably be re-phrased.	Addressed on p. 1-2.
Cat		General	CAWG	It is questionable if the segregated and often duplicative "elderly/disabled" services (beyond mandated ADA paratransit) need to be in place for the Baby Boomer generation. We should continue to look at serving all people, and stop pandering to select populations. It should also be noted that shuttle systems such as the Emery-Go-Round refuse to meet their ADA responsibilities, and actually add to the paratransit burden of the East Bay Paratransit Consortium. What ever happened to "coordination" and fiscal responsibility?	Chapter 6 has been expanded to include a discussion of additional underserved populations such as low income populations.
Cat		General	TAWG	This is a very good, helpful document. However, it's also very long and dense. I think it needs some restructuring to make it more inviting to readers.	Will endeavour to condense.
Cat		Unclear	TAWG	I like the best practices, but they're a bit too Colorado focused, and they add to the oppressive length. Might need to be moved to an Appendix for readability, or shortened and placed in box/sidebar format.	Will endeavour to condense.
Cat	10	General	TAWG	Don't automatically equate zero-car households with "green" or "urban" living, or assume positive connotations. Poverty is a much bigger reason why households don't own a vehicle.	We have added a sentence acknowledging this fact on p. 1-5.
RW		General	TAWG	Overall, the document doesn't adequately highlight equity, poverty, transit-dependency, rates of unemployment, access to work, etc. It discusses the growing senior population, but seniors are only one subset of the transit dependent population. It doesn't seem to mention Lifeline transit standards, or the Community-Based Transportation Plans which have been produced by ACTC.	We have added text about CBTPs, lifeline and other underserved populations in Chapter 6.
Cat		General	Verbal CAWG Comments	Are the statistics current from 2010? Staff stated that the statistics are from 2009 and 2010, and the Briefing Book will list the sources.	We have sought to cite all statistics.
CD&A		General	Verbal CAWG Comments	A member requested the briefing book acknowledge how land use, transportation, and the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) integrate with each other.	Clarifying summary paragraph added to Chapter 3.
Cat	10		TAWG	The Briefing Book (or elsewhere) should have some discussion about the medium- to long-term likelihood of a growing fleet of private electric vehicles and a need for the public sector to respond with standards on charging stations and parking design. Infrastructure dollars will not be clear because this could eventually be a market-based, private sector venture.	Will potentially address in Transportation Issue Papers.
CS	1 & 4		CAWG	In the summary and chapter, correct eastbound congestion in the am and westbound in the pm on I-580 in East County. It is reversed.	Correct. Updated on p. 1-15 and Chapter 4.

SB	5	5-2	TAWG	Ridership / trips is an important data point to evaluate transit, but <u>Passenger Miles</u> is another important element. Please include transit Passenger Miles as well.	A chart showing passenger miles by operator has been added; however, per psgr. mi. is a less standard measure of productivity and cost-effectiveness than boardings, so for purposes of brevity and clarity this has not been calculated (Addressed on Pg. 5-2)
SB	5	5-2	TAWG	The figure should include BART <u>Entries</u> at Alameda County, as well as what is shown for Exits. BART trips are more often regional (bi-county) in nature as compared to trips on other carriers, but this figure distorts that fact. Does the AC Transit ridership reflect boardings also include bus-to-bus transfers? We recall that the AC Transit's 2008 On-board Survey estimated that 17% of AC trips are AC to AC transfer trips. Any double counting should be eliminated.	Addressed on Pg. 5-2
SB	5	5-2	TAWG	For consistency, what percent of AC Transit ridership is in Contra Costa (p. 32, Table 18 of the ACCMA 2005/2006 Performance Report estimates Contra Costa's share of AC Transit trips to be 12%)?	Addressed on Pgs. 5-2 and 5-8 (Note: 12% estimate from 2006-07 Performance Report is used)
SB	5	5-2	TAWG	Please identify acronym for AHBF and AOFS (ferry services).	Is in legend; abbreviated for space reasons
SB	5	5-2	TAWG	How are the averages calculated? The average should be <u>weighted</u> by trips / passenger-miles. For example, for Figure 5-4, as the report indicates that the AC and BART carry nearly 95% of weekday riders, a weighted average Cost-Effectiveness would be closer to the BART (\$4.45) and AC (\$4.32) per trip numbers.	Addressed on Pg. 5-2
SB	5	5-2	TAWG	Passenger on-time performance should be included, if available.	BART On-Time Performance added to text (see Pg. 5-4)
SB	5	5-3	TAWG	The new West Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station opens on Feb. 19, 2011, so <u>44</u> stations (may also apply to BART Metro statement on p. 25). Figure should also be updated. Also, note that the Warm Springs BART extension and the Oakland Airport Connector projects have ACTIA/ACTA funding and are under construction. No longer "planned" as indicated in figure.	First issue addressed on Pgs. 5-3 and 5-25; re: 2nd issue, figure changed (Pg. 5-3) but text already mentions construction, Measure B funding
SB	5	5-4	TAWG	Please use updated BART map (with West Dublin / Pleasanton) -> www.bart.gov (beginning Fri., 2/19).	Addressed on Pg. 5-4
SB	5	5-4	TAWG	Please indicate that BART's standards plan for a 10-car train load that can carry 1,070 passenger per train (107 passenger / car), not a Maximum Capacity of 2,000 as indicated. The 2,000 number is closer to a crush load, and we should not be planning for that on a daily basis.	Addressed on Pg. 5-4

SB	5	5-21		TAWG	Instead of saying “The second” BART extension in Alameda, please use “Another.” One could count WSX and OAC as two extensions, so Livermore would be the Third. But, no need to frame it that way.	Addressed on Pg. 5-21
SB	5	5-21		TAWG	Under the last paragraph for Livermore BART, for the train yard, please use instead the phrase “There would be a train yard located along the extension.” BART, City and stakeholders will be evaluating this issue as part of a current ACTC funded study.	Addressed on Pg. 5-21
SB	5	5-21		TAWG	All planned projects, but especially those proposing service that cross regional boundaries, need to be consistent with the emerging SB375-guided Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). One of the key adopted targets for MTC’s SCS / RTP process, and interpreted as a statutory requirement of SB375, is that the region needs to house 100% of the region’s projected 25-year growth by income level (very-low, low, moderate, above-moderate) without displacing current low-income residents. It is unclear what this means for projects designed for daily commuters <u>into</u> the region (as distinguished from inter-city trips).	Addressed in SB 375 section on Pg. 5-27 (see below)
SB	5	5-25		TAWG	The Jack London Streetcar study was a partnership between BART, the City of Oakland and the Port of Oakland. It was not BART-alone that “considered” the streetcar project, but a stakeholder group that included the three entities (as well as other stakeholders).	Addressed on Pg. 5-25
SB	5	5-26		TAWG	Please verify your statement that the San Antonio District has “the highest population densities” in Alameda County. What is the source of information? Doesn’t Berkeley Southside and/or Oakland Chinatown have higher densities?	Addressed on Pg. 5-26
SB	5	5-26		TAWG	The Policy section should briefly discuss policy implications of SB375 for Alameda County with respect to its role as a gateway between the Bay Area and the Central Valley. It is unclear yet how the emerging SCS for the region will look to invest in commute travel across gateways, as region’s are supposed to plan to accommodate housing for its workforce. This is a significant policy question.	Addressed on Pg. 5-27

COMMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE DEADLINE

7				TAWG	7-3 para 2 – substitute “bicycle facilities” for “bicycle lanes” (we all use a combination of Class I-III facilities on our networks.)	Addressed on p. 7-3.
7				TAWG	7-3 change “as well as a growing network of bicycle boulevards.” Only Berkeley and Emeryville have Bicycle Boulevards, and only Emeryville has ‘grown’ the network since Berkeley’s initial installation in 2003.	Addressed on p. 7-3.
7				TAWG	7-3 – top of column 2: “Although improvements in bicycle and transit coordination can be made...” This sounds too positive and pat. Should mention efforts such as the 2009 AC Transit Bicycle Parking Study, the Safe Routes to Transit grant program, and recent major expansions to BART’s bicycle infrastructure (e-lockers, bikestations, modified rail cars.)	Addressed on p. 7-3.

7			TAWG	7-4 – last sentence: No! Growth in bike share occurred concurrently with significant investments (Bicycle Boulevards, bike parking, safety education). Social changes may also be a factor, but the growth didn't just occur magically.	Addressed on p. 7-4.
7			TAWG	7-6 – “replace short car trips under 5-10 miles.” to just 5 miles. That’s the usual distance considered for motor vehicle mode shift to bikes.	Addressed on p. 7-6.
7			TAWG	7-9 – top of page, add Albany and maybe El Cerrito (though not in Alameda County) “how the Ohlone Greenway was developed in North Berkeley and Albany.” (more is in Albany & El Cerrito than Berkeley.)	Addressed on p. 7-9.
7			TAWG	7-9 – Bicycle Parking. 1st Bullet – Berkeley also has bicycle parking ordinance/zoning requirements.	Addressed on p. 7-9.
7			TAWG	7-9 – Bicycle Parking. 4th Bullet – Berkeley also has shared use e-lockers (8 at Capitol Corridor Rail Stop)	Addressed on p. 7-9.
7			TAWG	7-9 – Bicycle Parking. 5th Bullet – and the newest, an electronic-card controlled Bikestation at Ashby BART.	Addressed on p. 7-9.
7			TAWG	7-10 – Wayfinding signage, 1st bullet – Berkeley also has bike route signage (and I expect many other jurisdictions do to.)	Addressed on p. 7-10.
7			TAWG	7-10 – Local Planning Efforts – Please add some comments on how the AC Bicycle Plan update is being coordinated with the CWTP, or will be incorporated or referenced.	Addressed on p. 7-10.
7			TAWG	7-10 – formatting error – Local support Programs should be title of next section.	Addressed on p. 7-10.
7			TAWG	7-10 – Berkeley also has a Bicycle Safety Education Campaign	Addressed on p. 7-10.
7			TAWG	7-10 – Safe Routes to Schools – Berkeley has also received SR2S funding.	Addressed on p. 7-10.
7			TAWG	7-10 – Safe Routes to Schools – Berkeley participates in the countywide SR2S program with TransForm.	Addressed on p. 7-10.
7			TAWG	7-11 – Countywide support programs: The Bike to Work Day bullet seems too brief given ACTC’s active role. Consider adding something like “ACTC has provided significant funding and leadership to expand BTWD in recent years.”	Addressed on p. 7-11.
7			TAWG	7-11 – Future Conditions – “Projected demographic trends and policy mandates...” This is the first hint of Smart Growth/Focused land use.	Addressed in Chapter 3.
7			TAWG	7-11 – Summary of Needs – Cut this or change this section significantly. The methodology of the survey may have been flawed, or respondents didn’t use the same methodology. What time frame was used? Did respondents cite only budgeted funds or identified but unfunded needs?	We are aware of the problems that accrued from reporting inconsistent survey responses, and are working to address them for the Bike/Ped plans. For now, we will delete this section.

7			TAWG	7-11 – Missing concepts. There’s very little recognition of the important of Measure B Bike/Ped funds in this chapter. Suggest inserting a table on recent Measure B Discretionary grants, or something. Maybe also mention the bike/ped set-aside in VRF.	We will add a bullet point on Measure B under “Countywide Support Programs.”
8			TAWG	8-2 – Please note upfront that the term pedestrians includes people in wheelchairs and other mobility devices, and that the term “walking” includes use of chairs/devices	Addressed on p. 8-2.
8			TAWG	8-2 – Please use another example besides downtown Berkeley, just to mix things up. Berkeley likes the attention, but is mentioned maybe too often in the Briefing Book. There are other exceptional pedestrian environments to cite: UC Berkeley campus, Oakland’s Chinatown.	We will replace the sentence that begins/ends: “For example, the downtowns of Oakland and Berkeley offer a compact, grid street pattern . . . highly conducive to walking.” with another example.
8			TAWG	8-2 Mode Share and Trip Purpose “a modest uptick in absolute terms, in relative terms...” Explain. Hard to understand. Should provide raw numbers, not just percentages.	We will clarify on p. 8-2.
8			TAWG	8-2 “More people walked to or from home....reflecting the tendency to walk in placed with familiar destinations nearby.” No, it’s not exactly “familiarity”. It’s that home is the most common trip origin or destination.	Addressed on p. 8-2.
8			TAWG	8-3 – Gender. I don’t understand the point here. They look basically equal (.9%), so unless there’s a point I’m missing, I’d cut or shorten. (This is a much more relevant point with bikes.)	We will shorten this significantly.
8			TAWG	8-5 – Figure 8-7 is great! However, this is the first time that density compared across the Planning Areas has been presented. The dwelling unit per/acre chart should be in the Introduction.F170	We will add to Executive Summary.
8			TAWG	8-7 – Pedestrian Share of total traffic fatalities. Needs context - compare Alameda County ped fatality:walk mode share ratio to others – state, fed, other counties.	We will provide contextual data if it’s readily available and comparable.
8			TAWG	8-7 – typo – cut last phrase of Physical Barriers “and other on-street bicycle infrastructure” doesn’t belong in Ped Chapter.	Addressed on p. 8-7.
8			TAWG	8-8 – Local Planning Effort – Explain relationship of Countywide Ped Plan to CWTP.	Addressed on p. 8-8.
8			TAWG	8-9 – Don’t know what Traffic Curriculum means	We will add a brief description

8			TAWG	8-9 – Missing ideas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should discuss the health impacts of active transportation, and recognize the growing role of Public Health Departments in walking/active living advocacy. • Should mention the important of Measure B ped funds. • Should mention ADA and ADA Transition Plans to benefit all pedestrians. 	First bullet: We will add a brief discussion. We will add a bullet point on Measure B under the “Multi-jurisdictional programs” section. Third bullet: We will add.
8			TAWG	8-10 – Summary of Needs - As in Bike Chapter, this is not an adequate treatment of needs. If you only got 50% response and responses varied widely, then the data is very likely misleading. Cite the more detailed responses in a sidebar – they’re interesting, but this is not a Summary of Needs.	We are aware of the problems that accrued from reporting inconsistent survey responses, and are working to address them for the Bike/Ped plans. For now, we will delete this section.
9			TAWG	9-3 – What’s the Oakland Intermodal Gateway Terminal?	Defined in footnote on pg. 9-3.
9			TAWG	9-7 – Future Conditions, Land Use and Goods Movement. Change negative term “industrial land supply is “at risk” of transitioning...” supply may transition...	Addressed on p. 9-7.
9			TAWG	9-7 – Truck This is the first mention of the Alameda County travel demand model.	The travel demand model is the source of charts in Chapters 1 and 2. A textual reference has been added in Chapter 1.
9			TAWG	9-15 – Figure 9-9 doesn’t add much value	Removed.
10			TAWG	Chapter 10 – general comments This is primarily a parking chapter, and there’s not much on TDM here I’d add these points, at least: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 511 has commute benefits program, including carpool ridematching. • Alameda County Guaranteed Ride Home Program • Pre-tax transit benefits nearly doubled in 2010 and bicycle benefits were added for the first time. • Berkeley (and SF and Richmond) passed an ordinance requiring all employers with 10+ employees to offer pre-tax commute benefits. (TRACCC Ordinance, more details available on request.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 511 commute benefits program, GRH, pre-tax benefits, and other programs added to p. 10-6. • Guaranteed Ride Home Program is mentioned in the introduction • Berkeley ordinance added to p. 10-8.
10			TAWG	10-3 - Use AC transit Easy Pass logo, not VTA (or Boulder?) Eco Pass logo.	Logo removed on p. 10-3.

10			TAWG	10-6 – This is an OK description of the evening parking issues in Berkeley, but Saturday between 10pm and midnight is not a peak hour observation	Addressed on p. 10-6.
10			TAWG	10-7 – Cut all these images. They don't add anything.	We have maintained 4 of these photos for illustration purposes.
10			TAWG	10-8 – Too much text on Berkeley parking here. Suggest cutting first paragraph under The Solution, at a minimum	Addressed p. 10-8.
10			TAWG	10-8 – Replace “Eco Pass” with “Easy Pass”	Addressed p. 10-8.
10			TAWG	10-8 - The TDM Conditions of Approval is much more relevant to readers/other jurisdictions. Suggest you cite Library Gardens or Brower Center Conditions. (available on request)	No action necessary in briefing book, TDM Conditions of Approval already mentioned on p. 10-8. We will consider adding this example to the Parking and TDM issue paper.
10			TAWG	10-11 – Increased Revenue – I thought BART had an Access Fund funded by parking revenue. Did they cancel it?	We double checked with BART. All the BART parking revenues now go into BART General Fund. A number of years ago the Board approved a contribution of \$625,000 / year for three years in an Access Fund but due to financial issues, the District took back the third year of funding. The Access Fund allocation was never renewed.