

CWTP-TEP Briefing Book Comments

Chapter	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter	Comment
1	1-1	Introduction	Keith Cooke	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.
1	1-2	1st Paragraph	Keith Cooke	"highly competitive bidding environment which has brought costs down" This is a recent phenomena and could change.
1	1-6	2nd Paragraph	Keith Cooke	"Provide" spelled wrong in the last sentence of the second paragraph.
1	1-6	7th Bullet	Keith Cooke	7th bullet on page 1-6. "Berkeley and Fruitvale"- Mixed descriptions are used here.
1	1-14	1st Paragraph	Keith Cooke	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.
1	1-14	3rd paragraph	Keith Cooke	3rd paragraph: "MTC Resolution 3434 links the expenditure..." This is an important item and deserves highlighting as to its implications.
1	1-14	2nd column, 2nd paragraph	Keith Cooke	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
1	1-14	2nd column, 4th paragraph	Keith Cooke	"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.
1	1-21	2nd paragraph	Keith Cooke	"very costly" is the text, commenter suggests: "... typically very costly." As an alternative way of communicating without trying to be definitive without any data.
1	1-21	2nd column, 2nd paragraph	Keith Cooke	"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
1	1-22	2nd column, last paragraph	Keith Cooke	"A full list of all projects..." Do we want to include any major projects that have not broken ground as of yet?
1	1-2	General	Patrisha Piras	There seem to be a fair number of typos, missing words, etc. which deserve a careful edit.
1	1-6		Patrisha Piras	Is not Oakland Airport part of the Port of Oakland, not a separate entity?
1	1-8		Patrisha Piras	"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?
1	1-10		Patrisha Piras	South County is the most racially diverse of the four planning areas. -- So what are we going to do about that?
1	1-21		Patrisha Piras	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."
1	1-2	Introduction	Matt Nichols	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
1	1-3		Matt Nichols	"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..."
1	1-8		Matt Nichols	Convolutd language; say it more clearly. "Unfortunately, collisions here are somewhat less proportionate..."
1	1-19		Matt Nichols	Define "self-help counties."
1	1-21		Matt Nichols	"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.
1	1-21		Matt Nichols	define "ABAG projections"
1	1-22		Matt Nichols	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.
1	1-22		Matt Nichols	Please add the opening of the Downtown Berkeley BART Bikestation to the list of Bicycle improvements.
1	1-6		Matt Nichols	1-6 "...highest number of pedestrian collisions, has among the fewest collision per 1,000 biking trips..." Is this accidentally conflating ped and bike data?
1	1-12		Matt Nichols	1-12 – drivers less aware and cautions - cautious
1	1-5		Nathan Landau	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.

CWTP-TEP Briefing Book Comments

Chapter	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter	Comment
1	1-6		Nathan Landau	P. 16 Area descriptions, starting here--It would 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.
1	1-7		Nathan Landau	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.
1	1-2	2nd Paragraph	Keith Cooke	"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.
1	1-16	2nd paragraph	Keith Cooke	2nd paragraph "that is caused by people "cruising" in their search for on-street parking." -This is just one of the reasons for congestion.
1	1-22	1st Paragraph	Keith Cooke	"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?
1	1-18		Patrishia Piras	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.
1	1-19		Patrishia Piras	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.
1	1-3		Nathan Landau	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.
1, 2	1-22 & 2-10		Matt Nichols	p. iii – Figures 1-10 and Figure 2-10 are the same. Intentional?
2	2-16	Figure 2-18	Matt Nichols	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.
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?
2	2-1		Nathan Landau	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
2	2-8		Nathan Landau	P. 28 Please note that only 10-12% of AC Transit's ridership is in Contra Costa, the bulk is in Alameda County.
2	41		Nathan Landau	P. 41--Population Growth and Density--It would be helpful to note, perhaps separately, the absolute population growth projected for each city
2	44/45		Nathan Landau	P. 44/45--The different patterns of commuting--mode splits--to the different employment centers should be noted.
2	54		Nathan Landau	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.
3		General	Lindsay Imai	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
3		General	Lindsay Imai	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. If we are 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.

CWTP-TEP Briefing Book Comments

Chapter	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter	Comment
3	3-4		Matt Nichols	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)
3	3-15		Matt Nichols	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 CO?
3	3-17		Matt Nichols	3-17 – This is not a particularly illuminating or illustrative ‘best practice’. They’re in the midst of a sticky process, and so are we. Also the strange finding of the SCAG software potentially undercuts much of this document – does land use make a difference or doesn’t it?
3	3-11		Matt Nichols	3-11 – references to MTC Change in Motion Plan and Transportation 2035 Plan (also on 3-2). They’re the same thing, right?
3	3-13		Matt Nichols	3-13 – first reference to LID, but acronym is not explained until 3-16.
3,5		General	Lindsay Imai	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, I think that 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. 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 appropriate financial support, to maximize transit ridership and mode shift.
4		General	Mike Tassano	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.
4	4-4	Figure 4-2	Matt Nichols	Figure 4-2 = no key. Does line width represent hours of delay?
4	4-7		Matt Nichols	4-7 – LS&R pavement condition needs a longer discussion, or at least a table showing pavement conditions and shortfall in each jurisdiction.
4	4-19		Matt Nichols	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.
4	4-16 to 4-20		Matt Nichols	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.
5	5-10	2nd Line	Jeff Flynn	2nd line, Paratransit is spelled incorrectly
5	5-10	1st paragraph	Jeff Flynn	"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.
5	5-10	Paragraph 1, Line 7	Jeff Flynn	Paragraph 1, line 7, change to "1 interregional route 3 commuter shuttle routes..."
5	5-10	Paragraph 2, Line 5	Jeff Flynn	Paragraph 2, line 5: LAVTA does not offer a discounted youth fare
5	5-10	Paragraph 2, Line 6	Jeff Flynn	Paragraph 2, line 5: LAVTA does not offer a student monthly pass.
5	5-10	Orange Box	Jeff Flynn	Orange Box: Change listing of routes to 3 commuter routes.

CWTP-TEP Briefing Book Comments

Chapter	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter	Comment
5	5-10	Orange Box	Jeff Flynn	Orange Box: Operating cost in orange box does not match operating cost in last line of body text.
5	5-10	Orange Box	Jeff Flynn	Orange Box: Annual ridership is too high.
5	5-17		Jeff Flynn	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 our WebWatch program which is on our website and provides the same service as NextBus. We also have over 60 real time signs at bus stops throughout our service area.
5	5-19		Lindsay Imai	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)
5			Lindsay Imai	Account for full cost per rider in the transit data. Given how expensive transit expansions can be, it is very important that we 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 into 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
5	5-3		Matt Nichols	5-18 – Needs discussion of Lifeline transit needs, and the specific transit needs identified in Community Based Transportation Plans.
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.
5			Nathan Landau	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:
5			"	There will be a greater need for transit—Higher senior population
5			"	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
5			"	Households will have a greater ability to use transit 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. Perceived desirability of low density, suburban development is decreasing Fewer households with school age children at home, simplifying trip patterns
5			"	

Chapter	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter	Comment
				Reduced need to drive 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.
5			"	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.
5			"	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
5			"	OUTCOME—Demand for transit is very likely to rise Demand for commute transit will rise, particularly with parking charges and limits Demand for non-commute, short distance transit likely to rise even more Car use shifts towards recreational, discretionary weekend and night trips.
5			"	TRANSIT SYSTEM NEEDS Robust local system—Grid pattern in urban Northern Alameda County, hub and spokes pattern in less dense areas Maintenance of commuter transit service, to serve proportionate increases in commuter travel Improvement of speed and travel time of non-BART transit, to improve its competitiveness
5			Nathan Landau	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.
5			Nathan Landau	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.
5			Nathan Landau	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.
5			Nathan Landau	Shuttles: P. 102 to 104: There doesn't seem to be consistent references to costs in the explanation of shuttles. I understand that 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 publically 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?)
5			Nathan Landau	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.
5			Nathan Landau	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.
5			Nathan Landau	P. 115 What, no costs associated with Streetcars or BART metro even though you provide costs for BRT? Either the 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)
5			Nathan Landau	P. 118: Expansion versus Enhancement I think 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 NOT an enhancement. The real issue is should we continue to provide for expansion when the basic vehicle replacement needs are not being met. We have that issue, just like BART does. It just so happens that we have generally replaced our vehicles in a timely way, and now it's

CWTP-TEP Briefing Book Comments

Chapter	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter	Comment
				<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>
5			Nathan Landau	<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 directly specifically for paratransit service.”</p>
5			Nathan Landau	<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. I find it odd and 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. I suspect you included those because you are actively involved in those associated programs. However, it is presumptuous to 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>
5, 2 and 6		General	Lindsay Imai	<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, I’d like to suggest that in addition to the information available in Chapter 6 and in Chapter 2 on population, that in Chapter 5, for each transit operator and, if possible, for each shuttle, you also 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</p>
5,6		General	Lindsay Imai	<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>
6	6-3		Jeff Flynn	<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>
6	6-4	4th Paragraph	Jeff Flynn	<p>4th Paragraph: LAVTA is not technically a “city based” service. We’re 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.</p>
6	6-6		Jeff Flynn	<p>LAVTA paratransit is available from approximately 4:30 AM to 1:30 AM. We are no longer 24/7.</p>

CWTP-TEP Briefing Book Comments

Chapter	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter	Comment
6	6-7		Jeff Flynn	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.
6	6-7		Jeff Flynn	Note: Livermore also does not operate a specific program to my knowledge.
6		General	Patrisha Piras	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)?
6	6-8		Matt Nichols	6-8 – Add City CarShare/City of Berkeley Accessmobile to Innovative Services. See 2008 MTC Doris Kahn Award.
6	6-12		Matt Nichols	6-12 – Add Accessible carsharing to list.
7	7-9	Bicycle Parking, 1st Bullet	Diana Keena	Bicycle Parking, 1st bullet: Emeryville has a Bicycle Parking Ordinance.
7	7-10	SRTS	Diana Keena	Safe Routes to School: Emeryville has not received a Safe Routes to School grant. Summary of Needs: I don't know what survey we 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.
7	7-11	Summary of Needs	Diana Keena	
11		General	Patrisha Piras	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 chooses to do so, as they do selectively.
Appendix	A-1	Status of Projects	Matt Nichols	#8 – ERC – Closeout/Complete
Appendix	A-5	Status of Projects	Matt Nichols	#60 – PE/Env phase. Comments/Notes: Downtown 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.)
Appendix	A-8	Status of Projects	Matt Nichols	#89 – ACTC is now lead agency.
Appendix	A-8	Status of Projects	Matt Nichols	#90 – Comments: Pedestrian Plan adopted, 2010. Approx. \$1.5M from Safe Routes to Schools & Safe Routes to Transit grants.
Appendix	A-8	Status of Projects	Matt Nichols	#93 – PE phase. Received \$2.25M FHWA Value Pricing Pilot Program and \$2M CMAQ Climate Initiative grants.
	General	Regarding All Statistics	Jeff Flynn	Regarding all statistics: What is the source? They seem to be off from what we have internally.
		General	Patrisha Piras/Steering Committee	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.
			Patrisha Piras	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, we can have little faith in any projections coming out of the AlaCTC. This should probably be re-phrased.
		General	Patrisha Piras	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?
		General	Matt Nichols	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.

CWTP-TEP Briefing Book Comments

Chapter	Page	Other Identifier	Commenter	Comment
		Unclear	Matt Nichols	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.
		General	Matt Nichols	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.
		General	Matt Nichols	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.
		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.
		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.
			Val Menotti, BART, 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.
			Midori Tabata, 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.