



785 Market Street, Suite 1300
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 284-1544 FAX: (415) 284-1554

MEMORANDUM

To: Community Advisory Working Group (CAWG) and Technical Advisory Working Group (TAWG)
From: Bonnie Nelson, Nelson\Nygaard
Date: March 1, 2011
Subject: Transportation Issue Papers

The transportation issue papers are intended to provide a bridge between the big picture needs/issues/priorities discussions that have been the topic of much of our discussions and outreach to date and the next stages of the Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) and Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) development that will occur over the next few months. These issue papers provide case studies and additional background on key issues for the CWTP as well as providing a framework to think about how to approach transportation in the Plans.

The issue papers are intended to stimulate thinking and discussions around some of the important but challenging issues that we are facing in development of these Plans. Ultimately, we hope these can spur innovative thinking about project and program packaging and evaluation as we prioritize projects for both the CWTP and refine our list of projects for the Regional Transportation Plan.

We are preparing six papers on transportation issues:

- Sustainability Principles
- Land Use and the Countywide Transportation Plan
- Transit Integration and Sustainability
- Transportation Demand Management and Parking Management
- Goods Movement
- Innovative Funding Opportunities

The final issue papers will be included in your April meeting packets. At your March meeting we are looking for the following feedback from you:

1. Are there related topics you would like to see covered in the issue papers? And/or are there things in the issue papers that you feel were already adequately covered in the Briefing Book, and therefore do not need to be repeated here?
2. Are there case studies you are aware of that should be reviewed for these issue papers?

Issue Paper #1: Sustainability Principles

- Introduction:

This section defines the goals of this section and provides definitions of sustainability and a sustainable transportation system.

- Goals
 - Define sustainability and explain how it applies to transportation
 - Provide examples of how other transportation plans have supported and implemented sustainability principles
 - Develop CWTP sustainability principles
- What is sustainability?
 - Provide definitions of sustainability - Meeting current needs without compromising needs of future generations
 - Discuss dimensions of sustainability - environment, economy, quality of life, equity
- What is a sustainable transportation system?
 - Provide definition of a sustainable transportation system
 - Discuss California's Sustainable Communities planning requirements and how these relate to the CWTP
 - Discuss how the transportation system fits into the context of other sectors' benefits & impacts, and the need to look at transportation as an integrated system along with land use, housing, economy, and environment
 - Discuss the importance of defining and tracking performance measures to measure progress towards sustainability; provide examples of performance measures related to sustainability

- Goals & Available Strategies

This section discusses what a sustainable approach to transportation might look like in Alameda County. This includes both how sustainability might be considered in the County's transportation planning and programming activities, and what types of projects, programs, and policies might support a more sustainable transportation system.

A sustainable approach to transportation requires:

- a multi-faceted approach which includes planning, financing and environmental considerations
- Adopting integrated planning - transportation consistent with land use – through Sustainable Communities Strategy, Transit Oriented Development (TOD), etc.
- Taking steps to reduce environmental impacts – GHG & energy (consistent with regional Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction targets), air pollutant emissions, water quality impacts, etc. – consistent with reductions needed to meet broader (societal) targets/goals (e.g., energy independence, climate stabilization, air quality attainment).
- Fiscal prudence – not spending beyond our means, or making investments that we can't afford to support in the future.
- Maintaining a state of good repair.
 - Highway
 - Transit

- Bicycling and Walking
- Other modes
- Maximizing efficiency of existing system – looking for ways to improve mobility and accessibility while minimizing fiscal burden and social & environmental impacts – through Intelligent Transportation Systems/operations, Transportation Demand Management, land use, etc.
- Maintaining acceptable levels of mobility and accessibility for passenger and freight traffic.
- Supporting investments, services, policies, and programs that improve social equity & ensure access to economic opportunities for all residents.
- Tracking progress through performance measurement.
- Case Studies
 - This section presents examples of successful and innovative approaches to incorporating sustainability principles into transportation planning and programming.
 - Caltrans – statewide transportation sustainability – adapt from National Cooperative Highway Research Program 8-74 case studies
 - An MPO case study from 8-74, possibly Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG)
 - Possibly another county or local government from California, if a good example can be found
- Challenges
 - This section discusses the most significant challenges that transportation agencies have faced in incorporating sustainability principles into transportation planning and programming.
 - Agreeing upon definition of sustainability for agency’s purposes and operationalizing that definition through policies, programs, projects, and funding priorities.
 - Making tradeoffs among different sustainability objectives – e.g., need money to invest in more energy-efficient modes, but also need to be fiscally sustainable.
 - Linking transportation planning with other sectors (e.g., land use).
 - Identifying and tracking appropriate performance measures.
- Strategic Investment Opportunities
 - This section discusses how the CWTP can encourage implementation of a more sustainable transportation system.
 - Review/list existing County (and relevant regional) projects, programs, and policies that relate to/achieve goals and strategies discussed above.
 - Suggest additional steps:
 - Address sustainability through the planning & programming process.
 - Suggest components of a “sustainable transportation portfolio” – policies; priority funding/focus areas (programs, modal, projects, etc).
 - Identify actions with clear benefits across all sustainability dimensions, and those that may involve tradeoffs – need to identify County priorities.

- Identify/include sustainability-related performance measures in a performance-based planning approach.
- Conclusions and Next Steps
 - This section identifies additional research needed or other actions needed to further enable implementation of a more sustainable transportation system.
 - County stakeholder consensus on definition of sustainability, performance measures & monitoring, and evaluate how current priorities and projects support meeting sustainability objectives.
 - To be further developed as issue paper research progresses.

Issue Paper #2: Land Use Implementation Tools for Reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) to Support the Countywide Transportation Plan

- Introduction

This transportation issue paper will focus on the issue of encouraging high density land use within areas of Alameda County that are well-served by transit. It will also focus on supporting areas that support walking and biking and have the potential to be better served by transit in the longer-term future. The planned and potential Priority Development Areas (PDAs) that have been identified by local jurisdictions through ABAG's FOCUS program will be an important component of this discussion. It will also be important to support other opportunities to reduce VMT by planning and implementing development that will support increased walking and bicycling throughout the county.

The issue paper will discuss what this means for the jurisdictions in Alameda County and for the Alameda CTC; the issues that challenge implementation of these land use patterns (e.g.; existing policies, standards, and jurisdiction practices; development issues such as property acquisition and infrastructure costs; issues of community support that can impact entitlement; etc.); and what the Alameda CTC can do to encourage implementation of these land use patterns through the CWTP. It is also important to recognize the policy challenge of spending transportation dollars on land use; this transportation issue paper will also identify the relative effectiveness of the various strategies and tools that are discussed in order to aid in the setting of investment and policy priorities for the Alameda CTC.

- What are the essential characteristics of walkable and bikeable places, in particular PDAs? Why are they important to Alameda County and the CWTP vision and goals?
- How can jurisdictions identify places, other than PDAs, that have the best potential to support biking and walking? How can priorities be set for investment in these areas?
- What is the relationship of these land use concepts to Transit Oriented Development and Smart Growth?
- What is the relationship of these land use concepts to other transportation, land use, and economic policy initiatives?
- What does the PDA designation mean to Alameda County beyond what is assumed in FOCUS partnership strategy? Are there other ways to define the linkage between land use and reduced VMT/increased transportation choice in Alameda County?
- Provide summary of what it means to be designated as a planned or potential PDA in terms of regional and other policies and funding programs.
- Relationship to jurisdictions' economic development goals and potential changes to Redevelopment Agencies.
- Potential impacts, both positively and negatively, of CEQA analysis of GHG, particulates, and broader air quality and transportation impact issues to infill and TOD opportunity sites.
- Relationship of Alameda County efforts to the RTP SCS strategies and transportation infrastructure.
- Other issues (to be expanded on through additional research)
 - Impact of BCDC Climate Adaptation Strategy

- Goals and Available Strategies

- How can the Alameda CTC encourage development in the PDA designated areas and other walkable and bikeable places throughout the county?
- Are there opportunities to advance planning/public involvement/environmental clearance?
- Are there other funding needs to jump start development in these areas?
 - Infrastructure – transportation and other types
 - Property acquisition/land banking
 - Policy and implementation strategy development projects requiring funding at higher levels than the MTC Technical Assistance Grants (max. \$60,000) and Alameda CTC’s TODTAP program. While station area planning grants and other MTC grants can provide funding for certain types of policy development and CEQA efforts, there are other locations (e.g.; outside of PDAs or outside of ½ mile from transit within PDAs) or types of planning or infrastructure investment (e.g. street standards, utility improvements, etc.) that may not compete well for existing grant programs, but that would advance implementation of development in walkable and bikeable locations in Alameda County.
- Are there tools that could be developed through coordination with regional agencies and utilities, other CMAs, Alameda County, and through state agencies and the legislature:
 - Funding sources to implement PDAs and other walkable and bikeable places:
 - Tax Increment Financing Districts beyond those that can be created for TOD areas.
 - Others to be identified through further research.
 - Supporting the creation of joint public-private partnerships.
 - Coordinating with Caltrans to facilitate advancing redesign of state-owned urban arterials within PDAs.
 - Encouraging utility companies to develop standards and infrastructure investment strategies that support PDA implementation.
 - Model ordinances to make implementation feasible (e.g. zoning, street design standards, parking standards and management strategies).
- How can the CWTP support non-Single Occupancy Vehicle oriented development in PDAs?
 - Are there policies and best practices that should be encouraged/required in locally designated PDAs to receive targeted funding?
 - Are there opportunities to target funding to projects in the PDAs and other walkable and bikeable places?
 - Are there opportunities for public/private partnerships and how can the CWTP encourage those partnerships?
 - Are TOD/PDA design guidelines needed for Alameda County?
- Case Studies
 - Should the CWTP direct funding in ways that are more related to land use and how would that be accomplished?
 - Maryland experience of “Priority Funding Areas”
 - Other possible programs in Utah, Maine and other locations, such as:

- More refined infrastructure impact fee calculations.
 - Establishing government facilities criteria and practices to support investment in walkable and bikeable locations.
 - Coordination with school districts to support walkable and bikeable locations.
 - Others to be developed.
 - Should Alameda CTC come up with model ordinances that could be adopted throughout the county?
 - Grand Boulevard Initiative – Corridor-wide Caltrans exceptions for improvements to El Camino Real.
 - CEQA mitigation toolkit or menu.
 - Others to be developed.
 - Challenges
 - Is there additional planning or additional research that needs to be done to help define a TOD/PDA program in Alameda County?
 - Strategic Investment Opportunities
 - To be developed based on issue paper research results.
 - Conclusions and Next Steps for Alameda County
- Key issues to address and recommended steps to begin addressing them.

Issue Paper #3: Transit Integration and Sustainability

- Introduction: What is the meaning of transit “integration” and “sustainability”?
 - MTC is currently carrying out a Transit Sustainability Project. MTC has defined a “sustainable” transit system as one that is:
 - In customer terms: Accessible, user-friendly and has a coordinated network (i.e., a “sustainable” system is also an “integrated” system)
 - In financial terms: Can cover operating and capital costs with growing fare revenues and reliable funding streams
 - In environmental terms: “Can attract and accommodate new riders, support emissions-reduction goals, and is supported by land use and pricing policies
 - In order to evaluate and issue recommendations to improve the sustainability of the regional transit system, MTC is focusing primarily on three areas:
 - Financial viability
 - Service design and delivery
 - Institutional (decision-making structures)
 - MTC is also taking into account external factors that influence the sustainability of a transit system, including land use and pricing
- Goals and Available Strategies
 - A similar approach to the sustainability of the transit system in Alameda County might take as a starting point the MTC study’s definitions, goals and objectives, as well as the following elements of a sustainable and integrated transit system:
 - A sustainable and integrated system functions seamlessly from the user perspective in terms of fare and schedule coordination; services by different operators may even be made to “feel” like service provided by a single operator using branding and informational tools
 - A sustainable and integrated system avoids delay, in part to serve customers, but also to increase cost-effectiveness
 - A sustainable and integrated system provides service that is reliable
 - A sustainable and integrated system consists of categories of service designed to serve well-defined markets and land use contexts
 - A sustainable and integrated system is integrated with the broader transportation system and with other modes
 - Possible Strategies Include:
 - Capital projects that might reduce or control transit operations costs
 - Alternative Transit Service Delivery Models
 - Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Paratransit: Alternative service delivery models that can meet ADA service requirements in a more financially sustainable way without degrading service quality
- Case Studies
 - Organizational integration: European “*verkehrsverbund*,” or regional organizations responsible for coordinating fares, schedules and branding among multiple transit operators.

- Examples of “supplemental” local transit service provided by public or private entities: Los Angeles DASH, Boulder CTN, Bay Area examples (Emery Go-Round, Oakland “B”, Palo Alto shuttles, Microsoft)
- Alternative demand-responsive models
 - Paratransit Case Study (under development)
- Challenges
 - MTC identified four primary sources of challenge in current system:
 - Financial viability
 - Service design and delivery
 - Institutional (decision-making structures)
 - Land use patterns and pricing, including tolls and parking rates
 - Which translate into: Specific challenges include:
 - Many operators: Highly varied service structures, fare structures
 - Diverse user groups and user needs: e.g. transit dependent and choice riders
 - Lack of fare and schedule integration and physical connectivity, e.g., lack of seamless transfer, long wait times for connections.
- Strategic Investment Opportunities
 - Is there a role for the County in ensuring that services provided by different operators are integrated in terms of fares, schedules, and passenger information?
 - How might local shuttle services supplementing regional trunk or feeder service be funded?
 - Do opportunities exist for private entities to provide supplemental service?
- Conclusions and Next Steps
 - Is there additional planning or research that needs to be done to help define a program in this area?

Issue Paper #4: Transportation Demand Management and Parking Management

- Introduction: What are Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Parking Demand Management (PDM)? (Brief since already well described in Briefing Book)
- Goals and Available Strategies
 - Leveraging existing transit investments/making transit service more cost-effective, for example through universal transit pass programs
 - Parking management as congestion management
 - Leveraging existing infrastructure, for example high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes
 - Incentivizing trip-reduction through workplace-based strategies (e.g. guaranteed ride home, programs to encourage walking and biking, and travel choice programs)
 - There are areas where TDM and PDM strategies can be especially effective, and where a TDM/PDM “gap” might exist:
 - Mitigating heavily peaked roadway congestion, such as for major events such as festivals, parades or sport events
 - Incentive trip reduction through school programs
- Case Studies
 - Regional role in local TDM efforts: MTC TOD Policy, National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board Technical Assistance Program
 - TDM Conditions of Approval: Library Gardens or Brower Center (Berkeley)
 - Managing demand for both curbside and roadway space through market-based pricing: SFpark
- Challenges
 - Cities in Alameda County should consider deploying PDM or more coordinated TDM strategies. Is there a role for the County (such as technical assistance, monitoring, or funding)?
 - Private entities are largely in charge of TDM, how can cities and the County leverage/incentivize TDM?
 - How can we determine which parking management strategies are appropriate to different transit and land use contexts?
- Strategic Investment Opportunities
 - What would a Countywide parking management strategy look like?
 - Is there a role for the County in developing more robust employer-based trip reduction strategies?
 - How can the CWTP incentivize local jurisdictions who control parking in their areas to incorporate best practices in parking management in their communities?
- Conclusions and Next Steps
 - Is there additional planning or research that needs to be done to help define a program in this area?

Issue Paper #5: Goods Movement

- Introduction: Why Goods Movement Matters on a County-Wide Level

Short introduction defining goals of this section and terms used. Recognize work already done by MTC on the Regional Goods Movement Study and by Alameda CTC in the Truck Parking Location and Feasibility Study. Describe some of the main benefits from goods movement-related businesses and activities in Alameda County, articulating why these are important.

- Information to include:

- Goods movement is derived from demand. It doesn't exist by itself- it exists to carry goods and services to people and industries that need them via truck, rail and air modes.
- Goods movement-related business provides a great deal of regional employment (e.g. the Port of Oakland creates 7,683 jobs- of which 50% are Alameda County residents). Numerous other businesses are also significant truck freight generators, such as Safeway, UPS, and FedEx.
- Goods movement-related industries contribute millions of dollars in taxes to the counties in which they are located. An estimate of Alameda County's contribution will be isolated to the extent possible.
- Though there are many positive impacts of freight movement, there are also negative impacts. Safety, air quality, congestion, and environmental justice issues currently exist throughout Alameda County. If not addressed by targeted strategies, these issues will be exacerbated with projected population and business growth in the future.
- However, there are ways to maximize the efficiency of the freight system while at the same time minimizing the negative impacts.

- Goals & Available Strategies: The Ideal Freight System

- The ideal Alameda County freight system will be described, including:

- Identification of infrastructure and operational features the system should include. Are there specific technological system needs?
- Identification of any best practices that are currently being implemented in the County and those that can be emulated.
- Identification of markets the system could serve, locally and internationally.

- Case Studies:

- Provide two to three examples of successful and innovative approaches to improving/maximizing goods movement in Alameda County.

- Truck Parking Solutions
- Virtual Weigh Stations
- Others to be identified

- Challenges: Defining Today's System- Existing Facilities and Gaps

- What are the existing challenges and barriers to implementation?

- This will briefly define the elements of the goods movement system that tend to be dominated by local industries and consumers. This system will be briefly defined (drawing on work from the 2004 and 2008 MTC studies, the Alameda CTC Truck Parking Location and Feasibility Study and others). Information to include:

- Industrial land use changes to higher, more profitable uses.
- High fuel prices compared to neighboring states
- Local business practices
- Where are the gaps/most salient needs in the locally-serving system?
 - What are some identified gaps in the locally-serving system? Include ones that are partially planned or funded. Some gaps / problems that will be featured related to the multimodal freight system include:
 - Illegal truck parking (which is being partially addressed through the army base redevelopment process, and has recommendations outlined in 2008 Alameda CTC's truck parking study),
 - Truck congestion on key corridors,
 - Need to define local truck route system,
 - Truck diversion to smaller routes /roads not suitable for truck passage,
 - Truck safety concerns,
 - Rail at-grade crossing safety concerns,
 - Truck and rail access to major water port and airport facilities, and
 - Localized air quality concerns- in particular around major freight generators like the Port of Oakland and major travel corridors such as I-580 and I-880.
- What parts of the freight transportation system support national and international trade?
 - This will define the elements of the goods movement system that tend to be dominated by national and international freight movement. This will include key freight corridors as defined in the MTC 2004 Goods Movement corridors truck parking study and other efforts that separated commodities into domestic vs. international.
- Where are the gaps/most salient needs in the national and international system?
 - A discussion of known, identified gaps / problems and some discussion of why they matter to the County.
 - Capacity constraints at the Port of Oakland Marine and air cargo facilities,
 - Constraints and bottlenecks on the main corridors used for “through freight”. This includes the Class I rail lines and yards, I-580 and I-80 / I-880 hotspots, and
 - Others
- Strategic Investment Opportunities: Recommendations to Address System Needs
 - Infrastructure Recommendations
 - What are the recommended infrastructure enhancements to support local, regional, national and international goods movement? This will be drawn from existing reports, studies, and published updates, including the 2004 MTC Goods Movement Project, Port of Oakland capital improvement program, TCIF project applications, 2008 Alameda CTC Truck Parking Location and Feasibility Study and other documents.
 - Policy and Institutional Recommendations
 - What are the recommended policy and institutional recommendations to support local, regional, national and international goods movement?

- Are the Alameda CTC truck parking facility and location study recommendations sufficiently supported in current policy? Are local jurisdictions, trucking companies, Alameda CTC, Caltrans and others following through with implementation actions?
- Is the existing clean trucks program sufficiently supported by existing policies / programs?
- How should the County approach the issue of conflicting land uses and industrial uses converting to higher intensive uses (i.e. industrial land abutting residential land, etc.)? Should it consider creating industrial site design guidelines aimed at industrial site developers? Should it create policies to try and preserve its existing goods movement–related land?
- Is our rail system sustainable for goods movement? What about conflicts or coordination with passenger rail & proposed trails?
- Funding opportunities
- Conclusions and Next Steps
 - Is there additional planning or additional research that needs to be done to help define a program in this area?
 - What other conclusions can be drawn regarding today’s freight system, its needs, and the potential to address those needs.

Issue Paper #6: Innovative Funding Opportunities

- Introduction: Why is our current funding situation so challenging?
 - A brief history of transportation funding in Alameda County (including sales tax, bridge tolls, developer fees, Vehicle Registration Fee, etc)
 - Transit operators rely heavily on sources that can fluctuate, such as sales taxes and parcel taxes
 - Federal and state funding has proven similarly unreliable in recent years
 - Volatility in funding affects transit, roads, highways, and all other transportation investments
 - User fees such as tolls can be politically controversial, but their use has been growing
 - Current pots of money are highly constrained in terms of allowable uses
 - Use of the transportation system is rising and therefore so is the cost of maintaining and operating the system
- Goals and Available Strategies
 - Due to these challenges, innovative funding mechanisms have arisen
 - Collaboration and partnership is becoming a necessity, giving rise to public/private partnerships such as Transportation Management Association (TMA) and Business Improvement District (BID) funding of transit services
 - Capturing the full value of public investment through value capture of private benefits, such as increased land values or profits for retail businesses driven by improved transit access
 - Expanding the scope of user fees to ensure motorists pay more directly for road and parking space, e.g. VMT tax and pay-as-you-go insurance (thus providing additional revenues for transportation improvements)
- Case Studies: National/international examples of innovative funding opportunities that could be applicable to Alameda County
 - Value-capture from private development (Portland Streetcar, Emery Go-Round, San Leandro Links)
 - Tax revenue-backed loans: Los Angeles 30/10 Initiative
 - User fees: Oregon VMT tax pilot; King County, Washington employer based TDM program
- Challenges
 - Some measures cannot be implemented at County level/may require State legislation
 - Private parties may not have motive to enter into partnership/may resist measures related to value capture
 - Political/public opposition to user fees
- Strategic Investment Opportunities
 - How should CWTP incorporate and encourage and advocate for these new funding mechanisms
- Strategic Coordination and Advocacy

- Are there additional areas or methods of coordination and/or advocacy that could be used to expand transportation funding
- Conclusions and Next Steps
 - Is there additional planning or research that needs to be done to help define a program in this area?