



Comments Received To Date on Administrative Draft Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP)

Summary of Comments

1. Request for **equity** by geography, race, economy and class, Title VI compliance and to clarify how public outreach is influencing decisions
2. **Specific projects and programs** requested and supported from jurisdictions, transit operators and CAWG representatives. See Table 1 for compilation of these comments on the financially constrained list
3. Requests to **modify or correct projects** (e.g., split into phases, ensure funding requests are correct)
4. Requests to **move items out of programs into projects**
5. Requests for **corrections** of data or data sources
6. Requests for **more data** (e.g. planning area subtotals or percentages, lane miles of projects, how projects and programs will impact VMT and GHG)
7. Transit operators requests that **projects and programs submitted to MTC and Alameda CTC be consistent.**
8. Requests of **clarification, explanations and definitions** (e.g., how does “committed” fit in plan, what does short term or ready for implementation mean, why 60/40 split)
9. Requests to ensure **operation and maintenance funding of transit expansion projects is included** in those projects
10. Request to make a **greater investment in maintaining existing transit system** before consider transit expansion
11. Request to **go beyond compliance with SB 375 Climate targets** to reduce GHG emissions
12. Concern about **gentrification and displacement in TOD** areas
13. Request to add **BAAQMD CEQA guidelines** to new policy environment list. Could affect TOD.
14. Add **CTC financial incentives to support PDAs in the land use chapter**

15. **Add to challenges and strategies** (express lanes as among innovative system management strategies, sea level rise as challenge, reference Transit Sustainability Project, refer to SJCOG I-580 interregional multimodal corridor study as TDM future trends/issues/challenges)

List of Commenters

Bruce Williams, City of Oakland
 Terrence Grindall, City of Newark
 Bob Vinn, City of Livermore
 Robert Tally, Caltrans
 Lunne Yu, WETA
 Obaid Kahn, City of Alameda
 Tina Spencer, AC Transit
 Soren Fajeau, City of Newark
 Donna Lee, BART
 Val Menotti, BART
 Lindsay Imai, Urban Habitat
 Matt Nichols, City of Berkeley
 Neena Murgai, Alameda County Public Health
 Erik Alm, Caltrans

Table 1. Comments on Financially Constrained Project and Program List

Jurisdiction/Operator	Comment
Programs	
WETA/Caltrans	<p>The plan should include information about planned ferry service projects and new routes serving locations in Alameda County. These Alameda County ferry projects have been submitted to MTC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22509: Provide ferry service between Alameda/Oakland and San Francisco and between Harbor Bay and San Francisco (\$12 million) • 22511: Provide ferry service between Berkeley/Albany and San Francisco (\$59 million) • 240014: Construct new Operations and Maintenance Facility in Alameda (\$33.4 million)*
AC Transit	<p>An updated project list provided to One Bay Area is listed below. These need to be added to the CWTP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 240701: Supplemental School Service Increases • 240700: Neighborhood Circulator • 240699: Restore Service to 2009 Levels • 240698: Frequent Transit Network • 240697: Express Bus Service on Expanded HOT Lane Network • 240696: Expanded Weekend Bus Service • 240695: Expanded Owl Bus Service
BART	<p>Attached is a spreadsheet of the Projects and Programs BART would like to include in the RTP and CWTP. I am told that components of the Station Modernization Program (which is the new one we are submitting), in the past, have been covered in the RTP with a RTCI submitted directly by MTC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Request: Station Modernization (\$660 million) • 22675: BART Station Access (\$344.1 million) • 240072: BART Security Program (\$86.4 million)*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 240073: BART Rail Vehicle Capacity Expansion (\$444 million)* • 240075: BART Station Capacity (\$294.7 million)* • 240089: BART System Capacity (\$78.3 million)* • 240182: BART Metro Program (\$625 million)*
Berkeley	240217: Downtown Berkeley BART Plaza and Transit Area. This project is a high priority for both the City of Berkeley and BART. This is a major bus hub at a BART station with one the second highest ridership in the East Bay in a downtown with significant recent Transit-Oriented Development, and adjacent to the largest university, employment center and trip generator in Alameda County. It has received a \$1.8M Transportation for Livable Communities grant from MTC. This project is actively moving towards construction in the near-term. BART and the City are actively seeking the necessary funds to complete the full scope. We believe that this project should have been included in a Group C: “Resulting from a Consensus Process” project as it should be considered MTC Res. 3434 project, and was developed through extensive public processes via a Transportation for Livable Communities-funded public planning process and the Berkeley Downtown Area Plan development process. We request a re-evaluation of the project’s performance, and a recommendation for full project funding.
Berkeley	240202: SR 13/Ashby. We are disappointed that the corridor improvements on SR 13/Ashby are not recommended for funding. We feel that the pedestrian, bicycle and transit improvements, the Safe Routes to Schools elements, the mixed residential/commercial character, and the communities of concern along this corridor merit funding.
Projects	
Alameda/Oakland	98207: I-880 Broadway Jackson Interchange: Request that this project be broken into 2 phases like some other key projects in the county. If this is possible then the first phase would be fully funded by discretionary funding request of \$75 Million for the CWTP plus the currently approved funding of \$11.1 Million (Measure B \$8.1 Million and STIP \$3 Million) making it \$86.1 Million project for the first phase, and leave the \$103.4 Million for the second phase to be considered as Vision funding.
Berkeley	21144: I-80 Gilman Street Interchange Improvements. We are quite surprised and disappointed that this project is not recommended for full funding. This is Berkeley’s highest priority project and is co-sponsored by ACTC. We think this ranking is probably an error. We suspect that the project’s value to bicycle, pedestrian, transit service and safety were not adequately recognized in the Performance Evaluation. We request a re-evaluation of the project’s performance, and a recommendation for full project funding.
Berkeley	240318: I-80 Ashby Interchange. This project is listed as a City of Emeryville project, but it was also submitted by the City of Berkeley. In addition to serving the most congested freeway corridor in Alameda County, this interchange has significant deficiencies for bicycle and pedestrian access to the Bay Trail and Berkeley’s Aquatic Park. We request a review of the needs and project benefits, and consideration of at least partial discretionary funding to enable a Project Study Report and Preliminary Engineering activity to proceed.
Berkeley	240226: Berkeley Ferry Terminal Access Improvements. We are unclear as to the origin of the \$106 million cost estimate, and are somewhat surprised by the recommendation to fully fund this project. The City of Berkeley provided a cost estimate of \$35M and requested just \$5M. While we support this project, we feel that a portion of these funds would be better spent on other priority projects in Berkeley. We request a review of the cost estimate and re-evaluation of the

	project elements.
Berkeley	240179: Downtown Berkeley Transit Center. We are pleased by the proposal to provide \$26.8M for the Downtown Berkeley Transit Center. (We note that the City submitted a cost estimate of \$24.3M, and would like to review the budget adjustments.) We would also like to review this proposal with ACTC, BART and AC Transit, particularly in light of our BART Plaza request (RTP #240217) which is not recommended for funding. We feel that the project goals for this and the BART Plaza and Transit Area project have considerable overlap.
Berkeley	230116: Railroad Crossing Improvements at Gilman. We are unclear as to the origin of the \$108.2 million Cost Estimate. The City of Berkeley provided a cost estimate of \$30.5M and requested just \$11M. While we obviously support this project, we feel that this project is highly dependent on the timeline and funding picture of the proposed rail expansion. In the near term, Berkeley feels that a portion of these funds should be programmed to other priority projects in Berkeley and the I-80 Gilman Interchange project in particular.
Berkeley	230171: Route 24/Caldecott Tunnel Enhancements – Settlement Agreement projects. The administrative draft recommends the full \$15M in funding for Project 193 (RTP 230171), which is the sister project in Oakland to Berkeley’s State Route 13/Ashby Avenue Corridor Improvements project. We would like further explanation as to why Oakland’s Project 193 is included in Program Subcategory 5D, while Berkeley’s State Route 13/Ashby Avenue Corridor Improvements is listed in Program Subcategory 5B.
Berkeley	On a regional level, we are uncomfortable with the recommendation to fund Project 240347 – Gap Closure and Development of Three Major Trails - at \$615.4M while providing no funding to Project 10: Countywide Bicycle Plan Implementation. While we support the gap closures and major trails, this strikes us as highly preferential to Class I trail construction, and fails to provide adequate funds for on-street Class II and III bicycle facility improvements. By not recommending any of the 1C Local Bike & Pedestrian Plan Implementation list, this 1 st draft also continues the preference for funding regional bicycle facilities over local bicycle and pedestrian plan implementation. Note that almost the entire 1C list could be funded with just half of the Project 240347 funds.
Berkeley	Regarding Attachment 5, it appears that Project 11 (RTP 240347) is listed three times, at \$114M for North County, \$115M for Central County, and \$214M for South County. It is unclear if this is an error, or if these are three separate projects. As noted above, this is an extraordinarily expensive investment, and we request a careful comparison of the cost-effectiveness of these projects against other bicycle/pedestrian projects.

*Already included in Administrative Draft CWTP program list